

to be evidence of nesting at Hillsboro. These two records would seem to indicate that Purple Martins may nest in one locality for one or more years and then establish a summer residence in a new and distant locality.

Martin 72547 was one of four nestlings banded on July 18, 1925. It left the nest on July 25th but returned and was captured daily until August 2d. In 1926 this bird returned as an adult male and mated with female 346492, nesting in the same room of the martin-house in which it was caught as a nestling in 1925. It was very timid, but was trapped on July 18, 1925, and several times thereafter until its young died in the nest. Of several hundred nestlings banded by the writer of various species this is the only individual known to have returned to nest in the locality where it was raised. None of the other banded nestlings have returned to martin-houses in the vicinity, this one instance probably representing a very exceptional case.

Male 72546, banded on June 13, 1926, returned on April 28, 1927, but did not nest. Female 410136, banded on June 13, 1926, was mated with male 346419 during that year but returned in 1927 and mated with male 194132. Male 194137, banded on June 23, 1927, was mated with female 194138, but returned in 1928 and mated with female 629201. Male 440137, banded on June 13, 1926, was mated that year with female 346412 (which returned from Mt. Vernon, Ohio, in 1927) but returned in 1927 and mated with female 194131.

These three returns would seem to indicate that Martins seldom, if ever, have the same mates on successive years. This habit may be related to the migratory movements which tend to separate the sexes, or to the short life-span of the species, and may account for the known shifting of two birds to new nesting localities as related above. The opportunities for detailed, intensive work close at home with this species and the unusually large percentage of returns from this one station, would seem to recommend the Purple Martin as a bird worthy of more attention in intensive, continuous banding studies.—LAWRENCE E. HICKS, Department of Botany, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Some Complicated Bluebird Family History.—At Pomfret, Connecticut, during May, 1932, Bluebirds B128957(♂) and B135555(♀), both wearing red bands, were mated and raised a brood of four young that left the nest on May 28th. About ten days later they built a second nest in the same box and eggs were laid. At this same time, Bluebird B176225(♀), nesting about eight hundred feet distant, lost her unbanded mate either by death or desertion, and on June 11th, B128957(♂), whose mate was laying eggs for their second brood, was seen making love to and feeding the five half-grown young of B176225(♀). For a few days he was back and forth from one mate to the other, then, as his first mate was sitting, he apparently forgot her and spent all of his time with B176225(♀). The young birds by his first mate were now beginning to care for themselves, and his step-children were under his protection until July 12th. His first mate, B135555, was left to bring up their second brood alone. It proved too great a task, and on July 8th her half-grown fledglings were found dead in the nest. On the same date she (B135555) was found to have acquired a new mate B176426(♂), and they began to look over a new box.

About the middle of July a new unbanded female appeared, and B128957(♂), his second mate now sitting, and his step-children large enough to care for themselves, immediately fell in love with the new unbanded female. One morning B176225(♀) found her spouse B128957(♂)

with the new unbanded female and a desperate battle followed between the two females. However, B176225 was forced to go back to her eggs, and the unbanded female immediately began to build in a nesting-box about three hundred feet from the nesting-box of B176225, and by July 26th had laid five eggs. The ambitious male spent the greater part of his time with the unbanded female until the young birds of B176225(♀) were hatched, then the unbanded female began brooding her eggs, and he spent practically all of his time caring for the young of B176225. One of these young left the nest on August 3d, and the rest of the full-grown young were found dead in the nesting-box. The parents, B128957 (♂) and B176225(♀), wandered away and were not seen again. At the same time the unbanded female abandoned her eggs.—MRS. KENNETH B. WETHERBEE.

Nelson's Sparrow and Tree Swallow Wintering in New Jersey.—

On December 21, 1932, at Leed's Point, about six miles northwest of Atlantic City, New Jersey, I observed three Nelson's Sparrows (*Ammodramus c. nelsoni*) and was able to collect one. These were associating with the Sharp-tailed Sparrows (*A. c. caudacuta*), which were common in the salt marshes. At that time the bays were frozen over, and about ten inches of snow covered the ground. Consequently these birds were feeding along the banks of drains and sloughs where running water prevented much accumulation of ice and snow. Dr. Witmer Stone in his *Birds of New Jersey*, page 233, states that the Nelson's Sparrow is a "rather scarce transient visitant" in the State, having been taken in May and October, 1892, near Atlantic City.

At this same locality and on the same day I also observed two Tree Swallows (*Iridoprocne bicolor*) flying hurriedly back and forth over the frozen ground. They undoubtedly were subsisting largely on a vegetable diet, as their insect fare during such a cold spell surely must have been reduced to the minimum.—CLARENCE COTTAM, U. S. Biological Survey, Washington, D. C.

Banding of a Brünnich's Murre at Wells River, Vermont.—

On Dec. 9, 1932, I found a Brünnich's Murre (*Uria l. lomvia*) in a field some distance from water. The bird was quite active and managed to make fair progress, chiefly by the use of its wings, and as it was expert in doubling and turning, some difficulty was experienced in its capture, but this was accomplished by throwing my coat over it. Band 210031 was attached and it was released in the Connecticut River. The bird showed evident satisfaction over again being in its native element, frequently dipping its bill and often rolling on its side. As soon as the current of mid-stream was felt, the bird turned facing it and floated downstream backward. It was last seen at a distance of more than one mile from the place of release.—WENDELL P. SMITH, Wells River, Vermont, December 12, 1932.

A Chickadee Recovery.—*Bird-Banding* has furnished surprisingly few notes on the migration of the Chickadee, so I am glad to chronicle a case of this kind recently reported by the Biological Survey. On October 7, 1932, I banded a bird of this species at my station in Amherst, Massachusetts. Mr. N. G. Purcell reports that a Persian kitten brought the bird to his house in Belvidere, New Jersey, some two hundred miles southwesterly from my station, on December 24, 1932.—MRS. FREDERICK MORSE CUTLER.