

interesting accounts of the habits of the species are given, those dealing with the Gentoo Penguin, Upland Goose and Steamer Duck being the most extended. *Halobæna murphyi* (p. 146) is described as new from a skin received from South Georgia Island, while *Anthus phillipsi* and *Phrygilus malvinarum* have already been described by the author and *Cleophaea hybrida malvinarum* by Dr. Phillips from material collected on the Falklands. The plates are some excellent reproductions of photographs of Penguins, Geese and Steamer Ducks.

The introductory paragraph of this interesting paper is unfortunately brief. Neither the personnel of the expedition nor the dates which it covered are given nor is there any mention of the size of the collection nor its disposition, though we infer that it is in the Museum of Comparative Zoölogy.—W. S.

Richmond on New Birds from Haiti.¹—Dr. Abbott's recent exploration of the northwestern peninsula of Haiti and the adjacent island of Tortuga has yielded a collection of twenty-three species of birds of which two prove to be new. These Dr. Richmond describes as *Nyctibius griseus abbotti* (p. 1), Port de Pimente, and *Vireo crassirostris tortuga* (p. 2), Tortuga Island. The occurrence of *Nyctibius* is particularly interesting as the genus was hitherto unknown from the island.—W. S.

Brooks on 'The Food of West Virginia Birds.'²—The aim of this publication is to provide a simple, readable work of reference on the birds of West Virginia with especial reference to their food habits. The author's long acquaintance with birds of the state, and his attention to economic ornithology have enabled him to succeed in his purpose. A few points not given sufficient consideration may be mentioned. In the section on "Birds in Relation to Trees and Forests" (pp. 12-13) the injurious effects of sapsucker work are passed over lightly and the impression even given that the value of lumber is enhanced. This is theoretically possible but practically of no importance, while damage is abundant and severe.

The statement in another place (p. 41) that sapsucker work produces the birds-eye effect in maples is misleading, as the birds-eye resulting from this cause is distinct from that having commercial value, and is invariably accompanied by defects that render it useless. In his section on "Birds and Fruits" (pp. 14-16), Mr. Brooks cites an observation of his that birds did not seem fond of mulberries, and says it seems to disprove the theory that mulberries serve as a protection to cultivated cherries. The protective value of mulberries among small fruits is so well established as to be no longer a theory. In any case, a single observation to the contrary cannot

¹ Descriptions of Two New Birds from Haiti. By Charles W. Richmond. Smithsonian Misc. Collns. Vol. 68, No. 7. July 12, 1917. pp. 1-3.

² Brooks, E. A. Bull. 15, West Va. Dept. of Agriculture, March, 1916, 74 pp., 20 half-tones, 3 col. pl.

overbalance almost unanimous testimony, based on many years of experience on the other side of the proposition. Mr. Brooks gives considerable space to general discussion of Economic Ornithology and the Protection of Useful Birds. Treatment of birds by systematic groups however makes up the bulk of the report.— W. L. M.

Bird Pests in War Time.¹—Recent publications of the British Board of Agriculture and Fisheries show that war has brought home the necessity of controlling crop destroying pests, birds as well as mammals. Thus sparrows are coupled with rats and rooks with rabbits. The formation of rat and sparrow clubs is advised and the details of organization, and amounts of bounties they may pay are specified. For sparrows the rates, in each case for a dozen, are: one penny for eggs, two pence for young, and three pence for adults. Various methods of combating sparrows and rooks are advised, those involving the destruction of eggs and young being most favored. The sparrow is definitely classed as "small vermin" for which under certain restrictions poisons may be legally laid. To conserve lead the use of ammunition for destroying pests is permitted only under license.— W. L. M.

Field Study of the Food of Nestlings.—The 1915 volume of the Proceedings of the Indiana Academy of Science which has just come to hand (June 25, 1917) includes an article on 'The Food of Nestling Birds.'² This paper contains detailed records of the number of feedings of broods of the Brown Thrasher, Robin (10 nests), Wood Pewee (2 nests) and King-bird. The general nature of the food also is shown.

So far as this data goes, it is good, but it does not have the value implied by the authors in their somewhat inaccurate remarks upon another method of studying the food of nestlings. "It is contended," say they, "that the stomach contents afford the only accurate and reliable method of study of the food of birds. We believe that this method is not applicable to the food of nestling birds for two reasons: first, the food is soft and not readily identifiable; and the second and more important reason is that the food is digested very rapidly. The stomach contents do not serve as a criterion of the *quantity* of food that is eaten in the course of a day" (p. 232).

The remark in the last sentence is true; we must depend upon field observations to a large extent for ideas upon the quantity of food consumed. It must not be inferred however, that stomach examination is useless in this respect; on the contrary, it has served as the basis for a number of valuable estimates.

The declarations of Messrs. Enders and Scott, relating to the identification of the food of nestlings by stomach examination are wide of the mark

¹ Leaflet No. 84, 1916, and Bulletins 2 and 4 of Series A, 1917.

² Enders, H. E., and Scott, Will, pp. 323-337.