Vegetation used in nest construction had been pulled from a area 1 to 2 meters around the site.

During incubation, only one pair occupied a lake, pond, or slough. Shortly after hatching the young left the nest, and broods were occasionally seen near other family groups. On 17 August, two pairs, each with three young, were sighted on Norton Lake, approximately 18 miles east-southeast of Fort Churchill. One pair, with their young, apparently had traveled at least 2 miles overland from their nesting site.

Of six broods observed following incubation, five contained three young, while one consisted of four young. One clutch was destroyed by an arctic fox (*Alopex lagopus*), while the fate of the remaining nest was not determined.

Although the number of breeding Whistling Swans located in the Churchill area represents a small percentage of the total North American population, they were common in 1968 where suitable habitat existed. Future studies will have to determine if the local population is decreasing, static, or increasing.

We are indebted to Clait E. Braun and Dr. Ronald A. Ryder, Colorado State University, for help in the preparation of this note.—ALLAN J. PAKULAK AND CARROLL D. LITTLEFIELD, *Department of Fishery and Wildlife Biology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80521, 25 November 1968.*

Eider hatching goose egg.—On 23 June 1967 I found a nest of a Common Eider (*Somateria mollissima*), containing four Eider eggs and one egg of a Blue Goose (*Chen caerulescens*). The incubating Eider appeared to be the sole inhabitant of an island 40 meters in diameter, situated in the South Branch Delta of the McConnell River, N.W.T. (60° 50′ N, 94° 25′ W). Only 11 other Eider nests were located in the 6 sq km delta and six of these were on one island. The Delta represents a peripheral breeding area of the McConnell River Blue Goose colony: not more than 200 Blue Goose nests were located here and none was within one quarter km of the Eider nest described above.

The Eider and her brood left the nest, located in the middle of the island, at noon on 9 July and swam towards an adjacent island 60 m distant, where I was observing from a tower 4 m in height. On land the four young Eiders had difficulty keeping up with the hen. They ran after her, flapping their wings for balance but falling every few meters. As a result they were strung out behind the hen over a distance of two–three meters. The blue-phase Blue gosling, on the other hand, walked beside and sometimes in front of the hen, feeding as it moved. When in the calm water between the two islands the gosling and Eiders experienced no difficulty in keeping up with the hen.

Upon arriving at a pool on the tower island the hen and her young immediately entered the water and began to swim rapidly about while feeding below the surface. The gosling remained out of the water, feeding on sedge (*Carex* sp.). When the family moved to another island on their journey down the Delta they crossed at the bottom of a riffle and swam obliquely up it against the current. Here the gosling was at a disadvantage. The Eiders, when falling far behind the hen, "hydroplaned" back up to her. The gosling, however, was unable to keep up and continually trailed the last Eider.

Later when the family left an island at the top of a very fast, choppy, riffle the gosling did not enter the water. Instead it ran along the bank paralleling the course of the Eiders. Seconds later the hen, followed by her brood, swam back to the island but the gosling did not join them in the water. Eventually the Eiders moved down the riffles staying as close to the bank as possible, and the gosling followed. At the end of the island the gosling jumped off the bank and joined the family in the still water. At this

point the gosling appeared to be wet and tired. It trailed the family as they headed to the next series of riffles and disappeared from sight.

The above incident has shown that a newly hatched Blue Goose gosling lacks the swimming ability, in fast water, of newly hatched Common Eiders and is unable to adapt itself to their mode of feeding.—BERNARD C. LIEFF, *Department of Zoology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, 28 October 1968.*

Shell color of eggs laid by yearling, 2-, and 3-year-old Pheasants.—In an earlier paper (Wilson Bull., 78:379, 1966), we reported that the shell color of eggs laid by individual yearling Pheasants (*Phasianus colchicus*) varied noticeably. Further investigation revealed that the shell color of eggs laid by these same hens as 2- and 3-year-olds showed similar seasonal variation.

Mean eggshell color changed with increasing breeding age for some Pheasant hens but not for others (Table 1). The eggs laid by hens 335 and 345 showed considerable

TABLE 1

MEAN SHELL COLOR OF EGGS LAID BY INDIVIDUAL PHEASANTS AS YEARLING, 2-, AND 3-YEAR-OLD BREEDERS IN 1964, 1965, AND 1966, RESPECTIVELY*

Hen	Age of Hen		
	Yearlings	2-Year-Olds	3-Year-Olds
335	14-E-6† (47)‡	15^{s}-G^{s}-10^{s} (74)	—
337	13-D-3 (78)	13-D-3 (86)	—
340	12-C-2 (84)	12-C-2 (98)	12-C-2 (95)
342	13-E-5 (104)	13-F^{s}-5 (122)	13-F-5 (94)
343	13-E-5 (65)	13-F-5 (82)	—
344	13-E-5 (88)	13-E-6^{s} (84)	—
345	12-C-2 (43)	13-E^{s}-3^{s} (99)	12-C^{s}-1^{s} (74)

* All hens were maintained individually in outdoor cages at Urbana, Illinois, and were fed a standard ration and water, ad libitum.

† Color values are expressed according to the system of Maerz and Paul (A dictionary of color, 1950). The numerals preceding the letter refer to the plate numbers in the orange to yellow color group, which contains eight plates (Nos. 9–16). The plates progressively designate decreasing degrees of purity (e.g., increasing amount of gray), reflecting 86 (Plate 9), 74, 67, 48, 38, 28, 20, and 10 (Plate 16) per cent light, respectively. Each plate is divided into 12 columns (lettered A–L) and 12 rows (numbered 1–12), and shows 23 analogous hues corresponding to the squares in the far right column (L) and in the bottom row (12). Each hue, at its level of purity, is thus expressed in 12 degrees of strength, grading from full strength at the terminal position (lower right) to no hue (upper left). Thus, the letter and following numeral measures hue and its strength. A numerical system was derived so that the differences for each value of mean color could be compared statistically between successive years. The superscript *s* denotes a significant shift ($P < 0.05$) in color value from the previous year.

‡ The numbers of eggs laid by each hen are in parentheses.

variation in mean shell color between successive years whereas those eggs laid by hens 337 and 340 showed no deviation in mean shell color from year to year. The degree of purity in the shell color of eggs laid by individual Pheasants in successive years was a more stable character than was hue (and strength of hue).

Although eggshell color is generally thought to be genetically controlled (Labisky and Jackson, op. cit.), it is obvious that the expression of the genotype in Pheasants is dependent on environmental factors and is subject to modification with age.—RONALD