

first week of July and again on August 3, 1945. Evidently they were nesting in the sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*) and juniper (*Juniperus utahensis*) areas nearby since one individual was observed carrying insects in its bill. Well known in the general area, this colony seems to provide basis for extension of the breeding range northward into Lincoln County.—ROSS HARDY, *Weber College, Ogden, Utah, February 18, 1949.*

Wood Pewee Pursues Bat.—While camping in mid-August, 1948, in the yellow pine forest (altitude 8500 feet) of the Sheep Mountains of southern Nevada, I was several times surprised to see a small pallid bat flying about in the daytime among the trees at heights of twenty-five to seventy-five feet from the ground. On two occasions, once at mid-morning and once in the early afternoon, a Western Wood Pewee (*Contopus richardsonii*) suddenly dropped from its high look-out perch on the top of a partly dead fir tree and closely pursued the bat for a distance of at least a hundred feet. It is possible that the Wood Pewee was one of a pair which had a nest near and that it chased the bat as a potential intruder, but I could find in its other behavior no direct evidence of nesting. The bat fully sensing the need of escape maneuvered cleverly in zig-zag course and kept the bird from catching up with it. At times the two were no more than six inches apart.—EDMUND C. JAEGER, *Riverside College, Riverside, California, May 15, 1949.*

Starlings on Point Reyes Peninsula, Marin County, California.—On February 8, 1949, I observed three flocks of European Starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*) totaling more than 47 birds about the ranch property at the head of Barries Bay, the westernmost arm of Drakes Estero, Marin County, California. On February 13, a trip was made to the same area with Seth Bailey, Howard L. Cogswell and Robert W. Storer. On this later trip we saw more than 50 birds in at least five separate flocks. Three flocks consisted of Starlings, the fourth of Starlings and Western Meadowlarks and the fifth of a dozen or so Starlings among several hundred Brewer Blackbirds and Red-winged Blackbirds. The flocks were scattered from the ranch at the head of Barries Bay south to the Mendoza Ranch on Point Reyes, a distance of about $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles. A hurried survey was made of the rest of the grassland north of Drakes Estero as far as the Pierce Ranch near White Gulch on Tomales Point, but no Starlings were seen north of the Barries Bay area. The east side of Drakes Bay was not visited.

Numerous birds were observed under very favorable conditions at distances of not more than 100 feet, but the local landowners prevented our collecting any birds. Starlings in both first winter and adult plumage were noted.

Starlings were seen in the same area on February 23, by Mrs. Junea W. Kelly of Alameda and on March 1, by Seth Bailey. When Bailey revisited the area on March 6 and March 20, no Starlings were seen.—GORDON W. GULLION, *Richmond, California, April 26, 1949.*

Vagrant Black-billed Magpie in Ventura County, California.—On April 10, 1946, I saw a Black-billed Magpie (*Pica pica*) eight miles north and three miles west of Piru, Ventura County, California, at an elevation of 4500 feet. The magpie and several ravens were feeding on the month-old carcass of a horse. Two days later the magpie was photographed by Ed N. Harrison of Encinitas, California, as it pecked at the maggot-infested axilla of the carcass. Although vagrancy is common in the Black-billed Magpie, this bird was more than 100 miles south-southwest of the closest published locality of record (Grinnell and Miller, *Pac. Coast Avif.* No. 27, 1944:292). One would not expect an escaped bird to be found in a dry mountainous area of chaparral and rock several miles from the nearest ranch.—CARL B. KOPFORD, *University of California, Berkeley, California, June 6, 1949.*

Fur Seals and Murre Chicks.—Occurrences have been reported of bird remains in fur seal (*Callorhinus ursinus*) stomachs by Huey (*Jour. Mamm.*, 23, 1942:95-96) and by W. A. Clemens, J. L. Hart, and G. V. Wilby (*Analysis of Stomach Contents of Fur Seals Taken off the West Coast of Vancouver Island in April and May, 1935*, publ. by Dept. of Fisheries, Ottawa, Canada, 1936). The following observation, as well as the meager records in the literature, indicate that ordinarily fur seals have little or no inclination to eat birds.

On the afternoon of September 1, 1948, I spent about an hour on the cliffs which are adjacent to Ardiguen fur seal rookery on St. Paul Island, Alaska. A mass of several hundred fur seals loafed in the quiet water about a kelp bed just beyond the light surf that broke at the foot of the cliffs. The

cliff ledges were occupied by a number of nesting Kittiwakes (*Rissa tridactyla pollicaris*) and Northern Murres (*Uria lomvia arra*). From my observation point close to the cliff's edge, I could see a number of murre chicks huddled along the ledges. Most of the adult birds had left, and the young thus left exposed ranged from newly hatched to nearly completely feathered chicks. Probably the newly hatched birds were the result of second layings occasioned by the egg gathering of the Aleut boys from the village.

Several of the older chicks were quite nervous and appeared to be nearly ready to leave their ledges. A few adult murres had alighted on the water beyond the gathering of seals, and their soft vocal sounds were plainly audible on shore. Suddenly two of the young murres fluttered at a steep angle from their ledges to the water below. The smaller of the two failed to clear the rocks and was washed about by the waves while it paddled frantically before it finally reached calm water. As soon as it was clear of the rocks, it dived instinctively, remaining under water for about 15 seconds during which it traveled about two or three yards.

Both small birds headed for deep water, chirping loudly, and swimming directly through the mass of fur seals. The parent of one chick answered its calls and joined it as soon as it passed through the seals. The two then swam out to sea together. The parents of the other chick were not present, and it seemed confused by the many seals. For ten minutes I watched it as it paddled and dived among them. During almost all this time, one seal or another swam behind the little bird with its nose nearly touching its tail. Dozens of others sniffed it curiously as it passed them. Although the chick stretched its neck and looked surprised at each curious animal, its only fear reactions were occasional short dives. At no time during its journey among the seals did they show any inclination to snap at or molest the murre. The only apparent reaction of the seals was one of idle curiosity. Mistakes in recognition, when the seal suddenly encounters a diving bird beneath the surface, might account for an infrequent bird being taken by fur seals.—KARL W. KENYON, *Fish and Wildlife Service, Seattle, Washington, June 30, 1949.*

The Incidence of Hybrids in Migrant Blue and Snow Geese in Kansas.—The Blue Goose (*Chen caerulescens*) and the Lesser Snow Goose (*Chen hyperborea hyperborea*) are common spring migrants through eastern Kansas. Hybridization between these two forms has been established by Sutton (Auk, 48, 1931:335-364). Harrold (Auk, 45, 1928:290-292) observed many hybrids in migrant flocks at Whitewater Lake, Manitoba.

On March 11, 12, 13, 16, and 18, 1949, migrating flocks of Blue and Snow geese were observed along the Kansas River, five miles northwest of Lawrence, Douglas County, Kansas. The estimated number of birds observed on March 12 was 20,000 individuals, most of which passed overhead without alighting. On March 13 a flock of 5000 (± 500) was observed at rest on a sand-bar in the river. Using a 36 \times telescope, a count of 2120 of the geese was made. Of these, 1552 (± 50) were Blue Geese, 426 (± 10) were Lesser Snow Geese, and 142 were hybrids. Most of the hybrids were similar to those described by Harrold (*loc. cit.*) and figured by Sutton (*op. cit.*, pl. V), having the underparts white with a dark band across the breast. At least two hybrid individuals were noted which had the entire underparts white, the breast band being absent.

The 142 hybrids comprise 6.7 per cent of the total of 2120 birds counted. This figure is undoubtedly low since an individual bird could be determined to be a hybrid only if its underparts could be seen and if it was not hidden behind other birds. Assuming that equal numbers of birds would be facing each direction we would be unable to see the underparts of one-fourth of the hybrid birds, namely those facing directly away from us. If this is true, we would miss 47 hybrid birds for this reason and our theoretical number of hybrids rises to 189 or 8.9 per cent of the total of 2120 counted. There is no way to correct the figures for those hybrid birds which were hidden behind their companions, but it is safe to assume that hybrids comprised at least 10 per cent of the migrant flock which passed through eastern Kansas.

Harrold (*loc. cit.*) has suggested that greater numbers of hybrids occur at the western edge of the migratory route of the Blue Goose. Comparative counts along the eastern margin of the flyway and on the wintering grounds would be of interest.

I am indebted to Mr. Roger O. Olmsted for assistance with the field work.—CHARLES G. SIBLEY, *University of Kansas, Museum of Natural History, Lawrence, Kansas, May 20, 1949.*