

A Beginning in a Territorial Study of the Eastern Robin.—The editor has asked me to send him such details as I possess of the nesting behavior of my Robins (*Turdus m. migratorius*), having to do with the territorial distribution of the nests about my banding station in Sanbornton, New Hampshire, together with such data as I have of the same kind about the house of a near neighbor, Mr. John Morse.

My station is on the main street of a small village. The street is lined with many maples and elms, and in the rear of my home there are a few old apple trees. It has been my practice for several years to attract as many Robins as possible to my premises by providing them with Robin-shelters in which they can build their nests. These shelters have a two-pitched roof covering a shallow boxlike base, the front being open, and they are placed in maple, elm, cherry, and apple trees.

During June, 1935, eleven pairs of Robins nested about my station, and five pairs nested about Mr. Morse's home, three hundred and forty feet distant. Of my eleven nests, five were built in shelters, and six occupied natural sites, apple trees being preferred. Of the five nests about my neighbor's house, two were in Robin-shelters and three occupied natural sites.

On June 11th, when all the eleven nests were occupied by nesting pairs, measurements were made of the horizontal distances between them by pacing, so that such measurements fairly represent the territorial spacing of the nests. The distances between the nests on the Morse place were determined in the same manner. In the case of my station, the distances between nests ranged from eighteen feet to two hundred and twenty-five feet, the average distance being one hundred and seventeen feet.

The area occupied by my eleven nests is about four and a half acres, indicating an average territorial requirement of approximately two fifths of an acre.

While the conditions existing in the two tracts above mentioned are manifestly partly artificial, this fact probably does not influence the territorial requirement of this species.

The abundance of Robins in Sanbornton is probably largely due to the occurrence of many lawns, which are greatly favored as a source of angle-worms.—E. C. WEEKS, Sanbornton, New Hampshire.

Bluebirds and English Sparrows in a Cliff Swallow Colony.—In his colony of Tree Swallows (*Iridoprocne bicolor*) in nesting-boxes at Princeton, Massachusetts, L. B. Chapman (*Bird-Banding*, Vol. VI, No. 2) reported that Bluebirds (*Sialia s. sialis*) were often ousted by the Tree Swallows. He pointed out that the Bluebirds were left unmolested only when they chose a nest-box on the edge of the colony. The conditions seem to be reversed in the case of Cliff Swallows (*Petrochelidon a. albifrons*) and Bluebirds. On July 27, 1935, a large colony of Cliff Swallows nesting on the barn and other out-buildings of a farm near Westport, New York, was found to contain a family of Bluebirds and also a family of English Sparrows (*Passer d. domesticus*). The Bluebirds had evidently ousted the Cliff Swallows as soon as the mud nest was completed, and were bringing up their three young unmolested, with Cliff Swallows nesting but a few inches away on either side. The nest was about fifteen feet from the ground.—CARLTON M. HERMAN, Syracuse, New York.

Known History of Eastern Song Sparrows F121239 and 34-148621.—On April 13, 1934, a Song Sparrow (*Melospiza m. melodia*) was trapped and banded, F121239, a male bird. It is suspected his mate of that season might have been present, but that soon after something happened to her, and he later disappeared for he repeated but twice after banding, on April 21st and May 18th. Nothing more was seen of him until he came about the traps and acted as though he had been acquainted with them; and he was trapped and considered a return migrating south, on August 29th, after which he was not knowingly seen again that year.

The first day of April, 1935, while I was banding Song Sparrows, a few return birds were noticed but were not at the time caught. One, however, was in company with an unbanded bird which was trapped and banded, 34-148621, a female as was later proven. And then, on April 4th, when I had been seeing these two birds much together, I trapped them both as they fed in a large flat trap. They proved to be the return male F121239, and this newly banded female, and were unquestionably mates. No further attempt was made to take them as repeats, since they were well known as sight-repeats.

They nested for their first brood just across the brook back of the house, in the tall sedge-grass growing there. At the time the young were ready for banding I had been obliged to give up any outdoor activities, so that these young sparrows were not banded, and this was also true of the second brood, which was again reared in the same vicinity back of the house. But for their third brood they came to the yard to nest.

Nest-building was completed in a branchy old-growth rose bush about midway between the piazza and elm feeding units, a little to one side and thirty-five feet from the main highway. The female was incubating her clutch of four eggs when I had to leave home. When I returned on July 29th, the young were fully feathered. The female allowed me to stroke her crown and back gently and then carefully push her off the nest. A Chardonneret four-compartment trap was placed beneath the rose bush, and the young, still in the nest, were placed in one compartment, while the other three compartments were set. The calls of the young and their efforts to escape drew the parents about my feet in anxiety, the female (34-148621) readily entering the trap. It was not necessary to trap the male since he was so well known anyway.

While I was preparing to band the young and during this banding, the behavior of the adults was most unusual and interesting. They approached me, and hopped about, but not excitedly, with their wings expanded (or spread) and lifted over their backs, and paying no attention to five other persons who were standing near. While the banding was still going on, they picked up a worm or other food when they saw any, the male going to the piazza for some doughnut, coming back only when the young called anew at being handled, when he again hopped about close to me and the trap, his wings raised as before. The young were tagged with bands 34-148658-9-60-1, and were replaced in the nest and covered with my hand until they were somewhat quieted. They stayed there for a time, but later in the afternoon they followed the adults to a cover of dogwood bushes and alders.

For a fortnight the young were not seen, except that one came into an artichoke clump in the garden one day soon after, when its parents came to the piazza for crumbs. They continued to feed at the piazza until the last week of August. No. 34-148659 repeated three times on September 2d. The female, 34-148621, also repeated there on the same date.—LEWIS O. SHELLEY, East Westmoreland, New Hampshire.

Common Black Duck, Red-legged Black Duck, and Mallard Sex-Ratios.—At my banding stations at Munuscong and Blaney, Michigan, during the period from 1927 to 1934, I have banded 795 Common Black Ducks (*Anas rubripes tristis*) showing a sex-ratio of males to females of 459 to 338.

The ratio among 40 Red-legged Black Ducks (*anas r. rubripes*) banded at Blaney was 29 males to 11 females, and the sex-ratio of 208 Mallard Ducks (*anas p. platyrhynchos*) was 102 males to 106 females.—K. CHRISTOFFERSON, D. D. S., Blaney, Michigan.