

Valuable Economic Reports.— Mr. E. H. Forbush, State Ornithologist of Massachusetts, in his annual report¹ discusses a number of interesting topics. The feeding and attracting of wild birds are discussed, and also the apparent poisoning of birds by the excessive spraying of trees. The Starling has reached several stations in Massachusetts and additional evidence of its driving away native birds and taking possession of Flickers' nests is presented. There is also an extended discussion as to the damage done by Reedbirds to the rice crop of the South Atlantic States and the shooting of the birds for market rather than as a protection to the rice. The rice industry has for the most part moved westward to Louisiana and the marketing of Reedbirds in South Carolina has greatly decreased in recent years.

Mr. W. L. Finley continues his reports as State Game-warden of Oregon, in a series of monthly bulletins under title of 'The Oregon Sportsman,'² while an exceedingly attractive brochure with many illustrations describes the good work that he has accomplished during 1911-1912.³

Bird Enemies of the Philippine Locust.⁴— A report on this subject by D. B. Mackie which we wish were more definite and detailed is nevertheless worth quoting because of the high rank it assigns to the bird enemies of this notable pest.

"Birds — There are no natural enemies which attack the locust so persistently in all stages as birds. They often congregate where the locust swarms are and remain for days or weeks at the swarm eating their fill as often as they desire. Their importance as locust exterminators cannot be too strongly emphasized. Unfortunately, many of our most persistent locust feeders are not wary in their habits and are ruthlessly snared whenever chance offers. Investigations of the value of birds as locust feeders are limited to cases where individuals have been taken and their stomach contents examined.

"Twenty-four species of locust-eating birds have been identified, in the following families:

Turnicidæ (1)	Alcedinidæ (4)
Coraciidæ (1)	Corvidæ (1)
Ardeidæ (2)	Sylviidæ (2)
Falconidæ (3)	Fringillidæ (2)
Artamidæ (1)	Anatidæ (2)
Phasianidæ (2)	Cuculidæ (1)
Meropidæ (2)	

¹ Fifth Annual Report of the State Ornithologist of the Massachusetts State Board of Agriculture. By Edward Howe Forbush. 1912. January 8, 1913. pp. 1-34.

² The Oregon Sportsman. Vol. I, Nos. 1-4.

³ Game and Fish Protection and Propagation in Oregon, 1911-1912. By William L. Finley, State Game Warden. pp. 1-23.

⁴ Mackie, D. B., Philippine Agr. Review, VI, No. 11, Nov., 1913, p. 541.

"These species represent only a small number of the birds which have been observed but not taken for identification." — W. L. M.

Report on Introduced Pheasants in Massachusetts.¹— There has recently been printed as Document No. 2049 of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, a valuable summary of the history of introduced pheasants within the state. Originally introduced in 1896, from 100 to 2500 have been liberated annually by the Game Commissioners, and the bird is now fairly common. The report touches upon the use of pheasants as game in other countries and other parts of the United States. Details are given of the life history, and methods adopted in rearing the birds. The special adaptability of pheasants to artificial propagation is the prime reason for their extensive distribution.

An open season on pheasants was allowed during only one year since their introduction. The birds increased and reports of damage began to come in. The Commission says: "During the past two years numerous complaints have been made relative to damage to farm crops. Many verbal complaints have been received of which we have no record. Of the formal reports which have been filed at this office, 21 persons complained of damage to corn, 15 to garden truck, 3 to peas, 2 to tomatoes, 2 to fruit, 1 to potatoes. In many instances the potential value of the crop partially or wholly destroyed reaches several hundred dollars, instances being cited where three entire plantings of early sweet corn were pulled up. In some cases fictitious claims have been made, where the damage attributed to the pheasants was done by domestic fowl and by crows. There is no question that in certain localities where the pheasants have increased abnormally very great damage may result unless an effective check is applied, and while in many instances real damage has been done to crops, we have many unsolicited testimonials to the fact that pheasants, though numerous, have never done appreciable damage."

Examination by the Biological Survey of stomachs collected at localities where damage to crops was attributed to the birds, resulted in the following showing: 37 percent of the food counts in the bird's favor; 27 percent is adverse, and the remainder practically neutral. Many notes on pheasant food based on field observations and on a few other stomach analyses are included.

The most interesting part of the pheasant report comprises the able recommendations regarding public policy in relation to the bird. "Apart from the insect-eating capacity of the bird, it has a high food value as a table bird. The present market price is \$2.50 to \$3 a pair, and many thousand dollars' worth of pheasants are imported annually.

"It would be logical, therefore to increase as much as possible the number

¹ Special Report of the Massachusetts Board of Commissioners on Fisheries and Game, relative to the Habits of those birds commonly known as Pheasants. Doc. 2049 Mass. House of Representatives, 1914.