

The Santa Cruz Island Vireo

BY JOSEPH GRINNELL

Vireo mailliardorum new species

CHARACTERS—Similar to *Vireo huttoni* of the mainland of California, but slightly inferior in size with especially smaller bill; coloration darker, more leaden olive above and a little more buffy yellow below posteriorly.

TYPE—♂ (in unworn adult annual plumage); No. 5425 Coll. J. G.; Friar's Harbor, Santa Cruz Island, California; September 1, 1903; collected by J. Grinnell.

MEASUREMENTS (in inches)—

Collection	No.	Date	Sex	Wing	Tail	Tarsus	Culmen	Bill from nostril
J. Grinnell	5424	Sept. 1, '03	♀	2.35	2.15	.78	.40	.25
"	5425	" " "	♂	2.40	2.16	.71	.40	.25
"	5426	" " "	♂	2.38	2.14	.76	.39	.24
J. & J.W. Mailliard	3145	April 15, '98	♂	2.39	2.11	.76	.40	.25
"	3171	" 17, "	♀	2.27	2.06	.72	.39	.24
"	3218	" 21, "	♂	2.43	2.15	.72	.40	.25

DISTRIBUTION—Permanently resident on Santa Cruz Island, California.

REMARKS—Santa Cruz Islands lies about twenty miles off the coast of Santa Barbara county, California. Although it is so close to the mainland, a large number of its plants and more sedentary animals have proven to be peculiar. Mr. Joseph Mailliard during a visit to this island in 1898^a secured three specimens of the above-described bird. Moreover he mentioned some of its points of difference as compared with the mainland *Vireo huttoni*; but his well-known conservative attitude in regard to slightly defined species deterred him from bestowing a name. During a recent visit to Santa Cruz Island I also found *Vireo mailliardorum* to be fairly numerous among the live-oaks in the canyons at the west end. Three specimens were obtained. The six skins at hand agree in the characters as outlined. The species is named for Messrs. Joseph and John W. Mailliard, whose conscientious work with western birds deserves at least this slight token of our recognition.

CORRESPONDENCE

The A. O. U. Model Law

TO THE EDITORS OF THE CONDOR:

DEAR SIR:—Under the head of 'Editorial Notes' in the September-October issue of THE CONDOR is a most surprising outburst of criticism and abuse of the A. O. U. 'model law' and, incidentally, of the A. O. U. Committee on Bird Protection, so evidently prompted by selfishness and so pervaded with ignorance and misconception of the real facts of the case that a word in reply seems desirable. The outcry¹ is against the clause granting permits to properly accredited persons for the collection of birds and their nests and eggs for strictly scientific purposes, which was inserted especially to allow "Ornithology to come in." "Take this feature away, says the writer,² "and it is a good law." He glories in the fact that his own State of California "is still free," and adds that "it is largely to this fact that its exceptional ornithological activity is due. We need a good bird law here, but we of the Cooper Club are not criminals and do not require to be bonded when we seek the festive song sparrow or chickadee."

The fact is overlooked that without this provision the ornithologists who merely collect birds, for scientific study, the pot hunter and the commercial bird trapper would all be in the same criminal category of law breakers, subject to arrest and punishment whenever detected.

³ The hardship, heré editorially so grossly exaggerated, of taking out a bond and paying the trivial fee of one dollar a year, suffices to differentiate the ornithological collector from the criminal classes, and ensures his protection from the annoyance of arrest, to which he would otherwise be liable. The law cannot well otherwise discriminate such non-criminals as the members of the Cooper Club, or of the A. O. U., or other reputable bird students, from the pot hunter, the mil-

^a Bulletin Cooper Orn. Club I, May 1899, p. 44.