156 feet from a metal grain bin, 125 feet from my garden and 400 feet from my residence. The nesting site, to say the least, is quite different from those I have observed at altitudes of 3000 feet and over in the moist ravines of the Great Smoky Mountains, but is similar to the Piedmont habitat of this species described by Odum (upland pine woods with deciduous understory).

The nest was constructed of dead grasses, leaves, bark, plant fibers, paper and lichens and was lined with fine grasses. The paper was obtained from waste paper which had been thrown into a near-by gully.

After the discovery of the nest, the brooding female was not disturbed until June 27 when several pictures were taken of her and the eggs. The female seemed unafraid and remained in the nesting tree while the pictures were being taken and the male bird made his appearance in the tree. The eggs hatched on June 28 and the nest was not visited again until dusk on July 1. The nestlings were in the nest but I did not see the parents about the nest. The following morning I looked into the nest and, to my dismay, the nestlings were gone. Thus, tragedy ended the existence of the first Mountain Vireo nestlings ever to be found on the lower Piedmont.

Mr. Thomas D. Burleigh, biologist, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Atlanta, Georgia, made a special trip to see the nest and the brooding bird and confirmed my identification. Mr. Burleigh had planned to collect one of the nestlings for a skin but their destruction prevented this, so Mr. Burleigh made another trip to the refuge on July 8 for the purpose of collecting an adult for a skin to authenticate this discovery. Although a singing bird was located in the pine woods one-fourth mile west of the New Hope Church, which is two and one-half miles southwest of headquarters, attempts to collect it failed.

In addition to the nesting pair of vireos at refuge headquarters, I found the Mountain Vireo at eleven other widely separated places on the refuge and the Hitchiti Experimental Forest during the nesting season. A limited amount of field work was done in the adjacent counties of Bibb, Monroe and Jasper, but the only summer record of the species outside of Jones County is that of a single bird heard singing on July 26, 1946, in a pine woodland one mile north of Shady Dale, Jasper County.

Future field work by competent ornithologists on the refuge and the intervening area between Jones and Jasper Counties and the Blue Ridge Mountains of north Georgia should reveal whether this is a major invasion of the Piedmont of a permanent nature or an isolated colony nesting here with a vast expanse of unoccupied territory between the refuge and the mountains.—RAYMOND J. FLEETWOOD, *Fish and Wildlife Service, Round Oak, Georgia.*

Nesting of the Evening Grosbeak in Algonquin Park, Ontario, 1946.—Incidental to field work carried on at Lake of Two Rivers in Algonquin Park for the Department of Lands and Forests, Province of Ontario, during the summer of 1946, two nests of the Evening Grosbeak (*Hesperiphona vespertina*) were found.

During the last week of May, a road, about one and one-half miles in length, was bulldozed through a mixed forest of second-growth white pine, black and white spruce, balsam and birch. The action of the scraper exposed a myriad of rootlets which, after a few days, became dry and quite brittle. Coinciding with this period at least ten pairs of Evening Grosbeaks established themselves in what might be termed a loose colony, in woods adjacent to a section of this road. Pairs were frequently seen on the freshly graded earth. On June 10, a female, accompanied by her mate, was observed to carry off rootlets in her bill. On June 12, a similar observation was made and on this occasion we were fortunate enough to see where the material was taken and deposited. The performance was repeated several times, with only the

female carrying the material but always accompanied by the male. The nest, situated 28 feet from the ground in a black spruce, was left undisturbed until June 22 when it was collected. It was found to be placed close to the trunk some six or seven feet from the top of the tree and almost entirely hidden by dense foliage. It contained four slightly incubated eggs.

On June 21 a second nest was discovered 30 feet 5 inches up in a balsam. Like the first, it was invisible from the ground and was situated close to the trunk, six or seven feet from the top. It contained three eggs on the date mentioned. This nest was left undisturbed until July 6. It was then found to contain three partially fledged young. One, taken for a specimen, proved to be a male. The stomach contents consisted largely of comminuted vegetable matter. Fragments of cherry pip, insect fragments and two pieces of gravel were revealed by gross examination. The remaining two young left the nest on July 8.

The female of this latter nesting pair possessed an aluminum band on her left tarsus, the type of band normally used in bird-banding studies. However, we were unable to find out more about it. Judging by the dullness of the band, she had worn it for some time. The male did not possess a band. On July 6, in late afternoon, a male was captured at our banding station two miles away. Next day, July 7, the male at this second nest possessed a shiny new band on its left leg. Subsequently, part of the number was read through a high-powered telescope and it fitted the series we were using, proving almost conclusively that this bird had flown two miles from the nesting site to obtain salt which we used as bait at the banding station.

A point of interest concerning the structure of the two nests found is that from seventy-five to ninety per cent of the materials used consisted of rootlets such as were exposed in the newly made road. Oddly enough, the taking up of nesting territories adjacent to the road coincided with the exposure of unlimited nesting material.—C. E. HOPE, *Division of Birds, Royal Ontario Museum of Zoology, Toronto, Ontario.*

Random notes of bird life under shell fire.—My personal observations lead me to believe that the avifauna of Europe suffered least of all animal life from the effects of concentrated shell fire. My observations covered an area roughly bounded by the Vosges Mountains on the south, the Meuse River on the west, the Rhine-Dortmund Canal on the north, and the Saur Mountains on the east. This area had practically all of the various terrain features of Europe, and contained most of the various forms of bird life that are to be found in that continent. High wooded mountains, broad plains, open forests, and river valleys were all included in this area. Both spring and fall migration, as well as summer and winter residents, were under observation. A detailed study could not be made, but rather a general picture could be drawn.

Shell fire has two effects—blast and shrapnel. The first is deadly at close range, killing and maiming by blast alone. The second effect, shrapnel, is dangerous to a great range, as the flying bits of jagged iron carry to a considerable distance.

MORTALITY: I was unable to go into this very deeply, due to obvious facts. A battle field is not the correct place to gather specimens and dissect them to determine just what killed the birds. However I did have the opportunity to go over some of the areas after a heavy shelling and note the effect upon the bird life.

BLAST seemed to have very little destructive power on bird life, either wild or domestic. It was not uncommon to see cattle and horses lying dead with no marks upon them. This was especially true in barns, the roofs of which had been hit with a heavy projectile. Chickens, pigeons, and geese in the same farmyard were moving