

TABLE 2
 FREQUENCY OF TERRITORIAL FIRST-YEAR MALES IN MIXED "DECIDUOUS" AND
 ALDER HABITATS

Habitat and location	Total no. of males	No. of first-year males
Mixed "deciduous" (Michigan) ¹	51	0
Mixed "deciduous" (Maine) ²	14	3
Alder (Michigan) ¹	28	7
Alder (Maine) ²	14	1

¹ Present study.

² Ficken and Ficken (1967, Wilson Bull. 79: 188).

measurements do not necessarily reflect features of the environment most important to redstarts, they do offer an easily-applied means of identifying habitats to the biologist. Such an analysis allows an objective comparison of habitats; this was not attempted in earlier studies (reviewed by Ficken and Ficken *ibid.*).

Table 2 compares the frequency of first-year male redstarts in the two Michigan study areas with two roughly comparable habitats studied by the Fickens in Maine. The mixed "deciduous" woods in Maine consisted of "some trees taller than 30 feet, an understory of saplings to twenty feet and sometimes up to 10% conifers." By comparison, the Grapevine Point area was a more mature forest. The difference in the maturity of the vegetative community may explain why first-year males were more common in mixed "deciduous" habitats in Maine than in Michigan. Most interesting was the relative abundance of immature males in alder habitats in Michigan. In Maine an analysis of five habitats used by redstarts showed that immature males were least common in alder swamps (Ficken and Ficken *ibid.*).

Taken together, the present report and the Fickens' study document in part the diversity of habitats used by first-year and adult male redstarts in different regions. If, as the Fickens have reported, adult males exclude first-year males from "optimal" habitats, comparative study of the species' ecology in different geographical regions should yield a clearer definition of the "optimal" habitat than now exists.

I wish to thank O. S. Pettingill and H. B. Tordoff for advice during the course of the study. I am indebted to R. B. Payne and R. W. Storer for helpful criticisms of the manuscript.—HENRY F. HOWE, *Museum of Zoology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104*. Accepted 31 Jan. 73.

Further observations of nectar feeding by orioles.—A recent note (Fisk 1973, Auk 90: 208) reported on nectar feeding in the Hooded Oriole (*Icterus cucullatus*) and suggested that nectar might be important in the diet of many orioles. I have neotropical observations on six species to support this supposition.

On 4 June 1971, I saw both Hooded Orioles and Scott's Orioles (*Icterus parisorum*) taking red sugar-water at feeders of the Santa Rita Lodge, Madera Canyon, Arizona (south of Tucson). According to canyon residents, both orioles visit the feeders frequently through the summer.

On its winter range in Panama the Orchard Oriole (*Icterus spurius*) is a regular visitor to the 40-mm orange flowers of *Erythrina glauca* (a common tree); I counted up to eight Orchard Orioles feeding in one tree in January 1969. The Baltimore Oriole (*Icterus galbula*) was an infrequent nectar feeder at the large

150-mm white flowers of the balsa tree (*Ochroma limonensis*) from December 1968 through March 1969. Two resident icterids that also fed regularly at the balsa flowers were the Yellow-backed Oriole (*Icterus chrysater*) and the much larger Chestnut-headed Oropendola (*Zarhynchus wagleri*).

Skutch (1954, Pacific Coast Avifauna No. 31) gives good descriptions of nectar drinking in other tropical icterids (e.g. *Gymnostinops montezuma*), and I know that other field workers have made similar observations. Thus nectar feeding, at feeders or in the wild, is indeed an established habit of the family, although its seasonal variations and overall importance are still unknown.—CHARLES LECK, Department of Zoology, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903. Accepted 20 Feb. 73.

The status of the Gray Hawk in New Mexico.—On 23 April 1876, near Fort Bayard, Grant County, New Mexico, Frank Stephens collected two sets of eggs that he identified as those of the Gray Hawk (*Buteo nitidus*). Through the years this identification has been accepted without question, but my recent study of the matter suggests strongly that the eggs are actually those of the Cooper's Hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*). Factors arguing against the eggs being those of *B. nitidus* are their coloration and size, the time of year collected, the nesting habitat, and the lack of other verified records of the species in the state.

The first mention of these eggs seems to be that of Bendire (1892), who examined them and pointed out that they were in the collection of the American Museum of Natural History, where they arrived in the collection of Harry Balch Bailey, who in turn may have obtained them from Stephens or from Charles Aiken, for whom Stephens had collected in New Mexico (Stephens 1918). At the American Museum, the eggs were catalogued as 445 (Ridgway number for the Gray Hawk), sets 1/2 and 2/2, along with their measurements in inches and the annotation: "nest of oak twigs lined with willow bark and leaves in the fork of an oak tree 40 feet from the ground, female flew from nest." In the 1930s the eggs were recatalogued by Dean Amadon (pers. comm.), who noted that one egg in set 1/2 (AMNH 634) was missing and that set 2/2 (AMNH 14,989) was "In group." The latter apparently meant the set was on exhibit, and now (January 1972) both those eggs and the one from set 1/2 are missing and presumed lost. In spite of this loss, we still have the catalog measurements of the eggs and the description in Bendire (1892), plus the one remaining egg. There is no way of knowing which egg of set 1/2 remains, but comparison can be made on breadths, which in the catalog are the same for both eggs, i.e. 1.48 inches (= 37.8 mm). This value is identical to that I obtained, and on this basis I conclude that the catalog measurements provide valid mensural data for the missing egg sets.

In checking the identity of Stephens' sets I considered the eggs of all possible southwestern accipitriform species. My preliminary survey ruled out all species but *Buteo nitidus* and *Accipiter cooperii*. The eggs of these two are generally similar and overlap to some degree both in color and size. The eggs in both are white in color, but typically those of *B. nitidus* are immaculate while up to half those of *A. cooperii* have scattered pale brown to buff spotting (Bent, 1937). Bendire (1892) indicated that two of the Stephens eggs were faintly spotted with buff, and I can confirm this in the one remaining and somewhat stained egg. Bendire actually contrasted this condition with Arizona *B. nitidus* eggs seen by him, in-