

Steinke (Wisconsin Conserv. Bull., 18:7-10, 1953) lists 23 crows found during 3362 miles driven in Wisconsin over a six-year period (1947-52) and Schorger (Passenger Pigeon, 16:53-55, 1954) listed 11 crows as road-killed over a 16 year period (1932-47). But only one of these observations was made during December.

Since crows are apparently seldom killed by cars during this time of year, and since the incident took place at night, it seems unlikely that the crow was killed by a motor vehicle. The evidence suggests that the crow was killed by the owl, which was either feeding on it on the road, or was flying across the road with its prey when it in turn, was killed by a passing car. There is, however, the possibility that the crow was carrion.

The only reference I can find of Barred Owls eating carrion is by Forbush (Birds of Massachusetts and other New England States, Vol. II, 1929, p. 206). The only reference I can find of crow being recorded as food for Barred Owls is in Bent (U.S. Natl. Mus. Bull., 170:189, 1938).—CHARLES R. SINDELAR, 1865 S. West Avenue, Apt. 5, Waukesha, Wisconsin, 2 February 1966.

Behavior of a Ruby-throated Hummingbird in a room.—An immature male Ruby-throated Hummingbird (*Archilochus colubris*) was observed while confined in a room at Western Illinois University in Macomb, Illinois, 18 September 1967. The room in which observations were made is 15 feet square and 21 feet high. The north and south sides of the room open to 10-foot-wide corridors, and 18-foot-tall windows comprise about one-half of each of the east and west sides. Five-foot-wide doorways (without doors) open from the east and the west sides to the exterior. The walls and ceiling of the room are white except brownish where some paint is flaking off. The ceiling is without fixtures or wires suitable for perching.

The day was overcast and humid, becoming partly cloudy. At 10:30 CDT the hummingbird was called to my attention. I watched it for the following hour and then for several minutes each hour until 17:00 that afternoon. It hovered and darted nearly at the level of the ceiling with its crown and bill tip usually less than an inch from the ceiling. The bill was inclined slightly upward, and the body hung at about a 60° angle from the ceiling. The bird did not approach the walls of the room, even where the windows came within three feet of the ceiling, nor did it move along the ceiling into the somewhat darker north corridor.

The dartings of the hummingbird were directed toward many small insects, probably dipterans and hymenopterans, resting on the ceiling or hovering immediately under it. The hummingbird caught and appeared to eat immediately several insects shorter than 5 mm in length; many attempted captures failed. If an insect were not caught as soon as it took flight, the hummingbird sometimes chased it several inches. Ruby-throated Hummingbirds normally capture flying insects (Tyler, *In* Bent, U.S. Natl. Mus. Bull., 176:342, 1940; Forbush, Birds of Massachusetts, 1927), but it seems noteworthy that the confined bird was catching insects rather than obviously seeking an escape route.

The bird continued flying just under the ceiling for at least six and one-half hours and presumably found its way out through one of the doorways between 17:00 and 19:00 that evening. Because it seems unlikely that the hummingbird would stay in the room for so long just to feed on the insects, its continued presence in the room probably indicates that it could not find its way out. But if it were trying to escape, why did it keep hovering near the center of the white ceiling rather than investigating the large, unshaded windows nearby? A hypothesis that it was responding to the brightest area as the potential escape route was rejected, for the ceiling was only one-fourth as

bright as the terrain which was visible through the windows. Nor was it staying in the darkest area, for the ceiling of the north corridor was much darker.

If the Ruby-throated Hummingbird possessed an innate drive to fly upward when meeting a vertical obstruction, this would explain its constancy in flying only inches below the ceiling, its failure to investigate the windows three feet lower than the ceiling, and its failure to find the doorways 13 feet below the ceiling. An innate drive of this sort would be of selective advantage in natural situations.—EDWIN C. FRANKS, *Department of Biological Sciences, Western Illinois University, Macomb, Illinois, 4 December 1967.*

Egg measurements of California and Ring-billed Gull eggs at Miquelon Lake, Alberta, in 1965.—During a study of the breeding biology of the California (*Larus californicus*) and the Ring-billed Gulls (*Larus delawarensis*) on two islands in Miquelon Lake, Alberta (53° 15' N and 112° 55' W), egg measurements were taken

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION IN LENGTH AND WIDTH OF CALIFORNIA AND RING-BILLED GULL EGGS AT MIQUELON LAKE, ALBERTA IN 1965

Length in mm	Number of eggs					
	California Gull			Ring-billed Gull		
	I egg	II egg	III egg	I egg	II egg	III egg
71.9-70.0	1	1				
69.9-68.0	9	2	1			
67.9-66.0	13	12	3			1
65.9-64.0	20	27	11	2		
63.9-62.0	8	8	24	2	5	2
61.9-60.0	3	5	10	9	9	1
59.9-58.0	1		5	14	14	17
57.9-56.0			1	14	11	11
55.9-54.0				2	3	6
53.9-52.0					1	4
51.9-50.0						1
Mean in mm	65.42	64.95	63.09	58.88	58.79	57.22
Width in mm	Number of eggs					
	California Gull			Ring-billed Gull		
	I egg	II egg	III egg	I egg	II egg	III egg
51.9-50.0	1					
49.9-48.0	13	9				
47.9-46.0	26	30	16			
45.9-44.0	15	15	29	2	1	1
43.9-42.0		1	9	23	25	7
41.9-40.0			1	16	15	30
39.9-38.0				2	2	5
Mean in mm	46.82	46.61	45.07	41.98	42.06	41.13