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

and found no young, eggs, or eggshells. I suspected that the young had hatched and moved away a short distance, or that a predator had devoured or removed the eggs. As we stood at the nest, my dog flushed a female from a site about 15 feet farther off the path. This nest also contained two eggs, and was similarly located, but partially concealed from the path by a small tangle of vines.

The terrain between the nests was level, but leaves, pine needles, sticks, and debris would have made rolling the eggs a difficult task. Although it is possible that there were originally two nests, one of which was destroyed, it seems unlikely that nests would be located only 15 feet apart. Furthermore, only one female was observed and only a single male called in the 18-acre woods during the spring and summer of 1966.

I related this incident to several persons at the time and expressed an opinion that the eggs had been moved by some means. The coincidence between my observations and those of Audubon is remarkable, to the extent that his statement provides a logical explanation for my own observations. At any rate, this incident justifies keeping the subject of egg transport in Chuck-will's-widows open to investigation.—DENZEL E. FERGUSON, *Zoology Department, Mississippi State University, State College, Mississippi 39762, 9 January 1967.*

Nest site movements of a Poor-will.—On 2 August 1965 the nest of a Poor-will (*Phalaenoptilus nuttallii*) was found in Little Valley, Nevada at an altitude of 7,300 feet. Little Valley is 25 miles south of Reno in the Carson Range. The nest, which was in a slight depression in pine needles and which contained two eggs, was on an east-facing slope. The dominant tree of the area is Jeffrey pine (*Pinus jeffreyi*), and the most common shrub of the immediate nest area is manzanita (*Arctostaphylos patula*).

In the course of taking daily weights of the Poor-wills I found that the nest site was frequently shifted. On 7 August the parent bird flushed, exposing the young, 14 feet west of the original site. On 8 August the young were found 20 feet north of site number two. The nest site was in the same place on 9 August but on 10 August the nestlings were found 35 feet west of site number three. On 11 August they were found 17 feet south of site number four. Because of inclement weather the nest area was not checked on 12 and 13 August, but on 14 August the nest was found 7 feet west of site number five. The bad weather persisted through 15, 16, and 17 August, and on 18 August the young birds could not be found.

This study was carried out at the University of Nevada Field Station in Little Valley.—RAYMOND N. EVANS, *Biology Department, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, 31 October 1966.*

The amphirhinal condition in the Passeriformes.—The occurrence of the amphirhinal condition has largely been ignored by ornithologists. Many of the early avian anatomists mentioned it briefly, usually in reference to the suboscines. For example, Forbes (1881. *Proc. Zool. Soc. London*, 1881:435–438) stated that in *Conopophaga* the external nares are divided into an anterior and posterior opening by the ossification of the alinasal cartilages, but he placed little taxonomic importance on the character because of its seemingly spasmodic occurrence in other families. Von Ihering (1915. *Auk*, 32:150) proposed that the term amphirhinal be used to apply to the "style of skull structure in which instead of one large bony nostril we have two, a posterior and anterior one . . . ." He was referring to the condition of the nostril found in the members of the Formicariidae that he had examined. Since that time very little work has been directed towards documenting the occurrence of this character or determining its functional significance.