

although undoubtedly somewhat reddened by post-mortem "foxing." The plumage is fresh save that the tail feathers show a slight amount of abrasion and it is reasonable to conjecture that it was collected in early winter. A very old and faded, hand-written ticket on the upright of the stand reads "Pyrgita Brand [sic] / Fringilla Wrangelli [sic] / Brand [sic] Sp. nov / Russie." At some subsequent date "Russi america" has been added, and still more recently Dr. Junge (Director of the Museum) has written in pencil the word "Type." On the bottom of the stand is written "Pyrgita? Brandt / Fringilla Wrangelli [sic] / Brand [sic] sp. nov. / Russie." The word "Wrangelli" has been lined through and "fuscus" written below. There is no indication of sex other than that provided by the bird itself. There is no catalogue number.

This type is somewhat redder (as a result of foxing, probably) than three other Bay region specimens in the Leiden Museum. It is not, nor in my judgment ever could have been, colored like the darker and grayer *crissalis* and *carolae*, of which there were three and one specimens, respectively, available also. Further evidence in support of this belief is found in the description of this specimen by Hartlaub, written ninety years ago (Jour. für Ornith., 3, 1855:361-362), wherein he describes a reddish brown, not a grayish brown bird. In regard to the measurements given by Hartlaub, it would seem that he used the English or Rhineland foot rather than the Pied du Roi which he usually employed.

Further, the type has the normally longer bill with straighter (less convex) lateral profile, and longer tarsi of the central coast race as compared with *crissalis*. The general size and particularly the bill rule out any association with *carolae*, aside, of course, from color considerations. Measurements of the type which, in so far as size is a criterion, is a female, are as follows: both wings (unflattened), 88 millimeters; tail (from insertion of the central pair of rectrices), 103; culmen (from edge of skin across ridge, to tip), 15.0; depth of bill (from edge of skin on mandibular ramus to edge of skin on ridge of culmen), 10.0; tarsus, 29.4; middle toe minus claw (not properly measurable because flexed around perch), 17+.

To repeat the previous determination, the name of *Oriturus wrangeli* is to be associated with the race of central coastal California since structural as well as color characters so identify the type. The citation for this earliest name for the San Francisco Brown Towhee, *Pipilo fuscus wrangeli* "Brandt" (Bonaparte), together with other comment concerning it may be found in the Auk as above cited.—A. J. VAN ROSSEM, *Dickey Collections, University of California, Los Angeles, September 20, 1945.*

**A Second Specimen of the Eastern Pileolated Warbler Taken in Oregon.**—On the morning of December 6, 1944, W. H. Crowell, former President of the Oregon Audubon Society, found a dead warbler on the lawn at his residence in the west Portland hills district, Oregon. The writer was out of town at the time, so Mr. Crowell laid the bird away in his refrigerator until I returned on December 21, when it was presented to me. It proved to be an immature Eastern Pileolated Warbler (*Wilsonia pusilla pusilla*) in first fall plumage. This identification was verified by Dr. John W. Aldrich. The only other record of the occurrence of this bird in Oregon is a specimen (Jewett Coll. no. 685) taken by the writer on December 11, 1908, on Government Island in the Columbia River ten miles east of Portland, Oregon (Birds of Oregon, 1940:515).—STANLEY G. JEWETT, *Portland, Oregon, June 30, 1945.*

**Snail-eating by the California Jay.**—In June of this year a California Jay (*Aphelocoma californica*) was observed at a distance of eight feet searching the main stem of a small bush of the cultivated plant *Ochna floribunda*. The bird's activity around a plant that would not be expected to yield fruit and its plucking away of dead and withered leaf clusters along the main stem led to more than casual observation. It was a surprise to see it locate and capture a common introduced garden snail, *Helix aspersa*, then hop to a fence rail and commence hammering at and breaking through the side of the snail's shell. Even with this evidence of gustatory interest, it did not occur to me that I was watching more than a display of curiosity and "play" until the bird began eating the contents of the shell.

On speaking of this interesting discovery to my family, I was surprised and chagrined to discover that they had observed the occurrence on several occasions, but they had not thought it worth mentioning.—R. B. COWLES, *University of California, Los Angeles, September 8, 1945.*

**More Records of the Chat in Marin County, California.**—We have previously reported in The Condor the trapping and banding of two specimens of the Chat (*Icteria virens*) at our residence in Manor, Marin County, California. The first specimen was taken on August 15, 1934, and the second specimen was taken on September 29, 1943. Additionally, we obtained a mid-summer

sight record of this species, also at Manor, in July, 1942. Except for these three instances we have consistently failed to note any other occurrence of the Chat in Marin County during twenty years of residence and extensive field work there, until the spring of 1944.

We have spent considerable time each spring and summer in trapping a number of different species of birds normally breeding along Manor Creek, which is a small water course paralleling the old, abandoned Northwestern Pacific Railroad right-of-way, close to where Manor Station was formerly located. This creek is one-half mile distant from our home, although a smaller tributary running through our grounds joins the main course midway between Manor and Fairfax.

On the morning of April 23, 1944, we heard a Chat call for the first time along Manor Creek. We had trapped that locality all of the two preceding days and did not see or hear anything that would indicate that this bird arrived earlier than the morning we first heard it sing. We were successful in trapping it a short time later and it proved to be a male, although it showed no external indications of being in a breeding condition.

On subsequent week-ends we trapped the same territory and had about concluded that the previous capture was a casual stray, when late on May 26, I again heard a Chat calling from the same locality in the creek bed. This bird was trapped the following morning, and it also was a male and was in high breeding condition. May 27 and 28 were spent covering the full length of the creek, but no other Chats were found or heard.

On June 10, a resident of Manor, whose property abuts Manor Creek, called my attention to still a third Chat, which was singing in exactly the same section of the creek bed at which we had previously taken the two birds. This man stated that, although he had lived in his present home for many years, he had only heard the characteristic song of this species during the previous two days—and nights! He complained that the bird's loud song kept him awake, and he threatened to shoot it!

We immediately checked with other property owners on the creek, and almost all of them had heard the Chat sing on either one or both of the preceding nights, and all were positive that they never before had heard or seen a Chat during the varying years of their residence in Manor. This tended to confirm an opinion we held at the time, namely, that the Chats we had caught were casual migrants and were not representative of any range extension by the species.

After trapping this third Chat, another male, the following morning, a further and more careful search was made for additional individuals, and we found what we thought was a female about two-thirds of a mile up the creek. We were unsuccessful in several attempts to trap this particular bird and it disappeared a few days later. Notwithstanding a weekly check of the locality, continued until late fall, we were unable to locate any other Chats during the balance of 1944.

It was determined not to record the foregoing captures other than in the usual bird-banding reports until we might learn whether or not additional Chats would again appear along Manor Creek in the succeeding year.

Starting in mid-April, 1945, a careful watch was maintained for possible new arrivals. It became my practice to walk the length of the creek over the old paralleling railroad right-of-way in the morning, prior to leaving for my office, and again in the early evening upon my return to Manor. No Chats were seen or heard this year until May 6. We had trapped in the area all of the preceding day and no Chats were discovered, yet on the following morning at six o'clock a male was rapturously performing his "dropping" song to a female, for all the world as if the pair had been at home in that creek bottom for many, many days. They, too, were trapped and banded and placed in one of our aviaries at home. We rather anticipated that other Chats would shortly follow, particularly with the territory again being open through the trapping and removal of the first pair, but no further Chats have put in an appearance, and it is now beyond the date on which we took our last Chat in 1943.

The capture of a breeding pair this year may be indicative that we were wrong in assuming that the Chats recently seen or taken in Marin County were, in fact, casual strays. To the contrary, this species may actually be expanding beyond the previously indicated limits of its breeding range, forced by the necessity of finding new nesting areas to replace those recently occupied or destroyed by war-time activities such as extensive military training camps, expanding manufacturing and industrial facilities, Government housing projects, etc. We know of large numbers of riparian locations in the great central valleys of California and also in the Coast districts which have been taken over for military or war industry purposes during the last few years and which provided the specialized environmental niches which "Icteria" preference dictates.

Is it therefore unreasonable to surmise that Marin County, heretofore off the beaten track for Chats, may become a regular, if but sparsely occupied, breeding ground for this most interesting species of warbler?—ERIC CAMPBELL KINSEY, *Manor, Marin County, California, June 12, 1945.*