

become, respectively, *Ectopistes macroura* (Linn.), *Zenaidura carolinensis* (Linn.), and *Z. c. marginata* (Linn.). Unfortunate as is this transposition of names, it seems to be a clear case, based on the correct application of sound and generally accepted rules of nomenclature. As the first citation by Linnæus under *Columba macroura* was Edwards's figure and account of the West Indian form of the Mourning Dove, it was natural, in less exacting times, to fix the name on the Mourning Dove, as being the first species mentioned, rather than on the Passenger Pigeon; but of late, in delimiting an early composite species, it is proper, and has become customary, to restrict the name to that part of the composite most clearly indicated by the diagnosis, which in this case is beyond question the Passenger Pigeon.—J. A. A.

Howell on 'Birds that Eat the Cotton Boll Weevil.'—Investigations conducted by the U. S. Department of Agriculture in an effort to control the ravages of the cotton boll weevil include the relation of birds to the weevil. This work was begun in Texas in the autumn of 1904, and continued during the summer of 1905. A recently issued Biological Survey 'Bulletin' contains a further report of progress (for notice of the first report see *antea*, p. 119) by Mr. Howell,¹ based on the examination of the stomachs of birds collected in Texas during July to October, 1905. Of the 62 species examined, 12 were found to have eaten boll weevils. In all 28 species have been found to feed on the weevil, of which the orioles, black-birds, meadowlarks, and the killdeer are among the most important. "Birds," it is said, "are not the least important of the boll weevil's natural enemies, and every species ascertained to feed on it should be protected at all times and places, not only in the cotton-producing area, but along their migration routes." Attention is called to the fact that a number of species that prey upon the weevil are not at the present time protected in Texas.—J. A. A.

Palmer on Federal Game Protection.—Dr. T. S. Palmer, Assistant in Charge of Game Protection, Biological Survey, has given a concise history of Federal Game Protection in the United States,² with especial reference to the first five years of the twentieth century. Prior to the year 1900 the Federal Government had done comparatively little for the protection of game, and nothing for the prevention of the introduction of noxious animals and birds from foreign countries, nor for the regulation of interstate commerce in game, and very little for the protection of game in national parks and reservations. Many of the individual States had

¹ Birds that Eat the Cotton Boll Weevil — a Report of Progress. By Arthur H. Howell. U. S. Department of Agriculture. Biological Survey, No. 25, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1906.—8vo, pp. 22.

² Federal Game Protection — A Five Years' Retrospect. Yearbook of Department of Agriculture for 1905, pp. 541-562.

passed efficient game and bird protection laws, and through cases arising under them the United States Supreme Court had decided important points affecting the rights of States in the protection of game. Among them is the case of *Geer vs. Connecticut*, in 1896, in which the Supreme Court rendered a decision that maintained that game was the property of the State and not of the individual citizens on whose land it might be found, and that the State could protect its game by legislation in any manner it might see fit, even to the prohibition of its export to other States. "This decision," says Dr. Palmer, "gave a new impetus to game legislation throughout the country and encouraged the States to incorporate non-export provisions in their laws."

The first important Federal law for the protection of game, well-known as the Lacey Act, went into effect May 25, 1900, and was the beginning of a new era in Federal game protection. Its origin and history, and the provisions of its five sections, are here briefly stated. Since 1900 four acts relating to game protection have been passed by Congress, each having reference to special features of game protection or to special areas, as the District of Columbia, Alaska, and the establishment of a game refuge in Oklahoma.

The topics especially treated in the present paper, besides the Lacey Act, are the importation of foreign birds and mammals; interstate commerce in game; the dissemination by the Biological Survey of information concerning game protection, and "the propagation, uses, and preservation of birds"; recent Federal legislation; Federal coöperation with State officials in the enforcement of game-protective laws, and with Audubon Societies in the protection of nongame birds; and an account of the various Federal game preserves, eleven in number, of which eight have been established since 1900. Thirteen text-illustrations, in the form of small maps, show diagrammatically the progress of various important features of game protection during the last five years.

The great importance of the Lacey Act, or the Federal law of 1900, as an agency in game protection cannot well be over estimated. Its enactment "infused new life into State laws and made possible the enforcement of provisions which previously had been of little effect. When its operation began to be felt the changed conditions caused shippers to seek means by which they could continue their trade undisturbed. Every advantage was taken of defects in State laws, and various devices, technical or otherwise, were adopted to evade the provisions of the Federal law requiring the marking of packages. Quail and other game birds were concealed in trunks, barrels, egg-cases, and similar misleading packages, and were marked 'butter,' 'dressed poultry,' or 'household goods.' Special shipping tags were devised for the purpose of concealing the identity of the shipper and minimizing the risk which he assumed in forwarding the shipments to market, but these devices have been rendered more and more futile. All the States in the Union except Mississippi now prohibit export, and several of them have stopped the sale of all or certain kinds of game.

Stringent laws prohibiting sale and shipment have been enacted in Missouri and Nebraska. These and the equally sweeping legislation of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin can be and are rigidly enforced through the cooperative influence of the Federal law and the support their enforcement secures from the strong public sentiment that caused their adoption. In Chicago alone thousands of birds illegally shipped have been seized, and from the evidence thus secured many of the shippers in other States have been brought to justice. Under the Federal law more than 50 convictions have been secured, and in nearly half of these cases fines of \$100 or more have been imposed. In each of three cases they amounted to \$150, in two to \$200, and in two others to \$400."

It is only a few years since the rapid annual decrease of game birds in general and of certain species of nongame birds began to attract general attention; the ornithologists of the country and a few sportsmen interested in the preservation of game alone foresaw the doom speedily awaiting many species of our most desirable birds unless measures were promptly taken to check the slaughter waged by market gunners and the milliner's emissaries. The campaign of education, instigated and directed largely by members of the American Ornithologists' Union, has resulted in the rapid growth of a healthy public sentiment in respect to bird preservation, rendering it possible to secure the enforcement as well as enactment of efficient State and Federal laws before such action became too late to be effective. As shown by Dr. Palmer's recital of present conditions, the crisis in game protection is apparently passed and the outlook eminently hopeful.— J. A. A.

Game Protection in 1905.— Dr. Palmer's report on 'Game Protection in 1905'¹ treats of legislation, decisions of courts, administration and enforcement of laws, condition of game, feeding game, importations of live mammals and birds, and game preserves. The year 1905 was "chiefly noteworthy for volume of legislation, more effective enforcement of laws, and experimental and practical work in maintaining and increasing the stock of game." Substantial progress was made in solving the problem of restricting hunting by unnaturalized foreign-born residents, the closing of the game markets of Kansas City and St. Louis, the systematic feeding of game, and the importation of several promising species of game birds, as the introduction of the Gray Partridge, Capercalzie, and the Black Game, chiefly to Grand Island, Michigan, and of Mexican quail into North Carolina and Massachusetts. More attention is given to game preserves by several different States, and several bird reservations were set aside during the year by the United States.— J. A. A.

¹Game Protection in 1905. By T. S. Palmer, Assistant, Biological Survey, Yearbook of U. S. Depart. of Agric. for 1905, pp. 611-617.