

turn; and it was shown that the present system — or want of system — was bad for each one: bad for such wild life as must still be used for necessary food, bad for every kind of business in the products of wild life, bad for the future of sport, bad for the pursuits of science, and bad for the prospects of wild “zoos”. The *Address* ended with a plea for conservation, and pointed out that the only class of people who could possibly be benefitted under present conditions were those who were ready to destroy both the capital and interest of any natural resources for the sake of snatching a big and immediate, but really criminal, profit.

The *Address* was sent out for review to several hundreds of general and specialist newspapers, and, thanks to the expert help so freely given me, ran the gauntlet of the press without finding one dissentient voice against it. Copies were also sent to every local expert known, as well as to those experts in the world outside who were the most likely to be interested. Three classes of invaluable expert opinion were thus obtained for the *Supplement*. The first class may be called experts on Labrador; the second, experts on wild life in general; and the third, experts on the public aspects of the question. All three were entirely in favour of general conservation for the whole of Labrador and the immediate establishment of special sanctuaries, as recommended in the *Address*.

Among the experts on Labrador were the following: — DR BELL, late head of the Geological Survey of Canada, who has made seven expeditions into Labrador and who has always paid particular attention to the mammals; DR CLARKE, Director of Science Education in the State of New York, who has spent twelve summers studying the natural history of the