Month	*Males*	*Females*	♂♂ *to* 100 ♀♀
SPRING ROOSTS (*Transients*)			
March	16	22	72.7
April	5	10	50.0
Totals	21	32	68.7
FALL ROOSTS (*Transients*)			
October	8	9	88.9

Table 3: Sex ratios from samples of transient Crow populations taken at spring and fall roosts in Ontario, Seneca, and Cayuga Counties, New York, fall, 1932, and spring, 1933.

Although the amount of material in this case is admittedly too small to permit the formulation of definite inferences, speculation on the significance of the ratios obtained is, perhaps, permissible. The question which arises is: if these new spring arrivals resemble in their sex ratio a more southern wintering population, can we conclude that they are representatives of such a southern population, migrating northward as a unit and remaining aloof from the populations encountered in transit? This would seem to be a logical interpretation, especially since a coincident sample of the birds remaining in the rapidly dwindling local winter roosts still shows in March the surplus of males of the wintering population (table 1, March). Of course it is possible that this preponderance of females in the spring roosts may be accounted for by a differential migration period, or by an early desertion of the common roosts by male birds in favor of their newly established nesting territories. Proper interpretation of such statistics awaits further observation and study.—J. T. EMLEN, JR., Division of Zoology, University of California, Davis, California.

The Bird-Banding Stations in 1934-1935.—The correction in the total number of birds banded during the year ending July 1, 1934, (*Bird Banding Notes*, 2:194) makes a rather important change in the figures presented in my article (*Bird-Banding* 6:26). Since the decrease in the total must be subtracted from those stations which banded less than one hundred birds during the year, that figure should have been 43,029, instead of 131,917, or 16 per cent of the total instead of 36 per cent. (The further corrections in the numbers for several individuals would reduce this to 29,376, or 10.7 per cent, but perhaps this should not be applied.) A similar tabulation for the year ending July 1, 1935, seems to show that the decrease in the total from the year before also has come from this remainder. My calculation shows just 104 fewer birds banded by 295 stations than by the 297 of the year before. This leaves only 17,945 to be accounted for by the smaller stations, or 7 per cent of the total. The standing of the various States has varied somewhat. Massachusetts, California and Pennsylvania show large gains, most of the other leading ones considerable losses. Alabama, Nebraska, Vermont, Washington, and Wyoming appear in the list; Colorado, Mississippi, Montana, and Rhode Island drop out. Among the States with the smaller numbers Indiana shows the most notable increase, with a little over twice as many stations and also total birds.—O. A. STEVENS, Fargo, North Dakota.

Notes on the Intelligence of the House Sparrow (*Passer d. domesticus*).—Supplementing the note by Mr. Venables in *Bird-Banding* of January, 1936, on the "Apparent Intelligence of the Sparrow and Starling at the Trap," I wish to record the following:

Of all the species of birds entering my traps this Sparrow most quickly learns to find its way out of our common funnel traps. I have watched some adults come to a bated trap for weeks. At first they carefully take all food from under the funnell entrance, frequently backing out and then gradually entering a little deeper until they slip in and out of the neck of the funnel. After a few days they are so well acquainted with the plan of the trap that they quickly run to the funnel exit opening from any part and will escape, even moving towards a person approaching. When young Sparrows follow adults to feed, or if a strange Sparrow comes with them, they are more easily confused and caught.