

Another interesting "overlapping" in this district is that of the Yellow-tailed and Spotted Pardalotes. In my opinion the former bird is probably not a valid species. The principal difference between *Pardalotus xanthopygus* and *P. punctatus* is that the former bird has the bright golden-coloured tail coverts. That could easily be due to climatic conditions over long periods of isolation in these dry scrub-lands. Specimens have not been procured from this district of *P. xanthopygus*, but from close observations in the field, the Pardalotes of the "Whipstick" scrub appear to be losing the golden coverts and a medium colouration of the two species has taken place, giving us a strong belief that a climatic change has taken place with the true Mallee form.\* Away from the scrub in the forest country the typical colouration of *P. punctatus* is uniform, showing that the birds that inhabit the scrub-lands are definitely progeny of the Mallee bird.

\*This presupposes that the yellow-rumped form developed before the "Whipstick" type. Might it not be more reasonable to suppose that the yellow-rumped form showed a further change to that first occurring in the development of the "Whipstick" type from the typical *P. punctatus*.—Ed.

## Stray Feathers

**Meliphaga ornata in Southern Victoria.**—A feature of a trip by the writer's party of four on August 30, 1936, to Toolern Vale Bird Sanctuary, often referred to in *The Emu* and particularly in Volume xxxiv, pp. 113-121, was the finding of a pair of Yellow-plumed Honeyeaters (*Meliphaga ornata*). This is the first record of the species for the sanctuary, and, it is believed, for a locality so far south. A true Mallee form, it is an addition to the growing list of northern birds found at Toolern, and also to the imposing list of Honeyeaters recorded from the district.

Found in company with the Fuscous (*Meliphaga fusca*) and the White-plumed (*M. penicillata*) Honeyeaters, the Yellow-plumed were easily distinguished from those birds by the striated breast and throat, and distinct yellow ear-tufts. Some of their calls were identical with those of the other species.

The sanctuary again proved its claim as one of the best districts for Honeyeaters in southern Victoria by producing thirteen species. These ranged in numbers from the one pair of Yellow-plumed under notice to hundreds in the case of the White-naped form (*Melithreptus lunatus*). Others recorded were *Melithreptus gularis*, *M. brevirostris*, *Acanthorhynchus tenuirostris*, *Meliphaga chrysops*, *M. leucotis*, *M. melanops*, *Meliornis novæ-hollandiæ*, *Myzantha melanocephala* and *Anthochaera carunculata*. *Zanthomiza phrygia* has also recently been recorded.

Fifty-five other species, including Cuckoos, were recorded during the day. Perhaps a few dates concerning the Cuckoos may be of interest. As early as July 26 a Pallid Cuckoo (*Cuculus pallidus*) was seen. Early in the morning of August 30 the species was heard to call. During the same day Fantail Cuckoos (*Cacomantis flabelliformis*) and Golden Bronze-Cuckoos (*Lamprolaima plagusus*) joined in the chorus of bird song. A single Horsfield Bronze-Cuckoo (*Chalcites basalis*) was seen as early as June 8—at Altona amidst the samphire scrub.—W. BURGESS, Hawthorn, Melbourne, 8/9/36.

**Notes from North-west Tasmania.**—The prompt appearance of Flame-breasted Robins (*Petroica phoenicea*) when severe cold sets in was again exemplified on May 6 this year, when the paddocks and gardens were white with frost; that morning the Robins were sitting about on the post and rail fences in the vicinity of the town, where none had been seen the previous day.

The Pipits (*Anthus australis*) disappeared as usual at the beginning of April, but on June 2, a pair was seen in a Devonport grass-paddock on a fine sunny afternoon. These isolated pairs are noticed in most winters, a few individuals appearing to brave the cold weather after the majority have migrated, as is the case with Fantailed Cuckoos and Swallows. On August 5 a pair of Pipits was seen indulging in a lively "flirtation" about twenty feet up in the air, advancing to each other and receding, uttering squeaky little notes during the performance. On the morning of that day a Striated Pardalote or Tree-Diamond (*Pardalotus striatus*) was heard calling from a tree in the garden, after tempestuous north-west weather. That is unusually early for this little bird.

A pair of Summer-birds (*Coracina nova-hollandiæ*) was noted by a friend on June 18, along a bush road leading to the beach at East Devonport; it is several years since I have seen any of these migrants remaining through the winter on this (west) side of the Mersey River.—H. STUART DOVE, West Devonport, Tas., 8/8/36.

**Vocal Mimicry of the Horsfield Bushlark.**—In reply to A. H. Chisholm (*The Emu*, Vol. xxxv, p. 318), I am submitting a short note on the mimetic powers of the Horsfield Bushlark (*Mirafrja javanica*). In recent years there seems to have been a tendency among the members of the younger generation, doubtless due to the advance of ornithology as a popular hobby, to specialize in some particular branch of bird-study. The same trend may be remarked in many other branches of modern study, the stage, art, music, etc. It seems a pity that vocal mimicry has not claimed a greater share of attention. The subject, from its very nature, gives a greater promise of entertainment than perhaps any other, whether to the layman or to the so-called expert.

Some of us may have listened to a famous musician, skillfully blending old folk-songs or compositions by other masters, weaving them together by his own artistry, improvising at times until further inspiration comes to him. To anyone who has heard a performance by the Bushlark the analogy will be apparent. He may not possess the powerful voice of some of his more famous brother-mimics, but his technique has a delicate finish and a distinctive quality which sets him apart. His best performances are always given in the nesting season, which, on the Darling Downs, extends from mid-November to the end of January, with a slight seasonal variation. Individual "concerts" vary, of course, in text, but the general scheme remains constant. A few notes borrowed from one bird, repeated from two to six times, but usually about three, are followed by a subdued twitter (original), which in turn gives way to another borrowed call, and so on. The complete performance varies in duration from five to fifteen minutes, according to the mood or memory of the artist. The text of his borrowed calls is, of course, supplied by the various birds he encounters, and he possesses either a considerable memory or an ability to "pirate" certain borrowed calls from brother-mimics. An instance of this is his rendering of the "tink, tink" of *Climacteris picumnus*, which bird has long since vanished from the district. The notes, then, must have been either heard during migratory wanderings or "cribbed" from the repertoire of another Lark.

It is worthy of note that the performance is always given on the wing, starting as the bird leaves the ground and increasing in volume and subject until he has attained a fair altitude, at which he glides to and fro for the duration of his concert. I use the masculine pronoun throughout, it being my opinion that the female has a relatively poor voice, her mate being the solo performer.—A. C. CAMERON, Biddeston, Qld., 18/6/36.

**English Nightingales.**—For years it has been an ambition of mine to have a pair of English Nightingales. In June, 1935, a pair was imported and arrived in good condition, with the exception of soiled feathers. I considered myself very fortunate to land them, especially as other hardy birds did not survive the trip. I had been warned on no account to put them together, as one would be sure to kill the other, so they were kept in separate cages in the bird room for two months. On fine days they were allowed to fly in one of the breeding aviaries for a few hours, but not together.

This way of keeping Nightingales did not appeal to me, so after getting them into good condition during the two months, they were let out into the Finches' aviary (between the breeding aviaries) and remained there for the next three

months. During that time they were watched closely in case they commenced fighting. They did not appreciate each other's company, and as soon as one went near the other there was trouble, but nothing serious for they soon separated. I was not satisfied to leave them in the aviary and at the end of November they were turned out into a large aviary with a hedge in it (98 feet x 30 feet x 12 feet high). This was an anxious time and I wondered if they would find their food and how they would be with the other birds. They took up positions one at each end of the hedge and it was well over a week before they were seen again. Occasionally they were heard to give their warning cry—"Krrrrr." After a time we could go along the hedge and find the hen within a space of twenty feet at her end; the cock could never be found, only heard.

After about two months they were seen flying out of the hedge on to a tree and then back to the hedge. As time went on they gradually became tamer and now the hen will settle on my hand and take a mealworm and then fly to the other end of the aviary to eat it. She usually does this four times and then appears satisfied, remaining at the far end. When I enter the aviary she flies straight towards me in line with the face, and then, when within three or four feet, turns to one side or flies overhead and perches nearby and waits for a mealworm. The cock usually follows the hen, but turns off when about twelve feet away. When it came to June and the birds had been with me for twelve months, without the cock being heard to sing, I began to wonder if he would ever commence. On June 20 in the afternoon his song was heard for the first time. Since then he has been singing each day, mostly in the morning between 7.30 and 9.30. So far he has not been heard to sing at night.—S. HARVEY, Millswood, Adelaide, S.A., 30/6/36.

**Helmeted Honeyeaters.**—For a long period little was heard concerning *Meliphaga cassidix*, but during the last three or four years most Melbourne bird observers have sought out and "paid homage" to the rare Honeyeater which is to be found at present at both Beaconsfield and Woori Yallock, each about 30 miles from the metropolis. Mr. George Mack gives an account of the bird in *The Victorian Naturalist*, Vol. L, pp. 151-156, wherein he states that it seems probable that the species will be found in widely-separated groups throughout southern Victoria. The Woori Yallock "colony" was not then known and its discovery supports Mack's suggestion, nevertheless I do not think that many further localities for the bird will be found. At different times between 1920 and 1928 I have traversed practically the whole of the Dividing Range between Healesville and Mt. Kosciusko (N.S.W.) and have wandered over much of the unsettled country of mid-eastern Victoria,

much of which is similar to the known habitat of the bird, without sight of the bird in the gullies of the extensive ranges throughout that section. Southern, and to some extent eastern, Victoria, are now comparatively well settled and from those areas we hear nothing of a bird which, coloured as it is, would be likely to attract attention. Birds from Wood's Point are the only records from north of the Dividing Range.

Observers in Gippsland might watch for the Honeyeater in their districts, but should not overlook the possibility of *M. melanops*, a bird to which *M. cassidix* bears a superficial resemblance, occurring there, because it seems certain that the Yellow-tufted form is found also in the heavy forest country where the Helmeted bird might be expected to be found. Mack refers to sporadic records, but existing sight records of reliable observers would extend them considerably eastwards.

The bird shown in the illustration was photographed at Beaconsfield on September 6, 1936. Two young birds, about eight days old, were in the nest. Unlike young Yellow-tufted Honeyeaters of about the same age, they had no greenish tinge in the down, that being black. No trace of the crest appeared. A curious action of the adults was their perching together on a twig close by and then extending their heads forwards and upwards, drooping and shivering the wings and maintaining the while a subdued "gurgling" note.

On September 13 I again visited the nest but found it on the ground, blown down by a very strong wind then disturbing the countryside. One of the young birds at least had escaped unharmed and was found about 10 feet away with the parents in attendance. The bird was able to make short flights through the scrub. The ear tufts were by then well pronounced and the crest was beginning to take shape and colour.—C. E. BRYANT, Melbourne, 14/9/36.

C. M. N. White on Australian Birds.—In the *Bull. Brit. Orn. Club*, Vol. lvi, pp. 90-92, March 4, 1936, there appears a note on the Australian Tree-Martin (*Petrochelidon nigricans*) which purposes to deal with the sub-species separable over an area of thousands of square miles on the basis of fifteen sexed skins. Thus White records as his material eight males and seven females, writing "To this race I refer all birds from Tasmania, Victoria, eastern South Australia, New South Wales, Queensland, and examples from New Guinea, Aru and Kei Islands, and other localities where it has been taken as a straggler." Such a sweeping distribution upon such scant basis negatives any result worthy of serious consideration. Without any regard of distance or climatic conditions over the thirty-eight degrees of latitude covered White writes "All examples from North



Helmeted Honeyeater at nest.

Photo. by C. E. Bryant.

Queensland and New Guinea, etc., I regard as non-breeding migrants." Then the south-western Australian race is admitted as distinct with the quaint observation: "Probably resident in its distribution. Mr. W. B. Alexander kindly informs me that this is certainly true in the Swan River district." At present in Australia there are no known laws governing the movements of the so-called migrant passerine forms, and therefore it is entirely futile to be dogmatic on such matters. In nearly every locality some birds are resident while others move, but comparatively only short distances, and these movements are somewhat erratic and not truly migratory. To interpret the racial forms of any such birds study of hundreds of birds would be necessary, and even then the results would be more or less tentative. It is, therefore, not very necessary to lay much stress upon Mr. White's conclusions.

In the same *Bulletin*, pp. 126-127, June 3, 1936, the same writer comments on the names and sub-species of *Petroica phoenicea* Gould and *Petroica rodinogaster* Drapiez. As regards the sub-specific determinations the above remarks also apply, but Mr. White has revived the specific name *chrysoptera* to displace *phoenicea*. In that he appears at first sight to be on good ground, but he quotes M. Berlioz as suggesting that Quoy and Gaimard's type never entered the Paris Museum. That is an error as it is well-known that it was placed there, though, through the vicissitudes of war, it may now be missing.—TOM IREDALE, Australian Museum, Sydney, 26/8/36.

**Birds at Cape Brett, N.Z.**—I write in response to Mr. A. F. D'Ombra's suggestion that someone familiar with New Zealand birds should comment on the identifications offered in his interesting article on "Birds at Cape Brett" appearing in the July issue. I was not at the Bay of Islands last Autumn, but as a rule the same birds are to be seen there every year, and I offer the following comments based on an acquaintance with the region during the past 20 years.

Gulls are mentioned in the first paragraph, two kinds being noticed on the fishing grounds. One is correctly identified as the Red-billed Gull (*Larus novæ-hollandiæ scopulinus*) and the other is described as "a similar bird with dark-coloured legs and beak, very like our Pacific Gull only it seemed to me to be smaller." As Mr. D'Ombra later gives a good description of *Larus dominicanus* in the bay and specifically says that he did not see any out in the ocean, that species is presumably ruled out. The only remaining possibility is that the birds with the darker legs and beak were immature Red-billed Gulls which are always distinguishable by their brown bills and feet from the red-billed adults. *Larus bulleri*, the Black-billed Gull, is not a marine bird except near river mouths in the South Island. It does, how-

ever, occur in numbers on the Hot Lakes which Mr. D'Ombraïn subsequently visited. On these lakes there are also a few resident Red-billed Gulls strayed from the sea, but they are outnumbered by the Black-billed Gull, especially on Lake Rotorua. Mr. D'Ombraïn describes the Gulls he saw on Lake Rotomahana as Red-billed Gulls, but his photographs, at any rate that of the young bird yawning,\* could easily be *Larus bulleri*.

The Petrels described by Mr. D'Ombraïn are not difficult to place as he gives a graphic and accurate account of their habits. His Mutton-bird is *Puffinus carneipes*, very common in this area and distinguished by just such behaviour as he describes. *Puffinus griseus* is comparatively rare on the northern fishing grounds and keeps farther out to sea. The "Kahawai bird" of his local informants is the Fluttering Shearwater (*Reinholdia reinholdi* Mathews, or *Puffinus gavia* of most authors). The popular name "Kahawai bird" has become almost useless as a term of identification. Years ago it was applied generally to *Sterna striata* and its recent application at the Bay of Islands to the Fluttering Shearwater is a restricted local usage. The Terns described in the article would be White-fronted Terns (*Sterna striata*) and are most unlikely to have been *Sterna nereis*.

Finally, there is only one possible identification for the bird which Mr. D'Ombraïn considered might have been a Wilson Storm Petrel. From the fact that it flew seldom and then had difficulty in lifting clear of the water, it can have been none other than the Diving-Petrel (*Pelecanoides urinatrix*), a species not uncommon off the Bay of Islands throughout the year.—R. A. FALLA, Auckland, N.Z., 30/7/36.

\*Mr. D'Ombraïn, who has already seen Mr. Falla's note, writes that this photograph was taken off Piercey Island, not at the lake. Since the type was set Mr. Falla has written advising of receipt of the above advice from Mr. D'Ombraïn and of a photograph which makes it clear that there were also Buller's or Ashy-backed Shearwaters (*Puffinus bulleri*) amongst other Shearwaters seen by Mr. D'Ombraïn.—Ed.

**Cuckoo Problems.**—Cuckoos still have secrets that require definite discovery, and that being so the extracts that follow from letters published in two English papers, *The Spectator* and *The Field*, concerning the laying of the European Cuckoo (*Cuculus canorus*) are of interest and productive of thought, because there is every probability of Australian Cuckoos doing what the European representative does.

The writer of the letters conclusively shows that the Cuckoo in the "Old Country" at times lays its eggs away from the nest of the dupe, and then, having carried it, probably swallowing it to a certain extent for safety, to the nest it has marked down, regurgitates the egg—a matter requiring a few seconds only, into the fosterer's nest.



That does not prove that the Cuckoo never lays its egg direct into the dupe's nest, and that it never sits on the nest, but when one considers how touchy birds are about their nests, with eggs or young, it is hard to conceive a Cuckoo being allowed leisurely to occupy a nest for laying without there being a serious disturbance. It has always seemed strange to me that the birds imposed upon should complacently allow a stranger to sit on their nests, but it is questionable if the Cuckoo ever does actually so sit, the other method being so much more simple and practically devoid of any unpleasantness between the parasite and the victim. It is an interesting question that requires careful and continued watching.

Has any one ever seen a Cuckoo sitting on a nest?

The letters in question were both written by Mr. P. C. Bunyard, a well-known ornithologist in England, and as they have been seen possibly by few bird-men out here I quote them *in extenso*.

In *The Spectator* of July 20, 1934, Mr. Bunyard writes:

"In your issue of February 9, 1934, Sir W. Beach Thomas again raised the age-old controversy as to how Cuckoos deposit their eggs. The results of my investigations, extending over thirteen years, have convinced me that there is only one method of deposition—regurgitation, i.e., the eggs are first oviposited on the ground or on old nests. There they rest until the Cuckoo has found a nest in the right condition for their reception. They are then taken up by the bill and swallowed into the gullet or oesophagus, where they again rest until regurgitated into the nest, among the eggs of the fosterer.

"In the following report of my remarkable experiences it will be found that I have finally proved, beyond the bounds of controversy, that the eggs are deposited by regurgitation, *via* the bill; and I do modestly claim that the evidence is by far the most important and conclusive that has ever been, or can be, brought forward.

"On June 16 I visited the South Kent marshes for the purpose of two weeks' intensive Cuckoo watching. By the evening of the 18th I had located no less than twenty-five pairs of Reed Warblers and their nests in all stages, i.e., some with fresh eggs, others with incubated eggs and young. The territory was ideal, though rather extensive for one Cuckoo parasitic on Reed Warblers.

"The Cuckoo, judging from her erratic behaviour, was a juvenile, i.e., a last year's bird. On June 17 I found one of her eggs in a Reed Warbler's nest with two eggs apparently quite fresh. On June 18 I found three, all in Reed Warblers' nests, one of which was on the point of hatching. On June 24 we found her fifth egg, which she apparently deposited on the previous evening after we had made a final inspection of the nest at 6 p.m., before our departure from the territory. Just previous to this she had been seen in the willow close to the nest. Being so irregular, it was practically impossible to forecast depositions with any degree of certainty and she was evidently not a prolific layer.

"On June 26, in pushing my way through a thick reed bed, I came across a Moorhen's old nest on which, to my great surprise, two Cuckoo's eggs were resting—one in the centre, the other on the edge. I at once recognized them as belonging to the Cuckoo in possession of the territory. From previous experience, I was convinced that this was only a temporary resting place, consequently I carefully marked them, with ordinary lead pencil, "6" and "7" respectively, and replaced them in their original position.

"On the morning of June 27 I made an immediate inspection of the Moorhen's nest, and found the Cuckoo's eggs resting where I had left them and, as the Cuckoo was about, prepared for a long watch—with the reed bed in which the Moorhen's nest was situated and the pollarded willow in full view. About 2 p.m. she came over and settled in the willow and almost immediately planed down into the reeds where the Moorhen's nest was situated. In less than a minute she returned to the willow and I had her in full view (with powerful 12 times magnification prismatic glasses) sitting on a dead branch, and I could plainly see that the bill was closed.

"There she sat motionless for half an hour, facing down the reed bed where there was a Reed Warbler's nest (previously inspected) with three fresh eggs. At 2.45 p.m. she glided down to the nest and in less than eight (counted) seconds she flew up from the reeds and away over the meadow, bubbling loudly four times. I then made an immediate inspection of the nest in which there were now two Reed Warbler's eggs and the Cuckoo's I had marked "7," the number being easily legible though much rubbed after having rested more than half an hour in the gullet. I then made an inspection of the Moorhen's nest and found egg marked "6" undisturbed.

"On June 28 I inspected the Moorhen's nest and found egg marked "6" resting where left. After inspecting all Warblers' nests again, I spent the remainder of a fruitless day's watching near the pollarded willow. On June 29 I went straight to the territory and inspected the Moorhen's nest, and found that egg marked "6" had disappeared. I then inspected all known Warblers' nests, but without result.

"On June 30 I made a final effort to find egg marked "6." My first visit was made to that part of the territory situated at least four to five hundred yards from the pollarded willow where I found two Cuckoo's eggs by the same bird on the 18th. One rebuilt nest I had so far failed to locate. After a careful search I found the nest containing three Warbler's eggs and a Cuckoo's on which I could just see my figure "6." I was not altogether surprised; at the same time it was a very happy ending to a remarkable and unique experience, in further proof of the habit of regurgitation—and definite proof that the eggs were not oviposited into the Warblers' nests!"

And later in *The Field* of March 22, 1935, Mr. Bunyard writes:

"In looking through the late Mr. C. F. Stedman's diaries, I came across the following under 'June 6, 1909. Near Ashford, Kent': 'Joe Legg told me he had found a Hedge Sparrow's nest with one egg and another different, so I went to see it. I found it was a Cuckoo's, but the nest was evidently deserted, as the eggs were cold. On blowing them I found the Hedge-Sparrow's egg *was quite fresh*; the Cuckoo's *was well advanced*, in fact, showing signs of feathers.'

"Obviously the Cuckoo's egg had not been incubated by that Hedge-Sparrow, or her own would have been in similar condition. Something may have happened to the original fosterers, or possibly the Cuckoo was not satisfied with the attention her egg was receiving.

"My attention has been called to two exactly similar cases recorded by Dr. C. B. Ticehurst in *The Birds of Suffolk*, from which the following has been extracted: 'The presence of an incubated Cuckoo's egg among fresh eggs of the fosterer's seems difficult to account for, but two instances are noted. In one case, recorded by the Rev. J. Tuck, there were originally four eggs of the fosterer in a Hedge-Sparrow's nest. The next day there were three eggs of the fosterer *which proved to be fresh* and an egg of the Cuckoo *which was decidedly incubated*. Mr. Tuck also records an *incubated Cuckoo's egg with three fresh eggs* of the Reed Warbler.'

"The importance of this evidence cannot be overestimated, supporting as it does the proved habit of deposition by regurgitation. Undoubtedly these Cuckoos' eggs were transferred, for some reason



Whitehead feeding young Long-tailed Cuckoo, Kapiti Island.

Photo. by Mrs. A. S. Wilkinson.

or other, by the Cuckoos, after they had been incubated by the original fosterers! Cuckoos do not lay stale or incubated eggs! I have many records of fresh Cuckoos' eggs being deposited with incubated eggs of the fosterers, undoubtedly due to the fact that nests with eggs in the right condition were not at the time available."

In the letter in *The Field* there is evidence, in the shifting of the Cuckoo egg from one nest to another, of considerably more intelligence on the Cuckoo's part, I think, than would have been generally expected.—F. L. BERNEY, Longreach, Qld., 21/7/36.

**Notes on *Urodynamis taitensis* and description of its egg.**—On November 6, 1927, my daughter found a nest of the Whitehead (*Mohoua albicilla*) situated six feet up from the ground in a *Coprosma areolata*. In the nest were three eggs of the Whitehead and an egg of the Long-tailed Cuckoo (*Urodynamis taitensis*). The egg of the Cuckoo measured 26 mm. x 18 mm. The ground colour was pale flesh and was blotched or speckled all over with reddish-brown and vandyke brown spots. On one side of the egg the blotches ran together to form part of a zone. The egg was more elliptical than ovate in form and when seen through a lens had the appearance of quartz.

To enable me to observe more closely the progress of the incubation of the Cuckoo's egg, it was removed and placed in another Whitehead's nest within six yards of my house. The eggs in this nest had been laid at the same time and were the same in number. I added the Cuckoo's egg to the clutch at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. Next morning at daylight, the Cuckoo's egg was on the ground unbroken. It had fallen eight feet on to some light brush. That shows the toughness of the shell. I returned the egg to the nest and it was still there as darkness came on that night. During the day the Whiteheads had paid several visits to the nest but appeared to notice nothing wrong. Next morning, however, the egg was once more on the ground, in pieces this time. Those Whiteheads were determined to have nothing to do with it.

Early in January of this year (1936), my daughter found another nest of the Whitehead in the same sort of shrub. It contained a young Cuckoo about a week old. The Whiteheads were busy feeding the young bird. As the nest was in an open place suitable for photography, I erected a staging so that my wife could operate the camera, as I was too busy to spare the time. We wished to get the foster-parent in the act of feeding the Cuckoo. The picture shown was secured after considerable time extending over four days had been spent standing on the staging.

A day or so before the young Cuckoo was ready to leave the nest (January 28), I placed a band on its leg. The ring was stamped "Kapiti N.Z. 1936."—A. S. WILKINSON, Kapiti Island, N.Z.