fortunately his desire to ensure the brooding bird freedom from interference resulted in nothing further being added to knowledge of the domestic habits. Each year since a single young bird was reared the adults have built and laid, but the young have lived only a few weeks. Adults are almost omnivorous but evidently young have "delicate" digestive systems. News of the hatching of young Satinbirds at the Healesville Sanctuary, Victoria, has since appeared in the daily papers. See Avicultural Magazine, Dec., 1902, p. 63, for an early record of breeding.—C.E.B.

"Anting."—This practice, which A. H. Chisholm restored to notice, has already been observed in the Corvidae, Timeliidae, Sturnidae, Turdidae, and in a Dipper (Cinclidae). See, in particular, W. L. McAtee, Auk, vol. 55, p. 98. Margaret M. Nice and Joost Ter Pelkwyk (ib., vol. 57, p. 520) now record the habit in the American Song Sparrow (Fringillidae). "Anting" appears to be inborn, for the young birds were hand-raised and never had any parasites. General experiments show an aversion to ants as food, but they are occasionally eaten after use for "anting."—C.E.B.

One-Letterism.—G. M. Mathews (Sth. Aust. Orn., 1940, vol. xv., pt. 7, p. 110) points out that as Muscicapa rhodogastra Lath., 1801, is a synonym of Petroica multicolor, rodinogaster (Saxicola rodinogaster Drapiez, 1820) cannot be used for the Pink-breasted Robin (unless Erythrodryas is recognized) and proposes the name julietae for the latter. Strict adherence to the International Code will mean the retention of the name in use, and it is difficult to find justification to extend the effect of Article 35, especially as covering an extra syllable. The type of Thiellus Bonaparte, 1856, is designated Puffinus chlororhynchus Lesson, 1831. It is queried whether the name is pre-occupied by Thyellas Gloger, 1827.—C.E.B.

Correspondence

To the Editor.

LITTLE BLUE PENGUIN

Sir.

My attention has been drawn to an error appearing in my "Further Notes on the Breeding of the Little Blue Penguin" (*Emu*, vol. XL, part 2, 1940, page 121) which I trust members will correct in their copies.

The error is in the fourth paragraph, line 5, of page 122, where I mention that the chicks left when they were 90 days old. The reference should be 52 days, 90 days being the total period from the time that the first egg was laid until the chicks left.

Apologizing for the error,

Yours, etc.,

E. W. Hursthouse.

Eastbourne, Wellington, N.Z., September 30, 1940.

The date of publication was January 6, 1941.