

almost within reach. Once she flew by my head so close that I could hear the buzzing of her wings. She continued to fly around me as long as I remained in the vicinity of the nest. The other parent bird appeared very much alarmed too, but never ventured nearer than fifteen feet. Both birds kept up a continual scolding.

The young had left the nest so quickly that I was unable to count them but I thought that five birds left the nest, which, with the one remaining in the nest would make the total of six. This seems to be in keeping with other records which have been published.

After examining the nest I went back to my observing point and waited to see what would be done about the young bird left in the nest. One of the parent birds returned twice but would not go inside. I found one of the birds which had left the nest and the parents became very much alarmed when I tried to catch it.

The entrance to the nest was six feet above the ground: it was two and a half inches long and three quarters of an inch wide. It was so narrow that it was impossible for the parent birds to go into the nest in a natural manner; they invariably entered and left the nest head first with the back toward the stem of the tree. In all visits neither bird ever flew directly to the nesting tree, always going first to the hemlock above referred to.

The nest was secured to the bark rather than to the stem of the tree but in loosening the bark I noticed several silk like threads leading from the nest to the stem of the tree. On the detached nest these show as little balls of dark gray material, probably from the cocoon of some caterpillar. The nest is formed principally of twigs of the fir, these being used to make the foundation of the nest where the bark is some distance from the stem. It is lined with pieces of birch bark and the inner bark of the fir. The rim of the nest has the usual crescent shape, the horns being two inches and a quarter higher than the rim of the nest proper. The depth of nest outside is seven inches, inside two inches, outer diameter six inches, inner diameter three inches, greatest thickness of nest (lower or foundation part) is two inches. The nesting site is about one and one half miles from the ocean and at an altitude of about forty-five feet. This is the first record of the breeding of the bird in this vicinity.

The only call I heard was the "tseet" usually heard when the birds are flying from one tree to another. This call was almost invariably given when the birds were coming to the nest. Several times I saw one of the birds alight on the hemlock tree near the nest, and with wings aquiver give the same call. Its manner and appearance then were those of a well grown young bird calling for food.— I. RALPH MEYER, LIEUT. U. S. A., *Fort McKinley, Portland, Me.*

Bicknell's Thrush in Franconia Notch, N. H. — Last summer (1912) a friend and myself found a thriving colony of Bicknell's Thrush (*Hylocichla aliciae bicknelli*) on Mt. Pemigewasset, New Hampshire, at an

elevation of 3,300 ft. On June 29, 1913, we found them at Lonesome Lake, 2800 ft., which is on top of one of the spurs of Cannon. We noted six singing males and saw one bird singing at a range of ten feet. The Olive-back was also present. We did not see them here last year. They were near the path in a mixed growth of fir, balsam, and spruce, yellow and black birch, rock maple and mountain ash.—ALICE COREY, *Plainfield, N. J.*

Destruction of Robins in a Storm.— There occurred on Long Island about midnight, Friday, August 29, the most severe electric storm I have ever witnessed. During my forty years of residence at Floral Park, I have never known a summer storm so severe as to kill any mature bird in full strength, but the one above referred to annihilated the Robins that live in the trees about my lawn. Thirty-six were picked up the next morning on about an acre of ground, and others in the near vicinity brought the total up to about fifty. The English Sparrows were very abundant also but very few were killed; the Starlings escaped uninjured as far as I can learn. I have hardly seen a Robin since that fatal night. The storm was accompanied by high wind although not severe enough to uproot trees or break branches to any considerable extent, but it was accompanied by the heaviest downpour of rain I have seen in many years and lasted for a considerable time.

The birds were evidently blown out of the trees where they were roosting and perished from the awful wetting they were subjected to on the ground.—JOHN LEWIS CHILDS, *Floral Park, N. Y.*

Some Land Birds at Sea.— While traveling from New Orleans, La., to Havana, Cuba, in May, 1913, I was much interested to find that there were several wild birds taking passage with us. We left the mouth of the Mississippi River about 10 A. M., May 11, and next morning, we were probably more than half way across the Gulf of Mexico. It was then that I discovered aboard the vessel a Kingbird (*Tyrannus tyrannus*), a Barn Swallow (*Hirundo erythrogastra*), a Catbird (*Dumetella carolinensis*), and a swallow that I did not positively identify. The Kingbird would fly far out to one side, keep pace with the vessel awhile, and then return and perch on the rigging. The Barn Swallow's chief amusement seemed to be flying up and down the length of the decks; but the poor Catbird appeared rather bedraggled, and as far as I could observe, had no occupation. In the afternoon of the same day I discovered a warbler, unknown to me, hopping about the main deck aft. It seemed perfectly at home and allowed a rather close approach. We reached Havana very early next morning (May 13) so I have no idea when our bird passengers left us. These birds stayed with us practically the whole day (May 12) and I think the Catbird was seen by some of the passengers the night before. It seems remarkable that the birds should have remained so long on the vessel and allowed themselves to be carried many miles in a direction opposite to that of their migration.—ERNEST G. HOLT, *U. S. Biological Survey, Washington, D. C.*