

built in the branches of trees (In Thailand I had found a nest in the roof of a pavilion.) In my experience, this Sparrow does not frequent streets and houses; it is a denizen of the ricefields, villages, and suburban gardens.

This ends my arbitrary list, and I would just remind the reader that way back in Part One I declared my intention of taking "at random" a selection of rarities and possibilities of which I have learnt something in Thailand and which I hope to pursue further in Malaya along the lines indicated in this article.

In compiling this paper I have referred principally to the following works:—

- Dugnan H.G., (1951) The Birds of Northern Thailand *Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.* 186
- Gibson Hill C. A., (1949) An annotated checklist of the birds of Malaya *Bull. Raffles Mus.* 20
- Herbert E. G., (1923-24) Nests and eggs of birds in Central Siam *J. nat. Hist. Soc. Siam* 6: 81-123, 215-222, 293-311
- Riley J. H., (1928) Birds from Siam and the Malay Peninsula in the U.S. National Museum collected by Drs. Hugh M. Smith and William L. Abbot *Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.* 172
- Swythies B.E., (1941) *Birds of Burma.*

RHINOCEROSSES

By

A. H. FETHERSTONIAUCH

Chief Game Warden, Federation of Malaya

The information contained in Mr F. P. Burgess' letter* is more valuable than he may believe. Up to date knowledge of the distribution of Rhinoceros is meagre and all first hand information is most useful not only in itself, but as narrowing the field when long overdue research can commence.

The size of tracks is not conclusive, but all such evidence is valuable if supported by accurate details. Some years ago when the Verney Expedition was looking for *Rhinoceros sondaicus* in Lower Perak, tracks, which to the best of my recollection measured 20.5 cm., proved to be those of a very old and unusually large specimen of *Rhinoceros sumatrensis*. A track of 22 cm. or over, measured on firm level ground should indicate the presence of *R. sondaicus*.

* This Journal p. 163, March 1951.



The Great Mormon Butterfly (*Papilio memnon agenor*)

Mr. Ladgater writes:—

The photograph was taken in the garden of my house in Freeman Road, Kuala Lumpur. I have been trying to get a good photograph of this species for some time, as single butterflies appear in my garden at fairly frequent intervals, but this is the first time that I have been able to obtain such a perfect specimen. It was "temperature controlled" for the photograph, and I was just in time to make the exposure before it took off strongly.

The last specimen recorded from the West Coast was a very old cow collected for the British Museum by the expedition referred to and I have seen no evidence proving the presence of other survivors in this area. Some years before the war, the late T. R. Hubback expressed the opinion that *R. sondaicus* was approaching extinction in Malaya, with possibly one or two isolated individuals surviving which could not propagate the species. He also held the belief that this species penetrated into the Malay Peninsula from Tenasserim, infiltrated down the West Coast, but never crossed the main range. I have never been able to see any valid reason why *R. sondaicus* should not have penetrated to the East Coast and have felt that a final pronouncement would be premature without exhaustive research in at least three areas from which credible reports of unusually large tracks have been received. The war put an end to research and circumstances will not permit of resumption at present, which goes to enhance the value of reports from independent observers.

The belief that *R. sondaicus* is found only in low lying swampy country is contradicted by S. H. Prater who states that this species has been recorded at heights up to 2,000 feet above sea level. I have received reports of unusually large tracks in Malaya up to 4,000 feet. Similar feeding habits are attributed to both *R. sondaicus* and *R. sumatrensis* and I have personally observed the latter from sea level to over 4,000 feet.

Positive proof of the survival of *R. sondaicus* in Malaya would be a feather in the cap of any Naturalist and I give the following hints in the hope that they may stimulate potential observers.

Positive Identification

Positive identification of *R. sondaicus* can be made from the typical "reticulated" hide with heavy folds at neck, shoulder and hip; the fold of skin behind the shoulder being carried right across the back. The hide of *R. sumatrensis* does not show this mosaic pattern and most of the body is covered with bristles; hairy fringes on the ears and body may be lost with age and folds are less clearly defined, where present. Useful illustrations to consult are included in "The Book of Indian Animals" by S. H. Prater (Bombay Natural History Society's publication).

Other Characteristics

The presence of a single horn. This alone is not a sure guide for the field observer as the posterior horn in *R. sumatrensis* is often little more than a thickening of the skin on the nose and impossible to observe accurately in the field.

Size. An animal over 4 ft. 6 in. at the shoulder will be *R. sondaicus*, but it must be remembered that an immature specimen will not be conspicuous for its size.

An exceptionally large track. This will most certainly denote *R. sondaicus* but again an immature specimen will not leave a large track. It will also be borne in mind that a beast leaves a very different track according to the nature and state of the ground, the speed at which it is travelling and whether up or down hill, or on the level. The best method of identification is to measure as many tracks as possible over as long a distance as possible, making careful notes of variations in soil, the state of the weather, and whether the animal was feeding, walking steadily, trotting or galloping, on the level or up or down hill. I had casts and photographs to illustrate the different tracks made by a single beast over approximately two miles of rather mixed going, but these went to the looters in 1941 together with other irreplaceable records.

I have purposely omitted any reference to localities in this article and would appeal to anybody writing for publication to suppress exact information of this kind. Perhaps it is hard to believe, but even in 1951 Rhinoceros still retain their alleged medicinal value. Present circumstances make their proper protection a matter of extreme difficulty and exact details of a locality believed to hold them may eventually prove to be manna from Heaven for a potential poacher. I will gratefully receive such details for official record, but will give the information at my disposal to *bona fide* observers only.

A KUALA LUMPUR GARDEN BY NIGHT

By

J. L. HARRISON

Institute for Medical Research

One day I hope to read an account by one of our members of the animals to be seen in his own garden. Such an account will be both interesting and I think surprising for a few years of patient observation is likely to turn up a large variety of creatures. I imagine that part of pleasure in such an account will be given to birds because they are undoubtedly the most conspicuous animals present and, excepting insects, probably the most numerous. Birds, however, keep their deserved popularity by keeping reasonable hours; the mammals which take over the garden at night are little known and little liked, although