

of *Telmatodytes palustris griseus* — a form which often lays colorless eggs, as I well know, having taken eggs as long ago as 1877 of the latter and which are now in the Charleston Museum. Mr. Ridgway gives the measurement of the eggs of *Cistothorus stellaris* as $.63 \times .48$ and of *palustris* as $.66 \times .46$. As *griseus* is smaller than *palustris* the eggs are naturally smaller. The colorless eggs of *T. p. griseus* taken by me in 1877 I believed were representatives of *Cistothorus stellaris* simply because they were white instead of chocolate! If the Short-billed Marsh Wren bred on St. Simon's Island between the years 1853 and 1865 (which is questionable) it would still continue to do so at the present time, as the conditions are unchanged.

While I am discussing these Georgia records it is well to mention that the eggs of Bachman's Warbler (*Vermivora bachmani*) were recorded¹ from Georgia by Mr. H. B. Bailey, taken by the late Dr. G. S. Wilson between the years 1853 and 1865. These eggs were described as "dull white; around the larger end is a wreath of dark brown, covering nearly one-third of the egg; while a few obscure spots of lilac are scattered over the rest of the surface." As is now well-known, the eggs of Bachman's Warbler are pure white without any markings of any color.—ARTHUR T. WAYNE, *Mount Pleasant, S. C.*

Birds of Central Alberta.— In 'The Auk' for October, 1909, appeared a list of birds by myself for this district, and in the January, 1910, issue appeared some comment on the list by Mr. W. E. Saunders of London, Ontario. May I be allowed the space to show where these so-called discrepancies are not discrepancies at all, as will be explained by the following.

Whooping Crane.— "A very common migrant, stopping at least part of the summer along the larger lakes. One nest was located which was afterwards abandoned." This statement is correct. I have seen no Sandhill Cranes here at all.

White-winged Crossbill.— My notes sent to the 'Ottawa Naturalist' for 1907 stating, "Seen but once," "a pair carrying nesting material in a spruce swamp," are those of 1908. This accounts for my stating it bred here. When a bird is seen carrying nesting material it is quite obvious that it nests in that locality. Where I stated in 'The Auk,' "seen but once" I should have said, "seen but twice."

Evening Grosbeak.— My 1906 list states: "Seen but once." My 1907 list, sent to the 'Naturalist,' says: "Seen but once." For 1908 the list states, "Found nest, four birds around most of time, quite common." My 1909 list states "Rare and breeding." As will be seen at a glance, these birds were "rare" during 1906, 1907, and 1909, and quite common during 1908; therefore the conclusion was drawn that the bird, on the whole, should be considered as "quite rare," as stated in 'The Auk.'

¹ Bull. Nutt. Orn. Club, VIII, 1883, 38.

Nelson's Sparrow.— My 1907 list, sent to the 'Naturalist,' states that it is common, also that it breeds here. My 1908 list states "rare" and "seen but once"; also that it "breeds here." My 1909 list states, "common and breeding." Therefore, taking the observations as a whole, I considered the bird was "fairly common."

Lincoln's Sparrow.— I do not claim that my list is complete and I so state in my article in 'The Auk' for October, 1909, where I say: "My list would have been a great deal larger if I had been able to visit the districts lying to the west and south, but as time would not permit me to do this I will have to be content with the list here given and trust that new species may be added each year until the list is complete."

Philadelphia Vireo.— My 1908 list sent to the 'Naturalist' states, "Very rare"; also that it breeds here, which was correct for 1908. 'The Auk' list says, "Very common," which was correct for 1909. These birds being very numerous during the season of 1909 led me to conclude that they were *very common*, which is correct.

Brewer's Blackbird.— My 1908 list, in the 'Naturalist,' states: "Common at Edmonton — but rare here," which was absolutely correct. Travelling over a greater territory in 1909 I found these birds to outnumber the Rusty Blackbird, hence my statement in 'The Auk' to that effect.

Golden Eye.— My 1908 list, in the 'Naturalist,' stated this bird was "very rare"; also that it bred here. 'The Auk' list states this bird is "Quite common during the spring and fall and met with occasionally during the summer. A nest found near here with ten eggs." These birds being more numerous during 1909 than during 1908 led me to make the above statement.

During the years 1907, 1908, and 1909, I kept a very careful record of the birds of this locality on forms supplied me by the Biological Survey of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. As my 1907 list was made up it was complete in itself, and for 1907 only. When my 1908 list was made up it was also complete in *itself*, and for 1908 only. When my 1909 list was made up *it* was complete in *itself*, and for 1909 only.

The list of birds appearing in the 'Ottawa Naturalist' for October, 1909, was made up by the editor of that journal from the duplicate copies which I made for the U. S. Biological Survey and were for the years 1907 and 1908 only, without any annotations aside from those noted in the reports.

The list sent to 'The Auk' was taken from my 1906 observations and from the duplicate copies which I made for the U. S. Biological Survey for the years 1907, 1908 and 1909, with annotations. Therefore it is very easy to see why the two lists slightly differ.

If this list does not harmonize with Mr. Saunders's or other lists taken in this locality I cannot help it, but I would have him understand fully that because it does not agree with other lists is no sign whatever that it is not correct.

I hope this will fully explain the so called discrepancies and corrections pointed out by Mr. Saunders.— SIDNEY S. S. STANSELL, *Edmonton, Alberta.*