

under tail coverts. Where it is particularly desirable to see the ventral aspect of the tail, a window of suitable size could be cut in the card. (2) Comparison of skins in series is not as easy with flat mounts as with regular study skins. (3) Where beaks are kept with skeletons or alcoholic specimens, the beakless skins are rather "incomplete looking" and, in a measure, less useful than would be ones with beaks intact. (4) Large birds might present difficulties, although it is believed that use of appropriate materials (a relatively inexpensive mounting medium, heavy cardboard or fiberboard, etc.) and special procedures (such as the use of a thin underpadding of cotton or other material) would obviate these difficulties.

Some advantages of the method are these: (1) There is an economical use of bird specimens, wherein one saves a skeleton or alcoholic specimen as well as a skin and can associate these (which would bear identical catalog numbers) with one another. (2) There is an economical use of space, the flat-skin collection requiring substantially less space than a collection of conventional study skins. (3) The time required for preparation of flat skins is somewhat less than that needed for conventional skins; this is particularly true when one is "set up" to prepare flat skins in numbers. (4) Flat skins are easier to prepare than regular skins, especially as regards the late, skin-assembly phase of the work. (5) There is ample space for data on the card or cards, as mentioned earlier. These data are likely to be more valuable when accompanying the specimen than when recorded in a field notebook, which might not always be deposited in the same place as the specimen. The importance of having data with specimens has been emphasized by Van Tyne (*Auk*, 69: 27-33, 1952). (6) Linear measurements, if not taken in advance (where possible, I prefer to take these in advance), can be taken from flat skins as easily, I believe, as from regular study skins (bill width being a probable exception). Admittedly, quantitative relationships between flat-skin wing measurements, on the one hand, and "chord" and "arc" measurements, on the other hand, remain to be worked out for different species. Color measurements, which may become increasingly important as a refinement in taxonomic procedure, can, in my opinion, be taken more easily from the flattish surfaces of the carded skins. (7) Where specimens are subject to much handling, as by students, the skins mounted on cards show less wear and tear through the years than do unprotected, conventional study skins.

This study is a byproduct of ecological research supported by an AEC grant (Contract At(07-2)-10).—ROBERT A. NORRIS, *University of Georgia Ecological Studies, AEC Savannah River Plant area, Aiken, South Carolina. Present address: 427 Eureka Street, San Francisco 14, California.*

Dichromatism in Juvenal Yellow Warblers.—According to Dwight (See Bent, *Life Histories of North American Warblers*. U.S. Natl. Mus. Publ. No. 203. 1953: 170) the juvenal plumage of the Yellow Warbler (*Dendroica petechia*) is uniform among all individuals of the species. He described the plumage as being pale olive-brown above; wings clove-brown, broadly edged with bright olive-yellow paling at the tips of the quills, edge of the outer primary bright lemon-yellow; below pale sulphur-yellow, unstreaked; tail pale clove-brown, inner webs lemon-yellow, outer webs edged with olive-brown. On 27 June 1960 I collected two sibling Yellow Warblers (WES 620 and 621) from a nest near Sarona, Washburn County, Wisconsin. The nestlings were about nine days old and were from

a nest that I had under casual observation since the time of egg laying. Four eggs, of which three hatched, were laid in the nest. One young disappeared prior to the date of collection. I have no data pertaining to the plumage of the missing nestling. The plumages of the birds collected are distinctly different and contrast with Dwight's description. The coloration of WES 620 resembles, in part, the juvenal plumage of the nominate race as described by Ridgway (*The Birds of North and Middle America*. Vol. 2. U.S. Natl. Mus. Publ. No. 50. 1901: 509); whereas WES 621 more closely resembles Dwight's description. Colors in my descriptions are from Chapman (*Handbook of Birds of Eastern North America*, Appleton & Co. 1919: 448). The adults appeared to be of normal plumage coloration. No attempt has been made to sex the nestlings, which are preserved in alcohol.

WES 620—Upperparts olive-brown; wings fuscous lightening at tips to greenish-yellow; underparts, breast brownish-ashy, flanks and belly cream-buff. The visible portion of the short rectrices was pigmented similarly to the remiges. A few mouse-gray down feathers remained along the capital tract.

WES 621—Upperparts rich light olive-green; wings same as in WES 620, but somewhat more developed and two whitish wing bars were noticeable. Underparts, breast, belly, and flanks, light chrome yellow; crissum somewhat brighter. This was the larger of the two birds, perhaps being a day older. The underparts of this specimen bear resemblance to Dwight's description, but the over-all coloration appears to be brighter.

The fact that two conditions of juvenal plumage coloration (one similar to Ridgway's description and the other similar to Dwight's) occurred within one brood of young is of interest.—WILLIAM E. SOUTHERN, *Department of Biological Sciences, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois*.

Old Record of Baikal Teal in North Carolina.—On 19 February 1961 I examined and photographed an adult male Baikal Teal (*Anas formosa*) that had been killed near Swan Island, Currituck County, North Carolina, by F. W. Curtis on 9 December 1912. I sent color transparencies of the bird to the U.S. National Museum, where the identification was verified by Herbert G. Deignan. The specimen was arranged in an old-style, game-mount, hanging by one foot with the wings partially spread and the head pointing downward. The bird has been enclosed in a glass case in the clubhouse of the Swan Island Club, Inc., since 1912, and had not been identified previously.

The A.O.U. *Check-list of North American Birds* (Fifth Edition, 1957) lists two previous records of *A. formosa* in North America, outside of Alaska. A specimen was taken near Brentwood, Contra Costa County, California, on 13 December 1931 (Moffitt, 1932. *Condor*, 34: 193). A single bird was seen by members of the Columbus Audubon Society on the Scioto River, Delaware County, Ohio, in April 1933 (Trautman, 1935. *Ohio Dept. of Agric. Bull.*, 1: 1-16). Each was believed to be an escaped bird (Swarth, 1932. *Condor*, 34: 259 and Trautman, 1940. *The Birds of Buckeye Lake, Ohio*. Univ. Mich. Press). J. Hatter (1960. *Condor*, 62: 480) collected an immature male at Ladner, British Columbia, on 20 December 1957. Whether the specimen in North Carolina was an escapee is not known; however, I know of no aviary, zoo, or park that was near this section of the Atlantic Coast in the early nineteen-hundreds.—PAUL W. SYKES, JR., *1522 Lafayette Blvd., Norfolk 9, Virginia*.