

(p. 5) Turbaco; *Celeus innotatus* (p. 5) Jaraquiel; *Bubo virginianus elutus* (p. 6) Loricá; *Pyrrhura subandina* (p. 6) Jaraquiel; *Eupsychortyx decoratus* (p. 6) Calamar; from Santa Marta, Colombia: *Ostinops decumanus melanterus* (p. 3) Las Vegas; *Icterus mesomelas carrakeri* (p. 4) Fundacion; *Eupsychortyx cristatus littoralis* (p. 6) Mamotoco; from Bolivia: *Ostinops sincipitalis australis* (p. 3) Buenavista; *Attila neoxenus* (p. 4) Rio Yapacani; *Microrhopias melanogastris iliaca* (p. 5) Rio Pilcomayo; *Xiphocolaptes obsoletus* (p. 5) Rio Yapacani. *X. major obscurus* is also proposed (p. 6) as a substitute for *X. m. saturatus* Cherrie preoccupied.—W. S.

Grinnell on the Evening Grosbeak.¹—Just at the time when the eastern race of this erratic bird is attracting attention through the New England and Middle States, by a southward migration of unprecedented extent, Dr. Grinnell gives us the results of a prolonged study of the relationship of the western birds which he considers are divisible into four geographic races instead of two, as given in Ridgway's 'Birds of North and Middle America.' No matter how many races we may decide to recognize we must agree with Dr. Grinnell's contention that the type of *Hesperiphona vespertina montana* was definitely fixed on the plate which accompanies the original description in 'The History of North American Birds,' and that this name belongs to the Mexican bird; Chapman's *H. v. mexicana* becoming a pure synonym. Furthermore Dr. Grinnell finds that birds from the mountains of extreme southern Arizona agree with the Mexican race rather than with that of the Rocky Mountains, which brings this southern form into the limits of the A. O. U. Check-List.

The birds from farther north — representing '*montana*' of the Check-List — he divides into three races: *H. v. brooksi* (p. 20), from British Columbia, type locality, Okanagan; *H. v. californica* (p. 20), from the Sierra Nevada of California north into Oregon, type locality, Crane Flat, Mariposa Co., Cal., and *H. v. warreni* (p. 210), southern Rocky Mountains from Colorado to northern Arizona, type locality, Colorado Springs.—W. S.

Brooks' 'Game Birds of West Virginia.'²—Nearly half of the fourth 'Biennial Report of the Forest, Game and Fish Warden of West Virginia' is devoted to an account of the game birds by Mr. E. A. Brooks, consulting ornithologist to the warden. The eight chapters of this excellent report cover the subjects of forest conditions as related to game birds; hunting game birds; economic value of game birds; propagation; protection; and description of the game birds of the State.

¹ The Subspecies of *Hesperiphona vespertina*. By Joseph Grinnell. The Condor, Vol. XIX, January, 1917, pp. 17-22.

² The Game Birds of West Virginia. By Earle A. Brooks. Fourth Biennial Report of the Forest, Game, and Fish Warden of West Virginia. 1915-1916. July 1, 1916. pp. 93-160.

The list of game birds contains not only descriptions and other information of value to the general reader and sportsman, but a discussion of the distribution of each species in the State including a large number of original records. The report forms another valuable addition to the literature of West Virginian ornithology and a work that can be consulted with profit by anyone interested in the history of American game birds, either from the point of view of the sportsman or the naturalist. A number of interesting photographs illustrate Mr. Brooks' paper the most noteworthy from an ornithological standpoint being a set of four eggs of the Duck Hawk on a ledge on the Great Cacapon River and a nest with three eggs of the Mourning Dove.— W. S.

Forbush's recent Bulletins on Economic Biology.— The Massachusetts State Board of Agriculture has recently issued a valuable Bulletin on 'The Natural Enemies of Birds,'¹ by Edward Howe Forbush, State Ornithologist. The balance of nature, a matter that is too often ignored in the present day enthusiasm for bird protection, is first considered, and then follows a detailed discussion of the several classes of bird enemies; mammals — domestic and wild; birds and reptiles.

Mr. Forbush rightly divides bird enemies into two groups "(1) Those introduced from foreign countries and which therefore tend to disturb the balance of nature, and should be eliminated so far as possible except when under control, either in domestication or in captivity. Such are the dog, house rat, ferret, cat, hog, ox, horse, sheep and goat, English Sparrow and Starling. (2) The native natural enemies, which have through thousands of years become perfectly adjusted in their relation to the species on which they prey. These should not be eliminated, with the exception of those few that threaten our lives or our material welfare, but should be conserved and controlled according to our needs. When a species becomes too numerous it should be reduced in numbers, if too few it should be allowed to increase."

The ninth annual report of the State Ornithologist² presents much matter of interest to those who are trying to interest the public in methods of practical bird protection, while another edition of Mr. Forbush's admirable Bulletin on 'The Domestic Cat'³ testifies to the demand for this publication and the awakening of the public mind to a serious consideration of the cat question. Arrangements have been made to supply this Bulletin to Audubon societies which may desire it for distribution.— W. S.

¹ The Natural Enemies of Birds. By Edward Howe Forbush. Economic Biology — Bulletin No. 3. Mass. State Board of Agriculture. 1916. pp. 1-58.

² Ninth Annual Report of the State Ornithologist, Mass. State Board of Agriculture, for the year 1916. By Edward Howe Forbush. December 6, 1916. pp. 1-26.

³ cf. Auk, 1916, p. 339.