

high-tide mark. When this fact was fully appreciated, a search for nests was soon rewarded with success. Much to my surprise, all that were found were in the dark recesses of hollow logs which had drifted there from the mainland of Alaska or Siberia. (There are no trees on the islands in Bering Sea.) Through a strange coincidence, the holes occupied were sometimes those which had once been excavated by woodpeckers when the driftwood stood in some forest.

Back in the hollows, the nests were set flush with the loose decayed wood. Also, they were constructed in a similar manner and of the same sort of materials as the Pribilof Snow Bunting's nests, except that reindeer hairs were omitted because of the absence of these animals from St. Matthew. The walls of one nest measured about one inch thick and the inside cavity was two inches deep by two and a half inches wide. Feathers of Arctic owls and sea gulls were noted in the nest lining. Most of the nests found contained young birds or well incubated eggs.

The coloration of the eggs was very similar to that of the eggs of the Pribilof Snow Bunting, except that the brown blotches were applied with more boldness. In one set, these blotches were arranged in an indistinct zone about the larger end. The eggs of this set, measured in millimeters by Mr. Joseph Mailliard, March 4, 1922, are as follows:  $22.3 \times 17.2$ ;  $22.5 \times 17.3$ ;  $21.9 \times 17.2$ ;  $22.0 \times 17.3$ .

*San Francisco, December 21, 1922.*

## FROM FIELD AND STUDY

**Fish Crow in Texas.**—Attention has been directed to the distribution of the Fish Crow (*Corvus ossifragus*) through correspondence with Mr. H. E. Wheeler of Conway, Arkansas, who recently published (Wilson Bulletin, December, 1922, p. 239) an item regarding the occurrence of the bird in Arkansas. So far as our observations go the bird does not occur in any part of Oklahoma. Mr. Wheeler states in his article that the bird is common in Texas but neglects to name localities. Ridgway (Birds N. and M. Amer., III, p. 274) is probably the most recent authority on the distribution of the bird. He does not give any part of Texas in its range, but says the bird occurs along the Gulf coast as far west as Louisiana.

M. L. Alexander in "Wild Life Resources of Louisiana", 1921, states that the Fish Crow replaces the Common Crow along the coast of that state, and although not specifically saying so, implies by this that he means the entire coast—as far as the Texas line.

The peculiar ecological conditions which typify this region and in which the Fish Crow finds things to its liking extend westward into Texas, and the bird should confidently be expected to occur there. Published statements to that effect have been lacking, however, so we take pleasure in giving one locality in that state where the bird is certainly a resident.

Mr. Pemberton spent most of February and March of 1922, and Mr. Kirn all of the time between December, 1921, and November, 1922, at Orange, Texas, and in the country to the west thereof. During all of this time Fish Crows were observed and while no specimens or eggs were taken, old nests were examined which undoubtedly belonged to this species. The birds struck both of us at once as being different from the crows of Kansas and Oklahoma. In size they were smaller; their flight more undulating than direct; their individual antics more playful; they were far easier to approach and observe; and most diagnostic of all, their voices were entirely different from that of the Common Crow. Their normal call is a hoarse, soft croak-like *caa*,

which is terminated abruptly, rather than the somewhat prolonged strident *caw-caw* of the Common Crow. When first heard, one gets the impression that the bird has a decidedly sore throat which renders calling very difficult and unpleasant and that a decision *not* to call is made after the call is started. There is that certain difference between this call and that of the crow as there is between the Eastern and Western Meadowlarks, and once heard it would never be forgotten. The Fish Crows were never seen away from moist areas and it is assumed that crayfish and the like form most of their food. Rice is the only local cultivated crop and is not planted every year; so, while the birds feed in the inundated rice fields, it is doubtful that they eat the rice.—J. R. PEMBERTON and A. J. KIRN, *Tulsa, Oklahoma, January 1, 1923.*

**A Nest of the *Leucosticte* on Mount Dana, Tuolumne County, California.**—While climbing Mount Dana on August 2, 1922, in company with H. L. Mason of the Carnegie Institution party, I noted a female Sierra Nevada Rosy Finch (*Leucosticte tephrocotis dawsoni*), at an altitude of about 11,300 feet, on a moderately steep southwest-facing slope not far from the top of the main ridge. Presently, as I watched the bird, it disappeared under a broad, flat rock, and on investigating I found, six inches back, a nest containing three small young in natal down, apparently not many hours out of the egg. The nest was built principally of sedges, the plant bases or stubble having been utilized for the mass of the nest, with finer materials for the lining. There was little vegetation in the immediate vicinity, the closest being an *Arabis* sp., and the nearest sedges being at least one hundred feet distant. The bills of the young birds were bright yellow. The only sound we heard them utter was a faint *peep*. When they noticed any disturbance in the vicinity of the nest, the little ones raised their heads and opened their mouths to the widest possible angle.

Only one parent, apparently the female, was seen. She was not shy, but several times came and went to and from the nest while we were close by. During the examination of the nest she remained close at hand, giving a call note resembling *plirp* or *plirp plirp*. Once she caught and ate a winged insect of considerable size. As soon as we left the nest, the parent proceeded to it and brooded the young, conversing with them in a soothing manner, using syllables like *tik tik tik tik tik* as she covered them. One of the young birds, after I took it from the nest, had dropped some fecal matter on a rock near the entrance to the nest. The parent picked up the fecal matter in her bill and carried it away over the rocks; the nest was noticeably clean, no eggshells or feces being observable either in or outside of it. For twenty minutes while we were eating lunch (11:45 A. M. to 12:05 P. M.), the mother steadily brooded the young, as well she might, for a decidedly cool wind had come up, and a thunderstorm was brewing.

After reading Dawson's thrilling account of the discovery of numerous nests of this Rosy Finch in the Mammoth Pass region and elsewhere (Jour. Mus. Comp. Zool., 11, 1922, pp. 8-26) the nest here recorded seems chiefly notable for its unusually prosaic surroundings, little more of adventure or of daring being recorded in the course of its discovery and observation than is usually the case with a junco's nest.—WALTER P. TAYLOR, *U. S. Biological Survey, La Jolla, California, November 17, 1922.*

**Bobolinks in Oregon.**—The observation of the Bobolink (*Dolichonyx oryzivorus*) in any of the Pacific Coast states or provinces is of interest. I am therefore prompted to mention two records of long standing, which came to my notice while connected with the Department of Zoology of the Oregon Agricultural College.

The first observation was made in 1903. Two of my students, working at the branch Experiment Station at Union, Oregon, reported a strange bird in the fields. To obtain an identification they sent a pair to Corvallis. The birds were later mounted and photographed by the writer. The data accompanying the photograph are "Photo 37, *Dolichonyx*, female, male; Union, Oregon, June 29, 1903; W. T. Shaw. Collected by F. C. Houghton and Leroy G. Matley." One of these birds, the male, is now in the collection of the Oregon Agricultural College.

The second observation was made at Lake Malheur, Oregon. On July 4, 1906, while collecting along the low grass-lands bordering this lake, a colony of Bobolinks