lesser coverts tipped with the rosy of the abdomen, secondaries and tail-feathers slightly edged with hoary, linings of wings white, each feather slightly tipped with rosy. Bill yellow, tipped with black for one-quarter of its length.

Juv., sex? (No. 1515, Coll. A. W. A,; January 24, 1886, Gold Hill, Colo.). Crown dull grayish-black, feathers edged with gray, fading on the occiput into the grayish brown of the neck. Lores dusky; nasal plumes dull whitish. Sides of head and neck all around grayish brown, deepening to umber-brown on the chin and throat. Lower parts anteriorly light brown, each feather edged with whitish; abdomen dusky, the feathers tipped with pale pinkish and dingy white, feathers of the back dull brown, with darker shaft-lines and paler edges; upper tail-coverts and lesser wing-coverts with rosy markings; greater coverts edged with white, very slightly tinted with same. Wings and tail blackish, all of the feathers more or less edged with dull white. Lining of wings white. Bill yellow, clouded with black; feet and tarsus black. The entire plumage of this specimen has a very bleached, uncertain appearance.

In comparing the full plumaged australis with L. tephrocotis, both in winter dress, I find the latter much the darker bird, the umber-brown on the breast and back of the female tephrocotis being of about the same shade as that found on the male australis. In tephrocotis the rosy hue is less extended, decidedly duller, and more broken by the ground colors of the body. In tephrocotis I often find the rump marked with crescent-shaped rosy spots on a chocolate ground, while in australis, although the rosy patch is seldom, if ever, continuous, it is usually less broken and extends farther forward. A few of the males of australis had the carmine of the abdomen clear and unbroken, extending in the middle much farther forward than in tephrocotis, which, in all cases examined, had the colored patch more or less broken by chocolate-brown.—A. W. Anthony, Denver, Colorado.

Note on Spizella monticola ochracea Brewst.-In his 'Additions to the Catalogue of the Birds of Kansas', Col. Goss suggests that, since all the specimens of this form examined by him had been "captured in the fall or early winter, further examination, especially of the birds in their spring plumage, might prove the paler form to be the immature winter dress" of the common species (true S. monticola), although he remarks that "Mr. Brewster, in making his examination, had before him not only his large collection, but that in the National Museum, which must have embraced specimens taken at different seasons of the year." For Col. Goss's information on this point, as well as for that of others who may not be familiar with the two forms in their various plumages, I would state that the National Museum collection embraces large series of both taken on their breeding grounds, S. monticola in northern Labrador (Ft. Chimo, Ungava, by L. M. Turner) and S. monticola ochracea in Alaska (various localities by various collectors), and that the two forms are in summer dress quite as distinct from one another as in winter, the young in first plumage being equally different. Moreover, the difference is perfectly

constant so far as birds from the two regions are concerned, the comparatively very small number of specimens of intermediate character coming of course from neutral territory.—ROBERT RIDGWAY, Washington, D. C.

Spizella pusilla wintering near Hartford, Conn. — This species seems to have some inclination to winter in this vicinity, as will be seen from the following data: While collecting Jan. 11, 1886, I saw four, three of which I shot for positive identification. Jan. 26, of this same year, I saw another which was in company with a flock of Spizella monticola. I could not find them again during the winter of this year. On Jan. 20, 1887, noticing a small Sparrow hopping around the door-yard I soon approached it, and found it very tame, and noticed that it was a typical Spizella pusilla. This bird remained around here, during a very 'cold snap,' until Jan. 26, after which it suddenly disappeared. From these facts, I think their stay here must have been voluntary, for the coldest weather failed to drive them away, and there were several seen at different times, which proves clearly enough that they were not all disabled birds. — WILLARD E. Treat, East Hartford, Conn.

Change of Winter Habitat in the Grass Finch.—I take the following entries from my note book: "January 2, 1885. Shot four males from a flock of twelve Poocætes gramineus confinis, the first I ever saw here in winter. They seemed to want to feed in one spot of stubble and would return to it after being fired at.-Jan. 5. Saw Grass Finches.-Jan. 8. Saw same flock of Grass Finches.-Jan. 12. I saw a flock of one dozen Grass Finches at the school house.—Jan. 13. I saw two dozen Grass Finches at the school house; think they came from the south; also Savanna Sparrows, and a flock of Waxwings. Mercury 30° F.-Jan. 16. Cold high wind all night. Temperature about zero. I saw three Grass Finches and a Song Sparrow.—Jan. 17. Mercury 9° (above). The Grass Finches are still feeding at the stock corral; not more than half a dozen seen at one time.—Jan. 22. Mercury 32°; wind E. S. E.; rain and sleet. In a two mile walk I saw a large flock of Grass Finches. In comparing ten skins eight of the skins are exactly intermediate between the typical gramineus and the var. confinis. One is typical gramineus, shot here (Cook Co., Tex.) March 12, 1880. One is var. confinis, shot at Colorado, Tex., May 18, 1882.—Feb. 2. I shot and compared three Grass Finches; they seem to constantly stand between the type and the variety; the bill of the western bird may be a little longer and the ear-coverts whiter or grayer. Size in inches:

From the above it may be seen that the birds persisted in staying through January, and my notes show that they were seen at intervals until March 12, when they were heard singing.