

question as to the identity of the species, and my individual is a male in at least two-thirds spring plumage.—ROBERT H. GRANT, 2415 Newkirk Avenue, Brooklyn, New York.

**Interior records of brant.**—In his 'Birds of the Northwest' (U. S. Geol. Surv. Terr., Misc. Publ., 3: 557, 1874) Coues said of *Branta bernicla*: "While ascending the Missouri in October 1872, I observed vast numbers of the Common Brant in flocks on the banks and mud-bars of the River." Then in the 'Report on Bird Migration in the Mississippi Valley' (U. S. Dept. Agr., Div. Econ. Orn., Bull. 2: 78, 1888) Cooke wrote: "During the winter of 1883-'84 this species was represented from Illinois southward by a few rare visitants. In the spring it was rare south of Minnesota, but by the time it reached that State its numbers had been increased by recruits from the southeast and it became almost common."

It is now possible to recognize these as among the 'growing pains' of American ornithology. From the almost pathological aversion of brant to flying over land (following all sinuosities of the coast rather than cross a headland) as reported by old hunters, it would be expected that any birds reaching the Missouri and Mississippi valleys would be mere stragglers that had been accidentally attached to flocks of other species.

Whether under the stimulus of this reflection or not, it has been realized by later ornithologists that all was not well with the early records of brant in the interior. Thus Roberts ('Birds of Minnesota,' 1: 66, 1932) relegates the brant to the hypothetical list among other birds of which there are no Minnesota specimens. DuMONT ('A Revised List of the Birds of Iowa,' Univ. Iowa Studies, n. s. 268: 158, 1934) takes similar action, saying: "There are a number of observations, in each instance unsupported by specimens. Undoubtedly, some of these refer to *Branta c. hutchinsi*." Lynds Jones long before had done the same in Ohio ('Birds of Ohio': 226, 1903). Kumlien and Hollister ('Birds of Wisconsin': 30, 1903) reject all brant records except one based on a specimen taken by Dr. P. R. Hoy. This was one of three birds "from the shore of Lake Michigan." Barrows ('Michigan Bird Life': 120, 1912) found only two records (representing a total of four birds) substantiated by specimens. There is no authentic record for Illinois and none are reported for Missouri (Widmann, 1907), Arkansas (Howell, 1911), and Oklahoma (Nice, 1924). Butler ('Birds of Indiana': 639, 1897) noted one from Indiana and one from Michigan. Oberholser ('Bird Life of Louisiana,' Louis. Dept. Conserv., Bull. 28: 680, 1938) says: "The American Brant is accredited to Louisiana by several authors, but the writer fails to find an occurrence definite enough to entitle it to a place in the Louisiana list. The small races of Canada Geese and the other geese are so commonly called 'brant' in the Mississippi valley that no dependence can be placed on any records other than those of actual specimens taken."

Earlier authors also have suggested that popular misuse of the term 'brant' is responsible for much of the difficulty. As a specialist on bird names, the present writer is sure that is the case. All geese besides the Canada are widely termed brant and even the big honker is not a complete exception. Some as the Snow Goose (young), Blue Goose, and Hutchins's Goose are even called 'black brant.' Certainly the editors and readers of older volumes of sportsmen's periodicals interpreted these names in the light of eastern experience and considered these 'black brant' to be the sea brant of their acquaintance. As we have seen, far better qualified observers and writers also were 'taken in.' In fairly recent years, correspondents have reported 'Black Brant' from Wisconsin, Kentucky, Minnesota, Iowa, and North Dakota, but there is no reason to believe that these are other than misnamed. People are

still seeing true brant where they 'ain't' and it is up to the compiler to be on guard.—  
W. L. McARTHUR, *Chicago, Illinois.*

**Redhead breeding in New Brunswick.**—On July 7, 1944, a brood of young Redheads (*Nyroca americana*) was found in a small slough on Middle Island in the St. John River near Maugerville, New Brunswick, by a party consisting of H. H. Ritchie, who is Chief Game Warden for New Brunswick, Provincial Warden John Campbell, and the writer. As far as can be determined, this occurrence constitutes the first authentic record of the nesting of Redheads for New Brunswick or for any of the Maritime Provinces of Canada.

The breeding area was a narrow, shallow pond of scarcely two acres in extent situated on Middle Island. Broods of several other species of ducks were found here and included those of the Ring-necked Duck (*Nyroca collaris*), Hooded Merganser (*Lophodytes cucullatus*), Golden-eye (*Glaucionetta clangula americana*), Blue-winged Teal (*Anas discors*), and Green-winged Teal (*Anas carolinensis*). The Redhead family consisted of the female and eight downy young less than a week old.

The Redhead brood and one of the Ring-neck broods remained quite near together and were studied at close range for some time. The two species were readily identifiable and differences in the young as well as in the females were clearly apparent to all members of the party. In order to confirm the record, however, Warden Campbell and the writer returned to the area on the following day, relocated the Redheads, and collected two of the young. One of these is now in the collection of the Chief Game Warden at Fredericton, New Brunswick, and the other is in the collection of the Maine Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit at Orono, Maine.—HOWARD L. MENDALL, *Maine Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, Orono, Maine.*

**Two unusual records for North Carolina.**—The finding of a dying Pomarine Jaeger (*Stercorarius pomarinus*) along the seashore of the Pea Island Wildlife Refuge, North Carolina, on October 27, 1943, by the manager, Mr. Sam A. Walker, established a new record for the refuge and added another to the few known appearances of this species in North Carolina. According to Pearson, Brimley, and Brimley, in their 'Birds of North Carolina,' up to 1942 only three records had been published for the state. The skin was presented to the North Carolina Museum.

A second new occurrence for the refuge was noted when Messrs. Walker, Thomas Dowdy, and Cecil Williams observed eight White Pelicans (*Pelecanus erythrorhynchos*) on the sound near New Inlet, April 2, 1944. When first sighted the birds were about three-quarters of a mile away and, after alighting on the water, they were approached closely enough by boat to insure definite identification. Seven records of the occurrence of this species in the state have been published since 1884, according to 'Birds of North Carolina,' with May 12 the earliest in spring.—FAXON W. COOK, *Fish and Wildlife Service, Chicago, Illinois.*