

*By Mr. Neill:*

Q. The least favourably situated ones will close down; those who are least favourably situated for putting up salmon cheaply will be the first to close down?—A. Yes; practically the whole Fraser river is closed down.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. Would they not have to close down because they could not get the salmon to pack, or is there another reason?—A. There are not the salmon to pack. I have here the sockeye packs on the Fraser river since 1903.

Q. We have all the figures; but that is your idea, that the reason the present canneries do not pay, and are losing money, is because there are not sufficient fish there to supply the different canneries with the fish?—A. That is it.

Q. Well, it is pretty hard to prevent the department from giving licenses to those who wish to engage in fishing. What would you say about, in order to conserve the fish supply, having a close season of one, two, or five years, and grant no licenses to anybody, allow nobody to catch fish or can fish?—A. I have urged most strenuously on many occasions that absolute closing of the Fraser river for a term of years. I was coming to that; that is one of the main recommendations that I would like to make to this Committee.

*By Mr. McQuarrie:*

Q. Would you do that before having any arrangement with the Americans?—A. Well, that is a moot question. I think it might come all right for you gentlemen to give the Americans an example of the proper way of dealing with that.

Mr. McQUARRIE: We would be helping the Americans.

The WITNESS: Yes. The question of the rehabilitation of the Fraser river seems to me to be absolutely on all fours with the sealing question. The sealing question was settled on a basis of the division of the results between the Canadian interests and the Americans, in which the Americans got the lion's share and the Canadians got the rest. The Americans, I understand, do not quite see eye to eye with the British Columbians with regard to the proportion of catch that they should get on Puget sound as compared with the Fraser river, but it is surely the business of men of any intelligence to get together and try to do something for the rehabilitation of the industry, because it would have been better for all concerned if it had been as it was in 1905, when it produced 837,000 cases; the output would have been worth something like fifteen million on the Fraser river alone, and in place of that thirty-four thousand cases of sockeye was all the sockeye that they got.

*By Mr. Putnam:*

Q. Have experts given any estimate of how many years it would take to bring the Fraser river back, how many close years to bring it back to normal?—A. Yes, I think so.

Q. How many?—A. I think eight years is looked upon as more or less the minimum.

Q. Would it require anything like that long? Would it require so long as that?—A. My opinion is that it would; it would require eight years. The fish propagate in cycles on the Fraser river of four years, and I think it would take two cycles before the industry could be properly rehabilitated.

Mr. STORK: Is it your opinion that it would then come back to the healthy days?

Mr. IRVING: That is very hard to say.

Mr. STORK: I do not see why it should not.

Mr. McQUARRIE: If the Americans keep on taking the fish there would be no improvement at all.