

to be known at the traps, perhaps scarcely a hundred yards away, where they have been living for the previous weeks. The fact that none include the traps within their territory must be attributed to the special shyness of the breeding season.

What, then, is the explanation of the discrepancy in numbers? To us it seems probable that the resident males, eager to breed, and perhaps, as the territorialists suggest, with sites already preëmpted, attach themselves to mates the moment the latter arrive, and the breeding segregation is at once begun. This, however, fails to explain the inequality in numbers among the large proportion of birds which must have passed us for points beyond.

The traps in question were closed for a period which included parts of the eighth and ninth weeks, but others in the same valley were under observation, as well as reports of those of a neighbor in an adjacent valley. It is highly improbable that this interruption affected the results materially, if at all. Sustained repetition ceased by the sixth week, with the exception of half a dozen sluggard males which had lived at the traps since the beginning.—THOMAS T. MCCABE and ELINOR BOLLES MCCABE, *Indianpoint Lake, Barkerville, British Columbia, September 12, 1927.*

Road-runner versus Mockingbird.—An incident which occurred at Azusa, California, on August 16 proved that mockingbirds have good grounds for their very evident hostility towards road-runners. Attracted by frantic cries and the scolding of mockingbirds in the yard, we found that a road-runner (*Geococcyx californianus*) had captured an immature but full-grown mockingbird, which it would no doubt have killed had it not been frightened away by our approach. When picked up, the mockingbird was lying helplessly on its back, but appeared not to be seriously hurt, and when presently released was able to fly away.—ROBERT S. WOODS, *Azusa, California, August 22, 1927.*

A Further Chronicle of the Passenger Pigeon and of Methods Employed in Hunting It.—The following extract from a letter written by Mr. John Thomas Waterhouse to his parents, the Reverend and Mrs. John Waterhouse, in London, from Camp Gaugh, Franklin Township, Burgen County, New Jersey, dated, March 23, 1838, may be of interest as adding to our knowledge of the Passenger Pigeon (*Ectopistes migratorius*): The account is quoted verbatim.

"For the last fortnight the air has been almost black with wild pigeons emigrating from the Carolina swamps to more northerly latitudes making their summer quarters in the lake countries. Within ten miles square during the last fortnight I suppose they have shot or netted at least twenty thousand. They fix up a kind of hut in a field made of limbs of trees and buckwheat stubble. They have one or two fliers which they throw out every time a flock passes; the fliers are of the wild pigeon breed usually wintered over or sometimes they take them direct from the flocks, tie their legs to a small piece of twine and throw them up. There is a floor cleared on the ground and buckwheat spread for a bait and [they] have a pigeon on the floor and also a stool pigeon which they move at pleasure by a rope fixed to it in the hut. There is then a net so fixed having a rope that fastens it to a stake in the ground at one end, and soon as ever the pigeons fly down the man in the hut pulls another rope fastened to the net and jerks it over them. They will sometimes net in this way at one haul three or four hundred. Whilst I am writing they are in the adjoining room picking seven pigeons for our breakfast. They were shot this morning at one fire of the gun."—ANNIE M. ALEXANDER, *Honolulu, T. H., August 19, 1927.*

The Amount of Food Consumed by Cormorants.—The interesting article by Mr. A. H. E. Mattingly on Cormorants in Relation to Fisheries in a recent number of the CONDOR (XXIX, 1927, pp. 182-187) with its statements as to the consumption of food by these birds, prompts me to add a note on the food of the Florida Cormorant (*Phalacrocorax auritus floridanus*). The National Zoological Park, under the Smithsonian Institution, has had numbers of these birds on exhibition. In winter the cormorants have been confined in the bird house, while in summer they have had the freedom of a large flight cage 158 feet long, 50 feet wide, and from 53 to 56 feet high. The birds breed regularly in the summer enclosure.

Under these conditions each individual cormorant receives from three-fourths of a pound to a pound of fish per day, given at one feeding, and for six days in the week. On Sunday the birds receive no food. On this allowance they thrive and live in perfect health for years.

As birds at freedom are more active, they may require somewhat more food though I am inclined to doubt that they eat on the average much more than the amount indicated for our captives. The Florida Cormorant is possibly slightly less in bulk than *Phalacrocorax ater* and *P. fuscescens* discussed by Mr. Mattingly so that his statement that these may eat one and one-half pounds of fish per day seems sufficiently large.—A. WETMORE, *U. S. National Museum, Washington, D. C., July 28, 1927.*

The Rufous-necked Sandpiper in Alaska.—In my note upon the occurrence of *Pisobia ruficollis* at St. Paul, Pribilof Islands (CONDOR, XXIX, 1927, p. 200), an injustice is done Mr. Alfred M. Bailey in omitting to state that he had already placed the species upon a firm basis as a North American bird, an injustice for which I wish to make such amends as I can. Bailey's records of occurrence at points on the Alaska mainland, as reported first in the CONDOR for 1924 (XXVI, p. 195), and elaborated in a later issue of the same magazine (XXVIII, 1926, p. 32), are as final proof as could be asked for, and I had no intention of questioning them, even by inference. My main interest in the Pribilof Island occurrence lay in correcting the previous erroneous identification of the specimen concerned, and Bailey's account of the species had for the moment slipped from my memory.—H. S. SWARTH, *California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California, August 19, 1927.*

The Barn Owl in its Relation to the Rodent Population at Berkeley, California—During June of 1926, the writer, in walking to his home on Haste Street from the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, between the hours of 10 and 12 P. M., almost nightly heard Barn Owls in the tower of the First Presbyterian Church, located at Dana Street and Channing Way. With the idea of comparing the food of these owls, that roosted well within the thickly built residential district of Berkeley, with that of certain other Barn Owls that were under observation (see Foster, CONDOR, XXVIII, 1926, p. 130, and XXIX, 1927, p. 246), and that roosted far from any human habitation, Professor G. L. Foster and the writer gained entrance to the church tower early in July, 1926, and found there, beneath the perches of two adult and five nearly grown young Barn Owls (*Tyto alba pratincola*), a large accumulation of regurgitated pellets. A number of the more complete pellets were selected from this accumulation and later examined, with the following results as to food items identified:

Kind of Animal	Number of Individuals
California Shrew (<i>Sorex californicus californicus</i>).....	1
California Pocket Gopher (<i>Thomomys bottae bottae</i>).....	84
California Pocket Mouse (<i>Perognathus californicus californicus</i>).....	4
Long-tailed Harvest Mouse (<i>Reithrodontomys megalotis longicaudus</i>)..	26
White-footed mice (<i>Peromyscus</i> sp.).....	52
California Meadow Mouse (<i>Microtus californicus californicus</i>).....	276
Norway Rat (<i>Rattus norvegicus</i>).....	2
House Mouse (<i>Mus musculus</i> subsp.).....	37
Brush Rabbit (<i>Sylvilagus bachmani</i> subsp.)..... (half-grown young)	2
Santa Cruz Song Sparrow (<i>Melospiza melodia santaecrucis</i>).....	1
Jerusalem Cricket (<i>Stenopalmatus</i> sp.).....	3

As compared with Professor Foster's findings (*loc. cit.*) it may be noted that in each case California Meadow Mice constituted more than 50 percent of the total number of individuals accounted for. California Pocket Gophers rank second, in number of individuals represented, in pellets from the church tower (perhaps due to our having picked up the larger, more intact pellets), but white-footed mice hold second place in the remains from Wild Cat Canyon. The greater number of species represented at Wild Cat Canyon probably is explained by the law of averages, since Professor Foster identified 1780 individual animals, and only 484 were secured from the church tower. The greater number of House Mice found in the church tower is hard to explain. Whether or not House Mice are more abundant near the city than