

mont as normal; Pearson (Birds of America, 1936) says "northern Ontario," yet follows with "accidentally to northeastern New York." Howell (Florida Bird Life, 1932) gives "southern Ontario, Vermont and New Hampshire," and Peterson (A Field Guide to the Birds, 1939) lists ". . . southeastern Ontario, and central New Hampshire south."

It appears natural for a given species to extend its range in one way or another over a period of years; the fact in connection with the present species's northward movement which should command the attention of ornithologists more than that is the habit of altitudinal nesting. Perhaps further research in connection with the Wood Thrush in northern New England would reveal additional interesting information relative to nesting localities which this species has chosen. It is altogether possible that this bird, being nowhere 'abundant' in the northern part of New England, has been overlooked in a great many places because of a lack of observers in the more inaccessible mountain regions. Too, its presence at Willoughby, but a few miles south of the Canadian border, gives rise to the possibility that the bird may be well established farther to the north, also in the higher altitudes, and well within the Dominion itself.

Assuming that competition from other species long-established in older stands of deciduous woodlands in the valleys and lowlands has proven too much for infiltrating Wood Thrushes to cope with, the metamorphosis from conifers to hardwoods would then become a factor in the altitudinal tendency of the species in the north, as well as the range extension itself. It could very well be that the thrushes moved in to the new growths of deciduous trees before too many other competitors had a chance to become established there themselves. One other possible explanation for the presence of the birds on the higher peaks might be that a subspecific difference exists between these birds and our well-established lowland Wood Thrushes which are known along the eastern seaboard. This statement, of course, must be made with the utmost care and only a suggestion; however, I have been unable to find reference anywhere to any species whatever which moves into higher altitudes as it moves *northward*. Bicknell's Thrush is an altitudinal breeder, but its range is well to the *south* of that of the Gray-cheeked Thrush, its somewhat larger counterpart. Similarly, the Sierra Hermit Thrush takes to the mountains to make its home, but at the same time it is considerably south of other Pacific hermit thrushes.

Whatever the motives behind this strange behavior of the Wood Thrush, the writer believes that its very presence in the higher Green Mountains well merits the attention of, and much additional research by, the ornithologists of the United States and Canada.—J. CHARLES TRACY, 1031 Wyoming Ave., Forty Fort, Pennsylvania.

Wrens use duck down as nest lining.—A great variety of materials, both native and man-made, is used in lining the nests of many birds. The resourcefulness of the Long-billed Marsh Wren (*Telmatodytes palustris*) in utilizing the down feathers of ducks as nest lining was brought to my attention during waterfowl investigations in Iowa in 1938-1941. While making observations on the nesting habits of the Redhead (*Nyroca americana*) which nests among the sedges (*Carex* spp.) and bulrushes (*Scirpus* spp.) in good wren-nesting habitat, I saw a Long-billed Marsh Wren fly to its nest with a duck-down feather. Upon closer investigation I found the wren had lined its nest with Redhead-down feathers. Further search revealed the Redhead nest about fifteen yards away from the wren's nest. Thereafter, while passing through the marshes looking for Redhead nests, I took

the opportunity of observing the nest linings of about 250 wrens' nests, of which 75 to 80 per cent or more were dummy nests built by the males. By carefully probing with my fingers I was able to see the nest lining without visibly disturbing the nest or contents. In the nests which contained eggs, the lining of the nest extended along the tunnel-shaped entrance and often protruded from the nest opening.

The first wren nest containing Redhead-down feathers was found on May 15 and the last on July 1. A total of six wrens' nests, of approximately 250 examined, contained many Redhead down feathers. The wrens' nests profusely lined with down feathers averaged eight yards distance from the nearest Redhead nest. Other female wrens' nests, fifteen or more yards distant from those containing down feathers, were lined with other marsh-birds' feathers but not Redhead down. Frequently, single Redhead-down feathers were found in wrens' nests, probably wind-blown from the ducks' nests. Undoubtedly the wren's territory in which the Redhead nest was situated played the deciding rôle as to which wrens' nests were down-lined and which were not so lined.

The wrens made extensive use of other birds' feathers, noticeably Coot (*Fulica americana*) and Red-wing (*Agelaius phoeniceus*), with which to line their nests. W. Welter (The Wilson Bulletin, 47: 3-34, 1935, identified feathers of the Red-wing, Virginia Rail (*Rallus limicola*), American Bittern (*Botaurus lentiginosus*), pheasant (*Phasianus*), Ruffed Grouse (*Bonasa umbellus*), and domestic chicken in wrens' nests in New York. The variety of feathers and plant debris which line the females' nests in Iowa suggests that the wrens utilized the materials at hand, probably within their own nesting territories. There was no evident correlation noted between the nesting sites selected by the wrens and the sites selected by the Redhead or other species of ducks. However, the fact that six wrens' nests, representing about 25 per cent of the females' nests inspected, were lined with Redhead-down feathers to the exclusion of every other form of lining material, suggests a preference for the down feathers when they are available. The wind, aided by the wrens, was responsible for the gradual disappearance of so much of the down from the Redhead nests that by the hatching date very few of them contained down feathers.—Jessor B. Low, *Illinois State Natural History Survey, Urbana, Illinois*.

Unusual feeding habit of grackles and crows.—That crows would avidly consume fish scraps, is perhaps not particularly surprising because these birds are rather omnivorous feeders. Purple Grackles (*Quiscalus q. quiscula*) also use a wide variety of foods, and we have occasionally observed them feeding in shallow water on stranded insects and even small fishes. To see several dozens of these birds feeding in deep and turbulent water after the manner of gulls and terns, however, was indeed a surprise.

On March 9, 1943, the writer, in company with J. Clark Salyer, William P. Baldwin, and Donald V. Gray of the Fish and Wildlife Service, was at the site of the new power plant at the outlet of newly constructed Pinopolis Reservoir, some 35 miles northwest of Charleston, South Carolina. About 12,000 cubic feet of water per second was passing through the electric turbines, 'boiling up' to form the headwater of the Cooper River. Apparently the turbines were cutting up or otherwise killing large numbers of gizzard shad and other small fishes. These, brought to the surface by the churning water, attracted Ring-billed, Herring, Laughing, and Bonaparte's Gulls, as well as crows, Purple Grackles, and even a solitary Red-wing. Several dozen cormorants were active in the first mile of the