AUSTRALIAN COOT IN MARINE ENVIRONMENT

At 1030 on 11 October 1980, I noticed an Australian Coot (Fulica atra australis) swimming in the sea near Karehana Bay, Plimmerton. The sea was calm with a light south-easterly wind, and the bird was swimming among rocks beside the road. After about 30 minutes, it moved to a crevice in a large rock at the sea edge, and it remained in this crevice, standing or sitting, for most of the day. At 1730 I thought it had gone, but after a few moments it came swimming out from behind some other rocks, and eventually stood on a seaweed-covered ledge with gentle waves washing over its feet. On the morning of 12 October, I could not find it.

The bird's plumage was immaculate and there was no sign of any injury. I observed it for long periods at fairly close range and it appeared unafraid; just content to sit and rest.

I cannot find any reference to Coots being seen in a salt-water environment in New Zealand, but Macdonald (1973, *Birds of Australia*) includes "brackish estuaries" as one of the bird's habitats in Australia. In Cramp *et al.* (1980, *The Birds of the Western Palearctic*, Vol. 2), the European subspecies is said to be "regular on reservoirs and even quiet inshore seawaters," and "Not marine, but will shift *in winter* to estuarine and other saline waters."

This also appears to be the first published record of the species in the immediate area of Greater Wellington.

*-----

J. C. R. CLARIDGE, 17 Moana Road, Plimmerton

In his most useful note on the smaller petrels of Macquarie Island, Jones (1980) mentions two issues requiring more discussion. In the first place he lists without comment the identification by Keith & Hines (1958) of a medium-sized gadfly petrel skull found in 1956 as the Mottled Petrel (Pterodroma inexpectata). In the past, I have had occasion to examine the skulls of most members of the genus Pterodroma and in point of fact have already questioned this identification (Bourne 1967). While the alternative which I suggested there, the Kerguelen Petrel (P. brevirostris), in fact normally has a larger orbit and narrower bill, there is still room for confusion, and it is much greater with the skull of the Soft-plumaged Petrel (P. mollis), which is virtually identical with that of the Mottled Petrel. I suspect that this identification was initially based on grounds of supposed geographical probability, which looks rather different now that the Softplumaged Petrel has been found at both Antipodes Island and Macquarie Island. I suggest that it may be advisable to refer old records of the occurrence of the Mottled Petrel at Macquarie and Antipodes Islands to the Soft-plumaged Petrel in future until there is better evidence that they occur together there.

Secondly, while the occurrence of two species of diving petrel at Macquarie Island has been questioned, there appear to be specimens of both of them. During the course of a tour of Australasian museums in 1974, I looked for any additional information to that summarised in my previous note on this group (Bourne 1968). While unfortunately I did not have time to go through the Macquarie material kept out of circulation for so long in Wellington, I did manage to locate six specimens from the island in Melbourne. I thought that three of them, B4726 collected on 3 May 1949, and two females M56/8/123-4 collected on the Isthmus on 25 September 1956, were South Georgian Diving Petrels (Pelecanoides georgicus), and the other three, B4727-8 collected on the Isthmus on 25 April 1950 and 25 January 1953 and 37724 collected on 14 October 1960, belonged to the small southern form of Common Diving Petrel (Pelecanoides urinatrix exsul) from their bill characters, though their dimensions fall within the wide zone of overlap between these two species.

It would appear that, whatever may be the position with the gadfly petrels, two species of diving petrel as well as two species of giant petrel Macronectes (Bourne & Warham 1966) have been occurring together undetected at Macquarie Island, as they also did until very recently at South Georgia (Bourne 1968, Payne & Prince 1979). This raises again the question whether the large and small forms of Common Diving Petrel found in the New Zealand area may also breed alongside each other anywhere, notably in the Chatham Islands, in which case they would also have to be regarded as distinct species P. urinatrix and P. berard. But surely it is impossible that two species of *Pelecanoides* could nest in the same area undetected in such a well-known country as New Zealand?

LITERATURE CITED

BOURNE, W. R. P. 1967. Subfossil petrel bones from the Chatham Islands. Ibis 109: 1-7.
BOURNE, W. R. P. 1968. Notes on the diving-petrels. Bull. Brit. Orn. C1. 88: 77-85.
BOURNE, W. R. P.; WARHAM, J. 1966. Geographical variation in the giant petrels of the genus Macrometes. Ardea 54: 45-67.
JONES, E. 1980. A survey of burrow-nesting petrels at Macquarie Island based upon remains left by predators. Notornis 27: 11-20.
KEITH, K.; HINES, M. P. 1958. New and rare species of birds at Macquarie Island during 1956 and 1957. CSIRO Wildl. Res. 3: 50-53.
PAYNE, M. R.; PRINCE, P. A. 1979. Identification and breeding biology of the diving petrels Pelecanoides georgicus and P. urinatrix exsul at South Georgia. NZ J. Zool. 6: 299-318.

W. R. P. BOURNE, Zoology Department, Aberdeen University, Tillydrone Avenue, Aberdeen.