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 aequinoctialis* 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),

Victoria, South South Australia, South-west Australia, Tasmania; *Corvus coronoides bennetti* (North), North Queensland, and North and North-west New South Wales; *Corvus coronoides cecilæ* (Mathews), Northern Territory, North-west Australia, Mid-west Australia, South-west Australia. As synonym of *C. c. coronoides* (V. & H.), he only allows *C. marianæ* (Mathews), whereas Ogilvie-Grant had included *C. c. perplexus*, *C. marianæ* (Mellori), *C. m. halmaturinus* and *C. m. tasmanicus*. This means that Ogilvie-Grant's *Corvus coronoides* (V. & H.) is exactly equivalent to Stresemann's *C. c. coronoides* and *C. c. perplexus*. Stresemann, however, only includes *C. m. tasmanicus* with a (?), as it may be a distinct form. Stresemann's *C. c. bennetti* is not North's nor Ogivie-Grant's species, but is exactly my *C. bennetti queenslandicus*. Stresemann had no topotypical specimens of *C. bennetti* and *thought* Moolah was in North-west New South Wales, so that he could call the distinct Queensland form by North's name. Then Stresemann's *C. c. cecilæ* is not exactly equal to Ogilvie-Grant's *C. cecilæ* as he rejects *C. b. queenslandicus* and includes *C. bennetti bonhoti*, which Ogilvie-Grant had decided was a synonym of *C. bennetti*.

Whether my attempt "led to confusion," as Ogilvie-Grant stated, time will tell; but from a comparison of the two preceding results, my own treatment is much nearer the truth.

The facts are simple. All the northern birds have white bases to the feathers, the southern ones dusky; while there is a small white-based interior form which, according to Australian Field Ornithologists, lives along with, and is entirely distinct from, the southern dark-based form. According to my reading of the facts, each is separable into geographical series, but on account of lack of variation in colour, dimensions are alone available, and they may intergrade.

The separation of New South Wales birds by Stresemann as a valid sub-species, *C. c. coronoides*, on account of large size is correct, but his measurements were made incorrectly, as he included moulting birds, and then averaged the measurement, which is absurd. Thus in the case of *C. c. perplexus* he cites Victorian specimens as having wing lengths of 312, 322, &c. Normantown birds as 315, 315, &c., and Perth 315. In these cases the wing had not fully grown and its measurement should not have been used in connection with averaging figures.

This is truly shown under *C. c. bennetti*, where he gives the figures of a long series of Cape York birds, collected by Kemp for me for the very purpose of settling the question of forms of these birds. He cites 292–353, giving an average of 322, but a larger number of these specimens had not the wing feathers fully grown.

Stresemann lumped all the Crows from India to Japan and through Australia as one species, with a wing length varying from 270–380, and bill from 44–69 mm., figures which speak for themselves.