

skins [doubtless the three before me at this writing] from this region show the San Fernando bird to be rather smaller than those from Arizona, with the white markings of the wings and upper parts somewhat restricted. It may seem desirable to separate them as a subspecies, but with the series at present available, I do not consider it advisable." The present findings corroborate Anthony's suggestions, save that I am unable to see any difference in size in the materials now compared, as between *cardonensis* and *uropygialis*. Ridgway (*loc. cit.*, pp. 95, 96) cites Anthony's locality, San Fernando, and the reference, under the heading *Centurus uropygialis uropygialis*, but without further comment.

The races of the Gila Woodpecker now to be recognized are as follows, listing them from north to south:

1. *Centurus uropygialis uropygialis* Baird. Arizona Gila Woodpecker.
2. *Centurus uropygialis cardonensis* Grinnell. San Fernando Gila Woodpecker.
3. *Centurus uropygialis brewsteri* Ridgway. San Lucas Gila Woodpecker.

—J. GRINNELL, *Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, March 27, 1927.*

**Birds of the Atlin Region, British Columbia: A Reply to Criticism.**—In the March, 1927, issue of THE CONDOR (XXIX, pp. 112-114) Major Allan Brooks subjects me to rather severe criticism regarding sins of omission and commission in my "Report on a collection of birds and mammals from the Atlin region, northern British Columbia" (Univ. Calif. Publ. Zool., vol. 30, no. 4, 1926). Major Brooks and I spent some pleasant months together engaged in the field work upon which that report is based, and devoted time and energy to discussion of the problems involved. As may be inferred, we did not always agree. Verbal arguments may become extremely heated without at all affecting the pleasant relations of the speakers, while the same arguments in print may convey a false impression of the feelings of the debaters. I wish, therefore, at the outset to disclaim any personal animus in the following reply, and to express my appreciation of the generous compliments contained in the first paragraph of Major Brooks' article. As regards the need of a reply it has been suggested to me that silence on my part would be misconstrued, and that it is desirable that I explain why I still adhere, as I do, to the convictions previously expressed.

First, though, when, as in the present case, there is assertion and repeated implication of forgetfulness and carelessness on my part, I may be permitted to examine into the qualifications of my critic to judge in such matters. Let us look at some of the statements he makes. Under *Dendragapus obscurus flemingi* (p. 113), allusion is made to "Swarth's Teslin Lake bird." I collected no Fleming Grouse at Teslin Lake, nor did I say that I did. Under *Bubo virginianus* (p. 114) is the following: "Swarth's citation of the specimens collected should have said young male and female instead of adult male and female taken July 3. These were a brood of two that I took with one parent." My citation of specimens collected includes this statement: "an adult male, and male and female in post-juvenal molt, July 3" (Swarth, *loc. cit.*, p. 113). On the next page explanation is made that these are of one family. What is there to complain of in this, and how can Brooks' criticism be explained other than as the result of careless reading of what I wrote? Under the circumstances I am satisfied to believe that in memory and carefulness I am at least equal to my critic.

Now as regards the status of certain disputed forms. Of the Horned Owls, Major Brooks is speaking from memory. He has not examined the birds since he saw them when they were shot. I have had the advantage of comparing them with other series. I may say here, that while it is due to his generosity that I secured these owls, he himself was so little interested in preparing any as specimens that in some cases he left the owl in the woods where it was shot, to be retrieved by me later. With no claim to originality I can but repeat a statement that I have heard, that it is extraordinary the lack of interest that is frequently shown in the larger birds!

As to the Goshawk, I do not understand Brooks' position. There is implied recognition of a northwestern race in his statement, and explicit recognition of such in a previous article (Condor, XXVIII, 1926, p. 79), which, in general, is my own view. If there are mistakes in nomenclature, as Brooks claims (*loc. cit.*), they should, of course, be corrected by whomever knows the facts. The specimen I shot and described is as I described it.

As regards the Harlan Hawk, it seems that we differ in our view of this hawk largely because of our individually varying "memories", and, as indicated above, I am not convinced that I should forsake what my own memory tells me, especially as my written note book (my main reliance) is in accord with my remembrance of conditions. Brooks' statement that his adult specimen is "a very pale bird" is too astounding for further reply than this, that my original rough notes on the birds he left in my hands contains the following comment upon this skin: "Breast white, due to exposure of white bases of worn, black-tipped body-feathers. Plumage generally very worn. New body plumage is very dark (sooty)."

Finally, as regards *Lagopus*, *Astur*, *Buteo* and *Bubo*, I submit that my critic has not made his position clear. He criticizes my own disposition of these several birds but offers no alternatives. Concede, if need be, that I am entirely wrong, as is asserted. Then, in each case, what is the proper course to pursue?

Of the Scaups and Golden-eyes, I admit that, with such experience as I have had with these ducks, I am ordinarily unable to differentiate on sight between Greater and Lesser scaups, and (in the female and immature plumages) between the two Golden-eyes. In my own publications I would generally treat determination of all such birds seen in a region as dependent upon the identity of specimens collected.—H. S. SWARTH, *California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, March 17, 1927.*

**Rare Hybrid Goose Taken in Washington State.**—While hunting geese back of Roosevelt, Klickitat County, Washington, on November 15, 1925, Mr. Jos. F. Coleman of Bickleton, a member of the Klickitat County Game Commission, shot an unusual goose which he gave to the writer to have mounted. After Wither Brothers, taxidermists of Spokane, had completed the work of mounting this bird I permitted Mr. J. L. Sloanaker of Spokane to ship it to the Museum of the University of California, Berkeley, California, for identification. Mr. H. S. Swarth of the said Museum later wrote to Mr. Sloanaker concerning this goose as follows:

I cannot help you much in regard to the goose. It is about the same size as the Hutchins Goose and looks as though it might possibly be a hybrid between that bird and the Black Brant. Whether it actually is the result of such a cross I can't say. It is apparently a young bird.

When the mounted goose had been returned to Spokane from Berkeley I submitted the specimen to the head office of the Bureau of Biological Survey in Washington, D. C., for identification, and after such identification, upon the request of the Biological Survey, the goose was donated to that institution for its collection. An official of the Bureau of Biological Survey wrote to me concerning the goose as follows:

The following is a scientific description of the hybrid goose which was transmitted by you to the Bureau for identification. The bird is apparently a hybrid between the Black Brant (*Branta nigricans*) and Hutchins Goose (*Branta canadensis hutchinsi*).

Top of head, lores, and neck all around brownish black; back and scapulars fuscous, some of the feathers with dark centers and most of them with pale edgings; lower rump, and shorter tail-coverts chaetura black; longer and outer tail-coverts white, slightly flecked with brownish, forming a V-shaped white bar at the base of the tail; wing quills (except the base of the primaries), together with secondary wing coverts (except the upper greater coverts and primary coverts), chaetura drab, edged with light fuscous; bases of primaries, outer greater coverts and primary coverts dull, deep neutral gray; large patch on the side of the head, between drab and hair brown, anteriorly washed with buff; anterior portion of the lores and the region about the eye flecked with grayish white, forming almost a complete eye ring; center of chin and of throat brownish black, like the crown, but rather duller and lighter; breast and sides of body dull hair brown, spotted with dark hair brown, in some places inclining to fuscous, particularly on the sides of the body; abdomen brownish white; crissum pure white, anterior portion of thighs brownish white, the posterior portion hair brown.

This hybrid goose was shot by Mr. Coleman from out of a flock of about seventy-five wild geese flying over him. One other member of this same large flock, shot at the same time as Mr. Coleman's hybrid goose, proved to be a Hutchins Goose (*Branta canadensis hutchinsi*) and the remainder of the flock were taken to be of the same kind. The Hutchins Geese are very common and are to be found in large numbers at certain seasons of the year on the Columbia River islands in the region of Roosevelt, Washington.

Letters of inquiry concerning this specimen of hybrid goose have been received by me from Dr. Walter P. Taylor, biologist, Tucson, Arizona, and from Mr. J. D. Figgins, Director of the Colorado Museum of Natural History, Denver, Colorado, and the mount created considerable interest while it remained in my office at Spokane.—WEBSTER H. RANSOM, *Spokane, Washington, December 18, 1926.*