

*By Hon. Mr. Stevens:*

Q. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Ditchburn a few questions. First, Mr. Ditchburn, would you mind giving the Committee a very brief statement regarding the evidence given in regard to fishing. The Indians complain of being deprived of their alleged rights in fishing. I do not ask for a long story, but just a brief statement from your experience and knowledge of the case?—A. Do you mean fishing commercially, or fishing for food?

Q. Both. There is a line of demarcation which is a little indistinct, there?—A. Well, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, so far as fishing for commercial purposes is concerned, I do not think the Indians have any complaint in that regard. They are in a much better condition to-day than they were some two or three years ago, in view of the fact that very many Japanese have been eliminated from the fishing business.

Q. As a result of the Royal Commission of 1922?—A. I would assume so, yes. The Indians can fish now under what is known as independent licenses, just the same as the white man, and for a reduced license fee.

Q. That is commercial fishing?—A. Yes, that is for commercial fishing.

Q. And you say there is really no complaint about that?—A. No.

Q. I do not notice that there is very much made. Take the other, the real complaint they are making, that their ancient right of fishing to use the fish for food has been taken away, or unreasonably interfered with. Will you state your views on that?—A. Their right has not been taken away, but it has been restricted under the Fisheries Act. The Indians are permitted to take fish for food purposes under the supervision and according to the regulations of the chief inspector of Fisheries. In some instances, it is found that the Indians are not able to get their fish, owing to the kind of regulations put into effect.

*By Hon. Mr. Murphy:*

Q. Do you mean unable to get fish for food?—A. Yes, for food purposes.

*By Hon. Mr. Stevens:*

Q. That is, you mean that these regulations are unreasonable and too restrictive?—A. In some cases, yes.

Q. Will you point out in what particular they are such, in your opinion?—A. For instance, the Indians on the Capilano reserve at North Vancouver have recently had considerable trouble in view of the fact that one of their members was prosecuted for taking fish with a gaff. He was taking what is known as the chump or dog fish.

Q. And they objected to that?—A. Yes. The regulations on the Seymour Creek are that you can only take fish by means of angling.

*By Mr. Hay:*

Q. Are these regulations Federal or Provincial?—A. Federal regulations.

*By Hon. Mr. Stevens:*

Q. Do you mean to say that the Indians are not permitted to take the dog fish by gaffing?—A. Yes, there are only two classes of salmon that you can take by angling. You cannot take the dog salmon nor can you take the sock-eye with hook and line.

Q. Capilano Creek runs through the reserve?—A. Right through the reserve.

Q. There is a reserve at Seymour too?—A. Yes.

Q. And the river runs through that?—A. Yes, it runs through that.