

(no. 29439, U. C. Mus. Pal.) and an incomplete humerus (no. 12176). A humerus and a perfectly preserved tarsometatarsus (no. 29438) denote the presence of *Oxyechus vociferus*. Both these genera being monotypic, the problem of identification is simplified. There appears to be little possibility of confusing the fossil remains of either genus with other North American genera of Scolopacidae or Charadriidae.

It is not surprising to find the Killdeer present, inasmuch as this bird today frequents inland sloughs and meadowlands. The Dowitcher is less to be expected, and yet shore birds of similar habit stop to feed or rest along the borders of small fresh-water ponds and are known to have been caught in the asphalt outpourings at Rancho La Brea within historic times.

The Lewis Woodpecker (*Asyndesmus lewisi*) is fairly well represented (no. 29441), by an upper mandible, lower mandible, tarsometatarsus, tibiotarsus, and radius, the latter bone, however, exhibiting no distinctive generic character other than size. The metatarsus is distinguishable from that of the Red-shafted Flicker, which is common in the deposits, by reason of its shortness, relatively greater width at the distal end, and by the shorter, weaker trochleae for the articulations of the phalanges. The mandibles are distinguishable from *Balanosphyra* primarily by their comparative straightness and dorsoventral compression, and by the poorly developed ridge on the culmen. The Lewis Woodpecker adds another member to the association of birds, comprising *Aphelocoma*, *Pica nuttallii* (A. H. Miller, MS), and others, which inhabited the live oak trees known to have occurred at Rancho La Brea in Pleistocene time (F. H. Frost, Univ. Calif. Publ. Bot., 14, 1927, p. 81). One would expect to find *Balanosphyra* present, but as yet no bones belonging to this genus have been detected. *Colaptes* is the only other woodpecker known from the deposits.

The fused carpal phalanges and the distal end of a humerus of an anserine (no. 29440) prove to be indistinguishable from the corresponding bones of the Shoveller Duck (*Spatula clypeata*). Among the ducks, only the Mallard and the Green-winged Teal have been recorded as present in the Rancho La Brea (L. H. Miller, Carnegie Inst. Wash. Publ. 349, pt. v, 1925, p. 72). However, the bones here mentioned are not to be confused with either *Anas* or *Nettion*. Generic characters in the carpal digits and the distal end of the humerus are not always discernible with certainty, and, although *Spatula* apparently can be distinguished from related genera of similar size on the basis of the differences seen in these elements, nevertheless the identification of the Shoveller Duck must be regarded as tentative.

Additional material belonging to species already reported from the deposits is as follows: An incomplete sternum and an ulna of *Zenaidura macroura*; an incomplete tarsometatarsus and the articular region of a lower jaw of *Accipiter cooperii*; and a carpometacarpus, ulna, and incomplete humerus of *Otus asio*. The Morning Dove and Screech Owl were known previously from only one or two bones, while the remains of the Cooper Hawk were so incomplete as to make doubtful the identification of the species. The present identifications, particularly that of the lower jaw, therefore, seem to confirm the presence of *Accipiter cooperii*.—ALDEN H. MILLER, *Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, June 13, 1929.*

**Hooded Merganser at Baldwin Lake, San Bernardino Mountains, California.**—Recently while looking over a small collection of mounted ducks at Big Bear Lake, I noted a beautiful full plumaged adult male Hooded Merganser (*Lophodytes cucullatus*). This bird was shot at Baldwin Lake some time during November, 1923, by Mr. Warren Smith. I was also informed by him that another, but a less highly marked bird, of this species was taken at the same place a few days later. This seems to be the first recorded occurrence for this bird in this locality. The bird is rare anywhere in southern California.—WRIGHT M. PIERCE, *Claremont, California, May 29, 1929.*

**Additional Notes from Cape Prince of Wales, Alaska.**—I wish to record a few specimens collected by the Eskimo representative of the Chicago Academy of Sciences, at the western tip of Seward Peninsula, Alaska. A rather extensive collection of carefully prepared specimens was received, including a new bird for that station and two new breeding records. The latter were:

Red-breasted Merganser (*Mergus serrator*), set of eight eggs with down, collected June 22, 1928, Nulook River, Seward Peninsula. (A set of Old-squaw, *Clangula*

*hyemalis*, taken at Metlatavik, June 30, 1928, contained three eggs which seemed to be those of a merganser.)

Black Brant (*Branta nigricans*), set of four with down and female, collected on the Opkawaruk River, June 24, 1928.

These eggs are now in the collection of Mr. Wilson C. Hanna of Colton, California. Among the bird skins received were:

Tree Swallow (*Iridoprocne bicolor*), juvenile, collected at Wales, July 30, 1928. (First record from Wales.)

Asiatic Pintail (*Dafila acuta acuta*), female, collected at Wales, July 30, 1928.

American Scoter (*Oidemia americana*), male and female, collected at Wales, July 24, 1928.

Red-breasted Merganser (*Mergus serrator*), female, collected at Wales, June 12, 1928.

I am indebted to Dr. H. C. Oberholser for identifying the pintail and immature swallow.—ALFRED M. BAILEY, *Chicago Academy of Sciences, Chicago, Illinois, May 10, 1929.*

**House Finch Vacillation.**—On March 31, 1929, a pair of House Finches (*Carduelis mexicanus frontalis*) began to examine, for nesting purposes, a roomy fold in the awning on a cabin which I was occupying at Cragmor, El Paso County, Colorado. During the winter a male House Finch had slept in the awning, but his roost was entered from the outside, whereas the prospective nesting chamber was reached by climbing in behind the awning. However, I assumed that the male of the pair was probably the bird which had become familiar with the awning by use.

During the first days of April the pair made increasingly numerous visits to the awning, and on April 12 began to carry building materials to their chosen spot. It happened that I was confined by illness to the screened porch upon which the awning was hung, and I looked forward to enjoying an intimate view of the finches' domestic affairs—virtually in cross section, as the nest was being built between the fly-screen and the canvas. I determined that I would gladly keep the awning hoisted up, as long as the birds wanted to use it. April 15 was the day of greatest building activity, material being lodged in the fold to a depth of at least six inches, in spite of the fact that much of it fell out at the bottom as fast as it was brought. On that day, too, I saw the pair mating in a neighboring tree, and saw the male feed the female. The female did by far the greater share of material-carrying.

Although the site was at best a poor one, on account of its "leaky" bottom, its sponsors valiantly protected it against the inquisitiveness of other house finches and of some English Sparrows, one of which, seeing the nesting material being carried in, himself climbed into the cavity to have a look. However, the following day building operations were only half-hearted, and then they ceased entirely. Within a short time all the material had dribbled away and the place was completely empty. Nevertheless, for the next six weeks the finches—male, female or both—visited the spot almost daily. To reach the nest fold was not altogether an easy matter, as it necessitated alighting in a clinging position upon the vertical fly-screen, "hitching" upward behind the awning and hopping into the cavity. Until May 25, when I left the cabin, the finches visited the awning on 27 of the days; and I learned from the next occupant that they came even after that date.

The birds had no set time for their visits, sometimes arriving as early as 5:15 a. m., on other days late in the afternoon. On certain dates, notably May 12 and 14, my notes indicate that "both finches came frequently throughout the day." The male had a habit, as he stood in the cavity, of uttering little phrases of song. During the first few days of these unproductive visits, I supposed that the birds were undecided whether to renew nesting operations at this site. But their continuance, as mere "calls," week after week, at a time when all house finches were obviously nesting and this pair presumably had an occupied home elsewhere, puzzled me. It would seem that these birds had formed such an attachment for the location of their first choice that, even when they had abandoned it as a nest-site, they were instinctively drawn back to it long after they had established a household elsewhere.—CLINTON G. ABBOTT, *San Diego Society of Natural History, San Diego, California, June 26, 1929.*