

Yield and value of the different fisheries in the year 1884.

Kind.	Quantity.	Value.
Salmon:		
Salted.....barrels..	5,630½	\$50,728 50
Fresh.....number..	173,056	51,916 80
Canned, cases 4 dozen 1-pound cans.....	141,242	776,881 00
Smoked.....pounds..	367,000	51,380 00
Sturgeon, fresh.....do..	352,900	17,645 00
Haddock, whiting, &c.....do..	240,700	9,028 00
Halibut.....do..	150,000	9,000 00
Herring and smelt:		
Fresh.....do..	34,550	1,727 50
Smoked.....do..		6,500 00
Fish assorted.....pounds..	58,400	3,504 00
Trout.....do..	76,050	5,323 50
Oolachans:		
Fresh.....do..	37,500	2,250 00
Salted.....do..	33,000	2,640 00
Smoked.....do..	28,000	2,800 00
Fur and hair seal skins.....		156,419 00
Oolahan oil.....gallons..	43	43 00
Black shark and dogfish oil, refined.....do..	45,000	24,800 00
Dogfish oil.....do..	10,000	3,500 00
Salmon oil.....do..	1,452	580 80
Clams, canned, cases 4 dozen 1-pound cans.....	300	1,800 00
Fish sold in markets, not including New Westminster.....		110,000 00
Fish cured for private consumption.....		8,000 00
Salmon and other fish: Estimated consumption by Chinese and other laborers on the Central Pacific Railway, not specially recorded.....		60,000 00
Eastern oysters imported and planted on beds.....barrels..	10	200 00
Native oysters.....barrels..	210	1,050 00
Total.....		1,358,267 10
Estimated consumption by Indian population as per previous computation:		
Salmon.....		4,375,000 00
Halibut.....		180,000 00
Sturgeon and other fish.....		250,000 00
Fish oils.....		80,000 00
		4,885,000 00
Grand total of approximate yield, 1884.....		6,243,267 10

Comparative statement of yield of the years 1883 and 1884, exclusive of Indian consumption:

Total, 1883.....	\$1,644,645 42
Total, 1884.....	1,358,267 10
Decrease 1884.....	286,378 32

143.—PETITION TO PROHIBIT THE SEINING OF BLUEFISH.

By FRED. W. DICKINSON.

[Letter to Prof. S. F. Baird.]

The firm in which I am partner (H. & J. Crosby & Co., Osterville, Mass.) and four hundred other petitioners from Cape Cod towns are soon to be granted a hearing by our legislative committee on fisheries on a petition to prohibit the seining of bluefish in the waters of Vineyard Sound controlled by the State of Massachusetts, between Wood's Holl and Chatham. Our reasons for asking the legislation are:

(1) In former years when bluefish were seldom taken except by hook and line or in weirs the fishermen had no difficulty in catching a full fare within a mile of shore, but within the past two years a great many

seiners have appeared and the fish have been driven farther and farther from the shoal water near shore, and during the latter part of the season of 1884 it was almost impossible to find a bluefish nearer shore than the Horseshoe—about 10 miles from shore. We understand that at least forty gangs of bluefish seiners are to fit out from Provincetown the coming season and as many more from other towns, and we feel that if seining is continued to be allowed on the shoal water the fish will soon be driven from their usual feeding-grounds, and no one, unless equipped with expensive gear, will be able to take them.

(2) The abolition of seining will be a great help to several hundreds of poor men on the south side of Cape Cod who depend almost entirely on what they make during the fishing season to support themselves and their families. None of them can get enough ahead to purchase sweep seines to compete with rich firms. This may appear a selfish reason, but in the little village of Osterville my firm paid to the fishermen \$3,100 for bluefish caught by hook and line during the season between May 25, 1884, and September 1, 1884, and it was all paid to poor men; the ones who had any capital shipped their own catch. Of course if large lots of bluefish were taken in nets it would lower the price to the consumer, but I think the "charity" better bestowed on the poor fishermen than on the proprietors of summer hotels and beach resorts, to whom fully one-half of the bluefish shipped to this market are sold.

BOSTON, MASS., *February 12, 1885.*

144.—INTRODUCTION OF CLAMS INTO DELAWARE BAY.

By C. R. MOORE.

[From letters to Prof. S. F. Baird.]

Originally there were no clams in the Delaware Bay. Thomas Beesley, at Beesley's Point, N. J., was my informant, and it must be about thirty years since he told me. He said that many years ago the early settlers on the bay side of New Jersey, finding no clams there, combined and purchased 50,000 on the sea side and carted them over to the bay and laid them out fronting their farms on the bay. They have ever since had enough for their own use. It is the quahog. Thomas Beesley was so reliable and so careful in stating everything that I placed implicit reliance on anything that he told me. If I had brought this matter to your notice ten or fifteen years ago, I could probably have got all the information needed, but the old people that I used to know all through Cape May County are dead. I believe that the soft clam, or maninose, as it is called here, is found in only one spot on the sea side, while it is plentiful on the bay side. In New Jersey they are abundant on the sea side.

BIRD'S NEST, NORTHAMPTON COUNTY, VA., *January 2, 1885.*