Cleveland Bird Calendar, 53,3:13). The nesting in Pepper Pike Village is the first authentic record for Cuyahoga County.

Elsewhere in northern Ohio the Bewick's Wren is considered rare. Thus to the east of Cleveland, in Ashtabula County, Hicks (1933. *Wilson Bull.*, 45:187) described this species as "very rare and not definitely known to breed." To the west (Toledo), Campbell (1940. *Birds of Lucas County*) described it as "the rarest of the wrens which visit Lucas County." Even in the central portion of Ohio, in the vicinity of Columbus, the Bewick's Wren is classed as an uncommon summer resident (Borror, 1950. A Check List of the Birds of Ohio).—DONALD L. NEWMAN, *14174 Superior Road, Cleveland Heights 18, Ohio, 15 February 1960.*

An albinistic Carolina Wren.—Gross (*In* Bent, 1948. *U.S. Natl. Mus. Bull.*, 195:127) reports albinism apparently rare in the Troglodytidae. Since then Bond (1949. *Cassinia*, No. 37:23) has recorded a completely albinistic House Wren (*Troglodytes aëdon*). On 6 December 1959, I banded a Carolina Wren (*Thryothorus ludovicianus*) which when at rest showed a white stripe near the outer edge of each wing, and a touch of white on each side of the lower back. I found that primaries Nos. 5 and 6 in each wing were white to within about half an inch of their tips, where they began shading into normal color, and that one secondary covert in each wing was white to within a short distance of the tip. —HERVEY BRACKBILL, *2620 Poplar Drive, Baltimore 7, Maryland, 9 December 1959.*

Neonates and incubation period of Chimney Swift.—An egg of the Chimney Swift (*Chaetura pelagica*), determined to be fresh by candling on 14 June 1958, was hatched in a forced-draft incubator on 30 June. The pink-skinned neonate hatched 372±11 hours after initiation of artificial incubation. In two other eggs of this clutch that failed to hatch, embryonic development was indiscernible on the sixteenth day. Robert E. Stewart of Laurel, Maryland, donated this clutch from his chimney and Aelred Geis donated another day-old specimen from that locality that was hatched in nature for corroboration.

The incubation period in the artificial incubator of 372±11 hours (15.50±.46 days) contrasts with the incubation period in nature in this species. Whereas MacNamara (1918. *Ottawa Nat.*, 32:39–42) noted a period of 16 days, the period is obviously lengthened considerably by adverse environmental conditions: 19 days has been noted most frequently (Amadon, 1936. *Auk*, 53:216–217; Kendeigh, 1952. *Illinois Biol. Monographs*, 22:1–356; and Sherman, 1952. Birds of an Iowa Dooryard). In the Common Swift (*Apus apus*), the Lacks (1951. *Ibis*, 93:501–546) have shown that the period varies between 18.5 and 24.5 days. The secondary effects of moisture loss from the eggs in depressing egg temperatures may be an important cause of variability, for chimneys are notoriously drafty nesting sites. The methods and conditions of incubation in this study were as previously standardized (Wetherbee, 1959. Artificial incubation of wild birds' eggs and developmental condition of neonates, University Microfilms). The swiftlet looked much like a neonatal passerine except that the toenails, which were duskily pigmented, were extraordinarily long and gracefully pointed, not short and hooked. This character of the toenails was noted previously in another apodiform, the Ruby-throated Hummingbird (*Archilochus colubris*) (Wetherbee, *loc. cit.*). There was also a blunt alular spur, not pigmented, on the swift at hatching. The long toenails are undoubtedly of adaptive significance in clinging to the precariously situated shelf-like nest and also in actual locomotion (see Kennard, *in* Bent, 1940. *U.S. Nat. Mus. Bull.*, 176:275).

The neonates had no down. Four nestlings in the pin-feather stage I took at Gainesville, Florida, also have no signs of natal down. Other workers have noted the absence of natal

down; but it is necessary to corroborate such statements because of the unfortunate lack of objectivity in the literature regarding this point. The generalization that "swifts and hummingbirds are completely naked" at hatching (Wallace, 1955. An Introduction to Ornithology, p. 47), moreover is erroneous, for at least some hummingbird species do have neossoptiles. Downy pterylosis of the Ruby-throated Hummingbird was recently described (Wetherbee, 1958. *Bird-Banding*, 29:232–236). *Apus apus* is hatched naked (Witherby *et al.*, 1938. Handbook of British Birds, 2:248). While Legg (*Condor*, 1956. 58:183–187) described the just-hatched Black Swift (*Cypseloides niger*) as naked, his statement that the two-week-old nestling is completely covered with "down" seems incompatible with his description of the day-old bird unless it is deemed necessary to reopen the argument that neossoptiles might be generated after hatching. Dixon (*Condor*, 1935. 37:265–267) also noted the Black Swift as naked at hatching. Legg (personal communication, 7 October 1955) thought that the "down" might be an adaptation for the nesting habitat of cool and moist situations. It seems probable that what is being referred to here is *not* natal down, but emerging teleoptiles.

There is a very crude correlation between cavity-nesting and nakedness of neonates in passerines (Wetherbee, 1957. *Bull. American Mus. Nat. Hist.*, 113:339–436) that may be applicable in this species. The bill had a dusky pigmentation like that of the toenails and this contrasted with the light pink of the rest of the body. The bill was without special rictal flanges and without special mouth coloration. Therefore, the assumption that the possession of flanges and mouth colors is a specialization for parental guidance in feeding the young in dark nesting cavities (Ticehurst, 1908. *British Birds*, 2:186–194) is not supported, for Barton (*Auk*, 1958. 75:216–217) has demonstrated that this species has had ample time to develop cavity-nesting evolutionary responses.

The eyelids of the neonatal Chimney Swift are closed craniad over the irides at a relatively low level of embryonic differentiation. Fischer (1958. *New York State Museum and Science Service Bull.*, 368) notes that they do not open until the sixteenth to twentieth day after hatching. Considering the disparity in development of the eyes and the feet, we have here an obvious differential acceleration that even defies axial-gradient growth. It is another example of the inadequacy and absurdity of the words "precocial" and "altricial" in ornithology (see Wetherbee, 1959. Comparative phylembryogenetic dimensionality of neonatal birds, University Microfilms).—David Kenneth Wetherbee, *U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Massachusetts Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts, 30 November 1959.*

Unusual nesting behavior of Chimney Swifts.—The Chimney Swifts composing a nesting colony on the campus of Kent State University usually pair soon after their annual return in the third week of April. Occasionally a few shift about from one possible mate to another over a brief time, but soon settle down with a mate for that season. However, one female, banded with No. 21-128574, was involved in an unusual type of nesting behavior for this species in the summer of 1959. Her life history is briefly reviewed here.

No. ---74 was banded 20 August 1953 as a juvenile bird. She was captured in a flock of 18 swifts composed of both adult and juvenile birds which were roosting together following the nesting period for that season. In 1954, this female returned to the campus, but did not nest. Chimney Swifts do not ordinarily nest until their second year. In 1955, she nested for the first time, in Air Shaft L1. In 1956, she was not recaptured, but the following year she was found nesting in Shaft V1 on the roof of another building. Because this shaft had not been trapped the previous year, it is possible this female had nested there in 1956 as well. When she was found again in 1957, she and her mate had a seasonal