

as also the actual practice of the British Government in dealing with native tribes, not only in Canada but the other dependencies, has quoted in his letter to your paper some opinions which, though antiquated, might have some weight from the high legal standing of those who gave them if the condition of the natives referred to in them was similar to that of these Tsimshian Indians, but, unfortunately for his argument, this is not so. The natives then referred to were nomad tribes without any fixed habitation, while these Indians have not only fixed abodes, but hereditary, defined tracts for hunting, fruit-gathering, and fishing. The provincial government, moreover, relies on the thirteenth section of the terms of union to support them, forgetting that since the union the terms of this section as the basis of an Indian policy have been officially condemned by both governments, and as may be seen in the blue-book of 1875, the then attorney-general of the province sketched a policy which included the recognition of the very claim which these Indians are now making about their hunting grounds. The Dominion Government, too, though in 1875 they considered the adoption of the thirteenth section for an Indian policy would be "little short of a mockery of the Indian claims," now seem willing to sanction and aid the provincial government in the adoption of such a policy.

Thus the government claims the right to deal arbitrarily with all the lands—to decide the size and nature of the reserves—to dispose of, whenever they wish, all land outside of the reserves now used by the Indians for hunting or fruit-gathering (even where these are within defined limits and have been hereditary in particular families) without granting any remuneration or acknowledging any claim or right of the occupiers of these special tracts. In fact, the Indians are dependent upon the charity of the government for the very ground on which they set their feet.

The Dominion Government, in recognizing this claim by