

*Acknowledgments.*—The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Messrs. Outram Bangs of the Museum of Comparative Zoology and Donald R. Dickey for use of material in their collections, and to Mr. Adriaan J. van Rossem for helpful criticisms and for the line drawing of bills published herewith.—LAURENCE M. HUEY, *Natural History Museum, Balboa Park, San Diego, California, February 23, 1927.*

**A New Race of Gila Woodpecker from Lower California.**—When specimens of the Gila Woodpecker collected by Chester C. Lamb in May, 1926, at the eastern base of the Sierra San Pedro Martir reached the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology and were compared with our series of the species from the lower Colorado River valley, outstanding differences were at once apparent. In visiting the Carnegie Museum last autumn, I found in the A. W. Anthony collection there, three examples that showed the same characters. And now others of similar features are available, from various localities in the upper waist of the Lower California peninsula, so that there is no question but that a definite area is occupied by a definable new subspecies differing from *Centurus uropygialis uropygialis* Baird to the northward and from *C. u. brewsteri* Ridgway to the southward. (See Ridgway, *Birds N. and Mid. Amer.*, Part VI, 1914, pp. 93-97.)

At the outset, I hasten to acknowledge borrowings of pertinent material from several sources: from the Carnegie Museum, through W. E. Clyde Todd; from the California Academy of Sciences, through Harry S. Swarth; from the San Diego Society of Natural History, through Clinton G. Abbott; and from the private collection of Laurence M. Huey. I am particularly indebted to Mr. Huey for presenting outright to the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology the specimen of his which, because least worn and least soiled by cactus sap, as well as because of its beautiful make, I preferred to choose as a type. The new subspecies may be called

*Centurus uropygialis cardonensis.* San Fernando Gila Woodpecker

*Type.*—No. 50529, Mus. Vert. Zool.; male, "breeding"; mouth of Cañon San Juan de Dios, within ten miles east of El Rosario, near latitude 30°, Baja California; collected by Mrs. May Canfield, May 2, 1925; orig. no. 2975, coll. Laurence M. Huey.

*Diagnosis.*—In its main characters similar to *Centurus uropygialis uropygialis*, but general coloration much darker: whole head (except for red patch on crown) and anterior lower surface strongly tinged with snuff brown rather than pale drab; and white barring on closed wings, tail, dorsum, rump, flanks, and lower tail coverts, narrower, leaving the black-barring correspondingly broader. Similar to *C. u. brewsteri*, but size larger, and coloration darker, in the same respects though not to quite so great a degree as shown in comparison with *uropygialis*. In other words, the new form differs from both the previously known races in the deeper brown tinge of the head and lower surface and in the greater degree of predominance of black over white in the barring.

*Measurements.*—Of type of *cardonensis*: Wing, 133.0 mm.; tail, 80.5; exposed culmen, 31.1; bill from nostril, 25.9; depth of bill at nostrils, 7.8; tarsus, 24.0; outer anterior toe, 19.7. Compare with table of Ridgway (*loc. cit.*, p. 94). The widths of the white bars on the inner webs of the outer rectrices in the type of *cardonensis* average 2.3 mm.; in an example of *uropygialis*, 4.0; in an example of *brewsteri*, 2.9.

*Range.*—So far as now known, only the giant cactus (*cardon*) association in the northern section of the Lower Californian peninsula, from about latitude 30° to latitude 31°. Life-zone, Lower Sonoran. Specimens representing unequivocally this race come from the following localities: San Fernando, 4; the type locality, 1; three miles east of San Quintin, 1; El Cajon Cañon, 3200 feet altitude, east base of Sierra San Pedro Martir, 4; San Felipe (latitude 31°, on the Gulf), 1. To the northward, the nearest locality represented by Gila Woodpeckers is El Major, near latitude 32° 10', in the Colorado delta; these are good *uropygialis*. To the southward, beyond a considerable gap doubtless inhabited by Gila Woodpeckers but from which I have seen no specimens, comes a series of good *brewsteri* from Santa Margarita Island, latitude 24° 30'. Intergradation between *cardonensis* and *brewsteri* must take place somewhere along between 26° and 30° latitude. Of *brewsteri*, I have before me 31 skins; of *uropygialis*, 44 skins.

*Remarks.*—The only previous published ascription known to me, of the Gila Woodpecker to the territory here included definitely within the range of *cardonensis* is by A. W. Anthony (*Auk*, XII, April, 1895, pp. 138-139, under the name *Melanerpes uropygialis*), from San Fernando. He says, after statements as to its local habitat: "My

skins [doubtless the three before me at this writing] from this region show the San Fernando bird to be rather smaller than those from Arizona, with the white markings of the wings and upper parts somewhat restricted. It may seem desirable to separate them as a subspecies, but with the series at present available, I do not consider it advisable." The present findings corroborate Anthony's suggestions, save that I am unable to see any difference in size in the materials now compared, as between *cardonensis* and *uropygialis*. Ridgway (*loc. cit.*, pp. 95, 96) cites Anthony's locality, San Fernando, and the reference, under the heading *Centurus uropygialis uropygialis*, but without further comment.

The races of the Gila Woodpecker now to be recognized are as follows, listing them from north to south:

1. *Centurus uropygialis uropygialis* Baird. Arizona Gila Woodpecker.
2. *Centurus uropygialis cardonensis* Grinnell. San Fernando Gila Woodpecker.
3. *Centurus uropygialis brewsteri* Ridgway. San Lucas Gila Woodpecker.

—J. GRINNELL, *Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, March 27, 1927.*

**Birds of the Atlin Region, British Columbia: A Reply to Criticism.**—In the March, 1927, issue of THE CONDOR (XXIX, pp. 112-114) Major Allan Brooks subjects me to rather severe criticism regarding sins of omission and commission in my "Report on a collection of birds and mammals from the Atlin region, northern British Columbia" (Univ. Calif. Publ. Zool., vol. 30, no. 4, 1926). Major Brooks and I spent some pleasant months together engaged in the field work upon which that report is based, and devoted time and energy to discussion of the problems involved. As may be inferred, we did not always agree. Verbal arguments may become extremely heated without at all affecting the pleasant relations of the speakers, while the same arguments in print may convey a false impression of the feelings of the debaters. I wish, therefore, at the outset to disclaim any personal animus in the following reply, and to express my appreciation of the generous compliments contained in the first paragraph of Major Brooks' article. As regards the need of a reply it has been suggested to me that silence on my part would be misconstrued, and that it is desirable that I explain why I still adhere, as I do, to the convictions previously expressed.

First, though, when, as in the present case, there is assertion and repeated implication of forgetfulness and carelessness on my part, I may be permitted to examine into the qualifications of my critic to judge in such matters. Let us look at some of the statements he makes. Under *Dendragapus obscurus flemingi* (p. 113), allusion is made to "Swarth's Teslin Lake bird." I collected no Fleming Grouse at Teslin Lake, nor did I say that I did. Under *Bubo virginianus* (p. 114) is the following: "Swarth's citation of the specimens collected should have said young male and female instead of adult male and female taken July 3. These were a brood of two that I took with one parent." My citation of specimens collected includes this statement: "an adult male, and male and female in post-juvenal molt, July 3" (Swarth, *loc. cit.*, p. 113). On the next page explanation is made that these are of one family. What is there to complain of in this, and how can Brooks' criticism be explained other than as the result of careless reading of what I wrote? Under the circumstances I am satisfied to believe that in memory and carefulness I am at least equal to my critic.

Now as regards the status of certain disputed forms. Of the Horned Owls, Major Brooks is speaking from memory. He has not examined the birds since he saw them when they were shot. I have had the advantage of comparing them with other series. I may say here, that while it is due to his generosity that I secured these owls, he himself was so little interested in preparing any as specimens that in some cases he left the owl in the woods where it was shot, to be retrieved by me later. With no claim to originality I can but repeat a statement that I have heard, that it is extraordinary the lack of interest that is frequently shown in the larger birds!

As to the Goshawk, I do not understand Brooks' position. There is implied recognition of a northwestern race in his statement, and explicit recognition of such in a previous article (Condor, XXVIII, 1926, p. 79), which, in general, is my own view. If there are mistakes in nomenclature, as Brooks claims (*loc. cit.*), they should, of course, be corrected by whomever knows the facts. The specimen I shot and described is as I described it.