

79.—OBSTRUCTIONS TO SALMON IN PEND D'OREILLE RIVER, MONTANA, REQUIRING A FISHWAY OR REMOVAL OF FALLS.

By **E. B. WATERBURY**, et al.

[From letters to Hon. Martin Maginnis, M. C.]

A scheme of which you are no doubt aware is on foot to open a fishway around Peu d'Orielle [Pend d'Oreille?] Falls, to admit of the ascent of salmon to all our streams tributary to Clark's Fork. The falls are 22 miles above the mouth of Peu d'Orielle, at the lower end of a cañon, which cañon is said to be 10 miles long. There are other rapids and falls, but none which salmon cannot easily overcome between here and the Pacific.

I need not attempt the discovery of advantages to you who know the broad country they would be distributed over, but will say this much from observation: I have seen smaller streams than Flint Creek so crowded with ascending salmon as to crowd the ones uppermost out of water and make the stream overflow its banks. Forty-pound fish are large fish for so small a stream, yet they fight hard for headwaters. The falls are in Stevens County, Washington Territory, 50 miles above Fort Colville, which is on the Columbia. I think Gov. J. J. Stevens gives some account of them in his reports at an early day.

While in the Idaho legislature I prepared a bill for this purpose, but as Idaho could reap but little benefit, and Montana was then about to have a separate Territorial government, the members thought it not necessary at that time, and I did not introduce it. I cannot conceive of a more popular and lasting move than your obtaining from Congress an appropriation of, say, \$10,000 to construct a salmon-way around those falls. The benefit cannot be properly estimated. After a couple of years, or say five, it would be worth \$200,000 a year to the people of the Territory, to say nothing of furnishing all the Indians with their winter and most of their summer food. Our legislature, you will recollect, appropriated \$1,000 at its last session, but that would only answer to get a survey when used, and Roth is of opinion a permit should be obtained from the legislature of that Territory. But I am convinced the Territory will do nothing, the obstruction being situated so far out of its limits and in a secluded place. I am convinced a smaller amount of money would construct a temporary fishway, but believe \$10,000 could be spent in rendering it permanent for years.

It is unnecessary for me to add that could you get such an appropriation the benefits to be derived from it could not be over-estimated nor over-represented. It will cause a pleasurable sensation over the whole west side of the mountains to read of such a move on your part in their interest, and you will have no opposition from any quarter.

Every military man, every officer of the Government, particularly Indian agents, as well as ranchers, miners, and others, will be delighted with these great edible fish at their doors. The officers at Fort Colville, or James O'Neil, agent of Colville Indians there, would gladly give you any information in their power.

CLEAR CREEK, MONT., *April 9, 1880.*

Under date of March 20, 1880, Granville Stuart, vice-president of the Helena (Montana) Rod and Gun Club, also wrote:

"Will you be so kind as to use your influence with Congress to have them pass a resolution allowing Montana to remove the obstruction at the Great Falls of the Pen d'Orielle [Pend d'Oreille?] River to such an extent as to allow the salmon fish to ascend the various streams of Western Montana, and authorize us to expend \$3,000 by legislative appropriation for this purpose? The obstruction is either in Washington Territory or Idaho. In the absence of any survey we cannot tell which. Of course the General Government should do this removing for us, but knowing that *that* is hopeless, we only beg permission to do it ourselves."

Messrs. J. C. Robinson, W. W. Botkin, and E. S. Paxson, a committee appointed by the Deer Lodge (Montana Territory) Rod and Gun Club, wrote under date of March 30, 1880:

"The undersigned, a committee appointed by the Deer Lodge Rod and Gun Club for the purpose, &c., represent that at the last session of our legislature an appropriation of \$1,000 was made for the purpose of so removing the obstructions in the Pen de Orielle River [Pend d'Oreille?], known as Kettle Falls, which prevent salmon fish from running up into the Hall Gate [Hell Gate or Hellgate?] and its tributaries; that the governor of Montana, who by the act is entrusted with its expenditure, claims that, before it can be done, a resolution of Congress authorizing it, or permitting an interference with the falls, will be necessary, especially as we think those falls are in Idaho, beyond our Territorial limits. It was thought that \$1,000 would be sufficient, but now it is believed that it will require probably \$2,000. We therefore ask that you use your efforts to procure the passage of a resolution authorizing the blasting out the falls so that fish can run up the river, and if you think there is any chance to do so, procure the appropriation of an additional \$1,000 to aid in the work."

Mr. B. H. Tatem, secretary of the Helena Rod and Gun Club, wrote, April 3, 1880:

"The Rod and Gun Club of Helena have lately learned that the appropriation of \$1,000 for the improvement of Little Falls cannot be expended until Congress authorizes Governor Potts to do so, and at a late meeting the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the Helena Rod and Gun Club, being desirous of the improvement of Little Falls, and learning that the appropriation

therefor is unavailable because of the want of legislation, respectfully request Hon. Martin Maginnis to use his best endeavors to obtain such legislation as may be needed.'”

On the 20th of April, 1880, Mr. Frank H. Woody, of Missoula, Mont., wrote as follows:

“At a recent meeting of the Rod and Gun Club of Missoula, Mont., a committee, consisting of Lieut. Col. George Gibson, U. S. A., Hon. W. J. McCormick, and the undersigned, was appointed to communicate with you in reference to the removal of certain falls in the Columbia River, in order that salmon might ascend the headwaters of said river. These falls are situated in either Washington or Idaho, the exact location of them being unknown to the committee. The last regular session of our legislature appropriated \$1,000 for the removal of these obstructions, but Governor Potts holds that the money cannot be used for that purpose until the Government of the United States grants permission for the removal of said falls. Now, what our club desires in the premises is this: That you, by some means, if practicable, procure the necessary permission for the removal of said obstructions, if you upon making the necessary inquiries find that such permission is necessary. I write this at the request of Colonel Gibson, who is chairman of the committee.”

80.—SUPPOSED OCCURRENCE OF SAIL-FISH, HISTIOPHORUS.

By Capt. WILLIAM M. BARNES.

[From a letter to J. T. Brown.]

The Pacific Ocean has been my cruising-ground for nearly thirty years, and several years have been spent near the line, from the South American coast westward to the Salomon Islands. My first and only sight of the *fish* was, I believe, in 1876, near Chatham Island, one of the Gallipagos group. We were perhaps 10 miles from the island, and were passing to windward of it, when our attention was attracted by an unusual object a mile off. Looking at it with a glass we saw the fin of some sort of a fish, having the appearance of a sail. As nearly as I now can tell the sail was all the time above water, just as if it had been the sail of a low boat or canoe, and continually rolling from one side to the other just as if it had belonged to a boat that was running before a small swell. The sight was so interesting that we tried to make a near acquaintance with this sort of craft, and I dropped down my first officer with his boat to catch the stranger. The mate put up his sail and ran down to the fish, which all the while had been sailing slowly toward the island. Just before the boat was within striking distance the fin disappeared, and a few minutes after it was up again a little way from the boat. My mate attempted a second time to get the boat within striking distance, and again the fin disappeared. After making a num-