

sides, abdomen, and tibial feathers mostly pure white, never heavily washed with buffy, never strongly mottled with dusky at the tips of the feathers in dark phase; under tail coverts pure white, never heavily barred or streaked with dark brown; differs from *Ciccaba v. squamulata* in having the upper parts darker and duller grayish brown with less of a fulvous or buffy cast; and the crown, hind neck, and back barred and vermiculated instead of spotted; differs from *Ciccaba v. tamaulipensis* in having the light markings of the upper parts finer and whiter.

Type.—Adult male, U. S. Nat. Mus. No. 167,729, Apazote, Campeche, Mexico, December 26, 1900, collected by Nelson and Goldman, original No. 7411.

Measurements of type.—Wing, 225; tail, 130; culmen, from cere, 18.5 mm.

Range.—Tropical Zone, Apazote and Champoton, Campeche, Mexico, to northern Peten, Guatemala.

Remarks.—Twelve specimens of this new form and twenty-five specimens of *Ciccaba v. centralis* have been examined. Females, which usually have a darker ground color on the upper parts than the male, may have the light superciliary area tinged with dark brownish.

This form is named for the late Warren F. Eaton, who rendered noteworthy service in the protection of Hawks and Owls.—LEON KELSO AND ESTELLE H. KELSO, Washington, D. C.

Chimney Swifts Nesting in a Barn.—In a barn near my home, Cattaraugus Co., N. Y., a pair of Chimney Swifts (*Chaetura pelagica*) have nested for fifteen years, perhaps longer. The nest is fastened to the end wall, near a six inch square opening made for a hay rope, but used for entrance by the Swifts. Only two birds return each year. New mates may have replaced one or both of the original birds, but the young, apparently, have found other haunts. The Swifts have usually nested with success. One season, however, a "rest" was taken, and though the birds started a nest, and continued to roost on the adjacent wall for some time, no eggs were laid.

The rigors of winter often injured or destroyed the old nest, and the birds usually rebuilt each year, but the 1934 nest, which remained intact, was reused in 1935. The Swifts strengthened it by adding a dozen twigs below, as a prop-like support, and cementing again the points where the nest rim met the wall.

Other duties precluded a careful study of the nesting in 1935, but a few observations of possible interest were made. Four eggs were laid from June 9 to 15 on alternate days. On the 13th, and thereafter a bird occupied the nest at every inspection, and incubation, I believe, was started that day. The pair were frequently at the nest together. Twice I observed one clinging to the nest edge while its mate incubated. At night a light revealed one on the nest and the other roosting nearby but not, to my knowledge, incubating side by side as noted by Miss Stella M. Davis, (Forbush, Birds Mass., v. 2, p. 312).

During the day the incubating bird permitted a close approach, at times within a foot or two. It then left the barn, or, quite frequently, moved to the wall near the nest. When the latter occurred, the Swift often flew nervously from place to place on the wall in a peculiar manner. Slowly elevating the wings to their fullest extent above the back, the bird then snapped them down and fluttered to a new position three or four feet away.

After a two day absence, I found three young in the nest on July 2; by the following day the fourth egg also had hatched. When bringing food, the parent entered the opening and alighted a foot or two below the young. After some hesitation the bird, with wings beating and tail spines scraping the boards, "taxied" to the nest. There also the parent maintained its position on the edge of the nest platform by use of the

wings, especially when the young were well grown and crowded forward. The only count of feedings made was on July 24, when three occurred from 10:45 to noon. Although I believe Chimney Swifts feed their young less frequently than do many small birds, there is no approach to the five hour or greater intervals between feedings characteristic of the Black Swift (*Nephoecetes niger borealis*) as observed by Charles M. Michael (Condor, 1927, v. 29, pp. 89-97). Feeding continued late in the evening, ceasing only with complete darkness. Some observers (e. g., Frank Bolles in Popular Science Monthly, 1894, v. 45, pp. 24-29) have described truly nocturnal activity, but my Swifts were always quietly roosting when I inspected them at night. The young, when about half grown, were obviously much crowded in the small nest and began to clamber about the surrounding wall. Audubon states (Birds of America) that if the nest falls, the Swiftlets climb the wall and live. While this is without doubt true when they are well grown, I noted one year that after the nest rim was accidentally broken, the young, but a day or two old, tumbled out, and although I repeatedly replaced them, only one survived. At three weeks of age the young in 1935, as they clung to the wall with long wings extended far below their tails, appeared like adults. They now exercised by the method described above for the incubating bird when alarmed, deliberately raising the wings, snapping them down, and fluttering to another spot. Despite much practice of this kind, the Swifts sometimes delay nest-leaving for several days after attaining full growth. On July 25, 1935, as I approached the nest, two of the birds flew from the barn for the first time, one I collected, and the fourth, after flying the length of the building without finding exit, settled again near the nest. That they at times find their way out of the barn with difficulty was demonstrated on a former occasion when I saw one, covered with dust and cobwebs, fluttering among the rafters. A visit on the night of July 27, 1935, revealed the five Swifts, parents and young, clustered near the nest to roost. Again on the 28th they roosted together, but two nights later they had left; thus corroborating the statement of Otto Widmann (Trans. Ac. Sc. St. Louis, 1922, v. 24, p. 58), and others, that when the young are able to fly well, the entire family joins others of their kind at some favored roost.

Young Swifts, as is well known, utter loud, rasping calls when fed. Any disturbance or jar sets them off, and the cries, given with upward thrusts of the open beak, are continued for several seconds. Then all cease calling in a moment, as by clockwork. The nestlings, when a week or two old, also give subdued twitters, which become louder with age and probably change into the rather similar notes of the adults. The old birds, while about the nest, give frequent utterance to vigorous and extended twittering.—DEAN AMADON, *Cornell University*.

Second Appearance of the Rufous Hummingbird at Pensacola, Florida.—From November 26 through December 13, 1934, the Rufous Hummingbird was seen almost daily at my home in Pensacola, Florida, and a specimen was obtained (Auk, vol. LII, p. 187).

On December 8, 1935, Mr. Francis M. Weston observed a Hummingbird in his yard, which is about a half mile from my home, while on December 12 a bird was reported by my mother; both were suspected of being the Rufous Hummingbird. I saw the bird on December 14 and again on December 17, at which time I was afforded such an excellent view that the bird could be identified unquestionably as an adult male Rufous Hummingbird (*Selasphorus rufus*). It was last seen on December 19.

The favorite food plant both years was the Chinese hibiscus (*Hibiscus rosa-sinen-*