

Because any one person fails to derive pleasure from a certain pursuit, it is not incumbent upon him to decry that pursuit as followed by anyone else, *unless* it involves an infringement of the rights of others. Let us be tolerant of one another's peculiarities.

We know of some very despicable cases of egg-hoggishness. Some egg-collecting is absolutely useless from any standpoint, and that sort we condemn. No *reasonable* collector will pursue any of our native animals to the verge of extermination. We believe that moderate collecting will not work diminution in the numbers of any of our birds. We believe in the *temperate* collecting of anything which results in added happiness to the individual, just so no one else is directly inconvenienced thereby. Such an occupation becomes all the more commendable when it results in the addition of reliable information to our sum total of scientific knowledge.—J. G.

**RECORD** In Mr. William Brewster's admirable work just published on "The Birds of the Cambridge Region of Massachusetts," we find in the preface a statement of principles which deserve the widest possible recognition by serious bird students. We have ourselves intended to express similar views in these columns. But now that we have them from so eminent an authority, and so distinctly stated, we take the liberty of quoting them verbatim. These sentiments should be taken to heart by the author of every proposed local list or record. Publication of any sort of information intended to be of scientific value is a serious step, and is not to be taken lightly. It is very easy to foist upon the science of ornithology undesirable, not to say erroneous, literature.

Mr. Brewster says:—"My early training and experience have led me to believe that—with certain exceptions about to be specified—the occurrence of birds in localities or regions lying outside their known habitats should not be regarded as definitely established until actual specimens have been taken and afterwards determined by competent authorities. No doubt it is becoming more and more difficult to live up to this rule because of the ever increasing and, in the main, wholesome, popular feeling against the killing of birds for whatever purpose. Nevertheless I cannot admit that mere observation of living birds met with in localities where they do not properly belong, or where they have not been ascertained to occasionally appear, should often be considered as establishing anything more than possible or probable instances of occurrence—according to the weight and character of the evidence.

"Exceptions to the rule may and indeed *should* be made in the cases of species which, like the Turkey Vulture, the Swallow-tailed Kite, and the Cardinal, are easily recognized at a distance and which are reported by persons known to have had previous familiarity with the birds in life. Sight identifications of species somewhat less distinctly characterized than those just mentioned, if made under favorable conditions by observ-

ers of long field experience and tried reliability, may also sometimes be accepted with entire confidence. But on no authority, however good, should a mere field observation of any bird that is really difficult to identify, be taken as establishing an important primal record.

"These principles, which, in my opinion, should govern the *makers* as well as compilers of all local records, were formerly endorsed, and also followed in the main, by most ornithologists. Of late they have been frequently disregarded, especially by the younger generations of bird lovers and students. I have endeavored to apply them consistently and firmly—yet at the same time tolerantly—in dealing with the records considered in the present paper. If some of my rulings appear arbitrary, it must be remembered that it is not always possible to explain the reasons which cause one to look askance at the testimony of certain observers while accepting that of others with entire confidence. It goes without saying that personal considerations—whether of friendship or the reverse—should never be allowed to influence the judgment of any writer on scientific subjects, but his personal knowledge of men and their methods not only does but *should* exert such influence. Moreover there is often internal evidence in printed testimony—perhaps no more tangible than that to be gained by what is called 'reading between the lines'—that leads one irresistibly, and, as a rule, quite safely, to adopt conclusions which cannot always be logically justified or consistently explained."—J. G.

**WHY SHOULD IT** In number 56 of *The Wilson*  
**HAVE BEEN** *Bulletin* (September, 1906)  
**PRINTED?** occurs an article entitled

"Common Birds of Whittier, California," which excites our severe criticism. In this article appears a half page of introductory matter in which the author states the list following to have been derived from notes taken between November 7, 1905, and May 7, 1906—a period of seven months. And yet the list is divided into "Residents," "Winter Visitors," "Summer Residents," and "Transients"! The author, by the way, is very evidently an "easterner" visiting southern California for the winter. As far as we know, not a specimen was secured to verify the determinations. The list is the main part of the paper, occupying nearly four pages, and embracing no less than ninety-two species. Only one of these, "Numenius sp?", is queried, and we are led to believe that there can be absolutely no doubt as to the identity of each of the other ninety-one species enumerated. What galls us most is that the list is couched in full scientific form, containing both scientific and common names and hence each species must be quoted in our synonymy. These will tax our printer's supply of question marks!

We have quoted elsewhere Mr. Brewster's remarks regarding records, and these are extremely apropos in the present instance.

The article in question is poorly edited in several particulars; for one thing there are altogether too many typographical errors. We would em-