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