

Hole-nesting grackles account for only 21 (0.8%) of 2601 nests recorded in the Nest Record Card Program. Of the 2601 nests, 62.5% were located in coniferous trees, 23.4% in deciduous trees, 7.8% in shrubs and 6.3% in other nest sites which included the hole-nesters. The mean height of 1621 nests in coniferous trees was 2.3 m, of 610 nests in deciduous trees 3.3 m, and of 211 nests in shrubs 1.8 m. The types of substrates recorded on the Nest Record Cards are summarized in Table 1.

These data show that coniferous trees, and especially the red cedar, are the most commonly used support trees. The red cedar supported at least 23.7% of all nests recorded; 8 other species of conifers, 11 deciduous species, 5 species of shrub, and 16 unusual nest support sites accounted for 35.9% of all Common Grackle nests reported on the 2601 cards analysed. The discovery of records of nests in 4 cavities in conifers, 1 cavity in a deciduous tree, and 16 nest boxes confirms our opinion that the Common Grackle is a plastic species capable of increasing its numbers by changing its nesting behavior in order to use marginal habitats and nest sites.

We wish to thank David Peakall, former Director of Cornell University's Nest Record Card Program, for his assistance to us during our visits to the lab. Thanks also to Carol Wernick for help with manuscript preparation.—GEORGE R. MAXWELL II, JEAN M. NOCILLY, AND ROBERT I. SHEARER, *Rice Creek Biological Field Station, State Univ. College, Oswego, NY 13126. Accepted 1 July 1975.*

Unusual intensity of fighting in Ring-necked Ducks.—At 10:07 CST on 22 May 1969, we observed vigorous aggressive interactions between 2 male Ring-necked Ducks (*Aythya collaris*) on the open water of a 1.1 ha pothole south of Minnedosa, Manitoba. An interaction was already in progress when the birds were first perceived. The males were clutching each other's breast feathers just below the neck with their bills and hitting each other with their wings which were partly or wholly submerged. One male achieved an advantage and kept the other wholly under water. At this point, a coot (*Fulica americana*) interrupted and chased the 2 males. The male which had had the advantage in turn chased the coot for 2 to 5 sec. Meanwhile, 2 female Ring-necks within 10 m of the males did not interact with each other or with the males.

Following the brief interlude with the coot, the fight between the males resumed, initiated by the male which had earlier dominated, and lasted 3 min more. The males then separated and joined the females. The 4 birds remained close together and each male associated with one female, suggesting that they were paired. Then one male left his female and swam head to head at the other male. They pushed against, and grabbed at each other's breasts before resuming the wing-beating. As the males fought the females moved away and never displayed aggression. This interaction lasted 60 sec and ended when a pair of Pied-billed Grebes (*Podilymbus podiceps*) chased the males apart. The males rejoined the females and one grebe chased all 4 ducks from the pond. The pairs separated and flew from sight.

The wing-beating was unusual in that the wings were frequently submerged as the birds struck at each other. We are not aware of a description of wing-beating by Ring-necks, but in Mallards (*Anas platyrhynchos*) this fighting posture generally occurs above the water surface (Weidmann Z. Tierpsychol. 13:208-271, 1956.).

Ring-necks were occasionally observed in the region during the preceding 2 weeks but no nests were found on an adjacent 280 ha study area and only 3 observations of

single pairs were made on this area throughout the breeding season. In the 1969 breeding season Ring-necks were not subsequently observed on the pothole where the fight occurred and the species appeared to be transient in the Minnedosa area.

Mendall (1958, *The Ring-necked Duck in the Northeast*. Univ. of Maine Studies, 2nd Ser., no. 73) observed fights among male Ring-necks on rare occasions during nuptial courtship. He noted that the male defends the female only when she is in immediate danger of being molested and also that spacing of breeding pairs appeared to occur without defense. Although the fighting had been in progress when we first observed it, aggressive behavior directed toward a female was not detected. It appears unlikely that these were courting birds or that either of the pairs was defending a nesting site. It still seems most probable that the fight arose in defense of the mate (Koskimies and Routamo, *Zur Fortpflanzungsbiologie der Samtente *Melanitta f. fusca* (L.)*. I. Allgemeine Nistökologie. Papers on Game Research 10, 1953).

These interactions appeared to constitute an unusually overt expression of aggression by a species which Mendall (1958) records as seldom displaying aggression. The lack of involvement by the females is interesting considering that males are believed less aggressive and females more aggressive in the genus *Aythya* than in the genus *Anas* (Delacour, *The Waterfowl of the World*, Vol. 4, Country Life Ltd., London, 1964).

We are grateful to John P. Ryder, Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, Ontario for his suggestions. Financial support for our studies in the Minnedosa area were provided by the Delta Waterfowl Research Station, Manitoba.—RODGER D. TITMAN AND NORMAN R. SEYMOUR, *Dept. of Renewable Resources, Macdonald College of McGill Univ., Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Québec H0A 1C0. Accepted 21 July 1975.*

Cedar Waxwings and Eastern Bluebirds feeding on winter stoneflies.—Aquatic insects such as stoneflies (Plecoptera) are seldom considered a principal food of passerines. Bent (U.S. Natl. Mus. Bull. 197, 1950) reported that stoneflies are a noteworthy item in the diet of the Cedar Waxwing (*Bombycilla cedrorum*), and Chapin (U.S. Dep. Agric. Bull. 1355, 1925) found an unidentified stonefly in the stomach of a Solitary Vireo (*Vireo solitarius*). Hamilton (Auk 49:352, 1932) observed a pair of Blue Jays (*Cyanocitta cristata*) feeding on stoneflies in late winter, but I could find no other records of passerines exploiting Plecoptera prey. Although this paucity of records involving songbird predation of Plecoptera is surprising, the lack of reports of predation on the "winter stoneflies" which emerge during winter when few other insects are available is also noteworthy.

The Cedar Waxwing and the Eastern Bluebird (*Sialia sialis*) winter in varying numbers at northern latitudes; both are largely frugivorous during the winter months. From 1200–1600 on 15 and 16 March 1975 I observed several small flocks of these 2 species feeding in a wooded area near Washington, Macomb Co., Michigan. The birds were preying on small insects later identified as the stoneflies *Allocapnia granulata* and *Taeniopteryx nivalis* which belong to the winter stonefly families Capniidae and Taeniopterygidae, respectively. The insects were emerging from two small, swift-flowing streams that contained numerous riffles, a gravel-sand bottom, some leaf detritus, and logs, rocks, and other objects that stoneflies crawl onto when undergoing ecdysis (Finni, *Ann. Entomol. Soc. Am.* 66:1243–1248, 1973). Snow covered the ground although the streams were essentially free of ice. Air temperatures were 4–5°C and the water temperature was 1.0°C.