We have found no record in the literature of jaegers killing large prey, though the larger antarctic *Catharacta maccormicki* has been seen killing Adelie Penguin (*Pygoscelis adeliae*) chicks weighing up to 2000 g (Young, 1963 Ibis 105: 310).

This unusual attack by Parasitic Jaegers on a larger prey organism may have resulted from a reduction in populations of *Microtus oeconomus*, a staple food item, which we found to be low in 1974, and by reduction in numbers of shorebird and passerine young by fox predation.

We acknowledge critical comment by L. L. Stebbins and P. D. Lewis, Jr., University of Lethbridge, and financial support by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bethel, Alaska 99559.—JOHN H. EISENHAUER, *Department of Biological Sciences, University of Lethbridge, Alberta* and JACK PANIYAK, *Chevak, Alaska 99563*. Accepted 26 Mar. 76.

Green Heron nesting in a Wood Duck box.—Green Herons (*Butorides striatus*) have been recorded breeding in a variety of habitats. Bent (1926, U. S. Natl. Mus. Bull. 135) reported that this species breeds either singly or in colonies. Normally it builds a crude stick nest in a tree or shrub or, more rarely, on the ground. Nests are usually associated with a body of water but may occasionally be a considerable distance from water. This note is the first published record of a Green Heron nesting in a cavity.

On 11 July 1975 I found a Green Heron nest in an artificial Wood Duck box on a steel fence post in Dunn Township, Ontario (42°54'N, 79°39'W). The cavity entrance faced southward and was 7.5 cm high, 10.0 cm wide and approximately 2.6 m above the surface of the water. The box was made of gray plywood and measured 27.5 cm square and 22.5 cm deep inside. The back of the box was 62.5 cm high tapering to 55.0 cm at the front. The nest was located at the edge of a slough about 50 m wide that averaged 0.3 m in depth. Water depth at the base of the nest was approximately 7 cm. Most of the slough was surrounded by a fringe of common cattail (*Typha latifolia*).

When I found it the nest contained at least three large nestlings. I did not disturb it at the time, but when I examined it later apparently all the young had fledged successfully. The herons had added a few twigs to the straw put in for Wood Ducks to make the nest.—ALLAN P. SANDILANDS, *Grand River Conservation Authority, 400 Clyde Road, P. O. Box 729, Cambridge (G), Ontario N1R 5W6*. Accepted 16 Apr. 76.

Snowy Egrets attracted to prey by Common Terns.—Snowy Egrets (*Egretta thula*) have been reported foraging with birds of several other species. These include other ardeids as well as Red-breasted Mergansers (*Mergus serrator*) (Christman 1957, Emlen and Ambrose 1970), Pied-billed Grebes (*Podilymbus podiceps*) (Leck 1971, Mueller et al. 1972), Forster's Terns (*Sterna forsteri*), Royal Terns (*Sterna maximus*), and Ring-billed Gulls (*Larus delawarensis*) (Rodgers 1974). In most of these cases the egrets were feeding on prey concentrated by activities of the other foraging species (e.g. Emlen and Ambrose 1970) or man (Rodgers 1974). This note records an instance of Snowy Egrets exploiting rich but highly ephemeral prey concentrations located by Common Terns (*Sterna hirundo*).

Observations were made near low tide between late June and mid-August 1975 in Plymouth, Massachusetts where the Eel River flows across sand and mud flats into Plymouth Harbor. Common Terns roosted on drier parts of the flats and bathed in the stream water, and egrets foraged there throughout the summer.

The typical sequence of events began when a few terns discovered a concentration of prey and began circling, calling and diving into the water. This quickly attracted more terns and up to 24 Snowy Egrets. The egrets foraged very actively amid the diving terns, stabbing repeatedly while running, wing-raising, and making short hops and flights. Foraging stabs were made at an average of about once every 2.5 seconds as compared to once every 14 seconds when not feeding in such groups. These foraging parties often moved varying distances up or downstream, apparently in response to movement of the prey or appearance of a new concentration. Between foraging episodes most of the egrets moved out of the water and preened. Several juvenile egrets were seen in the vicinity during these episodes, but apparently none took part in the group feeding.

The prey species was never seen, but the birds' actions suggested that they were pursuing schooling fish. The Eel River is a spawning ground for an anadromous clupeid, probably *Alosa* sp., and the young descend the stream in late summer.

These activities suggest that the egrets were taking advantage of the terns' greater mobility and ability to find scattered prey concentrations to exploit a resource that might otherwise escape notice. The terns

may have also benefitted from the association if the egrets' activities confused the prey and made the fish easier to catch.

The utility of this association to the egrets seems to depend on three prey characteristics. High abundance was essential for the technique to be rewarding to the large numbers of individuals involved. The brief and unpredictable appearance of the prey prevented the egrets from locating the prey themselves with any degree of consistency. Restriction of the prey to one general place gave the egrets time to fly there before the prey disappeared or moved elsewhere.

The highly active foraging techniques employed in this case contrast with the inactive techniques noted by Kushlan (1972) in another instance of high prey abundance. The difference seems to be due to the fact that in the latter case prey were concentrated in a small pond by the drying of the surrounding marsh and, having no escape, could easily be captured by an egret standing still. In the present case active techniques were necessary to follow the rapid movements of the fish schools in the flowing water, and the apparently sudden movements of individual fish. Thus prey mobility and habitat characteristics as well as temporal changes in prey availability (Kushlan 1972) may be important in determining feeding behavior in Snowy Egrets.

These notes were made while I was an intern at Manomet Bird Observatory and supported by an NSF graduate fellowship. I thank R. M. Fagen, B. A. Harrington, G. C. Kulesza, M. Livingston, M. F. Willson, and anonymous reviewers for helpful criticisms of the manuscript.

Literature Cited

Christman, G. M. 1957. Some interspecific relations in the feeding of estuarine birds. Condor 59: 343.

Emlen, S. T., and H. W. Ambrose III. 1970. Feeding interactions of Snowy Egrets and Red-breasted Mergansers. Auk 87: 164–165 .

Kushlan, J. A. 1972. Aerial feeding in the Snowy Egret. Wilson Bull. 84: 199–200.

Leck, C. F. 1971. Cooperative feeding in *Leucophoyx thula* and *Podilymbus podiceps* (Aves). Amer. Midl. Naturalist 86: 241–242.

Mueller, H. C., M. G. Biben, and H. F. Sears. 1972. Feeding interactions between Pied-billed Grebes and herons. Auk 89: 190.

Rodgers, J. A., Jr. 1974. Aerial feeding by Snowy and Great Egrets in Louisiana waters. Wilson Bull. 86: 70–71.

Robert I. Bertin, *Manomet Bird Observatory, Manomet, Massachusetts 02345. Present address: Vivarium, Wright and Healey Streets, Champaign, Illinois 61820.* Accepted 1 Apr. 76.

Possible ecological role of food caches of Loggerhead Shrike.—The importance and purpose of impaling food items on thorns, barbed wire, and other similar objects by the Loggerhead Shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*) is not fully known (Ridgway 1889, The Ornithology of Illinois, vol. 1, Illinois Nat. Hist. Surv. (reprint 1913); Graber et al. 1973, Illinois Nat. Hist. Surv. Biol. Notes 83). During April and May 1975 while studying a nesting pair of Loggerheads in Union Co., southern Illinois, I made observations indicating a possible role of food caches.

The male Loggerhead did not participate in incubating, but primarily defended the nesting territory and hunted for live prey within the pair's home range. Occasionally the male took prey items (mostly grasshoppers, Acrididae) to a nearby barbed wire fence and impaled them. During breaks from incubating the female visited the fence to eat from the cached foods.

The female fed the nestlings approximately once per hour during the day and the male fed them approximately once per ¾ hour in the evening from about 1700 until 2000. Most of the food that was presented to the young by the female came from the cache maintained by the male. During the evening the female brooded and the male removed food from the fence and presented it at the nest. The female also consumed items brought to her directly from the field.

Although the above observations are limited to one nesting pair of Loggerheads, I wish to offer the following explanation as to the possible ecological function of such behavior. El-Wailly (1966, Condor 68: 582) found that metabolized energy of the adults increased during incubation in the Zebra Finch (*Taeniopygia castanotis*) but was divided between male and female as both sexes share in the incubation process. West (1960, Auk 77: 306–329) and Kendeigh (1963, Proc. 13th Intern. Ornithol. Congr.: 884–904) found higher energy requirements for the female in Tree Sparrows (*Spizella arborea*) and House Wrens