

contain as many as 300 bison, 200 banting, 400 sambur, 350 hog-deer, and many other animals.

It is often stated that the preservation of wild life depends on the development among the people of a feeling that the animals are a great asset to the country and that they should be preserved by wise measures of protection. The writer records, with regret, his opinion that this is not likely to come to anything in India and Burma. The average villager regards the wild animals from two points of view, first, as being a source of danger to his crops, second, as a source of money, meat, and skins. The matter of the interest and beauty of their existence is a closed book to him. Meat can usually be sold and the skins are of great use in the villages. It is difficult for a villager to understand why a European sportsman should spend a week after a good head, when there are dozens of females (which provide equally good meat) waiting to be shot. It is suggested that the only way to protect the animals is, first, to have well-kept sanctuaries, and, secondly, to restrict the issue of guns and to punish the licence-holders if they are used for poaching. This can only be done if the members of the superior staff in each district in all departments (civil, forest, and police) are keen on preserving wild life and will do their best to see that poaching with guns, nets, traps and dogs, is prevented. It would help if the guns licensed are shortened so that they are of little use except at close quarters, and also if sportsmen would give the villagers the meat when animals become plentiful and can be killed without unduly diminishing the stock.

If it were not for the sporting instincts of the Burman and the fact that he is extremely fond of meat, game preservation ought to be easier in Burma than in India. He is forbidden by his religion to take life, and an encouraging beginning has been made by enlisting the help of some Buddhist Monks in one of the forest areas near Moulmein. It has been proposed to make the western slopes of Mount Mulayit into a Game Sanctuary. This is a measure which deserves the warmest support, and in a country like Burma,

the feeling may spread. The old men and the monks would probably be found willing to help in any scheme of this kind, and it seems to the writer that in the provision of sanctuaries, and in the active interest of the ruling officials in all the Civil Departments in each district, the future of the Fauna of Burma must lie.

GAME PRESERVATION IN BURMA.

EXTRACTS FROM ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE YEAR
ENDING 31st MARCH, 1935.

SANCTUARIES.

There was no change during the year in the number of game sanctuaries. There are at present five areas notified as sanctuaries distributed as follows:—

| Name of Sanctuary (1) | Area in Square miles (2) | Forest Division in which situated (3) | Species for which the Sanctuary is primarily constituted (4) |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| Pidaung . . . | 260 | Myitkyina . . . | Elephant, bison, <i>saing</i> , sambur, hog-deer, barking-deer, pig, tiger, leopard, bear. |
| Shwe-u-daung . . . | *80 | Mogok . . . | <i>Rhinoceros sumatrensis</i> , elephant, bison, <i>saing</i> , sambur, serow, barking-deer, pig, tiger, leopard, bear. |
| Maymyo . . . | 49 | Maymyo . . . | Barking-deer, birds. |
| Moscos Islands . . . | 19 | Taboy . . . | Sambur, barking-deer, pig. |
| Kahilu . . . | 62 | Thaton . . . | <i>Rhinoceros sondaicus</i> . |

* The total area of this sanctuary is 126 square miles, of which 80 square miles fall within the Mogok Forest Division (Burma) and 46 square miles are in the Mongmit Forest Division (Federated Shan States).

Numbers, Distribution, and Habits of Animals.

Pidaung.—The following table shows the numbers of animals reported to have been seen in the sanctuary during the year as compared with the numbers seen in 1933-34:—