REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BIRD PROTECTION, 1962

CONTINUOUS change is Nature's most constant characteristic. Few things in life are static. This fast-moving world is in constant change and each shift initiates a chain reaction. New developments, new philosophies, new policies, new tensions, and even the changing seasons and climates affect the status quo and often bring on a feast or a famine which reacts favorably or unfavorably on birds as well as humans.

IMPROVED PUBLIC SUPPORT

The year 1962 has been memorable for the American Ornithologists' Union in many respects. It has been a year of changes, some desirable, a few undesirable. Probably our greatest evidence of an improved climate for ornithology and its interests is the growing public consciousness of the importance of sound conservation to our American way of life. There is much evidence of an increasing awareness among our peoples of the recreational, esthetic, cultural, economic, and other values to be realized in the study and enjoyment of birds and other wild creatures.

An ever-increasing number of bird, nature, or outdoor clubs, with a constantly increasing membership, is one reflection of this. Also, we can point out the increasing trend to designate as bird refuges superior wildlife and recreational areas and even entire towns and cities. Both in response to a growing public demand, and because of better and more broadly trained leadership, many of our state and provincial game and fish or conservation departments are giving much more consideration and protection to non-game species. A number of states clearly recognize the value of birds as a stimulant to tourism and are, therefore, giving added protection and are aiding better than ever before a sound program in bird and wildlife management.

A number of states are giving added protection to the rare and vanishing species within their borders. The Michigan Department of Conservation's responsibility and foresight in setting aside for effective management a sizable tract of her jack pine lands as a refuge primarily to save its endemic but migratory Kirtland's Warbler is a commendable example of state-wide public sentiment in support of birds.[2] Also, the director of the Fish and Game Department of Nebraska has, for a number of years, instructed his enforcement staff that during the period of migration their first responsibility is to insure full protection, and almost escort, of the rare Whooping Cranes in their migration across that state.

Several states, at considerable expense, have set aside managed refuge land to save their vanishing grouse and prairie chickens.[7] This is indeed praiseworthy because those state officials are well aware that there is

little likelihood of those birds again becoming sufficiently abundant to permit much public hunting.

Another important reflection of a growing public awareness and concern about our wildlife and natural resources is shown in two extraordinary conferences held in the past year. One, designed to appraise the extent of management problems of Canada's renewable resources, was called by the Canadian Government and well supported by all provincial governments. The meetings were held in October, 1961, at Montreal. "Background" papers providing a factual basis for discussion at the conference were published as a two-volume document six months before the meeting,[5] and were widely circulated for study. At the final meeting, an effort was made to plan a coordinated approach as a basis for long-term planning of the most effective management of Canada's basic resources. Participation at this important and well-attended conference was by officials and specialists of interested departments of federal, provincial, and local governments, along with representatives of industry, and specialists from universities and private life. A record of the discussions and recommendations of the conference has been published.[6]

The other conference, which probably was less effectively planned but still worthwhile, was the White House Conservation Conference, called by the President of the United States, and held in Washington, D. C., on 24 and 25 May 1962. This was the second White House Conservation Conference ever called, the first memorable meetings being convened by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1908. At the recent conference, the President, probably half of his Cabinet, a number of his principal aides, prominent conservation leaders in Congress, most governors or their representatives, perhaps 200 of the prominent conservationists from all sections of America, and a few leaders of industry who deal directly with natural resources, participated. While the broad trends and programs in the conservation field were stressed, government leadership brought out its concept of the importance of conservation and the steps necessary to implement the programs of wise and sustained use.

Secretary Freeman appropriately stressed the multiple-use concept of private and public lands and the need to make greater wildlife use of these. He showed that we have too much land in agriculture and, that despite our explosive population increase, we shall need to retire 50 million acres of our present agricultural land by 1980, when we may have a population of some 260 million. We should retire our less productive land. The elimination of subsidies should accomplish this objective and at the same time eliminate from agriculture the submarginal and less competent workers.

Interior's Secretary Udall stressed the need of water and advised a

greater research effort in the National Saline Water Conservation program. Lack of sound national planning and high-level coordination were shown by Army's Secretary Stahr, who strongly urged almost unlimited public spending for more and more big dams. Apparently Secretary Stahr has little understanding of, and therefore little concern for, sound land use and watershed planning or for the conservation measures that will better hold rainfall.

Public Refuges

The A. O. U. certainly is in favor of any areas set aside by governments as national wildlife refuges, national parks, or national recreation areas because such action insures the preservation of some distinctive habitat for certain groups of birds with specialized requirements.

Refuge Areas

In the past year extensive and important new production areas have been set aside for waterfowl in Canada and the United States.

Six bird sanctuaries were established by land withdrawals in the Northwest Territories of Canada. One at Kendall Island comprised 234 square miles, or 149,760 acres (at 640 acres per square mile), while another on the Anderson River Delta measures 418 square miles. A sanctuary established on the south shore of Queen Maud Gulf, and including the principal nesting grounds of the rare Ross' Goose on the Perry River drainage, measures 24,240 square miles. Two sanctuaries were established on Banks Island to afford protection to breeding geese in this Arctic nesting area. These two areas comprised 7,977 square miles. These five large, important wildlife areas that especially favor geese and Arctic waterfowl aggregate 32,869 square miles (or 21,036,160 acres).

In addition to these great areas, a relatively small sanctuary was established at Cape Parry to afford protection of the westernmost breeding colony in Canada of Thick-billed Murres.

In the past year the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has either acquired, or has received authorization to acquire, the following refuges or additions to refuges (areas in acres):

Harris Neck (to augment the Blackbeard National Wildlife Refuge, Georgia)	2,687
Ottawa National Wildlife Refuge, Ohio	729
Wyandotte National Wildlife Refuge, Michigan	31
Primehook National Wildlife Refuge, Delaware	11,233
Toppenish National Wildlife Refuge, Washington	12,379
Lake Nettie National Wildlife Refuge, North Dakota	2,890
Brigantine National Wildlife Refuge, New Jersey	8,822
Mackay Island National Wildlife Refuge, North Carolina and Virginia	841
Total	39,612

In addition, two other refuges, Delavan Refuge in California and Pocasse Refuge in North Dakota, are being managed by the Service but the land has not yet been acquired. Important also are 34 pothole waterfowl production lands, totaling 36,302 acres, acquired in the Dakotas and Minnesota.

Legislation

Point Reyes, California, comprising 53,000 acres, becomes our third National Seashore Recreation Area by a recent act of Congress. Cape Cod Recreational Area, Massachusetts, was established by the preceding session of Congress, and Pea Island, North Carolina, was established some 25 years ago.

The Padre Island bill to create the 4th National Seashore Recreation Area has also become law. The proposed area comprises some 81 miles of the elongate coastal island, with adjacent units of the Gulf of Mexico and Laguna Madre serving as the east and west boundaries, respectively. Both Point Reyes and Padre Island are important areas that will insure essential coastal habitat for a considerable number of species of plants and animals, as well as affording much needed public recreation.

The Reuss Bill, H.R. 8520, to restrict drainage subsidies in the Dakotas and Minnesota, has become law, although it passed with a slightly weakening amendment. The drainage craze already has done serious damage in the principal duck nesting areas of the United States. Therefore, in view of the tremendous oversupply of grain in this country, and the cost of grain subsidies, this practice of drainage, so destructive to wildlife, should cease. It is indeed a paradox that a government should spend millions to establish waterfowl nesting areas and at the same time and in the same sections of the country encourage and subsidize drainage of private property (with the expenditure of more millions) that will prevent waterfowl nesting and which will produce more crop surpluses (mainly wheat) that already are costing the same government a million dollars a day just to store.*

Legislation Lost

There have been few sessions of Congress where so much profoundly important conservation legislation was seriously considered, and where so much passed the Senate, as in the 87th. Unfortunately, however, serious difficulties developed in the House, causing the failure of much of the legislation, even though it seems clear that, had the bills reached a vote, they would have passed overwhelmingly. These bills failed because of

* This and any similar statements are, of course, made independently of the Canadian members of the A. O. U. Committee on Bird Protection.

the power of one or two opposing congressmen who happened at the time to hold key positions as chairmen of committees handling wildlife and recreational legislation.

The Wilderness Bill, long debated in the Congress and admittedly highly controversial, is perhaps the primary cause of the failure of such important basic measures as the Outdoor Recreation bills, S.3117, S.543, and perhaps S.3118, and the Tule Lake–Klamath Refuges Bill, S.1988. The Wilderness Bill is perhaps the foremost conservation default of the 87th Congress. The bill passed the Senate by a vote of 78 to 8, but in the House Mr. Aspinall and his Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs largely emasculated it with crippling amendments. It appears that the bill was held in committee because there was strong evidence of overwhelming support to substitute the more acceptable Senate version if the bill were permitted to come to a vote in the House. Other even more popular legislation, particularly the Outdoor Recreation bills S.3117 and S.543, and the Tule Lake–Klamath Refuges Bill, S.1988, were held by Aspinall as a leverage with conservation interests to support the crippling amendments to his rewritten Wilderness Bill.

For the benefit of our members, it should be pointed out that the proposed Wilderness Bill, as it passed the Senate, was designed to establish a national or congressional policy to preserve a small percentage—about 8—of our national parks, national forests, national wildlife refuges, and perhaps a smaller sample of some other publicly owned land, such as the public domain, as unspoiled wilderness to be used for recreation, research, and demonstration purposes. The proposal related only to land already in the federal systems and publicly owned. It involved no transfers of land or jurisdiction and no new agency. Its aim was and is simply an attempt to keep special interests from despoiling these superb and unusual areas in the broadest public interest.

The Outdoor Recreation Bills, *S.3117*, *S.3118*, and *S.543*, would have given congressional support to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, established during the year by Executive Order. Authorization would have been provided for appropriation of 50 million dollars for five years to assist the states in effective recreation planning. Half that sum would also have been authorized to aid states in preserving unspoiled shorelines.

Tule Lake–Klamath Refuges Bill. On the border of Oregon and California are perhaps the most important and indispensable refuges in the entire U. S. federal system (Tule Lake and Upper and Lower Klamath refuges). There is a serious shortage of waterfowl habitat in this area, which makes these refuges important both for the security of waterfowl in the western half of the nation, and in preventing serious depredations upon crops by waterfowl. These reclamation projects, built under Acts

of Congress many years ago, provided both for agriculture and wildlife. For years a serious controversy has existed between these interests. S.1988, by Kuchel of California, would settle this controversy and give priority to wildlife for a minimum amount of land and water and close this small area to homesteading. The bill would exclude the possibility of disposal of these properties into private ownership and insure that the lands had the necessary water for proper management of these public refuges. The Senate passed S.1988 and the House was believed to be overwhelmingly in favor of this important legislation. Mr. Aspinall apparently tied this bill to his version of the Wilderness Bill.

The Youth Conservation Bill passed the Senate and the operating committee of the House but was held up in the Rules Committee under Chairman Howard W. Smith of Virginia, apparently because the provisions of the bill supported the basic concepts of integration. If the administration of a youth conservation program would profit by the mistakes, as well as the successes, of the old "CCC" program of the Roosevelt Administration, such a program could be of great benefit to the training of the young people employed (who previously were out of work) and to the cause of sound conservation.

Waterfowl Situation

Because of the widespread public interest and the economics involved, the waterfowl situation is always of great concern to Canada, the United States, and Mexico. Those government officials who have the responsibility of setting the hunting regulations face some extremely grave and troublesome decisions. Duck populations have been declining somewhat irregularly since 1956, and last year (1961) and this year there has been an alarming decline. The devastating periodic droughts in the Prairie Provinces of Canada and northern United States always cause a marked reduction of our waterfowl populations.

A recent extensive survey of the nesting grounds, reported by a Department of Interior (Fish and Wildlife) press release of 7 August, admits that the continental nesting population this year is about 43 per cent below the 1956 level, and about 17 per cent below that of 1961, also a very poor year for duck hunters. Last year's flight was most unsatisfactory, particularly in the Central and Mississippi flyways. The breeding population in the important Prairie Pothole Region this summer was down 74 per cent from the 1956 peak. A flyway forecast by the Federal Service indicates that the Pacific, Central, and Mississippi areas will each experience a "moderate" decrease, while the Atlantic flyway will probably have a "small" reduction in the fall flight. In view of the 17 per cent decrease over 1961 in nesting, and a 74 per cent reduction below the 1956

level, it would appear that we might expect more than a "moderate" or "small" decrease this fall (1962). Reports of mid-October indicate an alarmingly poor waterfowl season, at least with regard to ducks.

It should be remembered that the army of duck hunters who not infrequently demand liberalized regulations will suffer more than the naturalists and bird watchers when the duck population sinks to the point where the hunter bags few or no ducks. Our first duty, therefore, is to see that our capital breeding stock is not endangered. Because of the critical waterfowl situation, the governments of Canada and the United States, with cooperation from provinces, states, and private sources, have committed themselves to a considerably enlarged program of waterfowl research.

The Canadian duck hunting regulations for 1962, the most restrictive Canada has ever experienced, set a daily bag limit of four ducks in the Prairie Provinces, one less per day than last year. Seasons in the southern parts of those provinces will generally open 10 to 14 days later than usual. A delayed opening is equivalent to reducing the season, since hunting in that region is effectively terminated by freezing early in November. No Canvasbacks or Redheads will be legally shot in the Prairie Provinces, Ontario, or Quebec. The daily limit for White-fronted Geese has been reduced to three. The Canadian Wildlife Service, in cooperation with provincial game departments, is supplying hunting license vendors with descriptive folders on Canvasbacks and Redheads, and hunters are being urged through the press, television, and radio to be particularly careful not to shoot them.

Rare and Vanishing Forms

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. John Aldrich for valuable data gathered recently on a number of species herein listed.

The large race of the White-fronted Goose (*Anser albifrons gambelli*).—This form is seriously endangered because so little is known regarding its nesting and even its wintering grounds, and because this race frequents some of the same territory as do other races of this species that are hunted. It often is very difficult in the field to distinguish between races. A major need here, of course, is research to determine the facts.

The Aleutian race of the Canada Goose (*Branta canadensis leucopareia*).—As recently defined, this rather small race, which is now very rare, is essentially restricted in the breeding season to the Aleutian Islands. It suffered a precipitous decline when fox farming started on the Aleutians and the foxes fed extensively on the eggs and young, and probably on nesting birds. Aldrich assumes that it winters in small numbers in the interior valleys of California, mixed with other more numerous races of Canada Geese. The U. S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife is attempting to eliminate the introduced fox on the most important nesting islands of the Aleutian chain. Protection in winter is impossible until it is known precisely where the birds

winter, and whether they winter rather exclusively in restricted areas. Again, research is sorely needed.

Trumpeter Swan (*Olor buccinator*).—It is encouraging to report that this majestic bird, the largest of all our Anatidae, seems now to be slowly increasing and occurs in small numbers at Red Rock Lakes, Montana; Yellowstone and Jackson Hole, Wyoming; Malheur, Oregon; Ruby Lakes, Nevada; and in eastern Idaho, British Columbia, Alberta, and southern Alaska.

The Canadian Wildlife Service has commenced, in a small way, the reintroduction of Trumpeter Swans to points within their ancestral range. Birds from H. A. Hochbaum's Delta population have been transferred to Swan Lake, near Vernon, British Columbia, where they are being closely watched with the hope that a breeding population may eventually be established. The wild breeding population in the Peace River area, Alberta, continues to hold its own.

Nene or Hawaiian Goose (*Branta sandvicensis*).—Reports indicate that between 50 and 75 Nene now exist in the wild, nesting on the lava flows in the Hawaiian National Park of the Island of Hawaii. Some 200 birds in captive flocks occur at the Severn Wildfowl Trust in England and in Hawaii. The initial success in reintroducing captive-reared birds into native habitat on the slopes of Mona Kea, Hawaii, is indeed encouraging. Congress recently appropriated $15,000.00 to support this important restoration project. Artificially propagated birds reared by Peter Scott in England are scheduled to be liberated shortly on the famous Mt. Haleakala on Maui, where it is believed the birds formerly occurred. Effort is being made to hold in check the introduced mongoose, feral goats, and pigs in areas where the Nene occurs or will be introduced. Like the foxes on the Aleutians, these exotics have had disastrous effects on native ground nesting birds.

Hawaiian Duck (*Anas* [*w.*] *wyvilliana*).—Because of destruction of its essential habitat, this small mallard has long been decreasing on the Hawaiian Islands and is now an endangered species. It is most common on Kauai where its habitat has been least disturbed. It was recently transplanted to the Big Island, Hawaii. It is nearly extirpated from Oahu and rare on other islands. The World Wildlife Fund has appropriated money to start in Hawaii a propagation program for the rare Hawaiian Duck similar to the program now going forward on the Nene.

Mexican Duck (*Anas diazi novimexicana*).—This close relative of our common Mallard is resident in the upper Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico, in southeastern Arizona, western Texas, and southward in the highlands to central Mexico. It exists in very small numbers in the U. S. portions of its range and is believed to be uncommon southward. It is now a relatively rare bird because of drainage and loss of habitat. In the north also, it is endangered because of hybridizing with the common Mallard and perhaps also because of overshooting. Aldrich quotes Huey to the effect that only 100 to 150 wild birds now occur in New Mexico. He adds that there are 31 in captivity. With a constant increase in drainage of marshes and channelization of the Rio Grande and other streams, and in a land suffering almost constantly from drought, the future of this form is indeed precarious.

Laysan Duck (*Anas* [*wyvilliana*] *laysanensis*).—The situation seems recently to have improved somewhat for this endangered form. It is confined to Laysan Island, a small coral reef west of Hawaii, in the Hawaiian Leeward group. In September, 1961, some 688 birds were counted on the island. Also, more than 100 of these birds are now being propagated, apparently with success, by aviculturists. Some 56 young were produced in 1961. The bird is vulnerable because of its confinement to a single small island.

California Condor (*Gymnogyps californianus*).—This oversized vulture now seems to be confined to a V-shaped U. S. forest range in the mountains surrounding the southern end of the San Joaquin Valley, California. All information suggests that the population of about 60 birds, estimated some 12 or more years ago by Koford, is still remaining about constant. The future is not particularly bright, however, because of: (1) the trend toward, and constant demand for, more and more roads into its mountain retreat; (2) more people getting into the habitat of this shy and retreating bird; (3) more oil exploration and development; (4) more arid land being brought into production, and less use by livestock of these lands; (5) fewer carcasses being left lying for these natural scavengers; (6) frequent poisoning of predators and rodents by federal and state governments and local interests; and (7) the far-ranging flights of these soaring birds in search of food which make protection difficult.

The Florida Everglade Kite (*Rostrhamus sociabilis plumbeus*).—This kite is now confined in the breeding season to the shore of Lake Okeechobee in southern Florida, and wanders but a short distance away even in winter. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife recently found record of *but four males and two females* remaining. Possibly because of drought conditions, with the lake level some four feet below normal, there appeared to be no attempt at nesting this past season. Land use in this area is not favorable to this species as there is much diking and drainage, which steadily reduce the essential habitat of the bird. This hawk is not adaptable and has such a restrictive diet that it subsists almost exclusively on one species of water snail found along the periphery of the lake. The chance of survival of this species in the United States seems slight indeed.

Prairie chickens (*Tympanuchus cupido* subspp. and *T. pallidicinctus*).—These birds continue to remain low, as range deterioration continues almost throughout the entire range of the various species and races. They are not very adaptable and, consequently, cannot survive where their prairie grass habitat is destroyed. In Wisconsin, Michigan, and Illinois, the state game and fish departments have exerted much effort properly to manage their birds.[7] The public has been made aware of these interesting birds and many individuals have contributed funds to buy breeding grounds for them. In Wisconsin, two foundations have been formed and have spent more than $175,000.00 on the purchase of prairie chicken habitat. These lands, when purchased, are turned over to the State Department of Conservation for management. Another foundation was formed in Illinois, and it, likewise, is purchasing suitable prairie land to save its birds. Michigan and New Mexico conservation departments, likewise, are exerting every effort to set aside suitable habitat and so manage the prairie chicken that these species will be saved as a part of the states' avifauna.

"Attwater's" prairie chicken (*T. c. attwateri*).—This subspecies is in a most precarious state, and unless something constructive is done in the near future another race of a majestic game bird will be driven into oblivion. Before the turn of the century, this bird was abundant in the grassy prairies along almost the entire Gulf Coast of Texas, and ranged into 10 parishes in Louisiana. With the plowing of the prairie sod, overgrazing, clean farming, and relentless slaughter, the original population of possibly a million birds in Texas dropped to about 8,700 by 1937, and now probably to only a very few hundred.[9, 12] These are scattered over some 11 counties in small disjunct populations. While the small remnant is now well protected, the urgent need is for the establishment of at least two refuge areas of not less than 10,000 acres, each containing proper habitat where sound management practices will be used.

Whooping Crane (*Grus americana*).—The Whooping Crane's status has deteriorated

from that of a year ago.[2] There was no reproduction this past year, apparently because of high water and cold, unfavorable weather during the summer. In the winter months there has apparently been a further reduction so that only 28 birds are known to have migrated north (as of 1 May 1963). At the northward migration, 1962, there were 38 wild birds (plus 7 in captivity, 6 in the Audubon Park Zoo at New Orleans and 1 at San Antonio, Texas). There has been guarded optimism about the future as there were only 14 birds in existence as late as 1938. One bird died last year (winter of 1961–62) on the wintering ground and two failed to return to the Aransas wintering area from the long summer retreat in or near the Wood Buffalo National Park in the central-southern district of Mackenzie and adjacent northern Alberta. The future is hazardous for such birds of low fecundity reduced to such small numbers and so restricted in winter range. A major need is more acceptable winter range.

The few birds successfully produced and reared in captivity add some encouragement to the hope that the species need not perish if skilled management of captive birds is exercised. It would be wiser if captive birds were more widely dispersed than at present. This would reduce danger from disease, storms, and accidents.

Losses of wild whoopers, at least in recent years, apparently have consisted mostly of non-breeders, and most of these were believed to be subadults which summer (away from the breeding grounds) farther south in Canada where hazards may be more serious.

Hawaiian Gallinule (*Gallinula chloropus sandvicensis*).—This rare gallinule is an endemic resident of the islands of Kauai, Molokai, and Oahu, but it has been decreasing alarmingly for 10 to 15 years because of the continuous destruction of its essential habitat through drainage. Its existence on Oahu, where there is the greatest demand for human use of the land, is the most precarious. Conversely, it is most abundant on Kauai where there is heavy rainfall, more habitat, and fewer people. Transplanting attempts on Hawaii and Maui, unfortunately, were unsuccessful.

Eskimo Curlew (*Numenius borealis*).—Although thought at times to have passed the point of no return, the Eskimo Curlew still survives. At least two were observed on the beaches of Galveston, Texas, last spring, and it was seen near Rockport, Texas, in the spring of 1963. When we consider the many miles of Gulf Coast beach, within the presumptive migration pattern, it seems probable that other Eskimo Curlews have passed undetected.

Hudsonian Godwit (*Limosa haemastica*).—This attractive species is not in immediate danger of extermination. It has, however, long been rated as one of our very rare shorebirds. If a local picture is of interest, we note that each spring this species visits the 7,800 acre Welder Foundation Refuge, 30 miles north of Corpus Christi, Texas, in twos and threes. This past spring, from 10 to 45 birds were there for nearly a month, and a few remained for more than six weeks.

Puerto Rican Parrot (*Amazona v. vitata*).—This parrot is confined chiefly to the Luquillo National Forest of some 3,200 acres in eastern Puerto Rico, elevation 1,600 to 2,700 feet. The population has been steadily decreasing for a number of years, and about 200 birds are left. The causes of decline are presently restricted habitat and serious predation by rats. A Federal Aid study now completed indicates need for a well directed rat control project and acquisition of additional habitat. We are assured that effort is being made to accomplish this.

Ivory-billed Woodpecker (*Campephilus principalis*).—No recent study has been made of the status of this exceedingly rare giant woodpecker since our last year's report,[2] when we could find record of only five birds—two pairs and one single bird. It is probable that this species is on the doorstep to oblivion.

In addition to the above forms treated specifically, the following are also seriously endangered (some are probably rarer than a number treated in greater detail, but detailed data are lacking):

Reddish Egret (*Dichromanassa r. rufescens*), not in immediate danger, but probably decreasing slowly; "Giant" Canada Goose (*Branta canadensis maxima*), still extant but relatively rare, protection and a program of restoration needed;[11] eagles (see last year's report[2]), a bill with a crippling amendment has passed Congress to amend the Bald Eagle Act and add similar protection to the Golden Eagle (the amendment provides that the governor of any state can authorize whatever "control" is necessary on Golden Eagles but Secretary Udall has ruled that poison and hunting from airplanes are prohibited); Hawaiian Stilt (*Himantopus h. knudseni*), decreasing mainly because of destruction of habitat; Puerto Rican Whip-poor-will (*Caprimulgus noctitherus*); Bachman's Warbler (*Vermivora bachmanii*); Cape Sable Sparrow (*Ammospiza mirabilis*); Dusky Seaside Sparrow (*A. nigrescens*); Ipswich Sparrow (*Passerculus princeps*); Song Sparrows (three races) of the San Francisco Bay area, California.

Some 13 Hawaiian species of native forest birds of the families Turdidae and Drepanididae are reported as becoming dangerously rare.

Pesticide Problem

Space permits only brief mention of the complex, controversial, but highly important pesticide-wildlife problem. This report should be considered a supplement to the 1960 and 1961 reports.[1, 2] Those interested should carefully review the scholarly report in *The Wilson Bulletin*, by Dr. Joseph J. Hickey,[8] entitled "Some effects of insecticides on terrestrial birdlife in the Middle West," where many supplementary references are cited. Other excellent reports on the pesticide question and other major current conservation problems are succinctly and objectively discussed in the Conservation Committee Report to the Wilson Ornithological Society (Dr. Thomas G. Scott *et al.*[10, 11]).

Another reference of recent date and unusual significance is the three-issue summary appearing in the *New Yorker*[4] of 16, 23, and 30 June 1962, by Rachel Carson, entitled *Silent Spring*. The book by this same title was published in September by Houghton Mifflin Company, 2 Park Street, Boston 7, Massachusetts (see *Auk*, 80: 209–213, 1963). This book, skillfully and objectively written, although with deep convictions, represents an honest attempt accurately to analyze the effects that pesticides are, or may be, having on the environment in which we live, and shows some of the direct and indirect effects that pesticides are having upon birds and other organisms. The eminent writer, a lady of unquestioned integrity, is an accomplished biologist and has made the most exhaustive and careful study of this complex and difficult subject to date. This Committee believes that Dr. Carson's book should be carefully reviewed by every student of nature.

Among other significant papers concerning the pesticide-wildlife problem is Brown's[3] appraisal of four detailed case histories, including the fire ant. This is a splendid review and is objectively written.

Because of past controversies, particularly some that centered around the fire ant "eradication" program of the Southeast, the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council was asked to study the entire problem. One over-all and three sub committees were set up. Two reports have been published; Number 920-A deals with the "Evaluation of pesticide-wildlife problems," and Number 920-B with "Policy and procedures of pest control." The third part, to be Number 920-C, and to treat pesticide-wildlife research, has not been published although it was scheduled to appear some months ago. It has been held up because of controversies that have developed within the committee.

Perhaps the appraisal of the three committees by the Conservation Committee of the Wilson Ornithological Society[10, 11] succinctly expresses the views of many wildlife and ornithological biologists who have studied the reports and the problem: "The scientists designated to serve on the committee (and as Secretary) were obviously highly qualified in their fields, but their fields of experience are so closely allied to the problem that some question may be raised as to whether some might not have provided greater service as witnesses than as judges. . . ."[10]

Concerning 920-A, the 1962 report[11] states:

> Part 1, Evaluation of Pesticide-Wildlife Problems, has been examined. We are disappointed in it. The stature of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council will not be enhanced by this publication. . . . The fear expressed in the last annual report[10] . . . has been realized. The report is neither detailed nor documented, and there is a stiffness about it which marks it as a forced compromise instead of an unbiased, philosophical evaluation of the problem. Perhaps this could have been avoided if the report had been prepared by scholars who were not so closely associated with the problem. An important theme centers around a defense of pesticides. . . . The problem, as we see it, does not lie with whether the wise use of pesticides in general is justifiable. The problem lies in the question of whether the utmost intelligence is employed in decisions to use or not to use a pesticide in a particular situation and, if so, whether operating specifications, such as kind and form of pesticide, rate of application, time of application, etc., reflect consideration of wildlife and other values.

Your chairman also is critical of the two published reports because they bypass or gloss over consideration of major issues and problems which are basic to an objective study of the pesticide-wildlife issue.

It is to be hoped the President's Interdepartmental Pesticide Review Board may in effect correct some of the shortcomings of the National Academy of Science's pesticide-wildlife study. Obviously the basic problems are far from resolved in the broadest public interest. The American

public probably will yet be more fully aroused when the facts are more clearly understood. A more dynamic program of conservation education obviously is needed.

LITERATURE CITED

1. A. O. U. Report to the American Ornithologists' Union by the Committee on Bird Protection. 1960. Auk, **78:** 244–255.
2. A. O. U. Report to the American Ornithologists' Union by the Committee on Bird Protection. 1961. Auk, **79:** 463–478.
3. BROWN, W. L. 1961. Mass insect control programs: four case histories. Psyche, **68:** 75–109.
4. CARSON, R. 1962. Silent spring, a reporter at large. The New Yorker, 16 June, pp. 35–99; 23 June, pp. 31–89; 30 June, pp. 35–67.
5. CANADIAN GOVERNMENT. Resources for tomorrow. 1961. Conference report, background papers, Vols. 1 and 2. 1,061 pp. Ottawa, Queen's Printer.
6. CANADIAN GOVERNMENT. Resources for tomorrow. 1962. Conference report, proceedings, Vol. 3. 519 pp. Ottawa, Queen's Printer.
7. HAMERSTROM, F., and F. HAMERSTROM. 1961. Status and problems of North American grouse. Wilson Bull., **73:** 284–294.
8. HICKEY, J. J. 1961. Some effects of insecticides on terrestrial birdlife in the middle west. Wilson Bull., **73:** 398–424.
9. LEHMANN, V. W. 1941. Attwater's prairie chicken, its life history and management. North Amer. Fauna, No. 57, Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office. 65 pp.
10. SCOTT, T. G. *et al.* 1961. Annual report of the conservation committee. Wilson Bull., **73:** 310–319.
11. SCOTT, T. G. *et al.* 1962. Annual report of the conservation committee. Wilson Bull., **74:** 205–224.
12. WILKE, L. A. 1960. Their future is in your hands. Texas Game and Fish, **19:** 4, 5, 27.

Respectfully submitted,

IRA N. GABRIELSON
H. ALBERT HOCHBAUM
DAVID A. MUNRO
ROBERT A. MCCABE
RICHARD POUGH
CLARENCE COTTAM, *Chairman*