

because that is all we can eat." They do not take more beaver than they can eat. They believe that the slaughter of beaver for the pelt alone is a waste and we try to encourage that idea.

Q. Now, there is the first item, ten projects at \$50,000 each. Could you explain how much of that \$50,000 would be spent?—A. That \$500,000 is a five-year program. Our experience with the preserves we already have is that we can operate them at a cost of from \$3,000 to \$3,500 a year. These projects I suggest would be more expensive because we run these now with one supervisor and my own part-time, whereas if you set up three projects in Ontario it would mean you would have to have three field superintendents. We should not expect to find a competent man to operate, manage and control that area unless we are prepared to pay him an annual salary of, say \$3,600 a year.

Q. Would he be an Indian or a white man?—A. A white man.

Q. Would the Indians possibly develop to be able to supervise themselves?—A. Yes, but even with a white man it is a question of education, and we can educate a white man for that job more quickly than we can an Indian. The Indians do a tremendous amount of the field work, the actual intimate work on the ground, but the direction would have to be in the charge of a white man and a good white man, a man with a high order of administrative ability, and they are hard to get. Those men would have to be trained to some extent in the work. But to come back to cost, I would say roughly \$50,000 to each preserve which would provide the salary for a competent supervisor, his necessary travelling expenses, and the small costs of taking the annual census and keeping records as to the progress of his department.

Q. What would the headquarters technical staff be?—A. In connection with the beaver preserve we would have to have an organization to correlate the work done in the various provinces. You would probably need one chief supervisor in charge of the whole scheme and a minimum of clerical and stenographic staff.

Q. This \$50,000 would be spent over a period of ten years, or five years?—A. Five years.

Q. \$10,000 a year. This is one of the most interesting parts of our whole meeting—the extension of fur production, and I agree with Mr. Allan that the Indian is naturally a fur man. We would be able to give a lot of Indians work if this work were carried out.—A. The other item of \$400,000—the last item on the page—re-stocking with beaver, that is \$80,000 a year—that is also an arbitrary figure, and if I had the last word as to what would be done I would re-stock every preserve.

Q. Where do you get the beaver?—A. I would live trap beaver and put them on the preserve.

Q. Would you have to pay the provincial government from the province in which you get the beaver?—A. No, I do not think so, but you would have to pay for the actual trapping operations. We might have to pay in some instances where the farmers, perhaps on the prairies, complain that there is a beaver colony which is flooding their hay meadow. You send someone in to trap the beaver and they will say that every one of those beaver was on their property and that they are worth something, and you would probably have to pay \$10 or \$15 each to take them off. The costs to live trap a beaver and transport him is estimated at about \$50. If you have twenty preserves and you are going to put fifty a year in each preserve this is going to make 1,000 beaver a year at \$50, or \$50,000, that you are going to have to spend in re-stocking.

Q. This whole vote is \$1,800,000?—A. You are on the wrong program; the beaver program is the last one.

Q. What are the projects before this?—A. That is the muskrat. This \$1,800,000 is the extension of the muskrat program.