

some old reviews as 'Primæ lineæ ornithologiæ.' As Dr. Hartert has the advantage of having access to a copy of the work we should be glad to know which is the correct title of the Latin work; also why it is necessary to quote the name from the German edition; and why he quotes the date as 1788 instead of 1787 which is given by both Sherborn and Engelmann as the date of Volume I. It would benefit those interested in 'priority hunting' for which Dr. Hartert states that he has "no time," if he would also tell us what other new names, if any, the work contains thus supplying a valuable addition to Sherborn's list. It might be remarked that from the way in which Dr. Hartert gives the "correct quotation" for *Æthia*, it would appear that the Latin edition was part of the German one but if this were the case we cannot understand how Sherborn missed the name.

With Dr. Hartert's opinion that the adoption of the name from Dumont is quite impossible we cannot agree. The specific name *crisatella* had been applied to but one Auk-like bird, *Alca crisatella* Pallas, and the indication of this species as the type of *Æthia* is, we think, perfectly clear.— W. S.

**Bird Enemies of a few Insect Pests.**—The following statement about the bird enemies of grasshoppers is made in Farmers' Bulletin 747, prepared in the U. S. Bureau of Entomology: "The Bureau of Biological Survey has found that wild birds play a great part in the natural control of grasshoppers. These feathered friends of man are always present where grasshoppers abound and work almost constantly in aiding the farmer. The statement that all birds feed upon grasshoppers is so near the absolute truth that it needs only insignificant modifications. From the largest hawks to the tiny hummingbird there are no exceptions other than the strictly vegetarian doves and pigeons. Although birds of all families prey upon grasshoppers, the following may be selected as the most important destroyers of grasshoppers for their respective groups: Franklin's gull, bobwhite, prairie chicken, red-tailed, red-shouldered, broad-winged, and sparrow hawks, the screech and burrowing owls, yellow-billed cuckoo, road-runner, nighthawk, red-headed woodpecker, kingbird, horned lark, crow, magpie, red-winged and crow blackbirds, meadowlark, lark bunting, grasshopper and lark sparrows, butcher bird, wren, and robin."<sup>1</sup>

It is not possible to present as good an account of the bird enemies of many other pests for birds are particularly fond of grasshoppers. Another injurious insect recently published upon by the Bureau has its bird enemies however, and the statement is made that:

"Among the important enemies of the fall army worm are our common wild birds. Some of these are the following: Crow blackbird or grackle, yellow-headed blackbird, chipping sparrow, bluebird, mockingbird, and meadowlark."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Walton, W. R., Grasshopper Control in relation to Cereal and Forage Crops. Farmers' Bull. 747, October, 1916, pp. 11-12.

<sup>2</sup> Walton, W. R. and Luginbill, P. The fall army worm or "grass worm," and its control. Farmers' Bull. 752, Nov., 1916, p. 12.

Birds are also given considerable credit as predators upon the common cabbage worm. The species which "are known to feed upon cabbage worms are the chipping sparrow, English Sparrow, and house wren. It is certain, however, that other species eat them, and in one case it was found that during the winter the number of pupæ of the cabbage butterflies was reduced more than 90 per cent by birds feeding upon them."<sup>1</sup>

This is high praise for the birds and gives them commanding rank among predacious enemies of the cabbage worm. In the case of another injurious insect also, the velvet-bean caterpillar, it is said that the red-winged blackbird is the most important predatory enemy. Other birds feeding upon the pest are the mockingbird and field sparrow.<sup>2</sup>— W. L. M.

**Annual Report of the National Association of Audubon Societies.**—The Annual Report of the Audubon Societies<sup>3</sup> is a revelation to those who labored in the cause of wild bird protection twenty or more years ago, before public sentiment was aroused, and we think it is safe to say that the present development of the movement is far beyond their most sanguine expectations.

While the reports of the Secretary and the various special agents, are exceedingly interesting reading and the long list of members and contributors, most encouraging, we think the most significant feature is the series of reports from local societies of which nearly 100 are listed. These show how widespread is the interest in bird protection and what a tremendous hold it has upon the people of the country.

Another point in the development of the work is the apparent passing of the State Audubon Society except where it is well endowed or else purely local in character. Independent local clubs, conducted in accordance with the needs of the local community and working in affiliation with the National Association, seem to be the more natural form of development. While the State Societies did excellent service at the start it is impossible now to meet the demands made upon them without independent endowment, and the local organizations seem to turn naturally to the National Association as the central or affiliating body. The number and size of the units engaged in the work however are simply matters of organization, the objects attained are the same in any case.

In the introduction to his report Secretary Pearson calls attention to a very significant feature in the development of bird protection; that is the growing tendency of sportsmen's organizations to take up the cause of the non-game birds. These societies were established originally for the protection of game birds for food and for recreational shooting, and this extension of their activities is a recognition of the broader principle of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Chittenden, F. H. The common cabbage worm. *Farmers' Bull.* 766, Nov., 1916, p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Watson, J. R. Life-history of the velvet-bean caterpillar (*Anticarsia gemmatilis* Hübaer), *Journ. Ec. Ent.* 9, No. 6, Dec., 1916, pp. 526-7.

<sup>3</sup> Annual Report of the National Association of Audubon Societies, *Bird-Lore*, January, 1917.