always associated with the death of the bird.—D. W. Snow and B. K. Snow, *New York Zoological Society's Tropical Field Station, Simla, Arima Valley, Trinidad, West Indies.*

***Arenaria interpres interpres* in Florida.**—On 8 June 1959 the authors collected a female Ruddy Turnstone at Shell Point, Wakulla County, Florida, as a routine part of a study of boreal-breeding shorebirds present in this area during summer. Examination of the specimen showed it to differ markedly from other turnstones taken during the study by its exceptionally dark back. Comparison with descriptions of the American and European subspecies by Bent (USNM Bull. 146, 1929) and Witherby *et al.* ("Handbook of British Birds," Vol. 4, 1940) indicated that it might be of the European race.

The specimen was later examined by Bernard Feinstein of the United States National Museum and Kenneth C. Parkes of the Carnegie Museum (the authors gratefully acknowledge their generous assistance), both of whom diagnosed it as *A. i. interpres.*

This specimen apparently constitutes the southernmost record of *A. i. interpres* for the eastern coast of the Western Hemisphere. Bent (*op. cit.*, 294) cites a record from Monomoy Island, Massachusetts. A turnstone taken on Dewees Island, South Carolina, in 1918, was reported to be of the European subspecies, but was later reidentified as *A. i. morinella* by Chamberlain (Auk, 53: 441).

The present specimen (No. 2880.2a) has been deposited in the museum of the Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida.—Horace Loftin, *Department of Biological Sciences, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, and* Storrs Olson, *Tallahassee, Florida.*

Storm Damage and Renesting Behavior by the Chimney Swift.—Nearly every year that Chimney Swifts *(Chaetura pelagica)* have nested in air shafts on the buildings of Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, a few nests have been destroyed by storm damage before nesting was completed. Details of certain such accidents have been published by the writer (Auk, 69: 289–293, 1952). In the season of 1959 storm damage was unusually severe, and in addition to the usual behavior of Chimney Swifts when such accidents occur, two pairs renested following the loss of the original nest. In another case, a nest fell from the wall for reasons not known, and it, too, was replaced by another nest. These replacements were among the few such instances observed in this nesting colony under observation annually since 1944. Following is a brief account of each case illustrating the types of behavior among Chimney Swifts when their nests are destroyed.

The same pair of birds that nested together in shaft A1 in 1958 returned to that shaft in the spring of 1959. They began nest construction on 20 May, and the nest was completed four days later. A visiting bird joined the pair at this time and remained with them for most of the season. The first egg was laid on 27 May and was followed by three others two days apart. A fifth egg was discovered on 7 June. All three birds took turns incubating the eggs, but the parents much more so than the visitor. On 21 June the first egg hatched. Within a week three others had hatched. On 5 July a heavy rainstorm washed the nest from the wall. Three of the nestlings survived the fall, and the parent birds with their seasonal visitor continued to feed and care for them. Gradually they worked their way up the wall over a distance of some 41 feet and finally arrived at about the level where the nest had been attached, 7.5 feet from the top. Two of the three juveniles were captured for banding.

Two Swifts, which had not nested previously on the campus, took up residence that year in shaft C1. Nest building began 8 June. The first egg was laid 21 June, and two more were laid at intervals of two days. Some time later a fourth egg was observed on the nest, which was 14 feet down on the west wall. On 23 July, when the nestlings were in blue pin feathers, the nest fell from the wall. Only one of the nestlings survived. This one was tended by the parent birds, but the nest was not replaced.

The male Swift that nested in shaft A5 in 1958 returned to the same shaft for nesting in 1959, but with a new female to replace his former mate. Nest building began 3 June on the north wall, but progress was slow and the foundation was never completed. On 8 June the pair moved to the south wall and began a new nest foundation, 19.7 feet down in the shaft. This was the first time the writer observed relocation of a nest after the original foundation was laid. Three eggs were laid before the storm on 22 June weakened the nest. The following day the male was observed repairing it. Three nestlings with developing blue pin feathers were first observed on 15 July. On 18 July a heavy rain destroyed the nest. None of the nestlings survived. In the evening of 20 July the male remained in the nesting shaft alone, while the female joined a group of six others in shaft I3 and was not known to return to her nesting shaft again.

Another pair of Swifts undertook nesting in shaft B1, where the nest was started on 7 June, being placed only 5.5 feet from the top. The first egg was found on 20 June. Before another was laid, a heavy rain on 22 June washed the nest from the wall. That night the male roosted alone in that shaft. In two days the female returned; but while they remained together for some time, no attempt was made to replace the lost nest.

The above four cases are typical of Chimney Swift behavior when the nest is destroyed before the nesting process is completed. The following three cases are unusual in that the nest was replaced immediately following an accident. The pair that nested in shaft E6 from 1956 through 1958 returned to nest there again in 1959. Nest building began 24 May, 17.2 feet from the top and was completed in four days. The first egg was laid on 29 May and was followed by four others at intervals of one or two days. One hatched on 20 June. How many others may have hatched is not known. A heavy rain storm on 25 June washed the nest from the wall. Ordinarily, nests placed as deeply in the air shaft as this one are not destroyed by storms. The mates remained together, although they did not always roost side by side at night time. On 4 July a new nest was constructed on the same wall (north) as before, but this time 25.4 feet from the top. Four eggs were laid, and this nest has remained on the wall until the present time (February 1960).

The male that nested in shaft L3 in 1958 returned to that shaft for nesting in 1959, but obtained a new mate since his former mate failed to return. Nest building began 31 May, 8 feet down on the east wall. This was completed one week later, and the first egg, laid 7 June, was soon followed by three others. A heavy rainstorm on 22 June destroyed the nest. That evening the male roosted on the nest site alone while the female roosted in shaft L1. Then both birds dropped out of sight. On 7 July a nest with one egg was discovered in shaft K7 where the pair from L3 had relocated and renested following the loss of the first nest. The new nest was 24.4 feet down on the south wall, and three nestlings were successfully raised on this second nest. This was the first time that a pair in this colony nested in two shafts during one season.

The same male that nested in shaft Q2 during 1957 and 1958 returned to the same shaft for nesting in 1959, but obtained a new mate to replace his earlier one, which failed to return. The nest was begun on 5 June, 38 feet from the top of the shaft. One egg was laid 10 June. On 20 June, after an absence of nine days, the writer found the nest missing from the wall, and the parent birds were roosting side by side high on the south wall. Nine days later a new nest was made at about the same place as the old one. This was completed on 4 July. The first egg was not laid until five days later. A second egg was laid, and both presumably hatched. Observations were discontinued after 24 July, but the nest was still on the wall on 17 September and remained there through the winter.—RALPH W. DEXTER, *Department of Biology, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.*

Heavy Nematode Infestation of White Pelican.—On 10 October 1959 a dead White Pelican *(Pelecanus erythrorhynchos)* was recovered by the writer and Storrs Olson, Tallahassee, Florida, from the northeastern Gulf of Mexico, a mile offshore from Shell Point, Florida, on Apalachee Bay. There were no other pelicans in the vicinity, although 14 were seen the same day at St. Marks lighthouse, about five miles to the east. There were no signs of decomposition. Autopsy performed the next day showed that the skin of the pelican, an adult female, was intact, and that she had not been killed by gunshot. No fat accumulation was seen anywhere, under the skin or in the viscera, and the flight muscles appeared somewhat underdeveloped. The gut was totally empty, except for the presence in the stomach of well over 1,100 nematodes. As a result of this great infestation, the stomach was enlarged, distended, and markedly discolored; numerous small ulcers and damaged areas could be seen in the stomach wall, where some of the nematodes were still attached. The parasites were determined to be a species of *Contracaecum,* probably *C. micropapillatus* Stossich, a common ascaroid found in both White and Brown pelicans *(P. occidentalis)* (York, W. W., and P. A. Maplestone, "The Nematode Parasites of Vertebrates," Blakeston, London, 536 pp., 1926).

The actual cause of death of the pelican was not determined, but it is entirely possible that the extremely heavy nematode infestation might have hastened death, in one or more ways: actual damage to the stomach, blockage of further passage of food, or by weakening the pelican enough so that feeding became difficult. Instances of helminth parasites actually causing the death of their hosts are sufficiently rare that it is felt that the present nematode infestation was only a contributing factor in the death of the pelican.—LARRY C. OGLESBY, *Department of Biological Sciences, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida.*

Ivory-billed Woodhewer Feeds on Mud Flat.—On 27 December 1959, while observing shorebirds on a mud flat about three kilometers by road east of San Blas, Nayarit, México, I saw an Ivory-billed Woodhewer *(Xiphorhynchus flavigaster)* feeding on the same flat. The mangroves that cover much of the coastal plain in this area have been cut down and removed over several acres around the junction of the side road to Matanchen, so that stumps up to six inches high dot the flats. The nearest forest in which woodhewers might be expected to reside is on ridges over half a kilometer to the east.

The woodhewer was pecking at the mud, apparently feeding on the small insects that had attracted the many Audubon's Warblers *(Dendroica auduboni)* and Water Pipits *(Anthus spinoletta)* feeding near it. The nearest shorebirds were Semi-