

## GENERAL NOTES

**Cape May Warbler in Oklahoma.**—On May 7, 1955, in heavily-wooded bottom land of the Caney River, four miles north of Collinsville, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, L. Ray Bunch and I collected a male Cape May Warbler (*Dendroica tigrina*), apparently the first specimen for this state. The bird was singing and feeding industriously among the lower branches of a large pecan tree about 25 feet from the ground. With it were a male Myrtle Warbler (*Dendroica coronata*) and a male Yellow Warbler (*Dendroica petechia*). We saw no other Cape May Warbler. The specimen, now no. 2160 in the collection of the University of Oklahoma Museum of Zoology, was in full breeding plumage. It was very fat and its testes were enlarged ( $3 \times 3.5$  mm.). Dr. George M. Sutton verified our identification.

Nice and Nice (1924. *Univ. Okla. Stud.* No. 286:114), list the Cape May Warbler among those birds not reported in Oklahoma, but whose appearance is to be expected. Later, Nice (1931. *Publ. Univ. Okla. Biol. Surv.*, 3 [1]), in the last complete listing of the birds of this state does not mention the Cape May Warbler, nor is it shown in her list of additions to the 1931 publication (Nice, 1944. *Proc. Okla. Acad. Sci.*, 24:14–15). In the literature published since the latter date, I have found only one record of this bird being observed here. One was seen by R. C. Brummet in the Quartz Mountain State Park of Greer County and was reported by Baumgartner (1951. *Audubon Field Notes*, 5:264).—JOHN S. TOMER, 4045 E. 27th St., Tulsa, Oklahoma, August 29, 1955.

**Black Ducks eat stunned fish.**—A power generation plant on the shore of Lake Erie near Erie, Michigan, discharges its cooling water directly into the lake. On the morning of January 23, 1955, a cold, brisk wind was driving the warm discharge water out into the lake through a gap in the ice. Near the gap some 700 ducks, mostly Black Ducks (*Anas rubripes*), rested while nearer shore in a small cove of open water about 40 others were feeding.

In addition to the Black Ducks, the small group included single Mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*) and Scaup (probably *Aythya marila*) males and single Canvasback (*Aythya valisineria*) and Pintail (*Anas acuta*) females and two Goldeneye (*Bucephala clangula*) females. The Goldeneyes and Canvasback were diving; the Scaup floated idly; but the Black Ducks were busy taking and eating small fish about three inches long which they seemed to be finding just below the surface.

F. H. Kortright (1942. "The Ducks, Geese and Swans of North America," page 167), reporting the results of the examination of the stomachs of 390 Black Ducks, lists approximately 1 per cent of the content as fishes. In contrast, Milton B. Trautman (1940. "The Birds of Buckeye Lake, Ohio," page 178) reports that Black Ducks ". . . ate gizzard shad with . . . avidity . . ." and refers to their ". . . picking up and swallowing the benumbed and recently killed shad."

It seems likely that the ducks I observed were harvesting fish that had been stunned or killed by the hot discharge water. Although fish may not be a normal food for Black Ducks, this observation seems to confirm that they have no aversion to it and will eat fish in quantity when the taking is made easy.—JOHN M. McCORMICK, 1827 Richards Road, Toledo 7, Ohio, October 5, 1955.

**Comments concerning the age at which imprinting occurs.**—It should be called to the attention of workers in the field of ethology that many of the differences that have been reported in the age at which imprinting most readily occurs could be the consequence of inbreeding. In wild precocial birds, such as ducks and geese, the

phenomenon of imprinting is of great adaptive value, ensuring, as it does, that the young will respond properly to the parent at the same time at which they are physically capable of dispersal. Among altricial birds, needless to say, their physical inability to leave the nest makes the same mechanism less important. However, it will also be seen that the ability to be imprinted represents a highly maladaptive trait among domestic ducks and geese, as in such birds there would be a high likelihood of the occurrence of imprinting onto the wrong object. One would thus suspect the ability to be imprinted to be a rather labile trait which could be maintained only in the face of strong selection. As a consequence, inbreeding and domestication, with its concomitant and unnatural reduction of mortality, would tend to produce individuals differing greatly from the parent stock with respect to their imprintability. In this connection, it is well to recall the loss of broodiness in the white races of the domestic fowl (*Gallus gallus*). I would suggest that this could account for the differences in the sensitive periods and success of imprinting reported by several different workers: Fabricius (1951. *Proc. Tenth Internat. Ornith. Congr.*), E. H. Hess (1955. MS), K. Lorenz (1937. *Auk*, 54:245-273), M. M. Nice (1953. *Condor*, 55:33-37), and Ramsay and Hess (1954. *Wilson Bull.*, 66:196-206).  
—PETER H. KLOPFER, *Osborn Zoological Laboratory, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, September 28, 1955.*

**Little Gull taken in Indiana.**—On December 22, 1955, William J. Barmore, Ted Chandik, Richard E. Phillips, and I found an adult Little Gull (*Larus minutus*) feeding with about 20 Bonaparte's Gulls (*Larus philadelphia*) in the harbor at Michigan City, LaPorte County, Indiana. The gulls were feeding among the drifting ice cakes in a relatively open channel. After repeated observations of the Little Gull as close as 10 feet I collected it. This constitutes the first specimen for Indiana (although there are numerous sight records) and evidently one of the few specimens for the United States. It was very fat and weighed 155.5 grams. The sex could not be determined. Two of the three small minnows removed from the gullet were identified by Dr. Reeve M. Bailey, University of Michigan, as *Notropis atherinoides* (Emerald Shiner).

Phillips and I had observed an adult Little Gull at the above place on January 27, 1955, but had been unable to collect it. It fed with an immature female Black-legged Kittiwake (*Rissa tridactyla*), which I collected, and a few Ring-billed Gulls (*Larus delawarensis*), but there were no Bonaparte's Gulls. The previous night the temperature had been at least  $-10^{\circ}$  F. and the gulls were feeding in two small, warm water outlets of the Northern Indiana Public Service Company plant. Except where these outlets flowed into Lake Michigan, no other open water was visible.

The Little Gull skin and partial skeleton are deposited in the University of Michigan Museum of Zoology; the Kittiwake skin has been deposited in the Purdue University Wildlife Laboratory Collection.—RUSSELL E. MUMFORD, *University of Michigan Museum of Zoology, Ann Arbor, Michigan, January 26, 1956.*

**Evening Grosbeak nesting in Michigan.**—Actual nesting records of the Evening Grosbeak (*Hesperiphona vespertina*) in Michigan are few. Wood (1951. *Univ. Mich. Mus. Zool. Misc. Publ.* no. 75:456) listed only two, although summer observations of adult birds were recorded from several areas. I would like to thank Dr. Lawrence H. Walkinshaw, who gathered most of the following information, for graciously turning it over to me for publication.

Dale and Marian Zimmerman observed about 50 grosbeaks July 25, 1952, along Highway M-77 at the Alger-Schoolcraft County line, 11 miles north of Seney. These birds were eating the fruits of wild cherry and *Amelanchier*; at least three birds were stub-