



Fig. 14. ARETAS A. SAUNDERS

Mr. Saunders' "Distributional List of the Birds of Montana" was issued by the Cooper Ornithological Club under date of February 1, 1921, as no. 14 of the Pacific Coast Avifauna series. The author was for some years connected with the United States Forestry Service in Montana, and he was also for a time at the University of Montana Biological Station at Flathead Lake. His account of the birds of Montana consists largely of his own first-hand observations, but are supplemented by the published writings of other ornithologists. Three hundred and thirty-two species are listed as native to the state, as well as several others that have been introduced. The "List" is mainly concerned with the manner of occurrence of the various species, in just what part of the state they are found, and at what season of the year; but there are also extensive notes on migration, and descriptive accounts of the nesting of most of the birds. A number of half-tones figure many of the species, their nests and eggs, and also illustrate the character of the country in the life zones and faunal areas that are discussed.

Mr. J. A. Munro, of Okanagan Landing, British Columbia, has recently been appointed chief officer in charge of the enforcement of the Migratory Bird Convention Act in the western provinces of Canada. Mr. Munro's years of study of the avifauna of his region have rendered him peculiarly fitted to un-

derstand the problems involved in his new position. It will be gratifying to the ornithologists of the country to learn of this most appropriate appointment.

COMMUNICATION

A PLEA FOR PROFESSIONAL COURTESY

Some time ago, my studies in a certain field led to a discovery quite unexpected to me and of a more or less surprising nature to other men of similar interests. An account of the facts and a statement of conclusions was written for publication, but the manuscript was submitted to another investigator to whom I was personally a stranger. He examined the manuscript and returned it with helpful criticism and a most cordial expression of interest and of willingness to render aid in furtherance of the cause—a willingness which he has since repeatedly proven genuine. His assistance was publicly acknowledged with great pleasure on my part, a cordial relation between two fellow workers was established, and the scientific public was spared any controversy in print.

A few months ago I received a most courteous and friendly letter from an older and better known scientist offering suggestions on a brief note published over my signature. Instead of writing to me he might have published his criticism and done so in less friendly terms without violating the law of precedent. He took the more courteous way and spared the public a possible controversy.

Why are not all scientists as large as these two men? Why is there not among scientists that fraternal bond that exists among reputable physicians and is called professional courtesy? Why can not the reviewer present an honest difference of opinion and not impugn the motives or deride the conclusions of one who happens not to agree with him? Why can not the reviewed author be less sensitive or less inflammable, and measurably profit thereby? Or, failing in either of these points, would not our over-worked editors be justified in throwing out manuscripts that are controversial until the parties concerned had reached some agreement (to disagree, perhaps)?

If authors would settle their disputes between themselves and give us in our journals either the benefit of their conclusions or an amicable statement of points of divergence, we would feel that the scientific fraternity was reaping the benefit of cooperation rather than the whirlwind of dissension. May we not get together outside