

Q. Why?—A. Because it was not considered that it would be in the public interests to do so.

Q. Was it not a fact that the Inspector contended that only indigent Indians should receive those permits?—A. The area to which reference is made is the agency more or less in the vicinity of Vancouver, that lower section of the province where the rivers are small, and if the runs of fish are not afforded protection they can be readily killed out. It has been our policy for years, and I am quite satisfied it is a reasonable and fair policy, that the number of permits that should be granted there should be limited as much as is reasonably feasible to meet the requirements. There are no Indians there that are really in need of any permits.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: I think that our friend, Mr. Paull, has chosen a rather unhappy site in Capilano. This privilege of fishing for food would really be more applicable to places a little more remote. I think that preventing an Indian from spearing a dog salmon in the Capilano, or anywhere else, seems extreme, except, as Mr. Found pointed out, that it might lead to other abuses. The Indians at Capilano are not dependent upon fish for their food. It is so easy to demonstrate, being so close to the city, whether they need relief in that way. It is a rather unhappy location as a test for the soundness of the regulation. I would like to see more reference made, if possible, to interior points, or to the northern section away from the city altogether, and then we can better judge of what change there should be in the fishing regulations, if any.

Mr. DITCHBURN: The application Mr. Paull has reference to, put in by the Indian Agent, referred more particularly to the Indians who were living in the northern part of what is known as the Vancouver Agency, which runs up as far as the head of Bute inlet.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: That is different.

Mr. DITCHBURN: They were the Indians known as the Homalho, the Sechelt and the Sahoose, more particularly, and the Squamish, which are immediately in the city of Vancouver.

*By Hon. Mr. Stevens:*

Q. What have you got to say to that, Mr. Found?—A. I think I fairly answered that. I would like to ask Mr. Ditchburn if he urges that all the Indians in that section should have permits?

Mr. DITCHBURN: I think I have already told your Chief Inspector, that for the purpose of keeping down any Indian complaint it would be desirable that your department should issue permits to each family.

The WITNESS: That is quite another thing.

Mr. DITCHBURN: To the head of every family, not to every Indian. It was never understood that every Indian should get it, but it is to the head of each family.

The WITNESS: What we were trying to arrange was that the Indian Agents should select the people who required permits, and the permits would be issued to these people. The agent knows these people better than our officer. The Indian agents put in the names of the heads of families to whom he thought permits should be issued, and to any others.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: And they were refused?

Mr. DITCHBURN: They have not been issued yet.

The WITNESS: That has not come before me. Mr. Paull's question to me was that the agent put in a request for every Indian on these reserves.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: I thought Mr. Paull said every Indian in the Capilano Reserve.

[Mr. W. A. Found.]