and upon examining it, found the tips of both wings, as well as the left half of the tail, thickly covered with the resin of a species of poplar, young shoots of which were growing abundantly in the vicinity. A considerable quantity of sand adhered to the resin.

It seems probable that the bird would not have been able to clean the substance from its feathers, as its most violent efforts did not serve to separate the quills.—PIERCE BRODKORB, *Evanston, Illinois.*

The Type Locality for the Porto Rican Whippoorwill.—In the original description of the Porto Rican Whippoorwill published in 1919.[1] I recorded the type locality as "Porto Rico" this being the only information other than the date on the label of the specimen, which is in the collections of the Field Museum. In recent conversation with Mr. Clark P. Streator who secured this bird I made inquiry regarding it to learn that it was secured near Bayamón, a small town across the bay from the city of San Juan. Mr. Streator has since kindly looked through his papers and writes me that he arrived in San Juan, Porto Rico, September 28, 1888, and that after some difficulty in obtaining collecting permits he established quarters in Bayamón about October 8, working there continuously until about November 20. His collections of about three hundred birds and a few bats were made entirely at this point The Whippoorwill, the only one seen, was secured there October 29.

On November 23, 1888, Mr. Streator took passage for Fajardo in a small sailing vessel but on arrival there fell ill with an attack of dysentery from which he recovered with difficulty and which terminated his field work in Porto Rico.—ALEXANDER WETMORE, *U. S. National Museum, Washington, D. C.*

Habits of the Ruby-throated Hummingbird.—At Berne, N. Y., on May 29, 1928, on a small branch of a horse-chestnut tree, nine feet and eight inches from the ground, and on a level with my dining room window, a female Hummingbird was building the foundation of a nest. The nest was plainly visible at all times from the window, and at intervals, standing on a step-ladder, I peered into it. There were no eggs in it on June 5 and on the morning of June 7 the mother bird was putting the finishing touches on the inside of the nest. I did not look into it on June 6 or 7 as she was not sitting. In the afternoon of June 8 the mother bird for the first time seemed to be sitting, and as soon as she left, I found two small elliptical shaped eggs in the nest. Authors vary as to the length of time it takes for the incubation of the eggs, some claiming a period of ten days, while one author has written, "It is about thirteen days between the full number of eggs and the appearance of the young." June 20 the eggs were not hatched. During the next three days the female bird was apparently not feeding the young but on June 24 she appeared to be doing so, and on examination I found that the nest then contained

[1] Proc. Biol. Soc. Washington, vol. 32, Dec. 31, 1919, pp. 235–238.

two tiny birds. I believe the young birds were hatched on June 24, thus taking about sixteen days for the incubation. July 9, I judged by its whitish throat that one of the young birds was a female, and by the darkish hue of the other's that it was a male. The female was then exercising her wings, and seemed stronger than the male. Authors differ as to the length of time the young birds remain in the nest. One author says, "In a single week the young are on the wing," and another, "but I have become convinced that they remain in the nest only ten days." July 12, at about eight o'clock in the morning, the young female left the nest. At 7 o'clock in the evening the young male was still there, but by seven o'clock the next morning he had departed. Thus the young had remained in the nest about twenty or twenty-one days.

Since Berne is in the Helderberg mountains, and we had the proverbial forty days of rain after Ascension day, conditions may have caused a variation in the length of time of the hatching and of the young remaining in the nest.

I noticed the female bird on the nest hundreds of times. She was the one that built the nest, hatched the eggs, and fed the young. I saw the male bird near the nest but twice, once on June 17, and again on June 24, when the female was on the nest.

From time to time I watched the latter. She did not constantly sit on the nest while hatching the eggs, but was off and on it during the day. On June 18 I counted her movements and within twenty minutes she had flown off and come back six different times.—D. A. HINMAN, *Berne, N. Y.*

On the Cooing of the Crow.—In my 'Courtship Notes of the Crow' (Auk, XLIV, 1927, p. 551) I had supposed that I was the first to record "the pleasing sound which suggested the cooing of a Pigeon or the note of a cuckoo clock, but softer and more liquid." Since then I have discovered that two have preceeded me, and I am glad to record this here, not only to do them justice, but also to confirm an observation which seems almost unbelievable to those who have not made it.

Mr. C. J. Maynard in his 'Birds of Eastern North America,' ed. of 1896, p. 155, says: "I was once watching a pair of Crows that were building a nest in a small grove of white pines in Newtonville, Mass., and as I had succeeded in gaining a place of concealment not far from the birds, without attracting their attention, had a fine opportunity of observing their movements while they were entirely unconscious of my presence. The first thing that I noticed was a peculiar sound that resembled the cooing of a Dove, but it was far more musical. . . He would move sideways on his perch, bow his head, spread his tail, and droop his wings, at the same time uttering the cooing notes."

The second recorder is Mr. L. M. Terrill of St. Lambert, Quebec, who, in the 'Montreal Star' for April 17, 1926, writes: "A low-toned liquid 'coo-loo, coo-loo', rather musical than otherwise, immediately takes my attention. . .