

some more apparently authentic information which is worthy of recording, furnished me by a person whose name will be withheld for the present. San Luis Obispo was the main outfitting station for the pigeon hunting during the great flight of 1911-12.

One market hunter, shooting for the San Francisco market, killed 280 pigeons under one oak in one day. This same hunter was shooting every day during the flight, so it can be imagined what a number he must have killed. One dealer in ammunition sold 3500 shotgun shells for one day's hunt, and he says that on that day the individuals on this excursion brought in 1560 birds. These figures, together with the note previously published in *THE CONDOR* (xiv, 1912, p. 108), will give some idea of the extent of the slaughter. I firmly believe that these figures are not exaggerated, and that they are not far from the truth.

Hunters are now reporting a few pigeons at San Luis Obispo and at Santa Barbara. The first noted each year are termed scouts by the old hunters, who believe that the main army sends scouts on ahead to report on food conditions. The hunters are looking for another big flight this winter.

I will be in this country regularly during the coming season, and will keep a close watch on this beautiful but apparently doomed bird.—W. LEE CHAMBERS.

No-Sale of American-killed Wild Game.—Readers of *THE CONDOR*, and especially members of the Cooper Club, should take every opportunity to correct impressions which are being distributed broadcast apropos the effect of a "No-sale" law.

It has even been said that this measure is "class legislation." Laws which permit the sale of game are, it is true, class legislation of the worst type. They permit a few hundred market gunners, and the wealthy hotel and cafe patrons who are financially able to purchase game to reap the benefits of that which is protected at the instance of all people of the state. They are also allowing the rapid extermination of our best native species. Every animal which has been allowed to be exploited for profit has been practically exterminated. Even the whales of the sea are no exception! Remember the sea otter, the buffalo, the passenger pigeon!

To allow of the unlimited sale of game in California, as Assemblymen Harry Polsley of Red Bluff and Milton Schmidt of San Francisco desire, would be to cause its utter extermination within ten years.

Letters on file in the California Museum of Vertebrate Zoology indicate that ducks and geese have decreased from fifty to ninety-five per cent in the San Joaquin Valley in the last ten years.

We must have No-sale, and we must have it immediately.—W. P. TAYLOR.

An Unfortunate Dove.—On Monday, June 17, 1912, near Goose Lake in Modoc County, I found the body of a Mourning Dove which had met death as the result of a very peculiar misfortune. The bird was found on a horizontal beam four inches wide in an



Fig. 8. AN UNFORTUNATE DOVE

old deserted barn. It was facing the wall, i. e., lying crosswise of the beam, with the tail hanging over and closely hugging the side of the timber, as though its death throes were concerned with maintaining its precarious position. The cause of death was not far to seek. The upper mandible had been jammed backward and downward through or behind the ramus of the lower one, whence it could not be retracted. Not only so, but skinning showed that the windpipe had been caught and skewered, and pushed forward along with the distended skin of the mentum. The bird was in a very emaciated condition, inasmuch that the skin was very largely adherent to the flesh, and the end of the breastbone touched the anus. The viscera were a green mass, which for fear of poisoning we did not dissect for sex indication; but the bird seemed recently dead, inasmuch as there was no offensive smell, and the feathers were firmly in place. Moreover, no insect pests had begun to attack it.

Mr. Allan Brooks, who has examined the specimen, is of opinion that its plight was due to a recent head-on collision with a telegraph wire, and cites the example of a Western Chipping Sparrow whose bill was in exactly similar condition save that the wind

pipe was not involved. This dove, moreover, was a last year's bird, so that its peculiar hap could not have been due to a misguided paroxysm of parental regurgitation as I was at first inclined to surmise.—W. LEON DAWSON.

The Supposed Occurrence of the Blue Goose in California.—The recurring statement that the Blue Goose (*Chen caerulescens*) is of casual or occasional occurrence in California, an assertion which, on rather weak evidence, has had wide acceptance, renders it particularly desirable that the capture of every bird supposed to belong to this species be investigated, and the identity of the specimen be thoroughly established. This, however, is not always possible, as the birds on which hunters' statements are based are seldom saved long enough to afford an opportunity for examination.

The present remarks are incited by a recent instance, in which the capture of a Blue Goose appeared to be well authenticated, and which may serve as a demonstration of the extreme care to be used in accepting records whereby closely similar species may be confused.

A letter was received from F. J. Smith, of Eureka, Humboldt County, California, stating that he had in his possession a specimen of the Blue Goose, taken in that vicinity, on October 22, 1908, and requesting permission to send it to the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology in order that his identification be confirmed. The bird arrived soon after, and was carefully examined. Although the Museum collection contains no specimens of *Chen caerulescens*, it does contain a fairly large series of *Chen hyperboreus hyperboreus*, and on comparison the supposed Blue Goose proved to be a bird of this form, in the grayish, immature, plumage.

A search through descriptive literature failed to bring to light any statement clearly defining differences between the immature plumage of *caerulescens* and *hyperboreus*, and the question naturally arises as to whether previous supposed instances of the occurrence of *caerulescens* in California have not also been founded upon young birds of *hyperboreus*, the two forms being so very similar in this stage.

The Blue Goose was first included in the list of California birds upon the strength of the statement by Belding (Zoe, III, 1892, p. 97) regarding the capture of two specimens near Stockton, February 1, 1892. Fragments of one of them, head, neck, wings and legs, were submitted to Mr. Ridgway, and by him pronounced to be juvenile *caerulescens*. While the authority in support of this record is thus of the highest degree, still, considering the apparently close similarity of the two species *hyperboreus* and *caerulescens* in the immature plumage, and the absence of corroborative evidence since the time of Belding's record, we are surely justified in demanding stronger proof of the occurrence of the Blue Goose in California.

The specimen suggesting these remarks is an example of the ease with which mistakes in identification can be made. From written descriptions alone there was nothing to disprove its being *caerulescens*, either that species in immature plumage having no distinctive peculiarities serving to distinguish it from the same stage of *hyperboreus*, or else such differences having never been clearly set forth; but comparison with examples of *hyperboreus* unmistakably demonstrated the fact of its belonging to this species.—H. S. SWARTH.

The Black-chinned Hummingbird in Marin County, California.—While driving along the road at San Geronimo, Marin County, California, one day last spring (1912) I was hailed by C. A. Allen, who came out of his house to tell me of having noticed a strange hummingbird among the usual number of Allens and Annas that nest in his yard every year, and that he had finally captured it. This stranger turned out to be a male Black-chinned Hummingbird (*Archilochus alexandri*), and is the first record of this species in Marin County, as it does not seem to take kindly to the humid coast belt, but works its way to its northern limit by following the more interior valleys. Mr. Allen said he thought we ought to have the specimen on account of our having been so closely associated with Marin County for so many years, but he was collecting for Dr. Jonathan Dwight, Jr., at the moment, and felt that the specimen must go to him. Soon after receiving it Dr. Dwight wrote me of the circumstances, and said that he felt as if he were encroaching on our preserves, that the place for it was in our collection (Coll. of J. & J. W. Mailliard), and that it should be recorded by one of us. In due course the specimen arrived, and is now in the place where Dr. Dwight thought it ought to be. I mention these details in order to show our appreciation of the graceful courtesy thus shown to us—a sort of courtesy that ever should but does not always exist among collectors. The date on which this hummingbird was taken was March 3, 1912.—JOSEPH MAILLIARD.