

per minute during a four-minute period. In quick succession, we then made call note counts of migrants as follows: one mile east of the tower at a place without lights—one bird heard in five minutes, two miles southeast of the tower—no birds heard in five minutes. Returning to the base of the tower, we continued making counts as follows: with tower lights on, 30 birds in four minutes; all lights off, no birds in four minutes; tower lights on, 9 birds heard, all near the end of a four-minute period; lights on, 7 birds in four minutes; lights on, 55 birds in four minutes; lights off, 6 birds heard, all in the first two minutes of a five-minute period; lights on, no birds in first two minutes, but after the lights had been on four minutes we heard 76 call notes in the next four minutes.

Turning off the tower lights definitely eliminated the congestion of migrants about the tower. Immediately after the lights went off, we could tell by the diminishing volume of call notes that birds were leaving the vicinity, and in less than two minutes all birds were out of hearing. After the tower was relighted it took from one to two minutes for the first birds to come into hearing, but thereafter the number of call notes increased dramatically.

We could not identify, with certainty, any of the migrants that we heard during the night, but at 7:15 a.m. we found five freshly killed birds (three Fox Sparrows, *Passerella iliaca*; one Golden-crowned Kinglet, *Regulus satrapa*; and one Woodcock, *Philohela minor*), and three crippled birds (two Slate-colored Juncos and one Golden-crowned Kinglet) under the east and west guys which support the tower.

Our observations indicate that confusion of nocturnal migrants by tower lights occurs only on nights when the ceiling is low, and migrants are apparently forced to fly near or below the 1000- to 3000-foot level. On clear nights or on nights when cloud cover is high, we learned, through the use of special audio equipment (unpublished manuscript) that numbers of high-flying migrants pass the vicinity of the tower without becoming confused.

Thus, calculations of total numbers of migrants based on the sample of birds killed at television towers are erroneous on at least two counts: (1) migrants are attracted to the towers by the tower lights, and (2) only a very small per cent of the birds which reach the tower are killed.—WILLIAM W. COCHRAN, *WCIA, Champaign, Illinois, and* RICHARD R. GRABER, *Illinois Natural History Survey, Urbana, Illinois, April 24, 1958.*

**Early record for the Ivory-billed Woodpecker in Kentucky.**—An early record from Kentucky seems to indicate a greater amount of wandering among Ivory-billed Woodpeckers (*Campephilus principalis*) than has commonly been attributed to them. Col. Wm. Fleming noted in his journal for March 7, 1780, while near St. Asaph's, or Logan's Fort, about 20 miles south-southeast of Harrodsburg, that he had met with a species of woodpecker new to him (N. D. Mereness, 1916. "Travels in the American colonies," pp. 632-633). He saw two individuals, "the Cock and the hen," the former having "a bright red head with remarkable large tuft of feathers on the Crown . . . the body and the wings White and black." One of the birds was shot, the female, Fleming thought (but probably a male of the previous year, according to Dr. James T. Tanner [letter to K. L. Dixon, June 25, 1958]). Fleming's description was essentially as follows: ". . . the feathers on the throat and belly and part of the wing and tail a shining black, it had nine stiff and strong feathers in the tail. . . , the middle one being six inches long from where the feathers begins. . . , its wings ten Inches long from the shoulder [bend?] to the tip, 18 long feathers in the wing, the two first and longest black[,] the 3rd tipd with white and each succeeding one more and more till the next to the back

are white, both above and below, the front and fore part of the Crown black, from the junction of the upper and lower bill white feathers on each side, leaving a triangle of black feathers from the Eyes and back part of the Crown which is deep red, . . . [.] its legs was an inch and a half long with four toes. . . , the two outer ones the longest and four inches in length[.] the bill white and bony very strong and firm. . . , which is three inches in length, the tongue is six inches in length. The Iris when dead of a bright Yellow. . . , it weighed upwards of 1 lb."

Fleming evidently began counting primaries with the longest one, not with the outermost. Judging from Ridgway's measurements (1914. *U.S. Nat. Mus. Bull.* no. 50, pt. 6: 167, and pl. 8), the wing was larger than an Ivory-bill's, and the leg shorter, but it is not clear how the measurements were taken, and they may have been only approximate. The bill length is only slightly too large for *Campephilus*, and the total foot length seems right.

Tanner (1942. *Nat. Audubon Soc. Res. Rept.* 1) considered as the result of mistaken identity or, at least, unproved, the claims of Ridgway (*op. cit.*, p. 168), and of Allen (*in Bent*, 1939. *U.S. Nat. Mus. Bull.* no. 174:12) that this woodpecker formerly occurred in Franklin and Monroe counties, Indiana. Wetmore, however, recorded archeological evidence, presumably from the 15th or 16th centuries, of its occurrence in Scioto County, Ohio (1943. *Wilson Bull.*, 55:55). Although the present record does not validate the Indiana reports, it does make them appear more plausible.

Editorial help from K. L. Dixon and, through him, Dr. Tanner, is acknowledged with thanks.—DANIEL MCKINLEY, *Biology Department, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine, August 7, 1958.*

**Production of pellets by a Blue Jay.**—A captive immature Blue Jay (*Cyanocitta cristata*), which was recovering from a broken wing, habitually perched in a "mimosa" tree in our yard at Greenbelt, Prince George's County, Maryland. Mr. C. V. Morton, U.S. National Museum, identified the tree as (*Abizzia lebeck*).

As soon as we placed the jay in the tree it flew excitedly from branch to branch, gleaned insects from the leaves and branches, and ate the flowers of the tree. On two occasions, once on July 7, 1958, and once several days before, the bird regurgitated a hard pellet composed entirely of compressed blossoms of this tree. In each case, the pellet's surface was a hard, rough greenish-yellow crust. The interior was softer and consisted of the reddish tips of the flowers. The pellets were about half an inch in length and had two slightly tapering ends.—DONALD H. LAMORE, *605 College Street, Nevada, Missouri, August 26, 1958.*

**Ruby-throated Hummingbird captured by a Praying Mantis.**—A friend of mine, Conrad Steele of Lexington, Virginia, told me recently of a curious incident. Early in September, 1957, at Lexington, he saw a praying mantis (*Mantis* sp.) capture a hummingbird. While he is not particularly familiar with birds, the Ruby-throated Hummingbird (*Archilochus colubris*) is our only hummingbird. While sitting on a porch near which were some flowers that hummingbirds had been visiting, he detected a fluttering noise in a bush. Walking to the spot, he found that a mantis had its claws around a hummingbird's neck. When he clapped his hands the insect released the bird, which flew a short distance and fell to the ground. He picked the bird up, making sure that it was a hummingbird. After resting on his hand for a moment the bird buzzed away, apparently in good condition.—J. J. MURRAY, *109 East Broadway, Louisville 2, Kentucky, December 18, 1957.*