King, Am. Zool. 13:1259) and think that future tests should use smaller eggs, as Laskey (Wilson Bull., op. cit., 1950) did, our results do provide a systematic experimental test of, and are consistent with, the widely held conclusion that the activity of the host is important in determining which nests female cowbirds select to parasitize.

We thank Miami University for permission to work on the Bachelor Estate and Val Nolan Jr., Michael W. Monahan, and David R. Obsorne, who also provided the quail eggs, for reading a draft of this note.—CHARLES F. THOMPSON AND BRADLEY M. GOTTFRIED, *Dept. of Zoology, Miami Univ., Oxford, OH 45056.* (Present address CFT: *Dept. of Biology, State Univ. College, Geneseo, NY 14454*). *Accepted 8 Dec. 1975.*

**White-throated Swifts following farm machinery.**—On 15 December 1973 between 1435 and 1445 in the Avra Valley, 25 km northwest of Tucson, Pima Co., Arizona we observed approximately 50 White-throated Swifts (*Aeronautes saxatalis*) following a harvester. The harvester was first observed traveling north to south in a quarter section field of sorghum. A large cloud of dust was carried 200 m from the machine by a westerly wind. The swifts, flying in a counterclockwise elliptical circuit on the leeward side of the machine, entered the dust cloud ca. 3 m from the harvester then turned downwind and flew 100–150 m before circling back upwind. This behavior continued until the harvester reached the southern edge of the field where it slowed to turn about. During this pause the dust cloud dissipated and the swifts ceased circling, quickly rose to an altitude of 150–200 m, and dispersed over a broad area. When the harvester began cutting again, the swifts rapidly congregated and resumed their counterclockwise circuit in the new dust cloud. Although we were not close enough to observe prey capture, we presume the swifts were taking insects disturbed by the harvester. Several species of birds are known to benefit from the disturbance created by agricultural machinery, however we could find no records for swifts.—STEPHEN M. ALDEN AND G. SCOTT MILLS, *Dept. of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Univ. of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721.* *Accepted 17 Dec. 1975.*

**Common Terns feed on mole crabs.**—I camped on Ocracoke Island, Hyde Co., North Carolina on 21–23 July 1973. On my first visit to the ocean beach I noted Common Terns (*Sterna hirundo*) flying over the wave-washed sand, picking up and eating small prey. Observations from a distance of 10 m or less with a $10 \times 40$ binocular revealed that the birds were capturing and eating small mole crabs (*Emerita talpoida*). These crabs were frequently exposed momentarily by a wave breaking on the sand after which they rapidly burrowed back into the sand. An inspection of the wave-washed zone of the beach revealed that the mole crab population was several orders of magnitude greater than I have observed on any Carolina beach in my 7 years of regular visits to the coast. A handful of sand randomly taken from the appropriate zone of the beach usually yielded at least 1 crab, sometimes 3 or 4. The crabs were all quite small, ranging approximately 1.5–2.5 cm long. I scanned up and down the beach and estimated that about 70 terns were hunting for crabs in about 1 km of beach. No Common Tern was observed over the water and no other species of tern was observed hunting for crabs. Least Terns (*Sterna albifrons*) were observed catching fish 5–100 m offshore, Gull-billed Terns (*Gelochelidon nilotica*) were seen catching insects in the interior of the island, and Royal Terns (*Thalasseus maximus*) and one Sandwich Tern (*Thalasseus sandvicensis*) were seen flying over the area.