Commission of Inquiry into the Decline of Sockeye Salmon in the Fraser River



Commission d'enquête sur le déclin des populations de saumon rouge du fleuve Fraser

Hearing for Standing

Audience relative au statut de partie intéressée

Commissioner

L'Honorable juge /
The Honourable Justice
Bruce Cohen

Commaissaire

Held at: Tenue à :

Room 801 Salle 801
Federal Courthouse Cour fédérale
701 West Georgia Street 701, rue West Georgia
Vancouver, B.C. Vancouver (C.-B.)

Tuesday, March 23, 2010 le mardi 23 mars 2010

APPEARANCES / COMPARUTIONS

Mr. Brian J. Wallace Senior Commission Counsel
Mr. Brock Martland Associate Commission Counsel
Ms. Kathy Grant Junior Commission Counsel

Mr. Irvin Figg Fraser United Fishermen and Allied Mr. Paul Kandt Workers' Union

Mr. Keith Oliver Mr. James Walkus Chief Harold Sewid

Mr. Jack Emberly

TABLE OF CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

	PAGE
Opening Remarks / Observations préliminaires Presentation by Mr. Ivrin Figg and Mr. Paul Kandt Présentation par M. Irvin Figg et M. Paul Kandt	1
Presentation on behalf of Mr. James Walkus and Chief Harold Sewid Présentation au nom de M. James Walkus et le Chef Harold Sewid	10
Presentation by Mr. Jack Emberly Présentation par M. Jack Emberly	18

1 2 3 4 THE REGISTRAR: Order. The Cohen Commission of Inquiry 5 is now open to hear applications for standing. 6 Commissioner Cohen is presiding. 7 Mr. Wallace. THE COMMISSIONER: 8 MR. WALLACE: I am Brian Wallace and I am Senior Commission 9 10 Counsel, for the record. 11 12 established by the invitation of Commission 13 14 15 Those who Commission counsel invited today are 16 17 18 issues within your terms of reference. 19 20 21 this morning. 22 23 24 of what your terms of reference are for this 25 inquiry. 26 27 They're posted on our website, and just in 28 slightly summarized form they are: 29 30 - to review and assess previous 31 32 33 reports 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 considered include monitoring, counting of 43 stocks, forecasting and enforcement 44 45 The third head, Mr. Commissioner, of your

terms of reference are:

46 47

Vancouver, B.C. / Vancouver (C.-B.) March 23, 2010 / le 23 mars 2010 Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Commissioner. Bonjour. Mr. Commissioner, this morning's hearing is counsel to a number of applicants who have applied for standing before this Commission of Inquiry. those that we thought should have the opportunity to provide you with more information on the nature of their direct and substantial interest in the I'd like to thank those who have attended I wonder if I might just take a moment, Mr. Commissioner, to remind everyone just very briefly They're set out in an order-in-council. investigations, inquiries and reports and the Government's responses to those - to consider DFO policies and practices with respect to sockeye salmon fishing in the Fraser River, including scientific advice, fisheries policies and programs, risk management strategies, departmental resource allocation and fisheries management practices and procedures, and those practices and procedures to be

- to investigate and make independent findings of fact regarding the causes of the decline of Fraser River sockeye salmon including the impact of environmental changes along the Fraser River, marine environmental conditions, aquaculture, predators, diseases, water temperature, and other factors that may have affected the ability of sockeye salmon to reach their traditional spawning grounds or to reach the ocean, and to make findings of fact regarding the current state of the Fraser River sockeye salmon stocks and the long term projections for those stocks

And finally:

- to develop recommendations for improving the future of sustainability of the sockeye salmon fishery in the Fraser River, including, as required, any changes to the policies, practices and procedures of the DFO in relation to the management of the Fraser River sockeye salmon fishery.

Mr. Commissioner, the purpose of this hearing is to provide you with further submissions to assist you in determining to whom you should grant standing before this Inquiry and on what basis.

Some applicants have also applied to you for a recommendation to the Government of Canada for funding for legal representation before the Commission. This hearing is not for the purpose of making submissions on funding. Rather, I understand that if you believe you should learn more about an applicant's financial circumstances to support an application for a funding recommendation, you will invite those applicants to appear before you individually.

With those brief opening remarks, Mr. Commissioner, I have asked two of my colleagues, Mr. Brock Martland and Ms. Kathy Grant, to conduct as Commission counsel the hearing this morning. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Brock Martland. Thank you. MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner, and for the record,

Opening Remarks / Observations préliminaires Presentation by Mr. Figg and Mr. Kandt / Présentation par M. Figg et M. Kandt

Brock Martland, M-A-R-T-L-A-N-D. I am one of the associate Commission counsel for this matter. With me is Kathy, with a K, Grant, who is junior Commission counsel. What I propose to do, Mr. Commissioner, is simply to try to assist the process today by introducing the three applicants or groups that are before you for this appearance. We've allocated roughly twenty minutes' time per applicant, and I'll keep an eye on the clock if that's a concern. I don't expect frankly that it will be.

By way of overview, there are three appearing before you. First, the United Fishermen and Allied Workers' Union with its president, Irvin Figg, and Paul Kandt are present here today to my immediate left. They'll be addressing you first.

Following that, Keith Oliver, who is counsel, who is next along the line, if you will, counsel for James Walkus and Chief Harold Sewid. I may be mispronouncing the chief's last name. If so, I apologize. He'll be addressing you next.

And following that, Jack Emberly is present and will be addressing you. He is described in his application as a non-aligned citizen.

So with that I'll simply invite Mr. Figg and Mr. Kandt to address you, please.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR. FIGG: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning.

PRESENTATION BY MR. IRVIN FIGG AND MR. PAUL KANDT / PRÉSENTATION PAR M. IRVIN FIGG ET M. PAUL KANDT

MR. FIGG: I'm Irvin Figg. As you know, I'm president of the United Fishermen and Allied Workers' Union, which is a local of the Canadian Auto Workers.

Thirty-three years ago I came out to this coast and got a job as a carpenter at what was then the largest salmon cannery in North America. I started in the beginning of August, peak Fraser River sockeye season. It was a village of over 1,200 people on two shifts for six weeks without a day off, totally something that I'd never seen before. People there came to work in a fish plant and spent their lives, got married, raised their families, bought a house -- a really good job. Fishermen did well. It was a wonderful place to

Presentation by Mr. Figg and Mr. Kandt / Présentation par M. Figg et M. Kandt

work.

And in a relatively short period of time, it appears that we've come down to this. Not that many fishermen are still fishing, still in that fleet. The processing business has basically consolidated over and over again, restructured so many times we can't keep count. People who used to make a living off of salmon in this province can't do it any more. I see people in the three processing plants that we represent and the one cold storage -- Fraser River sockeye used to be the number one driver for their incomes in a year. Now it's just barely a memory.

Most members that we have left, you know, are kind of, well, like me, older, been around for quite some time, still hanging in there. remember the good times. We want to be in this They all want to be in this industry. industry. But they've all had to change. They've suffered pretty severe financial consequences over the last fifteen years in particular. People have left the business in droves. Those of us left, though, they've done their best to make their lives and have totally changed their lives, but kept their interest in the fishing industry, which primarily in the salmon companies and fleets used to always have Fraser River sockeye as a primary driver in every year.

But now it's not that way. However, when there's an opening we go fishing. And when there's fish in the plant, we go to work. So we hang on.

And do we have an interest in this? I'd have to say that my most direct interest is in particular, over the last twelve to fifteen years, our members in all three sections of our membership have asked the leadership of the union a myriad number of questions. We in turn have asked those questions, tried to find answers, and frankly we've met with very little success. And I can't tell you how pleased we are that this process is now in place and it's getting under way, and we hope to fully participate in this.

I'd like to turn this over to my colleague, who is a long-time union member and activist, former member of our general executive board, and still one of those guys that is a Fraser River

Presentation by Mr. Figg and Mr. Kandt / Présentation par M. Figg et M. Kandt

gillnetter, Paul Kandt.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, sir.

MR. KANDT: Mr. Commissioner, my name is Paul Kandt.

I'm a third generation commercial fisherman and proud to be it. I followed my father, who followed my grandfather into the business. I had a cousin who was lost at sea and an uncle who's retired in the business. I guess I'm the last of our generation and I'm hoping I'm not the only one that'll continue in my family in the business, but it's looking very grim.

I think I wanted to come up here and embellish on our written submission, primarily probably point number two, where we talk about the union and its long-standing committee, the Fraser River District Council, which I've been a member of since I began fishing in 1979 and my father was before me. We've always had a real concern over Fraser River and primarily sockeye, which is the mainstay of our industry.

We've had people that have participated from our Fraser River District Council and our locals that have been on the Salmon Commission as panel members. Edgar Birch, who's left us, deceased now, was one of our primary fellows that would keep us in tune and back and forth. We were always concerned about where the stocks were and openings and what our future was and treaty negotiations et cetera. We've had Russ Nugent as well, and Terry Lubzinski, still alive. We've got these people within our organization that -- I'm only one of the people that want to be represented in these hearings and participate and bring our input.

We have important information, our logbooks. We have fishermen that fished all the way from the North Island all the way through the Johnstone Straits, and great knowledge from Canoe Pass right to the Mission Bridge. We have members that have fished every opening and every chance they get, logbooks, historic knowledge, personal knowledge, and they've always been involved in the fishery, not just because it's a livelihood but a real concern for the future of the industry and the future of the stocks. And we've always taken every opportunity as members to participate in any reviews of the industry and of the stocks, and we

2.8

Presentation by Mr. Figg and Mr. Kandt / Présentation par M. Figg et M. Kandt

want to be part of that continuing trend.

We have the local knowledge, like I've referred to. We've fought for the right to do that and we want to be part of that again. We see many issues. We've even seen things -- over thirty years ago we sent a team to Norway of our membership to see what was going on with fish farms there. So we feel that we've always been ahead of what we think are problems. We bring to light issues such as the Moran Dam and the Kemano Completion Project. We've had members involved in trips to spawning grounds: Rivers Inlet, Chilko, Horsefly, Adams River surveys. We've analyzed them in our own annual conventions.

And we feel that we've -- you know, we're part of the community. Our community is directly involved by the health of the resource and our livelihoods. And there's less and less of us all the time, but we do have a genuine concern and we do have historical knowledge that may not be able to come from other sources, and we think that we could be a participant to this and add a different view that may be not shown in written documents and other places. And we may have alternate views that could help the Commission in reaching a conclusion and finding solutions perhaps to where the problems lie. And we feel that we're probably one of the groups that are the most directly affected.

I guess we kind of want to know what would be your expectations of us to be part of the participation of this Commission.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, sir. I wonder if you'd be kind enough just to remain there, and counsel may have some questions for you. And if you'd be gracious enough to be patient with us --

MR. KANDT: Sure.

THE COMMISSIONER: -- and answer those questions, we would appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner, I do have some questions. And I know that if this were an ordinary courtroom or the House of Commons, my questions would go through you. If it's agreeable, I may simply pose them and invite Mr. Kandt or Mr. Figg to try to address those through you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, of course.

Presentation by Mr. Figg and Mr. Kandt / Présentation par M. Figg et M. Kandt

- MR. MARTLAND: First, I really appreciate the submissions that have been made today and they're helpful. If I might pick up, Mr. Kandt, one of the points that you made is really that you feel that the union has different views and perhaps views that aren't reflected in the sort of ordinary stream of documents and reports and so forth. Is that something you might be able to expand on as to how the union's perspectives and views are different?
- MR. KANDT: I think that we -- you know, we have annual conventions and we have meetings and we talk amongst ourselves and we -- I mean, one of the things that we were thinking of how we would react to this is we'd hold meetings within our membership to find out if we -- we'd take questions back to our membership and get views of our members. I mean, not just have one person up here talking but to go back to the membership and come up with what the membership knowledge is and go more globally than one person expressing it. So it's trying to represent many of us and better views. Maybe Irv can --
- MR. FIGG: If I may, the one thing about us is we represent people in all three gear types in the salmon, okay? And within a union, we represent fishermen, shore workers and packing crews, right? And there's not a year goes by that there are not competing interests from all of these groups, and we have a long history of banging each other's heads together, right?, before season, to get all of this sorted out, which I think gives us a unique perspective on the resource.

Our fishermen choose to join the union, right? Nobody forces them. They don't have a deduction made if they don't want to, you know. They choose. And my experience as just a shore worker -- I'm not a fisherman. My experience is, though, these guys, our membership, do it out of far more different reasons than just making a buck and the economics of the fishery.

MR. MARTLAND: Can I equally pick up on the point about the logbooks. I'd be quite curious to learn a little bit more about the logbooks and how it is that that would be helpful, what might be involved in actually collecting them. I don't know if that's a really onerous type of task.

2.8

Presentation by Mr. Figg and Mr. Kandt / Présentation par M. Figg et M. Kandt

- MR. KANDT: It would probably be onerous, but we could collectively come up with -- you know, people keep track of the timing of runs, although there is -- you know, the Salmon Commission does have their own timing. But we do, you know -- our members do track this in their own records and say, you know, four years ago over the cycles when we did have fisheries and why we did have fisheries and what the results of the fisheries were in different areas.
- MR. MARTLAND: I wonder if you can indicate to what extent the union would typically take a position on an issue, whether that would be to pick up on some of the comments the fish farms or something like that. And is that something the union does on occasion or regularly is to say, this is our position on a particular issue that affects the fishery?
- MR. FIGG: Yeah. We're like any trade union. We have conventions, right?, and resolutions are put before the convention, and the convention decides after debate on what position to take on issues such as you've just spoken to, salmon aquaculture in the province. Those positions are all voted in the general executive board and the officers are all instructed to follow those positions.
- MR. MARTLAND: I know I'm peppering you with questions. I think this may be my very last one. One of the questions for my part as I've been looking through different applications just to try and understand how the union's perspective and how the union's role in our process might be similar to or different from, for example, different commercial fishers' groups.
- MR. FIGG: I think I've kind of said before, we -- you know, you may see applications that -- I'm not sure who everybody is that's applied, you know, but it's only logical that in the area groupings, you know, you're looking at D-E-G, H-E, right?, and they may put in their perspectives. But some of those people will only be licensed in that area and that's the only place they fished since 1996 when the coast was divided up. Okay? We do have a significant number of members who are multilicensed for different areas and we have members in all three of those areas, who will end up in our process for this round of hearings -- in our

Presentation by Mr. Figg and Mr. Kandt / Présentation par M. Figg et M. Kandt

process they're going to end up sitting in the same room together, right?, you know. And we will be talking to all of them to get together a coherent presentation for this Commission on what we believe are some of the prime factors in the decline of the Fraser River sockeye.

That's where I think we have an advantage, is that, you know, we cut through that chaff before it hits the microphone.

- MR. MARTLAND: And I said that was my last question.

 I've misled you because I thought of one more as you answered, which is this. Hypothetically, what would be the union's attitude towards or perspective on working alongside some of those commercial fishers' groups, perhaps in a coalition or perhaps with a single grant of standing with others? Is that something that strikes you as viable or unrealistic or somewhere in between?
- MR. FIGG: I'd have to say somewhere in between, but more to the side of definitely not our preference, as I've described to you. When we come up with our position on anything which we may come up with at this hearing, we are already doing the debating, right?, and the compromising and whatever is involved within our own group, to come out with something solid. And I just feel that if we end up being pushed into another area group or even perhaps a company group or whatever, that is going to limit our ability as leaders of the union to answer all those questions that I've been telling you about that we've been listening to for the last twelve years that we don't really have any answers for, because you know, then we'd have to go to another step after dealing with our people to deal with whoever we're with, and I don't believe we'll necessarily get what our membership deserves from us out of this hearing.
- MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner, I don't think I have any further questions from my part. I don't know if other counsel may or if you may.
- THE COMMISSIONER: No, I don't. I want to thank the two representatives who spoke here this morning, Mr. Figg and Mr. Brandt. Thank you very much for attending this morning. It is our hope and desire that you will hear from us before Friday as to our decision on standing with respect to your application. I thank you both again for taking

Presentation on behalf of Mr. Walkus and Chief Sewid / Présentation au nom de M. Walkus et du Chef Sewid

the time to be here this morning. 1 2 MR. FIGG: You're welcome. 3 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. 4 MR. MARTLAND: I'm doing this, I appreciate, backwards, 5 Mr. Commissioner, but I forgot to give you the 6 proper spelling of those two gentlemen's names, 7 just for the record, and perhaps I'll do that. THE COMMISSIONER: 8 Yes, that would be kind of you. 9 Thank you. 10 MR. MARTLAND: Thank you. And certainly if I get 11 anything wrong, I'll invite either gentleman to 12 correct me. Irvin Figg, I-R-V-I-N, Figg, F-I-G-G. 13 And secondly, Paul Kandt, Paul, ordinary spelling, 14 Kandt, K-A-N-D-T. 15 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Figg and 16 Mr. Kandt. 17 MR. MARTLAND: The next applicant before you is Keith 18 Oliver. I don't need to spell those two names. 19 Thank you. 20 THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning, Mr. Oliver. 2.1 22 PRESENTATION ON BEHALF OF JAMES WALKUS AND CHIEF HAROLD 23 SEWID / PRÉSENTATION AU NOM DE JAMES WALKUS ET DU CHEF 2.4 HAROLD SEWID 25 26 MR. OLIVER: Mr. Commissioner, I am appearing for Chief 27 Harold Sewid and James Walkus. Those are two 2.8 First Nations individuals who also happen to be 29 commercial fishermen. 30 They come from different bands. Mr. Walkus 31 is located in Port Hardy where his band resides, and that band has a number of reserve affiliations 32 33 throughout the Queen Charlotte Strait area. 34 Chief Harold Sewid is in Campbell River. 35 he's the chief he's at the band offices there. 36 But that band is responsible for a number of 37 reserve areas also in the Queen Charlotte Strait area but southeast of the area that Mr. Walkus is 38 39 concerned with. 40 Now, I have downloaded a Google map, so it's 41 not very detailed, which I'll pass up. 42 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. 43 MR. OLIVER: That map, Mr. Commissioner, shows four 44 circles in pen on it. The furthest up is around 45 Port Hardy, where Mr. Walkus is located. But as I

mentioned, his band area includes most of the

portion of Queen Charlotte Strait that is north of

45

46

47

Presentation on behalf of Mr. Walkus and Chief Sewid / Présentation au nom de M. Walkus et du Chef Sewid

that and along the mainland shore as far up as 1 Cape Caution. Now, I don't know, Mr. 3 Commissioner, what your own personal knowledge is 4 of the geography up there so I will assume there 5 is none. You can perhaps instruct me if you have 6 any detailed personal geographical knowledge. 7 THE COMMISSIONER: I've certainly visited Port Hardy 8 and that part of the province and Campbell River. 9 But if you're addressing the Charlottes or other 10 areas, you may want to fill me in on that. 11 MR. OLIVER: All right. Do you know where Cape Caution 12 is? 13 THE COMMISSIONER: I do. 14 MR. OLIVER: All right. So from Cape Caution southeast 15 along the mainland shore, down into the area that's broken up amongst the islands of the 16 17 Broughton Archipelago, is the area where Mr. 18 Walkus's band is most concerned. And continuously 19 from where his band leaves off down through the 20 balance of the Broughton Archipelago to the 21 Vancouver Island shore, below where you see I've 22 put a circle around two spots. One is, the one on 23 the left, Alert Bay, and the one on the right is Village Island. On Village Island is a reserve 24 25 called Mahmalillikullah, and that is the name of 26 the band that Chief Walkus is in charge of. 27 band officers are down in Campbell River. That's 28 the fourth and final spot on the map that I've 29 circled. 30 Now, as commercial fishermen, these two 31 individuals of course don't stay in their home 32 waters all the time. 33 THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry. Just for clarification, 34 Mr. Walkus, his band office is where? 35 MR. OLIVER: Port Hardy. 36 THE COMMISSIONER: In Port Hardy itself? And Chief 37 Sewid's office is in Campbell River? 38 MR. OLIVER: That's correct. Now, as commercial 39 fishermen -- principally I'll address the 40 information provided to me by Chief Sewid. He was 41 born and grew up in the Mahmalillikullah and Alert 42 Bay areas and he commenced commercial fishing, he 43 proudly tells me, at the age of nine weeks when he

was taken aboard a boat captained by his father.

since time immemorial -- as Chief Sewid puts it,

have depended upon the sockeye salmon fishery

Both of these individuals as First Nations

 Presentation on behalf of Mr. Walkus and Chief Sewid / Présentation au nom de M. Walkus et du Chef Sewid

since the beginning of time. And as, Mr. Commissioner, you might recognize the archaeological history that we've been able to assemble for the time that the First Nations have been in this area goes back a long, long ways. It goes back before any recorded history in Europe. It certainly goes back before any Europeans ever came to North America. And as Chief Sewid indicates, it goes back to the beginning of time in the sense of the First Nations own timekeeping.

Now, as the geography dictates, most of the livelihood of the bands that are scattered along that part of the coast was derived from the sea. The sockeye salmon were an extremely important part of that.

What Chief Sewid tells me is that the oral history is very important. The oral history has been passed down through many generations, and he talks to me about such things as learning to fish from his great-uncle, who taught his father as well, that his great-grandfather was the first of the First Nations fishermen to obtain a commercial fishing licence. Those were hoarded by the non-First Nations people under the government of the day until something just under a hundred years ago when they decided to allow First Nations to possess commercial fishing licences, and his great-grandfather was the very first one of those. He had a boat, approximately a 40-footer, which was considered large, very large at the time, with which he fished until he was done fishing. boat stayed in the fleet until, Chief Sewid tells me, approximately 1980.

That was crewed by mostly family members. Apparently the great-grandfather had a lot of sons, and of those, they were all fishermen and would have crewed for him.

Chief Sewid himself worked on fish boats from when he was nine years old in the summers. He would be in school in the portions of the year that the boats were out fishing for other things, but in the summers he would be there for the sockeye fishery. From the age of nine, he was a crew. From the age of nineteen, he was the captain of his own boat. And he continues to be in that fishing industry although, when asked about recent years, he has a very grim tale to

Presentation on behalf of Mr. Walkus and Chief Sewid / Présentation au nom de M. Walkus et du Chef Sewid

tell of the amount of fishing that is done generally speaking. He does say that 2005 was a remarkable year. He talks about other remarkable years. He said it was big in 1998, it was big in 1978, but he doesn't know of a year in his lifetime of fishing when it was as big as 2005.

He talks about listening to a woman he calls his grandmother, but he says in fact she is a great-aunt or a great-great-aunt, who, although uneducated, was able to pass on the predictability of watching the signs, and she would advise the First Nations fishermen which years were going to be a decent year. It's worth fixing up your nets and going out and catching the fish.

After many years of doing that, Chief Sewid asked her what it was that she relied upon to be able to come up with predictions that were generally more accurate than the predictions that came out of DFO. And it was the signs that were read by her, and presumably she relied on what other First Nations people who were reading signs would tell her, but those signs included such things as looking at certain mountains from certain vantage points, and if those mountains had snow at the end of May, then they knew there would be enough of a snow pack that the temperature of the water in the Queen Charlotte Strait area would be low enough to invite the sockeye salmon in rather than too warm, in which event they apparently choose Juan de Fuca Strait and the return down Queen Charlotte Strait is minimal.

Chief Sewid also has insight into some of the reasons why the fishery seems to have collapsed. Four years after the biggest year ever, 2005, was the collapse that spawned this Commission. Chief Sewid says he has had conversations with other chiefs and notes that chiefs up the Fraser River on its tributaries where there are spawning grounds have told him of no fish returning in 2005, despite that being the biggest year ever in the areas where Chief Sewid was concerned.

And he has tried to understand why that might be, and he has his theories. And his theories are not necessarily the same as the theories that you might hear from other groups. One of the things that he told me was part of his theory is that the sockeye are susceptible to certain viruses when

Presentation on behalf of Mr. Walkus and Chief Sewid / Présentation au nom de M. Walkus et du Chef Sewid

they have to coexist in close proximity to one another in warm waters, and that had the Department of Fisheries allowed a smaller escapement into the Fraser River in 2005, then there wouldn't have been such high concentrations of fish in close quarters in warm waters and more would have survived to reach the spawning grounds.

He has a number of insights that will no doubt be different from the insights that you will hear from other groups that may present before you. All of his insights and those of the other First Nations commercial fishermen that may choose to come along with him are insights that this Commission must go out of its way to hear. This Commission must have representation from all of the diverse groups that have significant insights into the behaviour of the salmon and upon which we can rely for the Commission to come up with some proper recommendations.

The substantial and direct interest of the First Nations commercial fishermen extends to their food fishery. The food fishery before the First Nations people got into commercial fishing was done by band members generally. Since there have been commercial fishermen as part of the bands, the food fishery has become something that they do for the rest of the band.

For example, chief Sewid advised me that in 2005, he put in 100,000 pounds of sockeye in the commercial fishery and then went out for a week and a half after the commercial fishery was over to put in food fishery. He doesn't tell me exactly how many pounds, but he does say he had 11,000 sockeye that he distributed to, firstly, his own band, families that are in his extended family, and then to others from all over Vancouver He had people coming to him from bands Island. located in Sooke at the south end all the way up to Port Hardy at the north end, notably from Chemainus, Duncan, Nanaimo, and that distribution of 11,000 sockeye in 2005, up to 600 per family and as few as 50 per family, until the fish are all gone.

Now, more recently, he says, in 2007 there wasn't very much food fish. In 2008 there was none. In 2009 there was a little. He says he went out in 2009 and he brought in -- I'm just

 Presentation on behalf of Mr. Walkus and Chief Sewid / Présentation au nom de M. Walkus et du Chef Sewid

looking for the exact number here. He said it was only about a hundred fish. And he had to run for eight hours to get to the Robson Bight from Campbell River in order to find even those few fish. He said normally there would have been three of his family's boats out on the food fishery, but when there's no fish, there is no point in them each spending \$2,500 or so on fuel to get to where the fish might be. So that fell to just him. And there was so little food fish it would seem that it wasn't money well spent just on the fuel to get to the grounds.

Chief Sewid and any of the other band members that he brings along will be able to give you insight into the cost to them of the severe dropoff in the availability of the sockeye salmon.

He says that last year he distributed all of those food fish that he did catch, up to twentyfive per family. Yes, I found my number. It was just a few hundred, he told me.

He tells me that in Alert Bay there used to be over a hundred seiners working in the commercial fishery and operated and crewed, not exclusively but almost exclusively, by First Nations people.

He identified for me the names of some of his boats. And I'll digress. Back in 1967, I went commercial fishing myself, and a friend of mine worked on a boat called the Sleep Robber. Sewid says that was his father's boat. On boats like that, that would be a wooden 72-foot seiner, they had a crew of five. The crew would be composed all of family members unless they had a particular spot they could not fill with a family member, and that occurred with some frequency. These boats were generally owned and operated by B.C. Packers, and B.C. Packers would provide the engineer. And he advised me that on his boats he frequently had an engineer who was a close friend of some of the other crew members or of himself. He remembers one year having a Russian, one year having someone from Newfoundland, and my own friend's father was a Swede. He was aboard the Sleep Robber.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Oliver, I don't want to necessarily interrupt. I do want to leave some time for counsel who might have questions for you.

Presentation on behalf of Mr. Walkus and Chief Sewid / Présentation au nom de M. Walkus et du Chef Sewid

So thank you.

MR. OLIVER: All right. I'll try and be brief. I'm actually probably quite near the end of my notes here in any event.

What I wish to impress upon you, Mr. Commissioner, is that this application for standing comes from two people who do have a very direct and very substantial interest in the subject matter of this Commission. They, their families and their ancestors have depended upon this fishery for generations. They have that oral history. They can bring their own special insights to the Commission so that the Commission is made more aware of all of the things that no one else will tell the Commission.

They have their cultural, spiritual and economic relationship with this Fraser River salmon. The economics, of course, are changing drastically. They will be able to advise you of how they think those changes in the economics ought to be managed, that if it's necessary to reduce the size of the fleet, they have their opinions on how that can be accomplished. They are most anxious to ensure that you have as complete a picture as is possible of the different views that are out there so that you can come to proper conclusions.

And it's my submission that they meet your criteria for standing and ought to be granted that standing.

I thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Oliver. And again, if you'd be kind enough just to remain so counsel may have some questions.

MR. OLIVER: Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.

- MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Oliver, I do have a handful of questions. One of them is just to confirm that I understand it correctly, that your two clients are seeking standing as individuals, and I'm wondering if you can enlighten us on why they've sought standing as individuals as opposed to through either their nations or some other way.
- MR. OLIVER: Well, as I've indicated, they are aware that there are other views out there. And I think principally they are aware that the other views out there do not always coincide with their own,

Presentation on behalf of Mr. Walkus and Chief Sewid / Présentation au nom de M. Walkus et du Chef Sewid

and they do not wish to have to come to a meeting of a great number of others who don't share their views and see their views lost when that meeting presents its own presentation to the Commission.

- MR. MARTLAND: Just to pick up, then, on that, is there a way for the Commission, then, to be confident that their views are representative of more than simply two individuals' perspectives or experiences and that that's more representative for a broader type of perspective?
- MR. OLIVER: At this stage, I don't think there is any evidence that I can bring to the Commission to give you that assurance, but once standing is granted, then these two individuals will be able to bring others of like mind to the hearings and have their evidence presented. That's what we plan to do. At this point it's difficult to motivate individuals. It's somewhat easier to motivate groups that have already collected themselves together. But individuals are faced with the enormity of the Commission process and it's remarkable that these two have taken the steps that they have and come this far.

There are quite a number of other individuals out there, so I'm advised, who do not wish to affiliate themselves as yet with anybody. And yet, both of my clients have indicated that their views are not unique to themselves, although they may differ in some very serious respects from the views that may be put forward by groups that purport to represent the Native bands.

- MR. MARTLAND: Are there examples of where your two clients may have a perspective or a viewpoint that's different, whether from particular nations or whether from commercial fishers' groups? I appreciate you've made that point, that their interests and their viewpoint may be significantly different. Are there some examples you can give us of that?
- MR. OLIVER: Well, I've given you the example of what Chief Sewid has advised me as to the failure of fish to return to spawning areas in 2005, as he's advised by a couple of upcountry chiefs. And he knows that what flows from that is a theory of survival of the salmon that is not shared by other groups, by the DFO, by other groups that he's aware of having stated their positions. At this

2.8

Presentation by Mr. Emberly / Présentation par M. Emberly

stage, however, we're a bit early to know all of the various nuances of where their views might differ from everybody else's.

In his experience, he has advised that he knows that he has a longer history than most and is able to rely on that longer history and that the conclusions he draws from it are not always shared by all of the other Natives that he associates with in his role as a chief.

- MR. MARTLAND: Would Chief Sewid be willing to testify as a witness?
- MR. OLIVER: Oh, yes. He plans to.
- MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner, I don't have any further questions for my part. Thank you.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Oliver, I thank you, sir, and I would like you to express our appreciation to your clients for their interest in our Commission and for having you appear here today.
- MR. OLIVER: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. I will do that.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you so much, sir.
- MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner, the last applicant who's speaking this morning is Jack Emberly, E-M-B-E-R-L-Y.

THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning, sir.

PRESENTATION BY MR. JACK EMBERLY / PRÉSENTATION PAR M. JACK EMBERLY

MR. EMBERLY: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner. Thank you for hearing me today.

As Mr. Martland said, I am an unaligned private citizen. I grew up in North Vancouver and as a kid took a stick and a piece of line and caught fish about 500 yards from where I lived, and if I was lucky enough to go down to the salt shock, I could catch salmon too.

Salmon are an integral part of who I am as an individual. I am also an avid outdoorsman, canoer and kayaker, and last May I discovered a huge fish kill in the North Alouette River in Pitt Meadows.

My submission is based on the premise that the survival of Fraser River salmonids is in part dependent upon the collaborative efforts of the public, Environment Canada and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, the two agencies mandated to protect the streams and tributaries of the Fraser,

Presentation by Mr. Emberly / Présentation par M. Emberly

and that this should be the goal of all participants. The better we function as partners, the greater our chance of reducing fish mortality or minimizing fish habitat disturbance or destruction. I believe the public partner is being short-changed.

I make this submission today almost one full year after reporting a massive fish kill, frysized fish, on the North Alouette River on May 25th, 2009, File DGIR948, samples of which experts in the area of salmonid enhancement in Pitt Meadows/Maple Ridge have observed and declared were salmon. I note that just prior to my discovery of those 100,000 or so dead fish in the North Alouette River, Allco Fish Hatchery, located just above the kill area, released 200,000 chum fry and 150,000 chinook -- Alouette River Management Society data, Maple Ridge, April 27 to 29.

I believe a large portion of that population may have perished by a cause that neither the DFO or EC has yet identified, but might have with a quicker and more effective response, and that this failure leaves the efforts of this hatchery to return a healthy salmonid population to the North Alouette in jeopardy. Furthermore, that the noble efforts and the dedication of the Alouette River Management Society, currency of another fashion, and the contribution of other volunteers who have selfishly dedicated themselves to fish and habitat in this area, may be in vain.

Is the Alouette watershed the only area in B.C. where this scenario might play out? I make this submission after being frustrated and disappointed at the response of both agencies mentioned above. Try as I might, I was not able to get either to show any passion similar to that that I've heard this morning already of the public partners I have mentioned, to begin a timely and effective investigation process even after being implored to do so on several occasions, or to show any desire, DFO or EC, to go beyond, quote/unquote, inspection of the fish kill site, not even to take the fish I had collected for them for analysis. It just didn't seem important to them.

The efforts of the EC, for example, were also

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31 32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

Presentation by Mr. Emberly / Présentation par M. Emberly

fruitless from the start. The officer who reluctantly agreed to visit the kill site did so only after a lot of encouragement. When she did come out on May 26th, she arrived without any preparation for an investigation. No boat, no hip waders, no net. I know this because I asked. was pouring rain that morning. You can't see the edge of the water by walking the dyke and you would not see fish unless you were close to the The officer reported seeing perhaps two dead fish. When she reported this to me on the morning of the 26th when she finished her inspection by cell phone, I was dumbfounded. asked her to come back when it was not raining. My request was refused.

Did EC senior staff think to order a second, more prepared visit when it was not raining? They did not. It wasn't important.

By the way, I returned later that day with a butterfly net from the dollar store. It wasn't raining. I had hip waders. The fish were still there. I collected about a hundred and froze them within about a half hour.

Kids and dads fish on the North Alouette River. People swim in it, kayak in it. We don't know to this day what killed 100,000 dead fish on the North Alouette River or whether this summer a similar event might kill more than fish. Does it matter?

DFO opened and closed its efforts in this area on the same day, May 25th, prematurely and without justification. The lack of interest was clear from my first conversation with a senior officer in this organization. I was asked - I was asked - what was the cause of the mortality. How was I to determine this? "Come out and investigate," I suggested. Isn't that what they The senior officer wasn't prepared to do that, but he assured me someone - quote/unquote the right person - would get back to me right away. It was a phrase I would hear from several officers in the DFO and Environment Canada over the next several weeks as Environment Canada and the DFO debated with me the question of which department should conduct the actual investigation. Nobody really seemed to want it. It was a hot potato.

Presentation by Mr. Emberly / Présentation par M. Emberly

DFO had decided - unilaterally, by the way, and one particular branch of that organization, I believe - that the kill was likely the result of quote/unquote toxic substances, EC's mandate, according to a 1985 memorandum of understanding which portioned off responsibility for investigations and enforcement.

This is a claim that DFO officials as a whole have repeated countless times in quote/unquote media lines issued by them whenever the Maple Ridge News, Global TV or CBC's Go Public asked why they didn't respond immediately with someone on the ground. DFO's answer: We look after sediment. EC handles toxic substances. The fish kill was most likely toxic substances.

DFO and Environment Canada officials both repeatedly refused to take the fish I had collected. But after relentless media coverage of the fish kill, EC accepted my samples a month after I collected them. The Maple Ridge News snapped a photo of the handover on or about June 26th. Test results were reported as inconclusive. I was told by EC that they received the fish too late.

The memorandum of understanding was supposed to be a temporary solution to a mounting workload and a way perhaps of avoiding duplication of effort. But it's not working. In fact, it may be reducing the effort along with the workload. is not just my opinion that the memorandum needs revisiting. Reporter Phil Melnychuk in the News Friday, March 19th, wrote that MP Randy Kamp said that the incident shows there could be improvements in how Environment Canada, which deals with pollution, and Fisheries and Oceans, which protects fish habitat, respond to incidents. Kamp is quoted as saying, "I think probably we could benefit from taking a look at how those are divided, whether the boundaries are clear and whether there's a way to coordinate that better." Good ideas all.

My question is, why didn't DFO do this earlier? Were they waiting for the public to point out that the memorandum needs overhaul, that it actually might impede the processes put in place to protect salmon habitat? How long would that go on if it wasn't for private citizens

Presentation by Mr. Emberly / Présentation par M. Emberly

sounding the alarm and demanding effective action? The public pays a lot for protection of our salmon by maintaining the operations of the DFO and EC. It needs to be money well spent.

Finally, I am making this submission after reading and rereading interdepartmental DFO memos shared between communications officers in Vancouver, the Conservation and Protection Office in Aldergrove and the Habitat Protection Branch senior officers and area biologists. These various memos focus on the fish kill from my report to DFO on May 25th. They suggest to me that communication within the DFO was ineffective and confused about its own role and responsibilities and that some officers may not have known what other officers were doing or not doing. Some officers asked colleagues to clarify the DFO role in the fish kill event well after it occurred.

One wrote: "Is this something we normally would investigate? Should we follow up with testing these 100 fish this person has collected?" Some DFO personnel suggest they may have had an early role to play, if "silt was an investigation consideration." One wanted to know if other officers had any knowledge of reports of silt. He writes: "I was not advised of any concern regarding silt (sediment, turbid water) during May or any other time I recall. Other than that, I have no knowledge of whether or not such a report was made to or received by DFO."

The same person wrote: "It is important to note that C&P" - Conservation and Protection - "have treated the report of dead fish separately from the report of habitat disturbance." Why?

There is much more along these lines. Memos like these have created a lot of questions for me. I think the answers might reveal information we can use to strengthen the partnership for protecting salmon.

So were any personnel within DFO privy to information about silt or sediment about the time I reported 100,000 dead fish in the river? Was that information from concerned citizens thoughtfully considered or relayed to personnel within the Department who would be expected to act upon such information perhaps through formal

2.4

2.8

Presentation by Mr. Emberly / Présentation par M. Emberly

investigations on site and right away? There were actually three different individuals who reported digging in the river just a few days before I discovered dead fish.

Was handing over the investigation to Environment Canada the best course of action? Was time and effort wasted if the answers to any of these questions is yes? Can we afford that if we hope to protect and sustain salmon in B.C.? These are questions that need to be looked at closely.

Finally, I refer you to the Maple Ridge News or www.savethealouette.ca, a website established by citizens along the North Alouette who have voiced concerns about low water levels to the Water Stewardship Division of the B.C. Ministry of the Environment repeatedly. Both sources have noted that last year there was hardly enough water in our rivers for salmon to spawn successfully, and yet licensing for irrigation of cranberry fields proceeds seemingly without the DFO on site to assess potential impact on fish habitat. the News, the WSD has stated it sends these applications to the DFO for review and environmental assessment if they're concerned that there may be impact on fish, and did so for one pipe installation where work was observed by the citizens I have mentioned.

DFO, in the same newspaper, denied it received this notice. To this date we don't know the facts. Where is the accountability here? The system needs correction.

The Alouette Valley Association, I am sure, would like to be assured that fish and habitat and the water needed to sustain fish will be guaranteed by registrations, legislation, the DFO and Environment Canada. They know what it costs to maintain these two latter agencies and think they should get bang for their buck.

The 1997 B.C. *Fish Protection Act*, not in force but not yet rescinded, could actually do that, but it collects dust on the shelves of Victoria.

Let me say finally that we are in danger of losing more than salmon in B.C. I am proud of the fact that my fellow citizens love to see salmon spawn in our rivers. I've heard many stories about that actually happening, you know, somebody

2.8

Presentation by Mr. Emberly / Présentation par M. Emberly

in their back yard having salmon spawn in a creek which is three feet wide -- at one time. Not any more. It's what makes them pick up the phone and call the DFO if they see something happening that could negatively impact fish or their habitat.

B.C. can't do without those calls. But they will stop and the apparent disconnect between the public partners and government will become cavernous, if this isn't the case already. This will happen if people become convinced that it's not worth the effort to pick up the phone and call the DFO.

Thank you.

- THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Emberly. If you would be kind enough just to remain for a moment. Thank you.
- MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Emberly, sir, I do have a couple of questions, if I might.

One of them is you advised that there was - and please correct me if I have this wrong - there was some testing in relation to the fish kill that you found in May of 2009 that indicated that they were believed to be salmon. Was there any more specific information as to the species, the type of salmon?

MR. EMBERLY: I repeatedly asked them to tell me, because they're the experts, what the species were. The report came back without any indication of that. When I handed the fish over to EC, Geoff Clayton, who was an extremely well known and knowledgeable man in salmon enhancement in Maple Ridge, looked at them and said, "Those are silver. There's a lot of silver there. There are definitely a lot of salmonids in that sample."

I also asked them too -- the analysis to show whether there was silt in the gills, and I got no response from that at all.

What I did get was just a statement saying that, you know, they weren't collected in the stipulated manner that EC collects fish and they got them too late. So they could show no -- the spectral analysis showed nothing, concluded nothing.

MR. MARTLAND: I know you're aware of our Commission's terms of reference, which cast, to use the net analogy, quite a broad net over a host of different topics. Could you expand a little bit

2.8

Presentation by Mr. Emberly / Présentation par M. Emberly

on how the fairly specific information that you have in relation to what happened basically a year ago and no doubt onwards in your dealings with DFO and Environment Canada since, how does that topic interact with the Commission's terms of reference in your view, sir?

MR. EMBERLY: I have here a PDF file that I received through the *Freedom of Information Act* of all the correspondence between -- interdepartmental correspondence within the DFO's various branches and offices regarding the fish kill, and they're ponderous. And I think -- and this file, the file number that I've quoted, is a living record of the practices and procedures of the DFO investigating and inspecting reports from a private citizen on a fish kill, a large fish kill.

I think it may serve, then, as a model and a source of information and questions for the Commission so that they can determine whether or not these practices and procedures that don't work are endemic in the DFO and EC. If they are, you know, they could be happening all over the province with people trying to enhance rivers and private citizens reporting things that the DFO should look at, and maybe they're getting the same ping pong behaviour from the agency. They're just bounced around and nothing effective is really happening.

So if it is a widespread problem, I think this may lead to that conclusion.

- MR. MARTLAND: And those file materials, I take it you've kept records, you've kept the documents, and more than that, obtained documents in relation to your file. Is that information you'd be willing to share with the Commission through counsel?
- MR. EMBERLY: Yes, I would, if you're willing to wade through it. I have about four binders of e-mails, press clippings and communications with countless numbers of officials, and I'd be happy to turn them over to you.
- MR. MARTLAND: I think my last question, to pick up on that, Mr. Emberly, is just to ask whether you would be willing to meet with Commission staff or Commission lawyers and, if it were determined to be appropriate, to be called as a witness for these hearings.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

2.8

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 Presentation by Mr. Emberly / Présentation par M. Emberly

- MR. EMBERLY: Yes, I would.
 - MR. MARTLAND: Mr. Commissioner, I don't have further questions. I don't know if anyone else may or if Mr. Emberly had any last remarks.
 - MR. EMBERLY: Well, I just have one. I wasn't looking to come here on my own today. I tried to get aligned with other groups that were coming in and were represented by counsel, and the bus was full, so to speak. So I ended up coming on my own. But I would be happy to be part of a group if that works out.
 - MR. MARTLAND: And if I might, out of that, was there a specific group or people you had in mind that might align with your perspective?
 - MR. EMBERLY: I've just been told that I probably don't fit. I'm like the boll weevil, looking for a home. But I'm in Maple Ridge and that is a long way for me to come, and I had a lot of difficulty getting here through the traffic and everything. I'm just a county boy. So any help you could give me, I'd appreciate it.
 - THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr. Emberly.

 Again, I appreciate your taking the time and the energy to get here today. Thank you.
 - MR. EMBERLY: Thank you, sir.
 - THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Martland.
- MR. MARTLAND: Yes, Mr. Commissioner. Just by way of a few last remarks. If I could express on the part of Commission counsel, although today's appearance was relatively brief and we didn't use all of the time that we had reserved in the case that it was necessary - I appreciate you may be aware of this, but also to advise members of the public and the applicants - the Commission has received a very significant volume, dozens of applications for standing that are being assessed, and this process today permits us to hear in particular from some of those applicants. The offer was given to others who declined to attend. We very much appreciate those who have attended today and shown a true interest in the subject matter of this inquiry. And from our point of view, we've covered the ground that we felt was important to cover through the process today. I would invite any of the applicants or indeed anyone who has questions stemming from this morning's appearance, to follow up directly with me after court. I'm

Proceedings / Procès

1 happy to be a point of contact. Subject to any other points, I'd be proposing 2 that we'd be simply adjourning at this point until 3 4 Friday, the 26th, at 10:00 a.m. when there is a 5 hearing and meeting that's been scheduled for some 6 of the applicants to attend. 7 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Martland. 8 Grant or Mr. Wallace have anything further to add? 9 MR. WALLACE: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. 10 nothing further. 11 THE COMMISSIONER: Ms. Grant? 12 MS. GRANT: I don't have anything either, Mr. 13 Commissioner. 14 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, on behalf of the Commission, 15 may I express again our appreciation for your 16 attendance here this morning. I think there is at 17 least one member of the press here and I'm 18 grateful that the press has attended this morning 19 and has taken an interest in the proceedings. And 20 as Mr. Martland said, we're now going to adjourn 21 and we will be holding a meeting with other 22 applicants who've been invited to attend on Friday 23 morning, March 26th. 24 Thank you all and thank you to our registrar. 25 THE REGISTRAR: These hearings are now adjourned until 26 Friday, March 26th, at 10:00 a.m. 27 28 (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED TO MARCH 26, 2010, AT 10:00 A.M. / PROCÈS AJOURNÉ JUSQU'AU 26 MARS 29 30 2010 À 10 HEURES) 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42

Does Ms.

I have