

We also tried laying a trail of bait (bread and odd scraps) right into the trap, and this attracted inside many birds of various kinds. A concerted and noisy rush would then be made, and though this would be successful with most of the species—both migrant and resident—it was seldom that the Sparrows or Starlings lost their heads. Without hesitating, they would fly straight *towards* the noise and danger and, dodging our uplifted hands, would make good their escape as soon as they were out from beneath the roof of netting. Their behavior made a most marked contrast with that of the other birds in the trap, who always flew *away* from the danger or else attempted to escape through the netting at the side.

The other resident species never solved this trick. Nor, of course, did the passage-migrant species.

One or two Sparrows and Starlings would be caught most days, but these were usually the same individuals. This had nothing to do with immaturity, but it was merely that their sense of cunning (for lack of a better word) was not so keenly developed as it was in the rest of their kind and, occasionally, they would panic and fly away from the danger instead of towards it.

If killing, instead of banding, had been the object of the captures and attempted captures, this would have been a good example of the working of natural selection.

It would be interesting to hear whether results from other stations with similar traps bear out the idea that the Sparrow and Starling might have a cleverness above the average for small Passerines. Though the great success of these two species, both in their own country and in North America, is no doubt largely due to such factors as their omnivorous habits, wide choice of nesting-sites, many young per season, and perhaps general hardiness and scarcity of enemies, it would seem, from my Isle of May observations, that intelligence might also play a part.—L. S. V. VENABLES, Tilford, Surrey, England.

**Additional Records of *Protocalliphora*.**—Through the coöperation of a number of Ohio ornithologists the Ohio State Museum has been able to secure a good series of specimens of *Protocalliphora*, dipterous parasites of nestling birds, and at the same time has added a number of interesting host records:

Prairie Warbler (*Dendroica d. discolor*), "Neotoma," Hocking County, Ohio, June 9, 1934, Louis W. Campbell and Charles F. Walker. Four nestlings left the nest when it was discovered. Thirteen fully grown maggots were found in the nest-material, from the puparia of which the flies emerged on June 22.

Worm-eating Warbler, (*Helmitheros vermivorus*) Washington Township, Lawrence County, Ohio. A nest containing four well-grown young was found on July 1, 1934, by Charles F. Long and the writer. On July 8th, after the young had left, the nest was collected by Mr. Long and six specimens of *Protocalliphora* were reared from it.

Carolina Wren (*Thryothorus l. ludovicianus*), Washington Township, Jackson County, Ohio. Twenty puparia were found in the nest July 28, 1935. Most of the flies had hatched at the time the nest was collected by Mr. C. F. Long, but three flies were reared from the remaining puparia; one puparium failed to hatch and four were parasitized by a minute chalcid parasite, presumably *Mormoniella*. Five wren nestlings apparently survived the attacks of the twenty maggots.

Yellow-breasted Chat (*Icteria v. virens*), Franklin County, Ohio, September 8, 1935, Floyd B. Chapman. Thirty flies emerged September 18th. The record is noteworthy in several respects: a late date for nesting Chats, a late date for the parasites, and the number of parasites. This and the three preceding records, seem to be new host records for *Protocalliphora*.

Mississippi Song Sparrow (*Melospiza melodia beata*), Columbus, Ohio, June 6, 1935, Mrs. Margaret Morse Nice. Four nestlings. On June 10th there were seven puparia and two larvæ in the paper sack in which the nest was placed. The last two larvæ pupated on June 10th and 11th, and the flies emerged over a period of four days, June 20th–23d.

Our observations indicate that the attacks of this parasite by no means always result in appreciable injury to the hosts. One of the nestling Prairie Warblers was captured and carefully examined. It appeared to be perfectly healthy and in good

flesh, with no visible marks of injury, an astonishing state of affairs in view of the fact that the bird and its three nest-mates had had to withstand the attack of thirteen large blood-sucking maggots. The young Worm-eating Warblers also appeared healthy and vigorous, but we did not examine them in the hand for fear of frightening them from the nest prematurely.

Mrs. Nice has full notes on the history of the young Song Sparrows, including daily weights. She reports that while slow in growth at first, the nestlings later caught up in weight, so that there was little difference between them and other unparasitized (presumably) nestlings.

I am greatly inclined to the opinion that the *Protocalliphora* larvæ normally leave the nest at maturity, dropping to the ground to pupate, unless prevented from doing so, as in the case of cavity-nesting birds or birds which use mud in the construction of the nest, like the Robin and the Barn Swallow. In the case of the Song Sparrow nest, none of the puparia or larvæ were in the nest-material, but were lying outside of it in the paper sack.

It will be noted that the parasites in the nest of the Prairie Warbler were taken before the young birds would normally have left the nest; the nest of the Worm-eating warbler was already on the ground; while the nest of the Carolina Wren was in a metal receptacle which prevented the escape of the larvæ. On the other hand, I have examined dozens of abandoned "open" nests, all with negative results. This theory, if correct, would explain the high percentage of parasitism, as shown by the records, of hole-nesting birds, and the relatively few records of *Protocalliphora* for birds nesting in the open. As a matter of fact, I strongly suspect that the latter are actually parasitized as heavily as the former.—EDWARD S. THOMAS, Ohio State Museum, Columbus, Ohio.

---

**Two White-throated Sparrow Returns.**—Great was the surprise of my fire-maker one morning in November last when on opening the kitchen stove to kindle it she saw a bird fly out. The bird fluttered to a window and was easily caught, when it proved to be White-throated Sparrow 34-143765 banded in January, 1935. The bird was put into a cage and left on the porch for my inspection. When I appeared I found that a cat had knocked over the cage and was trying to get the bird, but I arrived in time and released the bird unhurt, although very sooty and, I hope, fully resolved to explore no more stove pipes.

Number A101873 made a return less dramatic but very instructive as to the danger of making assumptions about birds that fail to return to the traps. This one was found dead on November 8, 1935, near a screened porch, having probably flown against the screen. The records showed it had been banded April 21, 1929, had returned October 26, 1929, October 27, 1930, and never since. This is my longest record on this species, but the bird had not entered my traps for five years, although quite probably wintering regularly on the place. The bird was at least seven years old.—MARION A. BOGGS, Wavnesville, North Carolina.

---

**Known History of Eastern Phœbe B127877.**—Since female Phœbes (*Sayornis phœbe*) are rather consistent birds in returning in successive years to their former year's nest-site, as I and others have proved by banding, among my records there stands out preeminently that of female No. B127877, banded on June 11, 1931. She was trapped in a Chardonneret trap by using the young as an enticement. In the following years she would not enter this trap or any trap and had to be taken at night while on the nest by a the use of strong light.

In 1931 she reared one brood of four at the iron-railed red bridge just below our garden, where Phœbes have nested for years on the central steel cross-stripping that supports the structure in the middle. The young were also banded, and they left the nest June 11th, after which date neither young nor adults were positively identified in the vicinity that year. But after they had gone, another unbanded pair relined their nest and reared a brood, which flew on July 29th. On June 3, 1932, B127877 was taken as a return-1 at this bridge when her second brood of five young were half feathered, and on July 14th her second brood of four were