referable to that form. Several other individuals assignable to *cismontanus* have since been seen at Powdermill; one was banded by the writer and A. C. Lloyd on 11 December 1966. Although *hyemalis* and *cismontanus* vary greatly in color in the fall, one character serves very well to identify females of *cismontanus* such as that collected at Powdermill. In *hyemalis* the gray of the breast continues (even if mixed with brownish) onto the flanks, giving a concave or horseshoe-shaped outline to the pigmented portion. In *cismontanus* the edge of the gray breast is convex, with pinkish-buff (sometimes mixed with gray) flanks contrasting abruptly with the edge of the gray breast area. There is usually more brown on the dorsal areas of adult females of *cismontanus* than of *hyemalis*, and it tends to contrast with adjacent gray areas rather than to blend with them. An excellent color photograph by Karl Maslowski of a junco showing *cismontanus* characters was published in the magazine *National Wildlife* (vol. 5, no. 1, December–January 1966–1967, p. 14).

Preservation of the specimens described above was made possible through the alertness and assistance of Robert C. Leberman, Albert C. Lloyd, Mary A. Heimerdinger, and Beulah Frey. The warbler and the grosbeak were prepared as study skins by Otto Epping, the towhee and the junco by the writer.—KENNETH C. PARKES, *Carnegie Museum, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 16 January 1967.*

**Two female Mallards incubating on one nest.**—On 1 June 1956, I flushed two Mallard hens (*Anas platyrhynchos*) simultaneously from one nest site on an island in Unit 320 of the Lower Souris National Wildlife Refuge near Upham, McHenry County, North Dakota. At this time, I suspected that both hens may have been sharing a single nest. Upon investigation of the nearby nesting cover, I discovered a well formed nest containing 20 mallard eggs.

Additional confirming observations were made on 8 June and 12 June, and on the latter visit the nest contained only 17 eggs. On 17 June, I returned to the island and crawled within 6 feet of the nest enabling me to see both females sitting side by side in incubation before they flushed. The nest contained 5 hatched ducklings and 3 pipped eggs; the other 9 eggs were intact. Within 5 minutes after this visit, both hens returned to the nest.

The final fate of this nest was determined on 24 June: 9 eggs remained in the nest, five with 18–20 day embryos, three with undeveloped embryos and one with a full term embryo. Apparently when one clutch of eggs hatched, both hens departed with the brood leaving one clutch of eggs in the nest. During the next week, I observed a brood of 8 mallard ducklings near the island with two hens in attendance.

Factors leading to the expression of this unusual reproductive behavior are unknown. The dual nest occupancy may have originated from parasitic egg laying by one hen with mutual tolerance developing in incubation. Remarkable cooperation was required for these two hens to complete the many complex behavioral rhythms involved in egg laying and incubation on one nest.—HAROLD F. DUEBBERT, *U. S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center, Jamestown, North Dakota 58401, 21 December 1966.*

**A Swallow-tailed Kite in trans-Pecos Texas.**—Due to rapid decline in numbers and decrease in range of the Swallow-tailed Kite (*Elanoides forficatus*) in recent years (Austin, 1961. "Birds of the world." p. 76; and Oberholser, 1938. "The bird life of Louisiana." La. Dept. of Conserv. Bull. No. 28:156) the following record is noteworthy. On 26 August 1966, we observed a Swallow-tailed Kite slowly cruising over downtown

Fort Davis, Jeff Davis County, Texas, just above the tree tops. According to Col. L. R. Wolfe (pers. comm.), the westernmost record of this species in Texas is from near Rockport, more than 400 air miles southeast of Fort Davis. The rarity of this species excluded the possibility of securing the bird as a specimen. We thank Dr. George M. Sutton, University of Oklahoma, for permitting examination of a specimen of the Swallow-tailed Kite.—R. ROY JOHNSON, *Department of Biology, University of Texas at El Paso* AND JANET E. JOHNSON, *308 Crane, El Paso, 30 January 1967.*

**Osprey carrying bird.**—On 11 October 1966 while watching a hawk migration near the shore of Lake Michigan, about 30 miles north of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, we saw an Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) approaching from the north which appeared to be carrying something bright red. As the bird passed us it was at an altitude of about 60 feet and was about 150 feet west of us. With favorable light and with the aid of binoculars we were able to determine definitely that the object being carried was a red bird, presumably a male Cardinal (*Richmondena cardinalis*).—CHARLES SINDELAR, *1865 S. West Avenue, Apt. 5, Waukesha, Wisconsin,* AND ERROL SCHLUTER, *3701 S. Center Road, Waukesha, Wisconsin, 2 March 1967.*

**Turkey nesting behavior.**—Between 23 May and 4 June 1962, observations were made on a nesting Turkey hen (*Meleagris gallopavo*) in Vinton Township, Section 22, Vinton County, Ohio. The Turkeys in this area are presumed to be wild birds reintroduced in 1956 and 1957 by the Division of Wildlife (Sickels, 1959. Proc. First Natl. Wild Turkey Management Symposium, Memphis, Tenn.).

The nest, well concealed under a greenbrier (*Smilax* sp.) thicket at the base of a redbud (*Cercis canadensis*) tree, was discovered on 14 May 1962. The Turkey hen flushed directly from the nest when observed, knocked two eggs out, and flew out of sight to the south. The nest had 13 eggs in it.

On 23 May, at 6:30 AM, the hen was again flushed (she flew directly from the nest), and one egg was taken to determine the age of the embryo by comparing it with a known-age Turkey embryo series at the Waterloo Wildlife Experiment Station. The embryo was approximately 18 days old, which would place the start of egg laying on 23 April and the expected hatching on 2 June.

A pop tent blind was placed facing south 54 feet from the nest on 23 May. A total of 55 hours was spent in the blind during which time detailed notes were taken on nesting behavior and on the newly hatched poults.

The hen sat attentively on the nest, occasionally stood up in the nest, and apparently fed very little during the latter part of incubation. At one point in our observations (2 June), the hen was on the nest at 4:53 AM. She left the nest at 3:10 PM and returned one hour and 17 minutes later. If we assume she was on the nest at dark the previous day, this would make a total of at least 19½ hours of uninterrupted incubation.

The human disturbance factor should be mentioned, for the hen was flushed on three separate occasions. In addition, the blind undoubtedly influenced her behavior to some extent for she appeared to be aware of its presence by facing it during the observation period. When first discovered she was facing in the opposite direction. These disturbances, coupled with a jet plane breaking the sound barrier, a noisy vehicle passing on a nearby forest road on 2 June, and someone's shooting a shotgun five times one-half mile from the nest on 3 June, did not cause desertion. It was apparent that the hen