

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-