OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Foods of Le Conte's Sparrow
Author(s): David A. Easterla
Source: *The Auk*, Vol. 79, No. 2 (Apr., 1962), pp. 272-273
Published by: Oxford University Press
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/4082534
Accessed: 18-02-2021 14:47 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms

JSTOR

Oxford University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Auk*

This content downloaded from 152.2.240.64 on Thu, 18 Feb 2021 14:47:36 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Ash-throated Flycatcher in Rhode Island.—On 15 September 1960 I collected an immature, female Ash-throated Flycatcher (*Myiarchus cinerascens*) on Block Island, Newport County, Rhode Island. It was moderately fat and weighed 26.2 g, with a wing length (chord) of 88.5 mm and a fully ossified skull. The plumage was extremely worn, with the bird still in juvenal plumage, and only a few sheathed feathers indicating the onset of the postjuvenal molt. The specimen (No. 261402), now in the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, was identified by Dr. Wesley A. Lanyon as belonging to the nominate race (*M. c. cinerascens*).

Although the Ash-throated Flycatcher has been recorded east of the Mississippi River with increasing frequency in recent years (Simon, 1958: 469; Williams, 1959: 528), this is the first record for Rhode Island and, indeed, for the northeast. Therefore, it is tempting to succumb to the obvious conclusion that the bird was carried away from its normal migration route by Hurricane Donna, which passed a few miles west of Block Island on 12 September. But an equally probable alternative explanation can be found in the recently proposed hypothesis that a number of birds fly north in the fall (see Baird *et al.*, 1959). This latter explanation has the advantage of accounting not only for this particular flycatcher, but also for the many other records of extralimitals that reach New England. It also can account, in part, for the appearance of the Ash-throated Flycather in other areas outside its normal range.

LITERATURE CITED

BAIRD, J., A. M. BAGG, I. C. T. NISBET, and C. S. ROBBINS. 1959. Operation recovery —report on mist-netting along the Atlantic coast in 1958. Bird-Banding, **30:** 143–171.

SIMON, S. W. 1958. An Ash-throated Flycatcher (*Miarchus cinerascens cinerascens*) in Maryland. Auk, **75:** 469.

WILLIAMS, L. E., JR. 1959. Ash-throated Flycatcher in Alabama. Auk, **76:** 528.

—JAMES BAIRD, *Massachusetts Audubon Society, Drumlin Farm, South Lincoln, Massachusetts.*

Foods of Le Conte's Sparrow.—During the fall and spring of 1960–1961, 15 Le Conte's Sparrows (*Passerherbulus caudacutus*) were taken at Tucker Prairie, a 65-hectare (160-acre) tract of virgin prairie, 27 km (17 miles) east of Columbia, Missouri.

Since the literature appears to contain nothing other than the statement by Walkinshaw (*Auk,* 54: 309–320, 1937) that nestlings were observed on four occasions being fed small insects, it seems appropriate to communicate my results.

With the help of Leroy Korschgen, Missouri Conservation Commission Biologist, the 1.33 cc total contents of the 15 Le Conte's Sparrow gizzards were examined and the following foods were identified:

Food item	Volume
I. Plant Foods (Names follow Gray's *Manual of Botany*, 1951)	
Acalypha virginica (Three-seeded Mercury)	Trace (less .1%)
Agrostis alba (Redtop)	Trace
Agrostis sp. (Bentgrass)	.7%
Andropogon Gerardi (Big Bluestem)	1.5%
Andropogon scoparius (Little Bluestem)	6.6%
Andropogon sp. (Bluestem)	22.1%
Carex sp. (Sedge)	Trace

This content downloaded from 152.2.240.64 on Thu, 18 Feb 2021 14:47:36 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Hypoxis hirsuta (Yellow Stargrass)	.7%
Myosotis verna (Scorpion-grass)	13.2%
Oxalis sp. (Wood-Sorrel)	Trace
Panicum lanuginosum (Panic-Grass)	2.9%
Polygala sanguinea (Milkwort)	.7%
Setaria glauca (Yellow Foxtail)	16.9%
Sorghastrum nutans (Indian Grass)	14.7%
Sporobolus heterolepis (Northern Drop Seed)	2.2%
Trifolium procumbens (Low Hop-Clover)	Trace
Unidentified vegetation	.7%
Percentage of total food ingested that was plant matter	82.9%
II. Animal Foods	
Arachnida (Spiders)	3.7%
Hexapoda (Insect fragments)	Trace (less .1%)
Coleoptera (Beetle fragments)	Trace
Chrysomelidae (Leaf Beetles)	.7%
Curculionidae (Weevils)	3.7%
Pentatomidae (Stinkbugs)	.7%
Lepidoptera (Caterpillars and moths)	.7%
Formicidae (Ants)	Trace
Cicadellidae (Leafhoppers)	7.4%
Percentage of total food ingested that was animal matter	16.9%

—David A. Easterla, *Missouri Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, Columbia, Missouri.*

Feeding Habits of the Mississippi Kite.—During July 1961, 12 hours of a five-day period were spent on the observation of the actions of the Mississippi Kite (*Ictinia misisippiensis*) on a semiprairie and meadow area in Montgomery County, Alabama. This area is partially surrounded by two rivers and comprises about 1,200 hectares (3,000 acres). The actual feeding area involved was completely bare of trees.

The study was conducted with three objectives in mind: (1) to determine the type of prey species taken, (2) methods of securing prey, and (3) the amount consumed in a given period of time.

With the aid of field glasses on a clear day it was possible to attain all three of these objectives rather satisfactorily. The types of prey taken included a species of May beetle (*Phyllophaga* sp.), Carolina Locust (*Dissosterra carolina*), and undetermined grasshoppers and dragonflies. Two kites were collected, as well as examples of the prey species other than those contained in the stomachs of the kites. During this particular period May beetles were very common and made up a major portion of the diet. Dragonflies and grasshoppers were both common; however, more grasshoppers were taken, probably because of their ease of capture. Many passes made on dragonflies were unsuccessful. The grasshoppers were picked up from the ground and eaten aloft. The beetles and dragonflies were taken and consumed in the air.

The method of attack on dragonflies and beetles was the same. The bird circled in a leisurely way, usually about 50 meters (150 feet) to 100 meters in altitude, then stooped in a falconlike manner, which in all cases indicated prey had been sighted.

This content downloaded from 152.2.240.64 on Thu, 18 Feb 2021 14:47:36 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms