The editor argues that this case is analogous to that of subsequent designation of generic types where the ultimate result is quite different from that possibly intended by the original proposer of the genus, but the analogy is misleading for the genus is an artificial grouping whose limits are pretty much a matter of individual opinion, while the species is a natural unit that cannot be dealt with in such an arbitary fashion.

An arbitrary restriction of a name to a particular species cannot stand after new evidence reveals an error. This evidence we believe Mr. Kennard has furnished conclusively, and the misapplication of names, used for many years for the Snow Geese through ignorance of their relationships, their migrating routes and winter and summer ranges, should be rectified on the basis of present day knowledge, not perpetuated in deference to the unwitting blunder of an early ornithologist.

> A. CLEVELAND BENT OUTRAM BANGS JAMES L. PETERS

[The Editor has only praise for the ornithology of Mr. Kennard's excellent paper but wished to point out the possibility of differences of opinion regarding the nomenclatural problems involved. He was careful to state that "others may not agree with our views" and in this, at least, he seems to be correct! He still maintains that there are two sides to the question as the rules of nomenclature unfortunately do not recognize the rectifying of "unwitting blunders."—W. S.]

Snowy Owl Report

The Editor acknowledges with thanks all the data on Snow Owls kindly submitted by correspondents. The letters were all sent to Prof. A. O. Gross who had already collected much material from New England and who was likewise in receipt of the data gathered by Mr. Ruthven Deane. Prof. Gross has prepared a summary of the flight which will appear in the October 'Auk.'