

On October 26, 1936, I saw one on the Maumee River at Riverside Park, Toledo, Ohio. On November 15, 1936, Lawrence E. Hicks discovered one at Maumee Bay, Lucas County, Ohio, and on November 22, 1936, I saw one flying over fields in Jerusalem Township, Lucas County, Ohio. September 13, 1937, an immature female was collected at Ashtabula, Ohio, by Lawrence E. Hicks (Walker, Bird-Lore, 39: 473, 1937). The skin was presented to Ohio State Museum. On October 3, 1937, Milton B. Trautman and I saw four at the mouth of the Maumee River, Toledo, Ohio (Walker, Bird-Lore, 39: 473, 1937); October 10, two were seen by Edward S. Thomas and Miss Marion Washburn at the O'Shaugnessey Reservoir, Delaware County, Ohio (Walker, Bird-Lore, 39: 473, 1937); on October 14, 1937, I found one at Maumee Bay, Lucas County, Ohio; on October 17, 1937, one at Riverside Park, Toledo, Ohio; and on October 24, 1937, one near the mouth of the Maumee River, Toledo, Ohio.

From these records I conclude that: (1) since 1930, a few have regularly occurred in the autumn at the western end of Lake Erie, and less regularly in the remainder of the State; (2) it is exceedingly rare in summer and apparently absent in spring; (3) either the species has increased as a transient since 1930 or, what is more probable, an increase in the number of observers and in their field experience, has resulted in a greater number of records, since the birds are easily confused with Bonaparte's Gulls.

This gull arrives in Ohio about October 1 and a few remain until the western end of Lake Erie freezes over. The earliest recorded arrival is September 12, 1936, and the latest date of departure January 18, 1931. There is one occurrence in summer, July 4, 1934, but none in spring. In early autumn, Franklin's Gulls associate with Ring-billed and Herring Gulls, but during November they seem to prefer the society of Bonaparte's Gulls. In all my sight records, I have carefully eliminated any possibility of confusing Franklin's Gull with the Laughing Gull. The latter bird has not been reported for Ohio. Compared with the Laughing Gull, the small bill and white throat of the immature Franklin's Gull form easily distinguishable field marks at a reasonable distance. Of my sight records, only three identifications were made at a distance of more than two hundred feet.

I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness and express my thanks to Edward S. Thomas, Curator of Natural History, Ohio State Museum, for checking the plumage of specimens of Franklin's Gull deposited there, and to Dr. Josselyn Van Tyne, Curator of Birds, and Milton B. Trautman, Assistant Curator of Fishes, of the University of Michigan Museum of Zoology, for aid and criticism in preparing this article.—LOUIS W. CAMPBELL, Toledo, Ohio.

**Notes on jaegers and gulls of Colorado.**—In checking over the various bird collections in Colorado, we have been surprised at the scarcity of large gulls and consequent lack of material to determine the species represented in our State. There were less than a dozen all together, the majority being *Larus argentatus smithsonianus*. In the State Teachers College collection at Greeley, Colorado, we found an immature jaeger identified as *Stercorarius parasiticus*. We considered it *longicaudus*, which has not been recorded for Colorado, and Dr. Alexander Wetmore verified our identification. The specimen, an immature male (S. T. C. no. 320) was collected on Windsor Reservoir, Weld County, Colorado, on October 18, 1902, by Elmer Sutter.

This past spring, on March 26, 1938, we were at Mile High Duck Club, in Adams County, with Robert B. Rockwell, and saw a second-year Glaucous Gull (*Larus hyperboreus*) cruising over one of the ponds in company with two dark-primaried birds, which were probably Herring Gulls. As the light was good, we had ample

opportunity to make a satisfactory sight identification. Later the same day we walked along the shore of Barr Lake, a large reservoir in the same area where several hundred gulls were congregated, and were surprised to see another, or the same one, close enough to identify. As we hesitated to publish a sight identification of such a rare gull, which has not been recorded from the State, we attempted to collect a series of gulls, with rather interesting results. We obtained a rubber boat and returned to Barr, March 27 and 28, collecting in the early morning the first day, and in the late evening, with half a gale bouncing the boat around, on the second day. There was no chance to choose specimens; it was a case of taking anything possible, and the gulls did not prove too cooperative. Four specimens were obtained March 27, and four the following day, and much to our surprise, we had five species of gulls, three of which, *Larus hyperboreus*, *Larus californicus*, and *Larus argentatus thayeri*, had not been listed authentically from Colorado. The last, however, was represented in the Museum, but the specimen had been erroneously identified.

In the following two weeks several trips were made to Barr with Robert B. Rockwell and Fred G. Brandenburg, and additional specimens were secured, which gave us a little information on our wintering gulls, but unfortunately work was started too late to determine the number and relative abundance of the various species on Barr, or to work on any of the other large reservoirs. The following birds were represented in our collection. All were taken on Barr Lake, Adams County, Colorado.

**GLAUCCOUS GULL, *Larus hyperboreus*.**—Two specimens were secured, both being beautiful, light-colored second-year birds with a trace of the first-year plumage. The first, collected March 28 (C. M. N. H. no. 18799), was a female, and the second (C. M. N. H. no. 18800), taken April 1, was a male. A third specimen was seen on the latter date among the several hundred birds on Barr Lake.

**HERRING GULL, *Larus argentatus smithsonianus*.**—Previous authors have considered this species rare in Colorado. Judging by our brief experience it is a common bird *locally*, either as a migrant in the early spring, or as a winter resident. A fine series of specimens ranging from high-plumaged birds to those in first-year dress was secured between March 27 and April 15.

**THAYER'S GULL, *Larus argentatus thayeri*.**—A beautiful specimen, a male, in semi-adult plumage, with pearl-gray mantle of the adult, and gray wings of the young (C. M. N. H. no. 18798), was collected March 27. An immature first year, a male (C. M. N. H. no. 18886), one of two flying together, was taken April 20, which we list tentatively as *thayeri*. The coloration of this specimen is not typical, and the identification may prove erroneous. There is another specimen, an unsexed immature in first-year plumage in the Museum collections, however (C. M. N. H. no. 880), collected at La Salle, Weld County, on November 3, 1912; we have included a discussion of this specimen below under the heading of Glaucous-winged Gull.

**RING-BILLED GULL, *Larus delawarensis*.**—This species was uncommon during the latter part of March, but was abundant by April 9. No attempt was made to secure specimens, as they are well represented in our collection.

**CALIFORNIA GULL, *Larus californicus*.**—It is surprising that there have been no authentic records of this species from Colorado, for it nests abundantly in Utah, our neighbor to the west. Lincoln (Condor, 1919, p. 237) has shown that the only specimen available from the State, recorded as *californicus*, was misidentified and he suggested the withdrawal of the species as a State bird. Among the specimens obtained at Barr Lake was an immature *californicus* (C. M. N. H. 18802), taken March 27. Dr. Joseph Grinnell and George Willett verified our identification.

GLAUCCOUS-WINGED GULL, *Larus glaucescens*.—This species should be withdrawn from the list of Colorado birds. We recorded the species from the State (Condor, 39: 132, 1937) on the basis of an immature specimen (C. M. N. H. no. 880), identified by Dr. H. C. Oberholser. It was collected at La Salle, Weld County, on November 3, 1912. Allan Brooks questioned the record and the specimen was sent to him for examination, and he wrote me as follows: "It emphatically is not *glaucescens*. While it agrees superficially with juvenile *thayeri* its tail is much whiter, the outer tail feathers being white barred only toward their tips and the central rectrix is strongly barred with white on its basal half. The measurements of bill and tarsus are much shorter than in any *thayeri* in my collection and agree exactly with a juvenile female *kumlieni* from Nova Scotia. I take it to be a dark juvenile of *Larus kumlieni*." We then sent the specimen to P. A. Taverner, at Ottawa, and he compared it with his specimens, pronouncing it not *kumlieni*, but either *thayeri* or *californicus*. Dr. Ira Gabrielson examined the specimen while Mr. Taverner had it, and he called it *thayeri*. Bailey took the specimen to Los Angeles in August, and he and George Willett compared it with specimens of *thayeri* in the Bishop collection, and were able to match the bird with similarly plumaged ones from Arctic Alaska. The skin was then sent to Dr. Oberholser and he reidentified it as *thayeri*. All ornithologists who have had occasion to attempt the identification of immature gulls will complete their task with a sense of humility, and a realization of how little material there is available from breeding areas which may be used for comparative purposes. And so, although it was not an unanimous decision of the various judges (Allan Brooks being doubtful) we shall have to conclude that the specimen recorded as *glaucescens* is *Larus argentatus thayeri*, until, at least, someone questions the identifications of the specimens in Dr. Bishop's collection!—ALFRED M. BAILEY and ROBERT J. NIEDRACH, *The Colorado Museum of Natural History, Denver, Colorado*.

**Remiges of the Atlantic Murre, a correction.**—In a note on 'Development of remiges in the Atlantic Murre' (*Uria aalge*) (Auk, 55: 529, 530, 1937) I stated, ". . . it has never been recognized that the young bird at the time of leaving the nest island and going to the water has no remiges." I now find that this fact was previously known and published by H. F. Witherby (Practical Handbook of British Birds, pt. 2, pp. 792-798, 1924). Mr. Witherby states, "As in Razorbill tail-feathers, primaries and secondaries do not commence to grow until beginning of moult to next plumage but primary-coverts and greater coverts give appearance of miniature remiges."—R. A. JOHNSON, *150 East St., Oneonta, New York*.

**The Swifts of Panamá.**—Unless otherwise stated, all quotations below are from pages 318, 319, of 'The Ornithology of the Republic of Panamá' by Ludlow Griscom (Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool., 78: no. 3, April 1935). Three forms have been added to his list of his 'Family Micropodidae,' as well as various localities and dates of interest.

*Streptoprocne zonaris albicincta*.—"Throughout in the mts.," but visiting the lowlands at least occasionally after the breeding season, as I infer from two specimens in the Princeton Museum of Zoölogy shot September 4, 1936, by H. Wedel in a dry stream-bed near the Cricamola River (Province of Bocas del Toro), only about fifteen miles south of where the river flows into the Chiriquí Lagoon. One is an immature male, iris 'black-brown,' the other an adult female, iris 'nubian brown'; each is labeled 'feet plum blue-black.' Neither had the gonads enlarged. Peters (Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool., 71: 314, 1931) records two taken at Fruitdale, west shore of Almirante Bay, November 17, 1928.