

titles covering the subject, as nearly complete as possible. I hereby invite assistance: clues as regards references in rare publications; information as to the basis of records, old or recent, where these are open to query, such as from known or suspected misidentification; and new information (localities, dates, and accurate determinations) based upon specimens or collections never published upon.

In this latter connection, there has been much collecting in Lower California and subsequent wide distribution of bird-skins, some of them very likely to furnish valuable facts of seasonal or local occurrence. All such facts should be at hand in order to make the proposed list as thoroughly inclusive as is possible at this stage in the growth of the ornithology of that interesting peninsula. I take this opportunity to thank certain students who already have furnished valuable information along one or another of the above lines, as follows: Messrs. O. Bangs, L. B. Bishop, D. R. Dickey, J. H. Fleming, C. W. Richmond, H. S. Swarth, J. E. Thayer, and A. J. van Rossem.

It may be of interest to some of my readers to know that, up to the present time (November 15, 1926), the Lower California bird list numbers 498 species and subspecies, though almost certainly a number of these will eventually have to be dropped into a "hypothetical list" (as being based on misidentification or upon mis-statement of locality). The number of titles in my Lower California bibliography now totals no less than 334.—J. GRINNELL, *Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, November 15, 1926.*

**The Painted Redstart as a California Bird.**—On October 28, 1926, Mr. Russell Hubricht described to me a bird that he had seen in Los Angeles that he could identify only as the Painted Redstart (*Setophaga picta*). At Mr. Hubricht's invitation, I visited the locality with him and had an excellent opportunity to study the bird at close range for some time.

I see no chance for doubt as to its identity and am ready to endorse unreservedly Mr. Hubricht's identification. I met this species in Arizona some years ago and have studied its more northern relative, the American Redstart, in the east and middle west. The actions, the size, the pattern, and the tones of coloration all check perfectly with the bird as seen in the Huachuca Mountains of Arizona. Especially fortunate were we in seeing the "fan-tail" act of the redstart, as it spread the tail and drooped the wings, while the body feathers were slightly elevated. This act is most advantageous in showing the white patches of wing, tail and shoulders, while the deep blood red of the ventral surface becomes evident as the bird turns about.

This individual seems to have taken station in a particular group of trees in one of the city parks, and it has been seen in this spot for five or six days passed. The Arizona range of the species is separated by a considerable barrier of desert from this California station, and the lines of migration along which it travels cannot pass very near. This appears to be a case of straggling that is more pronounced than that of the desert-inhabiting Vermilion Flycatcher or of the more northward ranging Eastern Kingbird, both of which species have been recorded from the San Diego region.—LOYE MILLER, *University of California, Southern Branch, Los Angeles, November 1, 1926.*

**Some Incidents in the Life of a Screech Owl.**—In previous issues of THE CONDOR (XXIII, 1921, pp. 97-98, XXVII, 1925, pp. 35-36) I have recorded my observations upon *Otus asio quercinus* as a breeding bird in this locality, and I told of the banding of one adult and four young on May 18, 1924. The adult received band number 226,191, and it is now possible to trace this bird through two more nesting seasons.

About March 1, 1925, I made a nest box, about 4"x4"x12" in size, with a circular entrance near the top, and a sloping, hinged lid, and I put it about fifteen feet from the ground in a tree about one hundred feet from the tree where the owls had nested the two previous seasons. On March 29, number 226,191 was in this box, and on April 5 she was there again, with two eggs. Fearing that she would leave if disturbed too often, I have only the following observations to offer: April 8, there were three eggs; April 12, four eggs; and April 19, five eggs; indicating a rather long period of laying, at least eight days being required to lay the last three eggs. On May 8, two of the eggs had hatched, indicating an incubation period of thirty days or more. On May 24, I banded four young, giving them numbers 226,196 to 226,199, inclusive. I do not know what became of the fifth egg; no trace of it was in the nest when the young were banded. By June 21, all of these young were out of the nest, but they were still being fed by the adults.