

Col. W. V. Legge, F.Z.S., F.R.A.S. (Ceylon), gave a paper entitled "Some Notes on the Location of Birds in the Vicinity of Homesteads, Break-o'-day District, Tasmania," the observations recorded being of value and assistance to working ornithologists.

*Next Annual Session.*—It was unanimously decided to hold the next annual session in Melbourne, on the motion of Mr. A. H. E. Mattingley, seconded by Captain S. A. White.

*Alteration of Rule.*—On the motion of Mr. A. H. E. Mattingley, seconded by Mr. E. Lane, rule 4 was altered to read as follows:—"The business of the society shall be conducted by a Council consisting of a president, two vice-presidents, secretary, treasurer, librarian, editors of *The Emu*, and six members," &c.

*General.*—Mr. L. Harrison exhibited an interesting clutch of the eggs of the White-shafted Fantail (*Rhipidura albiscapa*) containing an egg of the Pallid Cuckoo (*Cuculus pallidus*); also some abnormally small eggs of the Emu (*Dromæus novæ-hollandiæ*).

A flashlight photograph having been taken, and a vote of thanks passed to the chairman, the meeting adjourned for the excursion *viâ* Brisbane, Queensland.

Next day a visit was paid to the Australian Museum, where members were met and welcomed by the Curator, Mr. R. Etheridge, jun., F.G.S. The general collection of birds was examined under the Curator's personal guidance, and the type specimens of birds and eggs were kindly placed at the disposal of members for inspection.

In the afternoon members proceeded by the northern express to Brisbane, *en route* to Tumbulgun, a small township situate on the Tweed River, N.S.W., for the "working" field excursion. A fortnight of useful study was spent in the rich sub-tropical growths of that region, and many field notes of interest taken, which will be subsequently published in *The Emu*.

---

### Vice-Presidential Address.

THE following address by Mr. A. J. Campbell, Col. Mem. B.O.U., was read:—

#### *Introduction.*

Ladies and Gentlemen,—Owing to the unavoidable absence of our esteemed president (Mr. D. Le Souëf, C.M.Z.S., &c.), who is at present travelling abroad in the best interests of the Zoological Society, Melbourne, I have been deputed by the Council of the Australasian Ornithologists' Union to prepare the customary annual address.

Following the excellent example of our retiring President (Surgeon-Colonel C. S. Ryan, P.M.O., Victoria, whose admirable



address last year on the bird protection in America, with practical suggestions for Australians, has been widely read and approved), I have ventured to take as the basis of my remarks the subject of "Bird Protection in the Old World."

*Historical Sketch of the International Protection of Birds in Europe.\**

From time immemorial the Germans have been fowlers; indeed, one of their monarchs (Emperor Frederick II., 1194-1200) has been designated the "Crowned Fowler."

This national traditional inheritance may be also seen respectively in the bird-protecting decrees of Lippe-Detmold (1777), Saxe-Coburg (1809), and of the Grand Duke of Hesse (1837). The last forbade the slaughter and sale of certain birds useful to agriculture, and provided for the protection of their nests and eggs. But the first to treat the bird protection question on a scientific basis was Pastor Edward Baldamus, an ornithologist, contemporary and friend of the celebrated Naumann, who, in 1845, at the first meeting of the German Ornithological Society, at Köthen, presented a scheme for protection which the historian states was "severely ignored." The following year Baldamus laid his scheme before the committee of the Saxon Economic Society. It was again "shelved." Ten years later (1856) Baldamus reopened his scheme before the second General Assembly of the German Ornithologists, but was again unsuccessful. Later-day enactments, however, justified Baldamus's attitude. Surely he was a prophet before his time.

Subsequently (1868) the excessive increase of injury done by insects, together with the decrease of birds, forced the German farmers and foresters into the first practical movement regarding protection. They appealed to the Austrian and Hungarian Governments to join the other States to endeavour to bring about an international agreement for the protection of animals of value to agriculture and forestry. Both these Governments agreed to support the German farmers on condition *that the movement was restricted to the protection of birds useful to agriculture*. This suggestion was the beginning of international protection of birds in Europe, but, as we shall see, it was not till after many vicissitudes and conventions, extending over a period of more than 30 years, that an international policy of bird-protection became an accomplished fact.

Diplomatic negotiations were set afoot to provide for a friendly reception of the cause of bird protection in the interests of

\* Abridged from "The International Convention for the Protection of Birds, concluded in 1902; and Hungary. Historical Sketch, written by order of His Excellency Ignatius de Darányi, Hungarian Minister of Agriculture, by Otto Herman, late M.P., Director of the Hungarian Central Bureau for Ornithology. Budapest, 1907."



agriculture, and to restrict the catching in the masses, as far as possible, where bird-catching was particularly fashionable. This idea found favour in almost the whole of Europe. Even Italy, the greatest transgressor at bird-catching in the mass, declared, in 1869, its approval of the principle.

The time appearing opportune to draw up certain declarations of principles to be adopted by the contracting countries, the Swiss Federal Council, in 1872, proposed to summon an international commission to draft an agreement, a proposition which was seconded by the German Government. The commission never met. Some of the countries raised objections, and preliminary negotiations failed.

As Italy seemed the most difficult country to win, because bird-catching there was of great importance as a means of livelihood for the lower classes, one of the most prominent of zoologists, Ritter von Frauenfeld, Curator of the Vienna Imperial Museum, was despatched, in 1872, by the Austrian Government to Rome to endeavour to agree on certain points with Professor Targioni-Tozzetti, the delegate of the Italian Government. After an exhaustive treatment of the subject, the two experts agreed to six general articles. The articles were not received without much hesitation in Italy, where all the good intentions of the Government were in vain. The feelings of distaste among the people were unconquerable ; the prohibition of the permanent large nets, so well adapted for capturing birds in the masses, excited particular disfavour.

Then came the International Economic Congress at Vienna, in 1873, which afforded an opportunity for meetings of various delegates and experts. In the Agriculture Section, presided over by the Hungarian Minister of Agriculture (Baron de Chlumetzky), one of the questions of first importance was—"What measures are required for the protection of useful birds?" Some of the speakers who took up the cause were among the foremost ornithologists and experts of the day, including Dr. Frederick Tschudi (Swiss), who stated his conviction that every useful bird—notably insect-eaters—should be specially protected. Every year millions of little birds of great value to agriculture went into the stomachs of *gourmets*, therefore the first duty to decide was what birds might be hunted. He proposed the formation of an international committee, and submitted nine rules or suggestions for consideration. Emil von Marenzeller (Austria) approved of the idea of a convention or committee, and submitted three further points for discussion, also two lists — (1) useful birds ; (2) noxious birds. Dr. Alfred Brehm (Germany) also proposed important measures, concluding his speech by advising the inclusion in the scheme of popular teaching, or some means of acquainting the public at large with birds, for, in his opinion, no protection could be more



effective than that resulting from an enlightenment of the people. After further discussion by other eminent *savants* the president requested the following gentlemen—namely, Messrs. Tschudi (Switzerland), Marenzeller (Austria), Brehm (Germany), Blomeyer (Germany), Settegast (Germany), and Middendorff (Russia)—to form a committee with a view to bring into line the various proposals. The committee reduced the recommendations to seven. The Congress of Agriculturists and Foresters then formally moved that the Imperial Austrian Government be requested to secure the protection of birds useful to agriculture by means of treaties to be made with the other European States on the said seven points of recommendation. Both the Imperial Austrian Minister of Agriculture and the Royal Hungarian Minister of Agriculture found that the seven clauses were a suitable basis for international convention or negotiation. But there was already a written agreement existing between Austria and Italy. (See previous.)

In course of time Count Gyula Andrassy became Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister, and before inviting the States of Europe to consider the seven points of recommendation, the Count attempted, in 1875, to arrive at an amended agreement with Italy, a country which, by reason of its geographical position and the deep-rooted custom of its people, was of first importance. This wise move was entirely successful. A new “declaration,” with “protocol” attached, was formally signed by Count Andrassy on behalf of the Austrian Monarchies, at Budapest, 5th November, 1875, and by Visconti Venosta on behalf of the Government of Italy, at Rome, 29th November the same year, the stipulations being as follow :—

1. The Governments of the two parties to this contract bind themselves to create, through their respective Parliaments, strict and comprehensive legislation with a view to securing the protection of birds useful to agriculture, at any rate within the limits prescribed by the following clauses.

2. The destruction of nests and lairs, the taking of eggs, the fowling of small birds shall be absolutely forbidden. At the same time it is in general forbidden to sell nests, eggs, and nestlings procured in defiance of the prohibition.

3. Further, the prohibition of the following acts is declared :—

- (a) The catching or killing of birds at night with bird-lime, nets, guns, or other weapons. Night is the period between one hour after sunset and one hour before sunrise.

- (b) The catching or killing of birds so long as the ground is snow-covered.

- (c) The catching of birds on river banks, at springs, or on the banks of lakes, in times of drought.

- (d) The catching of birds by the strewing of seeds mixed with narcotics or poisons, or with other baits.

- (e) The catching of birds with nooses, nets, or any other implements used on the surface of the ground, such as traps, snares, the Dalmatian “plocke” or the “lancixera” used for snaring larks.



(f) The catching of birds with the "parexella," or, indeed, with any other style of moving, movable nets, or such as may be spread on the surface of the ground, in fields, on bushes and shrubs, or on roads.

The Governments of the parties hereby contracting reserve to themselves the right of prohibiting the catching of birds in any other manner, if the reports of experts deputed by Austria, Hungary, or the Senate of the Italian provinces prove that the methods in question are particularly destructive and harmful to the birds of the respective territories.

4. Recapitulation. Apart from the restrictions of 2 and 3, the catching or killing of birds shall be permitted only in the following manner :—

(a) From 1st September till the end of February, with guns.

(b) From 15th September till the end of February, in any other way not prohibited.

The sale of birds except during these periods shall be prohibited.

5. Under certain conditions, by special request, if such request be justified, the respective Governments may allow exemption from the regulations 1, 3, and 4, in the interest of the furtherance of scientific research.

6. As, according to 1, the only object of this declaration is to protect birds useful to agriculture, it goes without saying that 2-4 do not apply to domestic or field farming, or to the farm-yard.

Though the regulations of 2 and 5 do not apply to birds that, from an agricultural point of view, are not decidedly useful or noxious, if the latter are of some value as game, the respective Governments are inclined to take measures to protect such species as game.

7. The Governments of the contracting parties shall inform one another of protective measures taken in their respective States, and shall give all information that may be necessary or desirable.

8. The Governments of the contracting parties shall use every effort to secure the collaboration of the other States.

9. The present declaration shall be drawn up in two copies of identical text, and signed by the Foreign Ministers of the respective parties, one copy to be kept, after mutual signature, by each of the signatories.

The following year (1876) the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister saw in the foregoing declaration an excellent basis for the extension of agitation to cover the countries of Europe, and an appeal was first made to Germany and France, then to Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Russia, Spain, and Greece. Progress was slow, the majority of the Governments avoiding any binding promise, and being apparently dependent on the attitude of Germany, where the Reichstag was already considering the draft of a bill to provide for the uniformity of the regulations for the protection of birds all over the empire. All considered that no decision could be arrived at pending the passing of that bill.

The first International Ornithological Congress, 1884, which was opened by the Crown Prince Rudolph in person at Vienna, gave another impulse to the cause of international bird protection. However, the only practical (or rather impractical, as it subsequently proved) result was the forming of a Permanent International Ornithological Committee, with power to prepare a carefully elaborated scheme for the next Congress, or any other suitable occasion. In the meantime matters were kept



alive in Hungary, and the organisation of the second Congress was taken over by the Hungarian Minister of Public Instruction, chiefly because the Permanent International Ornithological Committee proved unworkable. Its members were scattered all over Europe. Therefore it is easily understood that the committee never met. The president and secretary held communication by letter only, acted apart, and spent the money voted by the States independently. This led to an open breach between the Brunswick president and the Vienna secretary, and the committee of portentous name, which should have been an important body, became incapacitated. Accordingly, the Hungarian Minister of Public Instruction (Count Albin Csáky) approved of a committee of management chosen by the Royal Hungarian Natural History Society, with Dr. Geza Entz (as chairman) and Otto Herman (as secretary), while the Government was represented by Imre Szalay, Ministerial Councillor. This committee was formed at the end of 1889, and at once entered into the work of organisation for the second International Congress, which met at Budapest, Whitsuntide, 1891. The Congress in all sections was a brilliant success, the Continental ornithologists being especially pleased because it was the first occasion on which Britishers took part in an international ornithological gathering on the Continent. Dr. R. Bowdler Sharpe, of the British Museum, was present, as also was Dr. Arthur Chadbourne and Dr. Lewis Bishop (of U.S.A.), while those who were requested to treat the several questions sent reports, viz. :—Cordeaux, Sclater, and Newton, of Great Britain, as well as celebrities from other countries—Fürbringer, the German anatomist; Giglioli, the Italian ornithogeograph; Palmén, the Finnish ornithobiologist; and Oustalet, the French ornithologist. The Congress was opened by the Minister of Agriculture (Count Andrew Bethlen) and closed by the Minister of Public Instruction (Count Albin Csáky). Class VI. dealt with everything relating to the economic significance of birds, including the question of international bird protection. Not the least interesting of its proceedings was a digest of the operative bird laws of the several European States. At this Congress it was resolved to return to the Austro-Italian "declaration" of 1875. The clock was thus put back 16 years, but a successful ending was in sight.

Germany, in 1892, endorsed the "declaration" of 1875. Then, after a delay due to the circumlocutive nature of diplomacy, France, in 1895, invited the States of Europe to appoint delegates to attend a conference at Paris to further discuss the question of international bird protection. After much discussion, not without critical junctures, a draft argument containing 15 clauses, with 2 schedules (useful birds and noxious birds) was prepared, and unanimously adopted by the International



Conference on 29th June (1895). The epitome of the fifteen paragraphs of the draft adopted is as follows :—

§ 1. Deals with the schedules of birds voted useful or noxious, but recognizes the right of signatory States to *enlarge* the schedules to meet the requirements of their own interests.

§ 2. Protects nests, broods, and fledglings, but admits the right of independent regulations concerning houses and the interior of courtyards.

§ 3. Prohibits instruments adapted to the wholesale taking of birds (*expressis verbis* : “la destruction en masse des oiseaux”)—viz., nets, gins, snares, bird-lime, &c.

§ 4. Deals with the enforcing of the foregoing clause, which may be done *gradatim* ; but the prohibition remains in force as ultimate aim.

§ 5. Arranges for close season for birds to be protected, to last from 1st March to 15th September, except in cases provided for in §§ 8-9 ; regulates import, transport, and “transito” traffic.

§ 6. Defines modifications permissible by authorities.

§ 7. Defines exceptions to be made in the interests of science and regulates the keeping of living birds.

§ 8. Contains regulations relating to the poultry yard, winged game, birds living on preserves, guns, and sale.

§ 9. Defines the exceptions which the respective States may make.

§ 10. Binds the signatories to adapt their own laws to suit the Convention, within a period of three years from date.

§ 11. Binds the signatories to communicate to each other any laws or municipal decrees relating to the matter in question.

§ 12. Provides for the settling of all questions that may arise in connection with the carrying into effect of the Convention.

§ 13. Deals with the eventual acceptances later on of other States.

§ 14. Deals with the date for the coming in force of the Convention, and the conditions for withdrawal.

§ 15. Deals with the sanctioning of the Convention and the interchange of documents.

Now came further trouble. The Governments which did not want to participate withdrew—Great Britain, Holland, and Russia. This was permissible, seeing that the delegates who had signed the minutes of 29th June, 1895, did not bind their Governments to anything, as the provision distinctly stated that the draft shall be submitted for the approval of the Governments—*i.e.*, the final decision was reserved. Italy lost no time in declaring she would not accept the draft. The withdrawal of Italy was deemed of great importance, because useful birds were there not only without protection, but were liable to most brutal methods of wholesale destruction. Moreover, its birds were mostly migratory, therefore alien property so far as Italy was concerned. Switzerland and Sweden made modified demands.

Five years subsequently (1900) came the World's Exhibition at Paris, which was made the occasion of another (the 3rd) International Ornithological Congress, which eventually and happily placed the final stamp on the international movement for the



proper protection of birds. This Congress was notable for two reasons—(1) because the delegates of the Paris feather merchants and of the millinery houses appeared before the Congress to oppose the cause of bird protection, which threatened to injure trade interests; and (2) because the Congress framed resolutions requesting the respective Governments to institute thorough research as to the food of birds, in order to decide the question of usefulness or noxiousness. This report was to have been delivered at the 4th International Ornithological Congress, held in London in 1905.

Finally, mainly through the splendid efforts of the Austrian and Hungarian Governments, the result of the two Paris Congresses was kept moving till success (if not altogether complete) was most assuredly attained. At Paris, on the 19th March, 1902, the following thirteen countries or States, through their respective plenipotentiaries, subscribed to a model bird bill to be incorporated in the laws of their countries, viz.:—Austria, Hungary, Germany, Belgium, Spain, France, Holland, Luxemburg, Monaco, Portugal, Sweden, Norway, and Switzerland.

The following were the clauses agreed upon:—

#### ARTICLE 1.

Birds useful to agriculture, particularly the insect-eaters and namely those birds enumerated in the first Schedule attached to the present Convention (which Schedule the Parliaments of the several countries may enlarge by additions), shall be unconditionally protected by a prohibition forbidding them to be killed in any way whatsoever, as well as the destruction of their nests, eggs, and broods.

Until such time as this result shall be completely realised, the high contracting parties bind themselves to take, or to propose to their Parliaments to take, all such measures as are necessary to carry the resolutions contained in the following clauses into effect.

#### ARTICLE 2.

It shall be forbidden, at any season and in any manner whatsoever, to steal nests and eggs, to take or destroy nestlings.

The import of these nests, eggs, and nestlings, their transport, the colportage of the same, their putting up to sale, their sale and purchase shall be prohibited.

This prohibition does not concern nests built by birds in dwelling-houses, or any kinds of buildings, on the same or in the interior of court-yards, which may be destroyed by owners, occupiers, or any person authorised by the same. [*Further the enactments of the present clause may be considered invalid in the case of the eggs of Lapwings and Gulls.*]\*

#### ARTICLE 3.

The construction and employment of traps, cages, nets, nooses, lime-twigs, or any other kind of instruments used for the purpose of rendering easy the wholesale capture or destruction of birds shall be forbidden.

#### ARTICLE 4.

In case the high contracting parties should not be in a position to enforce the prohibitions included in the preceding clause at once and in their entirety, they may mitigate the severity of the said prohibitions as required, but engage to restrict the use of methods, weapons, and instruments of

\* Later addition.



capture and killing in such a manner that the protective measures contained in Article 3 may be carried into effect gradatim.

#### ARTICLE 5.

Besides the general prohibitions enacted in Article 3, it shall be forbidden, from 1st March to 15th September of each year, to take or kill [*those useful birds which are enumerated in the first Schedule attached to this Convention*].\*

The sale or offering for sale of the same is also, during the same period, forbidden.

The high contracting parties engage, as far as their respective laws permit, to prohibit the import and delivery as well as the transport of the said birds from 1st March till 15th September.

[*The duration of the close season prescribed in this Article may be modified in the countries of Northern Europe.*]†

#### ARTICLE 6.

The respective authorities may give exceptional temporary licences to the owners of vineyards, orchards, and gardens, of nurseries, afforested ground or cornfields, or to the cultivators of the same or to individuals entrusted with the control of the same, for the shooting of birds whose presence is harmful and causes real damage.

However, the sale or offering for sale of birds shot under such circumstances shall be forbidden.

#### ARTICLE 7.

The respective authorities may grant exemptions from the enactments of this Convention for scientific purposes or to encourage the propagation of birds, in single instances and after taking all measures of precaution necessary to prevent any abuse of the same.

Permission may be granted—similar preventive measures being taken in every case—for the taking, sale, and keeping of birds intended to be kept in cages. Permission to be granted by the respective authorities.

#### ARTICLE 8.

The enactments of the present Convention do not apply to poultry, or to birds regarded as game (winged game) which are on preserves and are included by the Parliaments of the respective countries among birds considered as game.

The destruction of winged game, on any other territory whatsoever, is permitted with firearms only and in the period prescribed by law.

The signatory States [*are requested*]‡ to prohibit the sale, transport, and delivery of any winged game the shooting of which is forbidden in their own country, as long as this prohibition lasts.

#### ARTICLE 9.

Each of the contracting parties may grant exemption from the enactments of the present Convention :

1. In the case of birds, the shooting and destruction of which, as noxious to the interests of shooting sport and fishing, is permitted by the Parliament of the respective country ;

2. In the case of birds branded as noxious to the agriculture of the country by the Parliament of the respective State.

In case there should not be an official schedule compiled by the respective

\* *Original* : " les oiseaux quelconques, sauf les exceptions indiqués aux articles 8 et 9."

*Modified* : " les oiseaux utiles énumérés dans la liste No. 1 annexée à la Convention."

† Additional.

‡ *Originally* : " s'engagent."



Legislature [§ 2 of the *present clause*]\* shall be enforced in the case of those birds which are enumerated in Schedule 2 annexed to this Convention.

ARTICLE 10.

The high contracting parties will take steps to have their laws brought into harmony with the enactments of the present Convention [*within three years from the date*]† of the signing of the said Convention.

ARTICLE 11.

The high contracting parties engage to intercommunicate, through the medium of the French Government, all laws and municipal measures which are at present in force or have lately come into being regarding the subject of the present Convention.

ARTICLE 12.

The high contracting parties, should they find it expedient, shall have themselves represented at an international conference deputed to discuss questions that may arise in connection with the carrying into effect of the Convention and to propose any modifications, the expediency of which has been justified by experience.

ARTICLE 13.

Those States which have not participated in the present Convention may join the same, if they wish to do so. Any such intention must be diplomatically communicated to the Government of the French Republic and by the same to the Governments of the other signatory Powers.

ARTICLE 14.

The present Convention shall come in force at latest within a year from the date of the interchanging of papers.

It remains in force for all the signatory Powers for an indefinite period. Should any one of the same withdraw, such withdrawal does not affect the other Powers, and comes in force only one year from the day on which the withdrawal was brought to the notice of the other signatory States.

ARTICLE 15.

The present Convention shall be ratified and the ratified documents shall be interchanged at Paris within the shortest time possible.

[ARTICLE 16.

*The enforcing of the measures contained in the second paragraph of clause 8 of the present Convention may be dispensed with exceptionally in the northern provinces of Sweden, owing to the absolutely peculiar climatic conditions of those regions.] ‡*

*Suggestions.*

I take it for granted that ornithologists are nothing if not practical, particularly in the direction of bird protection. Then let us see to the great question in Australia before it be too late. Certainly we should not be behind the countries of either the Old World or the New in matters of bird protection. I believe the great future of Australia will be its natural productions—chiefly agricultural—and it is written, “The profit (the fruit) of the earth is for all.” Apart from the physical elements, the most important allies of the farmer, pastoralist, or orchardist are our beloved birds—not to mention the delight that many of

\* *Originally*: “l'article 9 sera appliqué.”

† *Originally*: “du jour fixé pour la mise en vigueur de la Convention.”

‡ Absolutely new addition: v. *supra*.



them give us in form, colour, and song. Australian producers appear slow to recognise the great utility of birds, because their (the birds') work is mostly unobserved. The diet of numerous birds consists mainly of the lower forms of life—insects, and such like crawling creatures. Experts who have studied the question know how the lowly hordes of insect pests increase, often at an astounding rate, and what a destructive power they are to almost every living green thing. Happily this insect life is kept in check by birds. Contemplate what would become of the forest and field—the pastures of man and beast—were there no birds? The land would in time become a wilderness. In endeavouring to combat the attacks or increase of insect pests there is no “insecticide” so cheap or so effective as the original and natural one—birds; therefore, let us at all times, in all places, and by all means protect our useful native birds from destruction, not to mention the humanitarian and ethical side of the question. Referring *en passant* to the humanitarian and ethical side, the study of Mr. A. Mattingley's graphic pen and picture description in the last issue of *The Emu*, concerning the ruthless destruction of beautiful snow-white Herons in Riverina by the plume-hunters, should spur all bird-lovers into hot action.

In all probability the following session of the A.O.U. will be held in Melbourne next November, 1908. I would suggest that we make that session famous by calling a congress of all persons interested in bird protection. We could at least have a conference of one delegate from each State (following the example of the kingdoms of Europe) appointed by the respective administrators of the *Game Acts*, and invite them to consider as a basis the Model Bird Protection Bill which our member, Mr. C. F. Belcher, M.A., LL.B., is preparing for the Council. The contingent expenses of such a conference would be trivial compared with the importance of such a national concern, and I have no doubt that the Government of Victoria, if approached through the Hon. the Premier or the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture, would readily guarantee the small expense.

Therefore, in conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, I beg to move, accordingly, that a deputation be appointed by this session, or the Council of the A.O.U., to wait upon the Hon. the Premier or the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture, Victoria, regarding this matter early next year.

---

### Report of Honorary Secretary.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—Your Council has much pleasure in presenting to you the sixth annual report, embodying a *précis* of the transactions of the A.O.U. for the year ending 30th June, 1907. During the past year excellent progress has been made in the Union's affairs.





Campbell, Archibald James. 1908. "Vice-Presidential Address." *The Emu : official organ of the Australasian Ornithologists' Union* 7(3), 126–136.

<https://doi.org/10.1071/mu907126>.

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/34860>

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.1071/mu907126>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/379458>

**Holding Institution**

American Museum of Natural History Library

**Sponsored by**

Biodiversity Heritage Library

**Copyright & Reuse**

Copyright Status: NOT\_IN\_COPYRIGHT

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.