

Using the pattern shown in Fig. 1A, string the nylon twine among posts to remove the sag from the netting; the step ladder will be needed for this. Tie off each section of string tautly (using the "inside" staples) to obtain the maximum enclosure space. The outside guy strings can be used to readjust the tension.

The final step is to stake the 4 sides of the netting to the ground. It is essential that this is done carefully to exclude birds. Our failure to properly secure the sides on one of our 18 enclosures resulted in bird entrance into the enclosure. The excess netting at each corner can be used for investigator access. The finished enclosure should resemble Fig. 1B. Total construction time (starting with pre-cut materials) for 2 people is about 2 h. An enclosure can be dismantled in less than 30 min.

Enclosures constructed when the corn was less than 1.5 m tall withstood high winds and hard rains without damage. In addition, corn yield was not significantly affected by the netting ($P = .27$, paired t -test, $n = 18$ enclosures, dry weight of 10 ears in both enclosures and controls). Insect abundances inside and outside the enclosures were also generally equivalent. Visual counts of insects per 10 plants revealed no differences ($P > .10$, $n = 110$) between enclosure and control areas among the 7 most common insect groups. Yellow pan traps (Southwood 1978), however, showed that the netting may act as a barrier to the movement of flying insects such as northern corn rootworm beetles (*Diabrotica longicornis* Say) and long-legged flies (*Dolichopus* spp.) (difference between control and enclosure areas, $P = .005$ and $.008$ respectively, paired t -test, $n = 32$).

Properly constructed enclosures effectively excluded all birds for the 2 months that they were used, even though several of the fields where the enclosures were located had high blackbird visitation. Nearly all materials recovered at the end of the study could be reused.

We thank M. Crovella and J. P. Hayes, Jr. for field assistance and R. A. Dolbeer and J. P. Hayes, Jr. for reviewing the manuscript.

LITERATURE CITED

- CAMPBELL, R. W., T. R. TORGERSON, S. C. FORREST, AND L. C. YOUNGS. 1981. Bird enclosures for branches and whole trees. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-125. USDA, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Exp. Station, Portland, Oregon.
- DOLBEER, R. A., AND P. P. WORONECKI. 1979. The effect of blackbird feeding and insecticides on earworm populations in sweet corn fields. U.S. Fish Wildl. Serv., Denver Wildl. Res. Center, Bird Damage Res. Rep. No. 12.
- HOLMES, R. T., J. C. SCHULTZ, AND P. NORTHAGLE. 1979. Bird predation on forest insects: an enclosure experiment. *Science* 206:462-463.
- MITTERLING, L. A. 1966. Construction of a "beta-confinement" bird enclosure. *Bird-Banding* 37:123-125.
- SLOAN, N. F., AND H. C. COPPEL. 1968. Ecological implications of bird predation on the larch casebearer in Wisconsin. *J. Econ. Entomol.* 61:1067-1070.
- SOUTHWOOD, T. R. E. 1978. *Ecological methods*. 2nd edition. Chapman and Hall, London.
- ERIC K. BOLLINGER AND JAMES W. CASLICK, *Department of Natural Resources, New York State College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853*. Received 5 Nov. 1982; accepted 4 Oct. 1983.

Direct Canada-Mexico Recovery of a Banded Least Flycatcher.—Studies of migrants in Ontario and of specimens from throughout the range show that adult (AHY = after hatching year) Least Flycatchers (*Empidonax minimus*) migrate south an average of about 38 days in advance of the immatures (HY = hatching year). Median "autumn" migration dates for AHY Least Flycatchers are 22 July (with the middle 90% of the records spanning the period 11 July-13 August) at Long Point, Ontario, and 3 August for specimens collected in the southern United States. Arrivals of AHY Least Flycatchers in Mexico and Central America start in early and mid-August, respectively. The corresponding dates for HY Least Flycatchers are 29 August (90% from 17 August to 13 September) at Long

Point, 9 September in the southern U.S., and mid-September for arrivals in Mexico and Central America (Hussell, J. Field Ornithol. 51:65–71, 1980; 52:97–111, 1981; 53:223–234, 1982). These data indicate a minimum migration time between Ontario and Mexico of about 25 days for both age classes.

A recent recovery in Mexico of a Least Flycatcher banded in Ontario is consistent with this view of the autumn migration of the species. The bird was banded by N. Garber at Long Point Bird Observatory (LPBO), Ontario, 42°30'N, 80°00'W (SE corner of 10' block containing the site), on 17 August 1982. It was aged HY on the basis of its incompletely pneumatized skull and broad buff wing bars; its wing chord was 62 mm, and it weighed 11.9 g. Sex was unknown because the wing chord length was in the overlap range. On this date it would be among the earliest 5% of HY migrants at Long Point (Hussell 1981). The bird was found 32 days later, on 18 September 1982, at Las Rosas, Chiapas, Mexico (approximately 16°20'N, 92°20'W). The recovery date is within the week following the first appearance of HYs in Mexico: the earliest HY specimen in Mexico was taken on 11 September (Hussell 1980).

The recovery locality is 3135 km S 24.9°W of Long Point, which indicates a minimum average daily flight of 98 km. Distance travelled and migration speed increase to at least 3700 km and 116 km/day, however, if a westward route around the Gulf of Mexico was followed, as appears to be indicated by specimen records. Because banding and recovery dates may not represent departure and arrival dates, migration speed may have been even faster than this.

Only two other Least Flycatchers have been recovered south of 35°N and only one of those was either banded or recovered during autumn migration. The latter was an HY bird banded by D. Bordner on 7 September 1966 at Island Beach, New Jersey, 39°50'N, 74°00'W, and shot at Filomeno Mata, Veracruz, Mexico, on an unknown date in December 1966 (Foy, Bird-Banding 47:214–230, 1976).

Thanks to R. B. H. Smith, LPBO, for providing data on the recovery reported here, to K. Klimkiewicz, Bird Banding Laboratory, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for confirmation of the recovery record, and to C. Hyslop, Migratory Birds Branch, Canadian Wildlife Service for information on other Least Flycatcher recoveries. This note is a contribution of the Long Point Bird Observatory and is Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Wildlife Research Section Contribution No. 83-10.—DAVID J. T. HUSSELL, Wildlife Research Section, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, P.O. Box 50, Maple, Ontario L0J 1E0, Canada. Received 30 Sept. 1983; accepted 27 Oct. 1983.

Crow Predation on Spotted Sandpipers.—American Crows (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*) use a wide array of food resources including the eggs and young of several species of birds (Baker, Wilson Bull. 52:124–125, 1940; Gross, U.S. Natl. Mus. Bull. 191:226–259, 1946). However, the spatial and temporal availability of young birds is likely to vary within habitats and accidental encounters or trial and error learning may result in temporary but profitable patches of food.

On 1 July 1982, I observed 4 recently hatched Spotted Sandpipers (*Actitis macularia*) and their parent foraging on sand dunes at Sandy Bay, Beaver Island, Charlevoix Co., Michigan. As the sandpipers moved among sparse vegetation, an American Crow descended from trees flanking the dunes and carried off a chick in its bill. Immediately, the adult sandpiper responded with sharp alarm calls, and the remaining chicks dispersed among the vegetation where they were effectively camouflaged. After 20 min the adult sandpiper called to the chicks, but as they left their concealment, the crow preyed on another chick.

By the following day, all chicks had disappeared and only the adult sandpiper remained in the area. A crow, however, was present farther down the beach where there was another brood of sandpipers. A crow was seen daily in the area and by 4 July no chicks remained from the second brood, although predation was not observed.

The relative high intelligence of crows probably plays an important role in their foraging behavior (Zach, Behaviour 68:106–117, 1979). In addition, previous experience