off and eaten toward the last of the meal. One mouse was completely finished before the other was eaten. Approximately five hours following a meal, one or two pellets would be disgorged. These pellets were about half an inch in length and half as broad.

At no time during his captivity did the bird utter any sound. During the daytime, we never heard a sound from the cage unless we startled its occupant; but at night he invariably made two sustained attempts to escape, one occurring about 10:00 p.m., following our own cessation of activities, and the other at about 4:00 a.m. Each of these lasted about an hour.

An experiment to determine the eye-shine gave negative results. This is in accord with the findings of van Rossem (Condor, 29, 1927, p. 26) on another member of the same genus, *G. brazilianum ridgwayi.*

The mask-like character of the color pattern on the nape and hind neck of the owl was a striking feature of the living bird and bore a marked resemblance to the appearance of the real face.—CLARENCE F. SMITH, *Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, Berkeley, California, May 15, 1935.*

On the Drinking Habits of Gallinaceous Young.—In late June, 1930, at Jackson, Michigan, I came into possession of a set of ten Prairie Chicken eggs, partially incubated, through the nest having been run over by a mowing machine. This nest was situated in the middle of a fourteen-acre hay field of mixed clover, timothy and alfalfa, about a quarter of a mile from the booming ground that has been used by the males for some years. I placed the eggs in an incubator containing turkey eggs and on July 6 nine of them hatched, the tenth embryo dying after pipping the shell. The next year (1931) I obtained six eggs from the disturbed nest of a Ring-necked Pheasant. All the eggs hatched on May 8.

For some years I had been interested in the problem of the drinking habits of birds. I therefore carried out a few simple experiments with these broods of chicks, to see what instinctive drinking habits, if any, they might exhibit. I placed small shallow pans of water in front of the chicks, but they gave no response. I elevated the pans of water, finally placing the pans on a level with the eyes. The chicks seemed not to recognize the water. When the water was upon the floor, they even walked through it without visible reaction. However, a chick often picked at its toes and apparently water entered the bill, for it sometimes lifted its head in the drinking act.

I placed particles of food in the water. The chicks sometimes picked at the particles, and occasionally this was followed by the drinking act. Removal of the particles resulted in a loss of all interest.

I tried to dip the bill in the water, and while the chick went through the drinking act after the immersion, it never drank of its own accord.

The next process tried was to fill a pipette half full of water and insert it in the box, holding it near the chicks. They showed no more apparent concern than for any other object similarly placed before them. I then squeezed the pipette, causing a drop of water to appear at the open end. The chicks instantly showed great excitement and clustered around the pipette, picking at the water. Each time a chick picked the drop (which I maintained by continued pressure upon the bulb), it went through the drinking act. I released the pressure on the bulb and the chicks became quiet upon the disappearance of the drop. The formation of another drop resulted in a commotion as before. I found that alternate appearance and disappearance of the drop resulted in the same set of reactions—interest and excitement followed by quiescence.

I raised and lowered the pipette to determine if elevation influenced the recognition. The chicks did not respond to a drop lower than half the distance from the eye to the floor nor when higher than the normal reach of the bill. I repeated the experiments several times from shortly after hatching until they were nine days old. In all cases they failed to recognize a water surface although they were stimulated by a drop of water at the end of a pipette.

A drop of water at the end of a pipette is a good simulation of a dew drop that glistens in the sunlight. The behavior of the chicks leads me to think that dew drops form an early, instinctively sought source of water. The presence or absence of dew

may be a potent factor in gallinaceous well-being. Drinking from surface water, as pools, may be a secondary, learned source of supply.

The problem of water supply, especially in the young, is one of the most important to birds. Animal food, the staple food for the young of seed-eaters, may be more than a source of concentrated nutrition. It may be fed the young, not because of its superior food value, but as a source of moisture. Dew and water of exudation may serve to furnish the remainder of the necessary water for precocial birds and as such be a vital determinant of the success of the family.—LEONARD WILLIAM WING, *University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, March 28, 1935.*

A Whistling Swan Visits Death Valley.—On December 5, 1934, Adrey Borell, Donald Curry, and the writer found a lone Whistling Swan (*Cygnus columbianus*) at the old Eagle Borax Works, which is below sea level in Death Valley, California. By remaining flat on my stomach, I crawled up gradually until I was within fifty feet of the swan. It fed with its head down, in a small brackish pool, digging into the black mud with vigorous strokes for the underwater stems of a water weed.

Fig. 41. Whistling Swan in flight over ruins of old Eagle Borax Works, Telescope Peak in background, Death Valley, California.

Wildlife Division negative no. 4136.

The swan, which was clearly an immature bird, spied me as I arose slowly to a sitting position in order that I might obtain a photograph. It then flew a short distance out into the center of the pond. Upon being approached, the swan took off easily against a stiff north wind and circled over the ruins of the old Eagle Borax Works, giving me a chance to secure a photograph (fig. 41) which not only serves to identify the bird as a swan but also identifies the locality.—JOSEPH S. DIXON, *Wildlife Division, National Park Service, Berkeley, California, February 11, 1935.*

The Man-o'-war-bird off the Oregon Coast.—On the morning of February 18, 1935, a strange bird was seen soaring over the east end of Tillamook Rock, an isolated islet