

stations if the requisite details of migration are to be learned by banding methods.—C. L. W.

**Nesting Records of song Sparrows 25935 and 39235.**—The following known history of two Song Sparrows (*Melospiza m. melodia*) will add another example of the sort described by Mrs. L. C. Harrill in the last number of our "Bulletin," namely, a case where a mated pair of this species raised two broods for two years in succession—1924 and 1925—at my station in Rock (Middleboro), Massachusetts. Song Sparrow 25935 was banded May 22, 1923, and fathered or mothered two broods during that year. On March 23, 1924, I banded its mate, No. 39235. These I called my pair of "35's." The latter bird pretty surely passed the winter season of 1923-24 with me, but 25935 migrated in the fall of '23 and returned April 1, 1924.

During the nesting season of '24 this pair raised two broods and in the fall both parent birds migrated.

On April 1, 1925, 25935 appeared as a return<sup>2</sup>, returning on the same date as in 1924, 39235 appearing May 15th. As was the case in 1924, they raised two broods, and in the fall they again migrated.

This pair of birds would come singly or together to the station for food for their young, and were frequently taken as repeats. They were the only pair of this species nesting near by during the two seasons. Of their young I banded four in 1924 and five in 1925. All nine were trapped in company with their repeating parents.

For two years prior to 1923, before I had taken up banding work, there was a single pair of Song Sparrows nesting about the premises, and, while my intimate acquaintance with their habits during this period leads me to believe that they were the same birds, later known as my pair of '35's, I will not enumerate the reasons for the faith that is in me. A. W. HIGGINS, Rock, Mass., February, 1926.

**A Junco Return.\***—When a bird returns three times the record means that it is over three years old. This bird's history, as appears from my Cohasset records, is as follows: It was banded January 25, 1923. It was a return February 4, 1924, a return<sup>2</sup> January 20, 1925, and a return<sup>3</sup> March 25, 1926, and the record shows that the bird must have been at least three years and nine months old on March 25, 1926. I hope that other banders will send the editor all records of this sort relating to any bird, for one of the things bird-banding is going to prove is the average age of uncaged birds.—L. B. FLETCHER.

**Juncos with Diseased Feet.**—Out of ten or fifteen Juncos (*Junco p. hyemalis*) at our station between December 11, 1925, and February 22 1926, four were found with diseased toes. In detail the records of the four birds thus afflicted follow:

No. A34083, banded December 11, had a whitish lump at base of the claw on the middle toe. A puncture by a sterilized needle showed that

\* The word "return" as used here is that defined in "The Auk," Vol. XLII, 1924, p. 329 (footnote).

the interior of the lump was dry and hard, not pus as we had supposed. The bird did not repeat.

No. A34090, banded December 12, had a similar lump in the same location, which had increased in size by January 1 when it repeated.

No. A34088, banded December 12, had normal feet, but when it repeated February 13 a white lump was found on the second joint of the hind toe.

No. A34094 was banded December 12. When it repeated on February 13 the middle toe of left foot had a noticeable white lump at the base of the claw, and a second lump on the second joint of the same toe, while on February 22 a third spot had appeared at the base of the claw of the hind toe. The other lumps had not grown in size.

This disease as far as we can learn is not common among birds of this species. As far as we can see the birds do not suffer on account of the growth, and are not lame or in ill health.

The four birds were banded on two successive days and had doubtless recently arrived as a group or part of one. No additional Juncos taken afterwards showed any evidence of the trouble, making it seem likely that the four birds were members of a single family.—MR. AND MRS. RICHARD B. HARDING, Brookline, Mass.

---

**Value of Repeats.**—Some of our banders feel that taking the same birds over and over again is of questionable value in banding work. Doubtless taking repeats can be overdone. I have called attention to this matter in a previous note (see *Bulletin of this Association*, Vol. 1, 1926, p. 17). It adds little to our knowledge to capture the same bird several times a day, as is sometimes done, but of course such cases are not frequent. Taking repeats, however, in the study of certain ornithological problems is of prime importance, and in this connection attention is called to the part repeats play in studying migration and the behavior of groups, as appears from reading Mr. Smith's and Mr. Messer's contributions on the habits of the Tree Sparrow in this number of the *Bulletin*. It is obvious that much of the value of the observations made is due to repeats, and the study of migration in general for years to come will receive much assistance from this source.—C. L. W.