

easily be cut away with a hack saw. The rough cut can be smoothed up and brought to the proper shape, (c), with the use of a flat file and a small sharp v-edged or preferably a small half-round file.

Due to the bander's lack of more than two hands during the band-removing operation, the bird must first be immobilized. This can be done surprisingly easily by wrapping it in a small piece of cheese cloth. The banded leg should be allowed to protrude while the other can be held along the side of the bird by the cloth. A couple of small rubber bands may be used to hold the cloth around the bird. The operator's hands are then free to manipulate the pliers and spanner. The band, (g), is grasped with the pliers (f) and held firmly while the hook on the spanner (d) is engaged with the end of the overlapped part of the band. By using a rotating motion of the spanner the band is easily unrolled or opened up and removed. In removing the band in this manner there is no pressure applied to the bird's leg during the operation. It is completely safe insofar as accidents to the bird's leg are concerned.

After the band is removed the burrs raised by the pliers should be removed with a small file. The band can be reformed around an ice pick and then replaced on the leg and the bird released.

*Contribution No. 8 from the Shaub Ornithological Research Station.

159 Elm Street, Northampton, Massachusetts

GENERAL NOTES

Additional Evening Grosbeak Recoveries.—A report of the records made by Evening Grosbeaks (*Hesperiphona vespertina vespertina* Cooper) which had been banded at our Hartford, Connecticut, station was carried in *Bird-Banding*, 23: 144-154, October, 1952. That report included all records known to us through November 30, 1951. Barely had our manuscript reached the editor, however, when we began to receive further reports of recoveries. A further list of the recoveries of our birds, reported to us since November 30, 1951, and complete through August 31, 1952, appears on the opposite page.

Three interesting age records are included among these birds. Female 44-214690 had worn our band for more than six years; female 45-200148, for almost as long; and female 46-213042, for almost exactly five years. It is noteworthy, too, that these three birds were released alive.

Of greater importance, perhaps, are the data which bear witness to the wide dispersal of this unpredictable species. Within a span of less than seven months (October 19, 1951, to May 8, 1952) recoveries of our Evening Grosbeaks were accomplished at such widely separated points as Wisconsin, Maine, and the province of Quebec to the west and north; as far south as Virginia and Maryland, and in intermediate New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut. Should we overlook the Quebec record for the moment it will be seen that a time span of little more than 4½ months shows almost no diminution in the geographical dispersal.

This addendum may also supply data which will help to chart the trail of this species' historic southward invasion during the winter of 1951-1952.

The predominance of female over male records may be explained in part by the fact that a majority of the recoveries were made within the southerly range where flocks have generally shown a preponderance of females. A second possible reason may be the fact that females, if our repeat records may be accepted as any criterion, are less trap-shy than are males. The law of chance, however, is probably the greatest factor of all.

TABLE OF ADDITIONAL EVENING GROSBREAK RECOVERIES

Band No.	Sex	Banded at Hartford	Legend	Recovered	At	By
44-214690	F	Dec. 28, 1945	A	Jan. 26, 1952	Ramsey, N. J.	Mrs. E. E. Dater
45-200148	F	Apr. 20, 1946	A	Feb. 17, 1952	Arlington, Va.	A. H. Fast
46-213042	F	Mar. 5, 1947	A	Mar. 8, 1952	Fairfax, Va.	Mrs. M. B. Peacock
48-218567	F	Apr. 11, 1949	A	Apr. 30, 1952	Carlisle, Pa.	F. C. Grimm
48-247878*	F	Feb. 7, 1950	A	May 5, 1952	Amsterdam, N. Y.	Mrs. M. A. Fitzgerald
48-247972	M	Feb. 13, 1950	A	May 8, 1952	Amsterdam, N. Y.	Mrs. M. A. Fitzgerald
48-263242	F	Feb. 22, 1950	A	Feb. 19, 1952	Lewiston, Me.	G. E. Ramsdell
48-273015	M	Feb. 26, 1950	B	Mar. 3, 1952	W. Simsbury, Conn.	D. Grant
48-273076	F	Feb. 26, 1950	A	Feb. 8, 1952	Pemberton, N. J.	W. A. Jarvis
48-273252	F	Mar. 15, 1950	C	Apr. 10, 1952	Franklin, Va.	H. L. Westbrook
48-273282	F	Mar. 17, 1950	D	Oct. 19, 1951	St. Agathe des Monts, Quebec	F. St. Louis
50-100417	F	Mar. 8, 1950	A	Feb. 15, 1952	Lewiston, Me.	G. E. Ramsdell
50-100494	F	Mar. 13, 1950	B	Apr. 16, 1952	Salisbury, Md.	A. W. Morris
50-101401	F	Mar. 18, 1950	A	Jan. 19, 1952	Kempton, Pa.	M. Broun
50-101478	F	Mar. 24, 1950	B	Mar. 29, 1952	St. Croix Falls, Wisc.	C. Riegel
50-101563	F	Apr. 15, 1950	A	Mar. 20, 1952	Arlington, Va.	A. H. Fast
50-101588	F	Apr. 17, 1950	E	Apr. 11, 1952	Etna, N. Y.	Mrs. S. Hoyt

(*48-247878 was previously trapped and released at Ansonia, Conn., on Apr. 24, 1950, by S. H. Booth.)

LEGEND

- A. Trapped and released.
- B. Found dead.
- C. Shot by boy with air rifle.
- D. Caught by a cat.
- E. Flew against window, survived; released.

Some significant additional records have already been received from Evening Grosbeaks banded during the 1951-1952 flight, but since we have been referring in this note to birds banded prior to that flight it would seem inconsistent to report any of these new records at this time.—G. Hapgood Parks, 99 Warrenton Ave., Hartford, Connecticut.

A Pair of Mourning Doves Occupies Same Nest Two Successive Years.—

A survey of the literature indicates a lack of information pertaining to the mating habit of the Mourning Dove, *Zenaidura macroura* Linnacus. The majority of the available evidence points toward some degree of monogamy in the mating behavior of this species. A notable exception is the following statement by Margaret Morse Nice (*Auk*, 39: 457-474, 1922): "I think we are on safe ground in assuming that when four eggs are found in one nest they are the product of two females. Whether such cases always or usually mean polygamy we have no means of knowing at present. . . . We have observed considerable lapses of fidelity of male doves to their mates."

The following observations suggest a monogamous mating habit in the Mourning Dove. On June 23, 1951, the female of a pair of Mourning Doves was caught in a nest trap on the Ohio State University Campus. This bird was banded with number 48-369048, and released. Two days later the male was caught in the same trap and given band number 48-369049. The nest and nesting platform were left in the tree, and during the second week of March, 1952, a pair of doves was using the same nest. On April 4, 1952, both adults were trapped, identified, and released. They were found to be the same birds which used this nest during 1951.

It would be interesting to know whether these birds were continuously together through the intervening winter, or whether they re-mated during the second breeding season as a result of both birds returning to the nesting territory of the previous year. A. Starker Leopold (*Wilson Bulletin*, 55: 151-154, 1943) reports some segregation of the sexes following the breeding season. He states, ". . . in addition to increasing gregariousness among the doves as fall progresses, there seems to be a partial segregation of adult males into small, closely united flocks." O. L. Austin, Jr. (*Bird-Banding*, 22: 149-174, 1951) says, "Site tenacity to the breeding grounds may . . . be considered a major behavior trait in the Mourning Dove."

The incident reported here may or may not represent normal behavior for the Mourning Dove. It may be that both birds returned to their former nesting territory, and re-mating and re-use of the previous year's nesting site occurred somewhat by chance.—Paul A. Stewart and James P. Mackey, Jr., Department of Zoology and Entomology, Ohio State University, Columbus 10, Ohio.

Eye-color in the Red-eyed Towhee.—The eyes of four adult male Red-eyed Towhees from Mastic, and one from Garden City, Long Island, N. Y., June 2 to July 18, were all deep or dark red, two of the five brownish red, and two bright red. One of the bright red ones had a brownish red eye when taken August 25 two years later, but it seems unlikely that this was due to advancing season, for the two with brownish red were on June 2 and July 6, the two with bright red on July 15 and 18. A male with a brown eye September 23 was most likely a bird of the year.

The eye of the adult female can be like that of the male (deep, dark red in one on July 27), but seems to be more variable. It was dark red-brown in one June 13, bright brick red in another July 14.

Fully grown, independent young Towhees, still in streaky plumage, sometimes have conspicuously black and white tails, presumably males, others dark brown tails with less conspicuous white, presumably females. At Mastic July 5 to 20, 1952, eye-color of five such males and one female was recorded. A male July 5 had a reddish brown eye; three July 13 to 14 (one of which repeated July 20), eye with a broad yellowish brown margin. There were a male and female July 19, the former with a dark, slightly tawny brown eye, the female with the same, somewhat paler.

It is likely that three broods were involved, and that the eye-color of the young varies by brood. Some years ago I examined a good many young House Sparrows,