Following the discovery, when the nesting bird was flushed at a distance of seven meters, the behavior of the birds during my intrusions became almost routine. As I appeared, about seventy meters distant, the incubating bird lowered its head and neck from the alert upright position until they lay forward along the outside of the nest with the head resting on the surface of the water. When I was approximately fifty meters away, the bird arose slowly from the nest and walked silently toward me. When it was some twenty meters from the nest, it sounded an alarm call which was answered immediately by the mate which was feeding nearby, and it, too, then walked rapidly toward me. While they advanced, both birds called, quivered their half-stretched wings, splashed water by stamping their feet, and picked large beakfuls of rushes which they shook violently and then discarded. When within twenty meters of me, they swung out of the line of my approach and then followed me to the nest. They shortened the distance between us, as they followed, and increased the tempo of their alarm call. They watched silently while I briefly examined the nest, then, as I left, they again followed me and resumed the call and the acrobatics previously described. When I was about thirty meters from the nest, one bird hastened back to it, while the other stopped following me but continued to call as long as I remained in sight. Variations of this pattern seemed largely dependent upon weather conditions; once, during a brief snowstorm, the incubating bird walked seven meters from the nest, watched silently as I measured an egg, and returned to incubate before I had retraced thirty paces.

A similar behavior pattern was exhibited by the newly-hatched chicks. When less than a full day old, both simply squatted in the nest as the adult sounded the first alarm call from a distance of about twenty meters. When more than a day old, however, the young scurried immediately into the surrounding rushes as the adult quietly walked away.

Both chicks were brooded in the nest during the night of June 10; this was the fourth night of occupancy for the older chick. By sunset on June 11, the new family had moved to higher ground some eighty meters distant, and it is probable that they had abandoned the nest.

Too few observations were made on the foraging of this family to discover a detailed pattern of defensive behavior, if any, under those circumstances. During visits on June 12, 19, and 21, however, it became apparent that the bold aggressiveness which characterized the adults during the nesting period had changed to a timid wariness while they cared for their young. They were constantly alert and either outdistanced me when I approached from afar, or hid when I came into view nearby. In the latter case, when flushed, they flopped about on the ground, with wings outstretched, mandibles agape, and they voiced a previously unheard moaning call. The young birds remained hidden during this effective distraction.

The group remained in the nesting marsh until mid-July. It is probable that the increased incidence of fishermen along the river front then induced these cranes to seek a more secluded area.—JAMES W. CASLICK, *Newfield, N. Y.*

A Case of Cannibalism by a Captive Tufted Titmouse (*Parus bicolor*).—Cannibalism is not a particularly unusual nor a surprising event in the case of raptorial birds. However, for a small insectivorous bird to eat the flesh of another individual of its own species when the body of the victim is almost entirely intact would seem sufficiently unusual to be worthy of record.

Shortly after sunset on October 27, 1953, two Tufted Titmice were taken from a banding trap and placed in a large outdoor cage adjacent to the Ornithological Laboratory at Ohio State University. The birds were left in the cage which had been

used to remove them from the trap, but the door of the small cage was left open so that they could readily move from the small cage into the larger one. Food and water were available in the large cage.

When I arrived at the scene the following morning, only one of the Tufted Titmice was to be found flying about. Careful search revealed the fact that a Norway Rat or a weasel had gained entrance into the cage during the night and had killed one of the birds. The body of the dead bird was dragged into a small hole at the corner of the cage where the mammal predator had entered. The bird's brain and abdominal viscera had been removed by the mammal. After examining the bird, I threw it on the ground and proceeded to repair the cage to prevent further damage by the mammal predator.

As soon as I had stepped out of the cage and closed the door, the remaining Tufted Titmouse flew to the ground and proceeded to peck at the flesh of the dead bird through the opening in the body cavity which the mammal had made. This behavior continued for some ten minutes while I stood about twelve feet away and watched. I then closely reëxamined the dead bird and found that the live titmouse had eaten considerable flesh from the wall of the body cavity and had removed most of the muscles from one femur.

While the appearance of this dead bird was somewhat different from what it had been in life, most of the feathers of the body were still intact. The opening which the mammal predator had made into the body cavity of the dead titmouse lay exposed when the second titmouse commenced to eat the flesh of the first.—PAUL A. STEWART, *Department of Zoology and Entomology, Ohio State University, Columbus 10, Ohio.*

Bronzed Grackle (*Quiscalus quiscula versicolor*) nesting on Beaver Lodge.—Grackles of the genus *Quiscalus* are well known for versatility in their choice of nesting sites. Further evidence of this adaptability was revealed by the discovery of a grackle nest among the sticks of an occupied beaver lodge in Algonquin Provincial Park, Ontario. On June 6, 1951, this nest contained young about six days old. Its rim was about twenty inches above the water and slightly below the top of the more steeply-sloping part of the side of the dome-shaped lodge. It was on the south side and was visible from the highway along the shore about sixty feet away.

As many as three beavers were seen at one time swimming within a few yards of the grackle on her nest. Beavers and grackles seemed to ignore each other. There appeared to be little chance of the beavers disturbing the nest: only one stick looked fresh enough to have been added to the exterior of the lodge within recent weeks, and this was on the opposite side from the nest.

This same beaver pond, a flooded black spruce-leatherleaf bog, supported several other pairs of grackles whose nests were within a few inches of the water. Some were in dead vegetation, some in living. What one might have judged to be more typical sites several feet above the water were neglected in favor of those so low that in at least one instance the exterior bottom of a nest containing young was in water. In one case, however, a nest was seven feet up in a hollow stub standing in the water.

Observations with a 37-power telescope showed that the young in all nests on June 6 were being fed largely on dragon fly nymphs.—HAROLD H. AXTELL, *Buffalo Museum of Science, Buffalo, New York.*

The Prothonotary Warbler in Surinam.—According to Hellmayr (Cat. Birds Americas, pt. 8: 334, 1935), the winter range of the Prothonotary Warbler (*Protonotaria citrea*) lies in Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, northern Colombia,