

particular territory will disappear even though there may be a complete absence of predators.

This of course knocks into a cocked hat the old arguments for predator control that have been advanced by the sportsmen *ad nauseum*, and places in the hands of the zoophile a powerful scientific weapon with which to combat the intolerant persecution of some of our finest birds and most interesting mammals.

But the authors play no favorites, and go on to show that by reasonable shooting, the fall *surplus* of Bob-whites *above winter carrying capacity* of their range may be utilized instead of being annually lost. In their own words: "Shooting is not a biological necessity [as has been asserted so often by sportsmen]; neither is it a practice necessarily detrimental to the species, if wisely regulated." However, they point out that "whether it endures may be contingent upon the progress which its followers are able to make in the elimination of the social and biological abuses which have hitherto attended it."

Another generally accepted idea that now seems in need of revision concerns the role of "buffer" species, for on page 377 it is stated, "We have no evidence which would lead us to suspect that fluctuations in buffer populations have played any part in either mitigating or increasing predator pressure on the particular bob-white populations with which we have been working."

The fourth and last part of the bulletin is devoted to management of the Bob-white's winter territory, and includes discussions of food, cover, predator control, management of shooting, and so on. The novice may find these discussions somewhat disappointing, for the authors do not lay down detailed directions for the execution of specific operations. His disappointment will turn to dismay when he reads that Quail "with or without evident cause may not use territories provided for them." But the trained wildlife manager will find here much thought-provoking material; for example, evidence that the nearer the peak a population is maintained, the higher must be the ratio of brood stock to winter population, just as progressively increased horsepower per knot is required to drive a liner at higher speeds.

The authors get right down to fundamentals when they write: "The bob-white thrives best in agricultural communities, and its fortunes in the long run are essentially the fortunes of the soil. Bob-white management may be to a large degree correlated with erosion control. Management of this, as well as other wild species of similar requirements, may reasonably be dove-tailed into sound agricultural practice over wide areas of land.

"Finally, effective bob-white management is not necessarily a matter of what is done; more often it seems to be a matter of what is *not* done. The truth and significance of this thought may possibly be more readily appreciated when one considers that, of the usual practices which evict Quail populations from many farms, not a few are practices which work to evict human populations, ultimately and permanently, from the same land."

Could there be a more impressive argument for the preservation of Bob-white?—E. G. H.

**Parker's Ethics of Egg Collecting.**—During the years 1934 and 1935, a lively controversy was carried on in the columns of 'The Field' (London) on the subject of egg collecting, in the course of which hundreds of letters were received. The editor, Eric Parker, has digested these and has presented a summary in most interesting book form<sup>1</sup> All of the arguments for and against the practice with which

<sup>1</sup> Ethics of Egg-Collecting | By Eric Parker, M. B. O. U. | with a foreword by | The Right Hon. Lord Desbrough, K. G. | Published by | The Field | The Field House, Bream's Buildings | London, E. C. 4. | Pp. 1-120 + i-iv. Price 5 shillings net.

we have become familiar in America, and some additional ones, are presented. Practically every statement is denied by some other contributor and, while it is evident that many claims are quite unsubstantiated, the whole thing would be very amusing were it not for the seriousness of the problem involved.

The destruction and possible extermination of birds in England by oologists or "egg clutchers," as they seem to be frequently termed there, seems to be much more serious than in America owing to the wealthy collectors who employ professional egg hunters to secure material for them. Neither of the two have any regard for the law or for the rights of private individuals upon whose grounds trespass is made. While fines are no deterrent to the wealthy collector, just what to do with these offenders is the problem. In one instance the entire layings of forty pairs of Red-backed Shrikes for an entire season were secured by one collector. Another collector, seeking erythristic eggs of the Guillemots, kicked all the eggs on the cliffs, which he was exploring, into the sea in the hope that some of the second sets would contain erythristic eggs!

The old argument that the birds will all lay again is brought up and promptly denied for a number of species and the reply so often made here that, if one collector takes only the first laying, another will take the second! Other correspondents claim that egg collecting is the inherent right of every Englishman and, while they do not see any need for more than one set of each kind, egg collecting is one of the finest "sports" that there is and should not be interfered with. Then the egg collectors bring in the old, old discussion as to whether the bird or the egg comes first and claim that the collecting of specimens of the birds is far more potent in decreasing the numbers of a species than the collecting of its eggs.

Raptorial birds come in for especial consideration because many of them have been ruthlessly persecuted. The claim is made that the game keepers kill every Hawk that comes upon their territory and that they are responsible for the decrease in the birds and that furthermore they do not hesitate to sell eggs to collectors. The protectors proceed to mark the Hawk eggs with indelible pencil to make them useless for specimens and the oologists promptly smash them so that the birds will lay again. Then appears the "falconer" in the discussion; he marks the eggs just as does the bird protector but with the object of ensuring their hatching so that he may procure the young birds for training!

As a preventative it is suggested that a list of all collectors be printed, including the actual egg gatherers, with addresses and portraits if possible—a "black list" as it were, so that owners of property may be able to recognize them. Another suggestion is to have employees of an estate soak the collectors in the Duck pond. Members of conservation societies have organized to trail every known collector on his jaunts and suggest the formation of a "society for the extermination of the egg collector." Another suggestion is that egg collectors are really kleptomaniacs and cannot be reached by law as they are unable to restrain their desire for eggs and they should therefore be gathered together in some suitable institution and kept there for the duration of the egg-laying period!

The main result of the discussion seems to have been to raise a very widespread interest which, it is to be hoped, will make egg collecting so unpopular with the public at large that collectors will be forced to abandon their hobby.

In America it would seem to be high time to give this matter very careful attention. We all know that a large number of those who make collections and secure permits under the plea of scientific research never contribute anything to science. Our data on distribution, dates of laying, and location of nests have been derived as

much from those who never collect eggs than from those who do and does not require the collecting of the eggs. Moreover many present day investigations on behavior of nesting birds, care of young, length of incubation, etc., etc., are curtailed or prevented by the collecting of the eggs.

We are not arguing for the abolishment of collecting but we think that in securing permits, either state or federal, the recipient should be required to state explicitly, before a new permit is granted, just what scientific results were furthered by his collecting of the year before. The mere listing of the specimens does not tell the story and cannot easily be checked up.

Moreover, since in recent years collecting of skins except for scientific institutions or definite problems have very largely been abandoned, why cannot the oölogists also "play the game" and refrain from the collecting of eggs in the case of Eagles, and other birds that are rare or threatened with extinction?

If something is not done we shall soon see various states following the recent action of Georgia (since, we believe, modified) banning all collecting. The ranks of bird lovers and students of the living bird far outnumber the collectors, and with proper organization they may control legislation, abolish all collecting and render science a severe blow.—W. S.

#### Other Ornithological Publications.

**Baxter, Evelyn V. and Rintoul, Leonora J.**—Notes on the Status of Birds in Scotland in 1935. (Scottish Naturalist, July–August, 1936.)

**Bond, James.**—Resident Birds of the Bay Islands of Spanish Honduras. (Proc. Acad. Nat. Sciences Philadelphia, LXXXVIII, pp. 353–364, August 14, 1936.)—This is a report on a visit made in late February and March, 1936 (the inclusive dates have been inadvertently omitted) with a list of forty-three forms recorded from the islands and annotations on those observed by the author. The following are described as new: *Buteo magnirostris sinus-honduri* (p. 355); *Ortalis vetula deschauenseei* (p. 356); *Anthracothorax prevosti nigrilineatus* (p. 359); *Centurus santa-cruzi insularum* (p. 360); *Centurus rubriventris tysoni* (p. 361); *Myiarchus tyrannulus insularum* (p. 361).

**Brodkorb, Pierce.**—Geographical Variation in the Piñon Jay. (Occas. Papers Mus. Zool., Univ. of Michigan, No. 332, May 26, 1936.)—*Gymnorhinus cyanocephalus rostratus* (p. 2) from California is described as new; *G. c. cyanocephalus* is restricted to the northern Rocky Mountains and *G. c. cassini* (McCall) is used for the bird of Utah to Arizona.

**Brodkorb, Pierce.**—A New Subspecies of Bittern from Western North America. (Occas. Papers Mus. Zool., Univ. of Michigan, No. 333, May 26, 1936.)—*Botaurus lentiginosus pecti* (p. 2)—Sonoma County, Calif.

**Brodkorb, Pierce.**—A New Genus for *Empidonax atriceps* Salvin. (Occas. Papers Mus. Zool., Univ. of Michigan, No. 331, May 26, 1936.)—*Cnemonax* (p. 1).

**Butler, Amos W.**—Vultures in Indiana. (Proc. Indiana Acad. Sci., Vol. 45, 1936.)

**Manuel, Canuto G.**—Review of Philippine Pigeons I: The Genus *Phapitreron* (Philippine Jour. of Science, February, 1936.)—Two forms described by Hachisuka and one by Mearns are reduced to synonymy while *P. amethystina celestinoi* (p. 300) from Bohol, and *P. a. mindanaoensis* (p. 301) from Mindanao, are described as new.

**Manuel, Canuto G.**—New Philippine Fruit Pigeons. (Philippine Jour. of Science, February, 1936.)—*Leucotreron leclancheri longialis* (p. 307) Batan, and *Neoleucotreron merrilli faustinoi* (p. 307) Mt. Tabuan, Luzon, are described as new.

**Crandall, Lee S.**—Birds of Paradise in Display. (Bulletin N. Y. Zool. Soc., May–June, 1936.)—With a short preliminary discussion of the nature of display, whether