

apparently moulting, and has only tufts of yellow and black feathers slightly more elongated than the rest over the eyes. The measurements of the bills of the two specimens are practically identical, and in both the top of the head is blacker than the cheeks. They are therefore specimens of *E. serresianus*, according to Mathews, or *E. chrysocome* of the British Museum Catalogue. The size and shape of the bill at once distinguish them from *E. pachyrhynchus* of the Catalogue, but I am not clear whether this is the species which Mathews calls *pachyrhynchus* or whether his *pachyrhynchus* and *serresianus* are both included under the *chrysocome* of the Catalogue.

### What are Australian Petrels?

BY GREGORY M. MATHEWS, F.R.S.E.

A PECULIAR coincidence in connection with my paper on the above subject has just been noted by me.

In a journal not commonly available to Australians, namely "Contributions to Ornithology," conducted by Sir W. Jardine, there appeared, in 1850, "A Brief Account of the Researches in Natural History of John Macgillivray," by John Gould. This was an account given before the section dealing with Ornithology of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Macgillivray, than whom no better field naturalist or collector has visited Australia, wrote:—"I sent you . . . three lists showing the daily occurrence of *Procellariidae* during our outward voyage—*first*, between Rio de Janeiro and the Cape of Good Hope; *second*, between the Cape of Good Hope and the Mauritius; and *third*, between the Mauritius and Van Diemen's Land."

Gould commented:—"The following are the lists referred to, and they are of great value, as showing the range of the species enumerated therein; and are peculiarly interesting to me, as they tend to confirm the observations made by myself, during my voyage to and from Australia, of which a full account has been given in my work."

I do not propose to reproduce the tables here, but draw attention to the following features:—

In the first table occur *Diomedea culminata*, a few, and *Procellaria conspicillata*, numerous, which species are missing from the second and third lists; *P. aequinoctialis* appearing in the second but not in the third.

In the third, however, appears *Diomedea fuliginosa*, very numerous about the middle of the Great Bight, along with *Procellaria glacialoides*, also very numerous, and *Daption* right to the southern coast of Tasmania. It is as well to note that Macgillivray's route reads as follows:—On 10th June, 1847, latitude 39.03, longitude 110.47; to 23rd June, 1847, latitude 44.04, longitude 145.22. While the above is not conclusive, it suggests ex-

actly what I had previously recorded, that *Procellaria conspicillata* and *Diomedea culminata* were not procured by Gould in Australian waters. It will be remembered that Tom Carter, in *The Emu* vol. xii., page 192, 1913, has also recorded that from 900 miles west of Albany, Western Australia, to 800 miles east of Durban, South Africa, he observed numbers of *Procellaria acuinotialis* with a white chin spot, but "no specimen was seen with any white markings above the beak or on the face." The italics are Carter's.

Also, in his very valuable paper in *The Emu*, vol. xv., pp. 243 *et seq.*, 1916, Ferguson does not record *Diomedea culminata* (Gould) from Australian waters at all, though confirming the records otherwise given by Gould and Macgillivray for other Australian Albatrosses.

As regards "Australian Seas," and the point raised by Alexander, I do not see how half-way between the nearest land can be taken in connection with Africa and the Antarctic, as these places are so far away. Nevertheless, it would certainly determine the range of the species if the limits were accepted, with the proviso that only specimens actually procured be accepted. Sight records of Petrels miles away from land would be very dangerous.

### Australian Crows.

BY GREGORY M. MATHEWS, F.R.S.E.

IN *The Emu*, vol. xii., pp. 43-45, 1912, an account of a criticism of my treatment of Australian Crows, by Ogilvie-Grant, was given in detail, and it seemed good to me to leave the matter at rest until I should monograph the forms in my "Birds of Australia." There was little question that Ogilvie-Grant's conclusions were not final, but with the material then available it was more a matter of opinion than fact. A year or two later a young German, named Stresemann, studied the Crows, and his results, on the larger amount of material, were little better than Ogilvie-Grant's. I endeavoured to indicate his mistakes to him, and he agreed at that time that it would be unwise further to complicate the matter. War then broke out, and perhaps from that fact Stresemann did publish his result in a German periodical, *Verhandlungen der Ornitholog Gesellschaft*, Bayern, xii., 4, pp. 277-304, May 1916, which has only recently been received here, since the conclusion of the war.

It seems just to give a summary of his results as they are now on record, and undoubtedly incorrect, for the one reason that he has made all the Crows in Australia as belonging to one species, which no Australian will admit.

Four forms are admitted:—*Corvus coronoides coronoides* (V. & H.), New South Wales; *Corvus coronoides perplexus* (Mathews),