

frequent in the northern as in the southern form. Such birds, judging by their remiges and wing-coverts, are not necessarily immature birds but may be fully adult.

Ridgway states (Bds. N. and M. Amer.) that a considerable number of specimens from the range of *usneæ* (Massachusetts, New York, etc.) are indistinguishable from true *americana*. As far as the color goes this is doubtless due to individual variation, but the writer believes that the northern specimens agreeing with *americana* in proportions are almost always immature birds in the first nuptial plumage. In such specimens, as in most other Warblers, the wing averages slightly shorter than in fully adult birds, and as the bill is as large as in the adult, the relative lengths of these parts thus resemble those of the southern race. If *adults* only of the two races are compared the differences in measurements and proportions are found to be more constant.

There seems to be a slight average difference in coloration between *usneæ* of the Atlantic States and the Mississippi Valley bird, which has been separated as *ramalinaæ*. The latter usually has the jugular band more conspicuous and of a deeper black. The characters that separate these two races are so slight, however, that the decision of the A. O. U. Committee in rejecting *ramalinaæ* is doubtless a wise one. There is no difference in proportions between the latter and *usneæ* nor so pronounced a difference in color.

The following table shows the average measurements of males, in millimeters, according to locality and age.

		Wing	Tail	Bill from nostril
Florida and southern Georgia	4 im.	56.2	41.3	7.8
	6 ad.	57.8	42.5	7.6
Delaware	5 ad.	60.4	44.9	7.1
Northern New Jersey to Massachusetts	9 im.	59.2	43.	7.3
	8 ad.	61.4	43.8	7.2
Texas	3 im.	55.1	41.2	7.
	5 ad.	58.6	42.5	7.2
Michigan and Minnesota	2 im.	57.8	41.6	7.
	3 ad.	60.1	42.6	6.9

W. DEW. MILLER, *Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist., New York City.*

Breeding of the Louisiana Water-Thrush (*Seiurus motacilla*) in Berkshire County, Massachusetts.—On the afternoon of June 28, 1902, I was following up the course of a brook in Glendale, Berkshire County, Massachusetts, in company with my old friend and schoolmate, Daniel Chester French, when we came to a secluded, shallow pond, less than a quarter of an acre in extent, lying between two wooded ridges of moderate elevation. It was made, a number of years ago, for the purpose of obtaining ice, by a farmer living in the neighborhood who built a rude dam across the brook at a point where, after winding sluggishly through what was then a grassy

meadow, it raced down a rather steep incline between well defined banks overgrown with mountain laurel and densely shaded by trees of various kinds. As we approached the pond we heard a Water-Thrush chirping sharply. A moment later it appeared at the edge of a thicket with something in its bill which looked like a large grub but which did not prevent it from continuing to utter its metallic note, at short, regular intervals. It was soon joined by its mate, the male, I thought. He, also, chirped but less anxiously and frequently than the other. Both birds now began fitting close about us, enabling us to make sure that they were Louisiana, and not Northern, Water-Thrushes. They came, indeed, so very near and into lights so favorable for revealing their characteristic color and markings that we were left in no doubt whatever as to their identity. After watching them for several minutes we advanced and almost immediately discovered their nest, which was within twenty feet of where we first saw them. It contained six young, well feathered and almost large enough to fly although they kept their eyes tight shut while we were looking at them, perhaps in the hope that by so doing they might escape notice. They crowded the nest to its utmost capacity and the coloring of their upper parts — a rich, deep, seal brown — closely matched that of the mud-soaked leaves which formed its outer surface. It was the largest nest of a Water-Thrush that I have ever examined. The crown of a man's hat would not have held half its total bulk. Its situation, also, was somewhat unusual for it was placed on the side of a shallow pit which had been dug at the base of a bank to obtain earth for the construction of the dam. The rear wall of this excavation was vertical — or even overhanging — at the top at several points, but the birds had selected a place where it merely sloped steeply downward and outward and had here built their nest on a slight projection or knob scarce a foot above the level ground beneath, and wholly unsheltered above, either from observation or from the weather. I did not return to the spot that summer but I have since revisited it almost every year, about the same season, without obtaining evidence, however, that the birds have again nested there or, indeed, anywhere in the immediate neighborhood.

Mr. Walter Faxon, to whom I mentioned the above described experience not long after it had occurred, wrote me on October 14, 1902, as follows: "If you record the Southern Water-Thrush's nest (as I hope you will) you might take the occasion also to mention that I found a male [of this species] still in song on the 8th of June, 1901, at Richmond Pond, on the line between the townships of Richmond and Pittsfield." Doubtless this bird is distributed well over the southern half of Berkshire County.— WILLIAM BREWSTER, *Cambridge, Mass.*

Concerning *Thryomanes bewicki cryptus* in Colorado.— Merritt Cary, in 'The Auk' for April, 1909, p. 185, records *Thryomanes bewicki cryptus* from Shell Rock Cañon, in the northwest corner of Baca County, although the specimen was not secured, and was merely supposed to belong to this form,