Relation of the Tail Length of Cock Ring-necked Pheasants to Harem Size.—During the winter of 1953–1954, Donald Reid, a graduate student in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Michigan State College, trapped 29 cock pheasants and marked them by cutting off their tails and placing a colored plastic band around the neck of each. This was done on the Michigan State College Farm, East Lansing, as part of a study of winter movements away from concentration points. The following spring between April 12 and May 21, it was noted that a marked difference existed between the numbers of hens seen with marked and unmarked cocks. During this period, individual marked cocks were observed 41 times. Three times a hen was with the cock; the other times the cock was alone. Individual unmarked cocks were observed 241 times. On 130 of these occasions, the cock was alone, 36 times one hen was present, 28 times there were two hens, 18 times three, 16 times four, 5 times five, 3 times six, once eight, and once nine hens were present. The differences between individual marked and unmarked cocks both with respect to the number seen alone and to harem size are highly significant statistically ($P < 0.001$). Observations of two or more cocks together were not included in these tabulations.

At the time the spring observations were made, in only 17 of the 41 observations of marked cocks was a colored neck band seen. Sixteen of the 17 with both neck band and bobbed tail and 22 of the 24 with only the bobbed tail were without hens. This difference was not significant and suggests that presence of a neck band probably had no effect on the ability of cocks to attract hens.

Following the logic of Tinbergen (Wilson Bull., **60**: 6–51, 1948) the long tail of the male may be a sign stimulus which acts as a visual releaser to evoke the attentiveness of hens. This seems plausible when it is realized that the courtship display of the cock pheasant involves the spreading of the tail while moving before the hen. This may be similiar to the situation described by Tinbergen in sticklebacks (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*). He observed that females of this fish were attracted to models of males with red abdomens but showed no interest in identical models in which the abdomens were not red.

There are two factors operating on the study area which may have tended to accentuate the disadvantage at which tailless cocks were placed. First, in this unhunted population, the sex ratio was about even. There was 1 cock per 1.05 hens in April and May based on 651 observations. Second, judging from roadside counts and counts of crowing cocks made in connection with other studies, the population density was high compared with most Michigan areas. Under the highly competitive conditions of an equal sex ratio and high populations, it seems possible that the lack of a tail might result in a more pronounced courtship disadvantage than under the more common circumstances of distorted sex ratios and lower popution densities.—Aelred D. Geis and Lucien H. Elbert, *Zoology Department, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.*

Eastern Meadowlark (*Sturnella magna*) Eating a Traffic-killed Bird.—The note by Paul A. Stewart (Auk, 72: 83–84, 1955), about a captive Tufted Titmouse (*Parus bicolor*) feeding on the carcass of one of its own species, recalled to me a similar observation I made on a wild meadowlark near Bath, New York, on July 5, 1939.

A freshly-killed meadowlark, partly smashed by automobile traffic, lay near the edge of a well-traveled concrete highway. As I neared the spot in my car, I saw a bird tugging at the carcass. It was an Eastern Meadowlark, and as I stopped to watch, I clearly saw this bird pull off and eat bits of flesh from the dead bird.