

NOTES AND NEWS

The review section of the current volume of the *Auk* continues to give attention to mimeographed writings by listing merely the titles of journals appearing in this form. This discreet practice revives in our minds the question of the status of mimeographed contributions as formal publications. Mimeographing can not be commended from the standpoint of permanency, but no absolute criterion of this sort can be applied in view of the ephemeral nature of much that is printed in orthodox fashion. More significant is the matter of the meager editorial scrutiny which some mimeographed contributions receive; this deters their recognition as publications. Care in selection of material and in its preparation is in a measure proportional to the cost of publication. Somewhere the scientific bibliographer must draw lines, and one of these lines can be set automatically to exclude mimeographed writings, thus placing them in the category of manuscripts. Such arbitrary limitation should be less open to criticism than a debatable selection made on the basis of adjudged merit of the contribution involved. Storer, in *Science* (vol. 75, 1932, pp. 486-487), discussed this question and in the end accepted Stiles' view that any material intended for permanent record and made reasonably available should be considered published. This would include, therefore, certain mimeographed "publications." It would be unthinkable that any serious investigator would ignore mimeographed material if something really pertinent to the solution of his problem could be obtained from it. So likewise with material available to him in ordinary manuscripts. However, from the legalistic angle of nomenclature and in other circumstances of similarly formal nature we hold that mimeographing does not constitute publication.—A. H. M.

The postcard vote called for in our last issue (p. 180) on the question of completely closing the season on waterfowl (ducks and geese), versus continuance of an annual open season, met with sufficient response, we think, to be fairly significant. The vote was 23 to 1 for a closed season of at least two years' duration; some were for a much longer closed period. Only one vote was received from any person vocationally identified with a state or federal agency engaged in game administration, although several voters are, or have been, hunters. This was thus an expression of judgment by free-lance naturalists; and for the most part these are field observers in the West. Speaking, now, for the one person whose initials are appended, the declaration of a prolonged closed season seems the only practicable method in sight of saving the rarer *species* from extinction—from joining the limbo of the Labra-

dor Duck. It is believed that the present factor of shooting is the dominant one against the ducks; but if reduced nesting ground be the most important adverse factor, then, say, a 3-year respite from gunning would prove the point: Marked increase then would justify throwing the season open again. We as naturalists are doubtless "sentimental" in this matter: we abhor the wiping out of *any species*—the lopping off of the results of age-long evolutionary process. To many hunters, no doubt, mallards and pintails are the "best" ducks anyway, and as long as these can be fostered through "management" of breeding grounds and can hold up under the annual shooting, all is rosy. But the naturalist equally desires the continued existence of the canvasback, redhead, spoonbill, ringneck, ruddy, and the rest. These other less tolerant ducks, we hold, could all suffer extermination and still there might be "ducks unlimited" from the sportsman's viewpoint. *We* want to insure continuing existence of *all* our species of waterfowl. Again this fall there will be slaughter of ducks and without discrimination of species on the part of many shooters; this was decided in places of authority long ago. But another year will come, and everyone nature-minded should study the problem and then publicly stand by the conclusions he reaches; we yearn for real waterfowl protection before any species is actually gone.—J. G.

The magazine "Aviculture", published by the Avicultural Society of America, is now edited by two Pacific Coast representatives of that organization, Dr. Leon Patrick and Mr. Eric C. Kinsey. Both men are members of the Cooper Ornithological Club. It is hoped that the profitable interchange of ideas between aviculturalists and Cooper Club members with other special interests will be continued and amplified through this fortunate circumstance. Mr. Kinsey as associate editor has announced to us the intention of making the magazine one of high scientific worth.—A. H. M.

We have read lately at least three government bulletins in which methods of stopping or lessening damage done by birds are recommended, other than by killing the birds. Contrivances to repel levies by birds upon crops or upon fishes in ponds, or to exclude them from access to these, have been devised through observation and experimentation, and they prove to be cheap to construct and thoroughly effective. We particularly commend to our readers, in illustration of this kind of economic treatise, Leaflet No. 120, U. S. D. A., "Excluding Birds from Reservoirs and Fishponds", written by W. L. McAtee and S. E. Piper. The trend thus away from the killing of birds, by poison or otherwise, for "economic"

reasons, is one that will be warmly commended by all naturalists who are concerned over the welfare of our native bird-life.—J. G.

Of decided historical as well as ornithological bearing is the contribution entitled "Birds of the Southwest" [By Charles Edward Howard Aiken] (Colorado College Publ. No. 212, Colorado Springs, March, 1937, 78 pp., map). This is a compilation painstakingly done by Edward R. Warren from the notes and collections left by Aiken and now owned by the Colorado College. The feature of greatest interest, perhaps, to readers outside of Colorado is Aiken's journal of his trip to New Mexico and Arizona in 1876. This includes many data concerning the birds met with, some of which must be new to published literature and have importance for a knowledge of the changing status of bird-life in a 60-year period. Mr. Warren not only edited this entire contribution, but also is responsible for the extended biography of Aiken which forms part of it.—J. G.

MINUTES OF COOPER CLUB MEETINGS NORTHERN DIVISION

MAY.—The regular monthly meeting of the Northern Division of the Cooper Ornithological Club was held on Thursday, May 27, at 8 p.m., in Room 2503 Life Sciences Building, Berkeley, with President Kinsey in the chair and about fifty members and guests present. The president took occasion publicly to thank Mr. William H. Behle for the large part which he, as general chairman, played in the success of the annual meeting in April. Minutes of the Northern Division for March and of the Southern Division for March and April were read by title only. Applications for membership were read from A. E. Culbertson, Fresno State College, Fresno, California, proposed by William T. Shaw, and W. Lawton Hargreaves, Lakehurst Hotel, 1569 Jackson Street, Oakland, proposed by Hilda W. Grinnell.

Mr. Kinsey praised the work of the Junior Audubon Societies of Marin County in protecting nesting birds on the school grounds. Mr. Dyer said that young thrashers which he is hand feeding had begun to sing, although only a week out of the nest. Mr. Hargreaves described the nesting site of a pair of Western Bluebirds in the garden of an old house on Broadway at Webster Street in Oakland, a section having heavy traffic. Mr. Kinsey told of the almost complete extermination of formerly large colonies of Yellow-billed Magpies in Hall's Valley, near Mt. Hamilton, due probably to shooting and to poison set out for rodents, in spite of protection on the extensive privately owned ranch of J. B. Grant. There was discussion of the attraction of rock salt for many bird species in their natural state. English aviculturists have long considered table salt detri-

mental but are now experimenting with rock salt.

Mr. Gordon H. True, Jr., Economic Biologist of the State Division of Fish and Game, spoke on "Introduced Game Birds in California." He outlined the history of game introduction in this state, which began with individual attempts and is now carried on by the California Fish and Game Commission from a center at the Yountville Game Farm. Present methods he illustrated with three examples: the Chinese Pheasant, a distinct success, the Hungarian Partridge, not successful, and the Chukar Partridge, whose status remains an unknown quantity. He concluded that the importing of exotic species is justifiable where an unoccupied ecologic niche may be filled, but questioned the propriety of bringing in species which would compete with native species.

A reel of motion pictures of Utah shore birds, taken by Dr. John W. Sugden, was shown by Mr. Behle. These pictures were taken at the Bear River Refuge, the heronries of the Jordan and Bear rivers, and islands of Great Salt Lake and Utah Lake. A nesting colony of Franklin Gulls was of particular interest. Mr. Dyer very kindly loaned his motion picture projector for the occasion, and he himself presented a reel in colors showing Allen Hummingbirds in his garden in Piedmont and ducks on Stow Lake in Golden Gate Park, San Francisco.

Adjourned.—FRANCES CARTER, *Recording Secretary*.

JUNE.—The regular monthly meeting of the Northern Division of the Cooper Ornithological Club was held on Thursday, June 24, 1937, at 8 p.m., in Room 2503 Life Sciences Building, Berkeley, with President Kinsey in the chair and about thirty members and guests present. Minutes of the Northern Division for May were read and approved. Minutes of the Southern Division for May were read. Names proposed for membership were as follows: Mrs. Victor Bello, Ross Grammar School, Ross, California, by Mrs. Otis H. Smith; Mr. Arthur W. Jefcoat, care Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Paynes Creek, California, by J. M. Linsdale; Mr. Chandler P. North, 68 Tamalpais Road, Berkeley, by Frank Richardson.

Mr. Alden Miller read a letter from Mr. John H. Baker, together with a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the National Association of Audubon Societies condemning the practice of poisoning native wild mammals by Federal and State agencies. Mr. Baker requested the adoption by this club of the same or a similar resolution, and the sending of notice of action taken, with copy of the resolution, to the President of the United States, White House, Washington, D. C. The resolution was unanimously adopted and the action authorized.

Mr. Covell asked whether or not the Cooper