

regeneration of the gonads, and only those birds without gonadal regeneration were used in the study. The breast feathers of all the birds were plucked every month, and the regeneration studied for over a year. The birds were grouped as follows:

Group	Sex	Status	Number of birds	Regeneration
I	Male	Adult normal	23	Normal adult type
II	Male	Adult castrate	22	Normal adult type
III	Female	Adult normal	20	Normal adult type
IV	Female	Adult ovariectomized	18	Normal adult type
V	Male	Juvenile normal	5	Normal adult type
VI	Male	Juvenile castrate	5	Normal adult type
VII	Female	Juvenile normal	3	Normal adult type
VIII	Female	Juvenile ovariectomized	4	Normal adult type

All birds always regenerated colored adult plumage, showing complete independence of the cycling gonads and the pituitary, suggesting that the factors controlling plumage pigmentation in this species of Indian finches may be genic in nature.—P. D. TEWARY and J. P. THAPLIYAL, *Banaras Hindu University, India*.

Observations of Drakes Accompanying Hens with Brood.—During the 1960 and 1961 rearing seasons on the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge, Utah, I observed nine drakes of seven waterfowl species each accompanying a hen with brood: Ruddy Duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis rubida*), 31 May 1960; Redheads (*Aythya americana*), 2-3 June 1960, respectively; Shovellers (*Spatula clypeata*), 5-7 June 1960, respectively; Gadwall (*Anas strepera*), 7 June 1960; Blue-winged Teal (*Anas discors discors*), 5 June 1960; Cinnamon Teal (*Anas cyanoptera septentrionalium*), 12 June 1960; and Mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos platyrhynchos*), 1 May 1961. Dates refer to the time of first observations only. Except for the Ruddy Duck and Mallard drakes, which are occasionally reported with a hen and brood, and possibly the Blue-winged Teal and Shoveller drakes, which may stay until hatching of the brood (Hochbaum, *A Canvas-back on a Prairie Marsh*, Baltimore: Monumental Printing Co., 1944) the above sightings are apparently of rare occurrences. None of the drakes seemed to remain with the hen longer than a week after the brood was hatched.—NICHOLAS J. CHURA, *Wild-life Research Unit, Utah State University, Logan, Utah*.

Behavior of a California Gull Feeding on a Large Mallard Duckling.—Odin (*Auk*, 74: 185-202, 1957) and others report the predaceous nature of the California Gull (*Larus californicus*) without detailed accounts of feeding behavior, which are difficult to obtain. In 1961, I (*Auk*, 78: 271-272) reported the manner in which a small juvenile coot (*Fulica americana americana*) was prepared for swallowing by being crushed and jabbed by the bill of the feeding gull. Subsequently, I witnessed a Mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos platyrhynchos*), 23 days old and weighing about 260 g, being consumed without prior "softening" by the gull.

On 26 May 1961 I placed several captive Mallard ducklings for observation in a small stream-fed enclosure located on the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge, Utah. I was standing but 2.5 meters away when a gull swooped down and unsuccessfully attempted to grab one of the ducklings, which escaped by diving to the bottom of the stream. The gull flew away without an immediate second attempt, and the ducklings emerged from the water and preened themselves on the bank. I retreated to a point 12 meters away when the same or another gull landed beside one of the busy ducklings, quickly grasped it just behind the head and took flight. The victim kicked and jerked

its body, causing the gull, which barely cleared the fence, to land immediately outside the enclosure and swallow the head and neck of the duckling for a better grip. Taking flight it initiated a series of deep swallows, and the Mallard rapidly disappeared into the gullet of the gull. Less than a minute later the gull alighted on a nearby pond and took several sips of water before flying away into the marsh.—NICHOLAS J. CHURA, *Wildlife Research Unit, Utah State University, Logan, Utah.*

Comparison of the Weight-Lifting Capacities of a House Finch and a Golden Eagle.—While observing the nest-building activities of a pair of House Finches (*Carpodacus mexicanus*), I saw the female return to the nest site with a large piece of fabric in her beak. By frightening her I caused her to drop the load. It proved to be a ribbonlike piece of cloth 1.2 to 1.8 cm in width, 80 cm long, 4 layers thick, and weighing 4.885 g. She had picked up this rag in a yard near the nest site and was seen flying in over the roof of my garage.

Wishing to secure further data on the strength and lifting ability of House Finches, I found that Partin (*Condor*, 35: 60, 1933) had made an exhaustive study of House Finch weights and had determined an average of 20.85 g for the species. Thus a female House Finch having a body weight of 20.85 could lift and become airborne with a bulky load weighing 4.885 g on an almost windless morning. This appeared to be a remarkably heavy load for such a small bird.

Lewis and Marian Walker (*Nat. Mag.*, 33: 320–323, 1940) give details of weight-lifting trial flights for a male Golden Eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*). They found that the eagle could carry 2 lb (907 g) in “effortless” playful flight; that 4 lb (1,814 g) proved “difficult,” and 8 lb (3,628 g) was beyond the carrying capacity of the bird. There was no mention of the body weight of this experimental eagle. However, Poole (*Auk*, 55: 517, 1938) gives the weight of a female Golden Eagle as 4,664 g. Bent (*U.S. Nat. Mus. Bull.* 167: 300) gives the weight of an adult male Golden Eagle as 4,169.4 g.

Thus, the House Finch weighing 20.85 g carried a 4.88 g load, which is 23 per cent of her weight, and the Golden Eagle weighing 4,169.4 g carried a 907 g load, which is 21 per cent of his weight.

The eagle could probably have easily lifted a few more grams, but it is noteworthy that the ratio of their body weights to the loads carried is very nearly equal.—LAURENCE M. HUEY, *San Diego Society of Natural History, Balboa Park, San Diego, California.*

The Terminology of the Short Extensor Muscles of the Third Toe in Birds.—During my current study of the myology of the pelvic appendage in the genera *Tympanuchus* and *Pedioecetes*, I was faced with the problem of conflicting terminologies for the short extensors of the third toe. This paper is the result of my effort to resolve this problem.

Hudson (1937: 54), on the basis of studies of a wide variety of birds, states: “In no case was more than one short extensor found attached to the third toe. Gadow, however, gives two: *M. extensor proprius digiti III* and *M. extensor brevis digiti III*. He states that both are well developed and entirely independent of one another in the Ratitae. This condition apparently does not occur in any other group of birds. It seems probable that the name *M. extensor brevis digiti III* should be discarded as a synonym of the *M. extensor proprius digiti III*. The former name was introduced by Gadow while the latter had been used by previous writers. It is not uncommon for a muscle to be double in certain restricted groups of birds, but this is no valid argument for the use of two muscle names.”