nest 3 m distant from the other nest. The authors, by calculating time intervals and presumably by the proximity of the two nests, concluded that the same female was responsible.

Regardless of probability such a conclusion should only be based on incontrovertible proof (through marking) that the female in each case was the same bird. Several possibilities for error present themselves: the sexes are not separable in the field (except by behavior) and the female in question was apparently unbanded. A change in the title to "A possible double-brooded Eastern Kingbird" would have clarified the situation.—George K. Peck, Dept. Ornithology, Royal Ontario Museum, 100 Queen's Park, Toronto, Ontario M5S 2C6, Canada. Accepted 25 Aug. 1983.

Wilson Bull., 96(1), 1984, p. 142

Response to Peck.—The comment by Peck on our note "A double-brooded Eastern Kingbird" brings up a valid point. Since the female involved was not banded, we cannot be absolutely sure that the same female was responsible for both nests. Therefore, the title change he suggests might have been appropriate. However, we disagree with other statements in his comment.

He states that we based our conclusion that the same female was involved on the time interval between nests and the proximity of the two nests. He fails to mention that a banded fledgling from the first nest was present with the adults at the second nest, and that the two adults were seen with the fledgling during the four checks of the nest area between fledging of the first nest and discovery of the second nest. These observations strengthen our conclusion. He also states that "Several possibilities for error present themselves" yet he only refers to one valid possibility (unbanded female). The fact that the sexes are separable in the field only by behavior is irrelevant to the conclusion that the same female was involved in both nests.—Peter J. Blancher and Raleigh J. Robertson, Dept. Biology, Queen's Univ., Kingston, Ontario K7L 3N6, Canada. Accepted 21 Sept. 1983.