

escaped. I found the birds with one exception fat and in excellent condition, but was disappointed to find the stomachs empty; in only three cases I found slight traces of vegetable matter. The birds had not fed since they strayed into the Niagara River. The weights varied from 11 lb. 15 oz. to 18 lb. 10 oz.; a fourth were birds of less than a year old, the remainder were fully white, and some must be very old birds. Mr. P. A. Taverner secured drawings of all the variations in the beaks. The tedious work of making up so many skins was safely accomplished by Mr. H. H. Mitchell and assistants.

---

## THE MACAW OF DOMINICA.

BY AUSTIN HOBART CLARK,

*United States Bureau of Fisheries.*

SOME time ago I published <sup>1</sup> an account of the Macaws which at one time inhabited the Lesser Antillean Islands of Guadeloupe and Martinique, and possibly Dominica, though I was unable to find a definite record of their occurrence in the last named. Mr. Walter Rothschild, who has recently published a magnificent work on the extinct birds of the world, was also unable to state definitely that a macaw had at any time been a resident of that island.

Through the kindness of Mr. J. H. Riley of the U. S. National Museum, who gave me the reference to the work, I am now enabled to remove the query from my previous record of a macaw from Dominica. In a book by Thomas Atwood, dated 1791<sup>2</sup>, I find the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Lesser Antillean Macaws; Auk, Vol. XXII, No. 3, pp. 266-273, July, 1905.

<sup>2</sup> The | History | of the | Island of Dominica. | Containing | a description | of its situation, extent, | climate, mountains, rivers, | natural productions &c. &c. | together with | an account of the civil government, trade, laws | customs, and manners of the different inha- | bitants of that Island, its conquest | by the French, and restoration to the British dominions. | by Thomas Atwood. | London: | printed for J. Johnson, No. 72, St. Paul's Church-yard. | MDCCXCI.

Col. H. W. Fielden and Mr. C. B. Cory both mention this work, but it was not accessible to me when I was working on West Indian birds.

following; speaking of the birds of Dominica he says (p. 29): "The mackaw is of the parrot kind, but larger than the common parrot, and makes a more disagreeable, harsh noise. They are in great plenty, as are also parrots in this island; have both of them a delightful green and yellow plumage, with a scarlet coloured fleshy substance from the ears to the root of the bill, of which colour is likewise the chief feathers of their wings and tail. They breed on the tops of the highest trees, where they feed on the berries in great numbers together; and are easily discovered by their loud chattering noise, which at a distance resembles human voices. The mackaws cannot be taught to articulate words; but the parrots of this country may, by taking pains with them when caught young. The flesh of both is eat, but being very fat, it wastes in roasting, and eats dry and insipid; for which reason, they are chiefly used to make soup of, which is accounted very nutritive."

Of course the possibility at once suggests itself that the "mackaw" is only the larger parrot of the island, *Amazona imperialis* Richmond, the "common parrot" being *Amazona bouqueti* (Bechstein); but in the former there is no red on the face, nor is it green and yellow, nor are the chief feathers of the wings and tail red; moreover, it is quite unlikely that anyone should confuse a macaw and a parrot, while it is quite probable that the two parrots were considered the same species, a misunderstanding of the specific limits of parrots being very prevalent at the present time in the tropics of the New World. There is such a great difference in life between a macaw and a parrot, while the parrots of the genus *Amazona* with which I am acquainted in the field are in general habit so similar, that I am forced to the conclusion that Atwood has considered the two parrots as one, and taken his description from the more brilliantly colored, and that his macaw is a *bona fide* member of the genus *Ara*; but it appears to be different from all the known members of the genus, and may to advantage be known by the provisional name of ***Ara atwoodi***.

I take this opportunity of correcting an error which appears to have been the cause of considerable confusion; in an article on West Indian parrots,<sup>1</sup> I gave a list (p. 344) of all the species known to inhabit or to have inhabited those islands; those now extinct

---

<sup>1</sup> The West Indian Parrots; Auk, Vol. XXII, No. 4, pp. 337-344, October, 1905.

were referred to in a footnote announcing the fact. By a typographical error, the reference number which should have followed *Amazona martinicana* was placed after *Amazona bouqueti*. I did not consider it necessary to call attention to this obvious slip in a special note, more particularly as nothing was said of the species being extinct in the main body of the paper (p. 343) where it is mentioned, while the name *martinicana* is here used for the first time, provisionally conferred upon a long extinct form. Count Salvadori, however,<sup>1</sup> in the following year, notes that "Mr. Clark mentions this species [*bouqueti*] as already extinct," and later<sup>2</sup> publishes a letter from Mr. A. H. Verrill apparently showing that the bird is rather abundant at the present time. While it is unfortunate that the mistake occurred, I cannot quite see how such a palpable typographical error could have passed unnoticed. As a matter of fact I am happy to be able to state that the bird still exists in certain parts of Dominica.

Count Salvadori is not convinced by the arguments with which I tried to show that *Amazona violaceus* (Gmelin) was near *A. imperialis* Richmond, but thrusts it back again into the synonymy of *Deroptyus accipitrinus*; Mr. Rothschild has since resurrected it again, however, and I am still firmly of the opinion that it has nothing whatever to do with *Deroptyus*, for the reasons I have already given. While Mr. Rothschild agrees with me on this point, I must take strong exception to several of the species of Psittacidae he admits to the West Indian avifauna, and in this I am glad to find myself in agreement with such an eminent authority as Count Salvadori. My views on West Indian Psittacidae remain the same as stated in my previous papers.

Mr. Rothschild appears to have overlooked my article on the West Indian Parrakeets, for he makes no reference to it in his bibliography nor in the main body of his work, nor does he mention the numerous species which have become extinct on Barbados, and several of the other islands, to which I called attention in my 'Birds of the Southern Lesser Antilles' (not mentioned by him) and in my 'Extirpated West Indian Birds.'

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibis, [8] VI, October, 1906, p. 643.

<sup>2</sup> Ibis, [9] I, April, 1907, p. 365.