

On 5 and 6 June, a single Mourning Dove egg was laid in each of two different Catbird (*Dumetella carolinensis*) nests. These nests were approximately 200 meters apart and I suspect that the same dove laid both eggs.

On 5 June, a dove had laid an egg in one of the Catbird nests just after it was completed. She had added a few twigs of her own to the nest. The dove egg remained in the nest until 8 June when there were two Catbird eggs. I suspect that the Catbird removed the dove egg.

On 6 June, a dove egg was laid in a Catbird nest that had just been completed the previous day. It remained there for two days and then disappeared. Catbird eggs were not observed in this nest.

It may be that the Mourning Doves that laid these eggs had eggs in the oviduct before they had constructed a nest and used the first convenient site they could find.

These observations were made in connection with Red-winged Blackbird research supported in part by the Chapman Memorial Fund. I would like to thank James Linder, a student at Midland College, for bringing the one nest to my attention.—LARRY C. HOLCOMB, *Department of Biology, Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska, 27 September 1966.*

Overlapping nestings by a pair of Barn Owls.—In February, 1961, a male Barn Owl (*Tyto alba*) was captured in a church spire in New Haven, Middlesex County, Connecticut. It was banded and returned to the tower after four weeks in captivity. In April a Barn Owl was incubating seven eggs in a corner of the room over the tower belfry. Five young were reared from this clutch, fledging in mid-August, after which the family left the tower.

In 1962 five eggs were laid between 8 and 17 April. Subsequent candling revealed that only three of these were fertile and only two hatched. Between 16 May, when I first saw the two young, and 4 July I made only brief visits. Usually both adults were seen (the male banded) but no attempt was made to capture them, as they invariably flew up inside the spire to perch on a small platform near the top. Light from a small glass window near the platform made them easily seen. On 4 July the older nestling displayed aggressively when I entered the tower. Both were running and jumping about, but were not able to fly upward.

The following day I returned to the tower, accompanied by Mr. Michael Trevor and Rev. Edward L. Duncan. The young were as aggressive as on the previous day, but were easily handled for banding. The only adult present, an unbanded bird which we assumed to be the female, did not fly up the spire but allowed itself to be captured rather easily. In contrast to the struggling, hissing young, this bird was docile when handled. When released, it flew to the perch inside the spire window and remained there.

Despite my assurance that his attempts would prove futile, Trevor insisted on searching the tower for possible eggs. To my chagrin, he located a clutch of four warm eggs in a hollow of the wall, eight feet directly over the original nest site. After ascertaining that at least one egg contained an embryo, we left the tower. On 11 July we returned, finding only a banded adult present. Where the four eggs had been, there was now only the empty cavity.

While there is no proof that the same female or even the same male owl was involved in the two 1962 nestings, there is less evidence that more than two birds were involved.

If three or four owls were occupying the tower concurrently one would have expected to find more than two birds present on at least some visits. Moreover, one might have expected a greater degree of overlap between the two broods if two pairs or two females were present.

Stewart (1952. *Auk*, 69:227-245) notes that Barn Owls have been found breeding in all months of the year, even in the northern part of their range. He cites a case of a pair in New York with young in late July and again in December. In this case the female was banded and was recaptured with the second brood. Wayne (1908. *Auk*, 25:21-24) pointed out that in South Carolina the eggs are often laid in September. The only case of overlapping broods known to me is that reported by Morejohn (1955. *Auk*, 72:298) from California. The situation was similar to that in the Connecticut birds: the first brood had been reduced, by non-hatching and nestling mortality, to one bird. Of the four eggs in the second clutch, one was opened by Morejohn and found to contain an embryo, and two of the remaining three hatched.

The above data suggest that in some parts of the United States individual Barn Owls are in breeding condition in all months of the year and that a pair may retain its breeding capability for a period longer than that found in most other large raptors. These characteristics facilitate the production of second broods, despite the four months required from egg laying to fledging in each brood. If the size of the first brood and the availability of food are such that one adult can provide food for both the young and the other adult, the second clutch may occasionally be laid before the first brood is out of the nest.—PETER L. AMES, *Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, California, 27 July 1966.*

A possible case of egg transport by a Chuck-will's-widow.—Audubon (1821. *Ornithological Biography*, I.) reported observing oral egg transport in the Chuck-will's-widow (*Caprimulgus carolinensis*). Although Audubon's account for the Chuck-will's-widow remains unconfirmed, Truslow (1966. *Natl. Geographic*, 130:882-884) has observed and photographed similar behavior in a Pileated Woodpecker (*Dryocopus pileatus*). Ganier (1964. *Wilson Bull.*, 76:19-27) dismissed Audubon's account as a fabrication, or possibly a ghostwriter's attempt to inject "novelty" into his writings. Ganier concluded that the lack of substantiating evidence for Audubon's observations was sufficient to refute the story and stated that "future authors should avoid its repetition."

In the late spring of 1966, I witnessed a sequence of events suggesting that efforts to discredit egg transport in Chuck-will's-widows may be premature. Unfortunately, I attributed no special significance to the observations (until I read Truslow's paper), and consequently, I failed to record dates and other pertinent details desirable in a published account.

My home near State College, Mississippi is adjacent to an 18-acre woods—predominantly pine with a mixture of young deciduous growth in the understory. A number of cleared paths traverse the woods and I walk them almost daily. In 1965, a Chuck-will's-widow nested near one path. On several occasions the female feigned injury by performing various antics in the path. No nest was observed.

In 1966 (about mid-May), I flushed a Chuck-will's-widow from a nest near the same area. The unprepared nest was 15 to 20 feet off the path on the forest floor which was matted with pine needles and deciduous leaves. I did not touch the two eggs. The next day, the female flew off the nest as I approached, but she remained on the nest when I walked by the following day. On the third day, I took my 5-year-old son to see the nest. When the female was not visible from the path, we approached the nest