

CORRESPONDENCE.

To The Editorial Committee of the S.A. Ornithologist.

Gentlemen,

As this magazine is the organ of the S.A. Ornithological Association its value would, I think, be much enhanced by the publication of the reports of the monthly meetings instead of giving merely the very meagre notice of the Annual Meeting. We are told that a most successful year is recorded. Why not give particulars of the successes? Of the several sub-species discovered, excepting in two instances (in which only one bird is

named), we have no clue to the order, family, genus, or species. Regarding *Calyptorhynchus banksi stellata*, how did Capt. White prove what is stated regarding the colouration of the under surface of the tail? What were the colours in the female and young male?

I desire also to suggest that when a new name for an old species is used it should be followed by the name given by Gould, and that reasons for the alteration should be given. Most of your readers, I imagine, do not possess a copy of Mathews' newest list. What is the name of the book, and where is it obtainable? As Gould himself named *Ptilotis penicillata*, which he said was rarely met with in New South Wales, but was very abundant in South Australia, it would seem probable that it was named from South Australian specimens. If so should not its third name be *penicillata* instead of *whitei* under the new system? Mr. A. Zietz found a bird almost exactly like it, but much smaller, at Lake Callabonna. Surely this Northern White-plumed Honey-eater is not the one which is entitled to the double *penicillata*.

I am, etc.,

M. SYMONDS CLARK.

Knightsbridge, August 26th, 1914.

[Mr. Clark's suggestion that an extract of all the minutes should be published will be carried out.—Eds.]

