30. **Penthestes atricapillus septentrionalis.** Long-tailed Chickadee.—Perhaps the birds seen really belong to the Columbian "island" of **atricapillus** proper, but they appear to me lighter in tone, with more of white edging on wing and tail.

31. **Penthestes gambeli.** Mountain Chickadee.—Active members of the Amalgamated Push.

32. **Regulus satrapa olivaceus.** Golden-crowned Kinglet.—Not so common as on Puget Sound. Only once seen, on a densely thicketed hillside.

33. **Merula migratoria propinqua.** Western Robin.—Several lingering about the orchards and shade trees of Cannon Hill.

34. **Sialia mexicana occidentalis.** Western Bluebird.—Still common locally; a dozen seen Nov. 20th. These birds are undoubtedly intergrades and possibly deserve to be classed as **S. m. bairdi.**

Seattle, Wash.

THE YELLOW-BREASTED CHAT IN MICHIGAN.

P. A. TAVERNER.

Southern Michigan marks the extreme northern limit of the range of the Yellow-breasted Chat in the Middle West. They can hardly be regarded in the state as common or regular visitors, except locally. They must be viewed as intrusive forms from the Carolinian Fauna to the south of us that have, for the past decade or so, been extending their range northward. In the past, they have appeared here occasionally under peculiar and, as yet, unknown conditions, persisting for a while, and then vanishing more or less completely for a greater or less period of time.

The causes of these intrusions and disappearances are still beyond explanation. They seem to come and go according to no law, rule or set of conditions. That they are but accidental and the result of chance no scientific man will for a moment admit; but the complexity of the conditions renders the solution very difficult indeed. In many cases, such investigation involves an exhaustive study of the conditions prevalent over the winter ranges of the individuals in question; and until we have positive data regarding where the different individuals of the various northern races spend their winters we cannot hope for any great success along these lines. It may be well to call attention to the fact that these occurrences

have not taken place as isolated phenomena, but have generally been accompanied by the intrusion of other species that may or may not have been caused by the same set of conditions. Prominent among these contemporary incursions, in this section, has been the spread of the following species,—Lark Sparrow, Grasshopper Sparrow, Dickcissel, and Cardinal. Some of these have formed permanent residences, but others, notably the Dickcissel, have, after a short persistence, vanished again completely. In this latter case the extinction seems to have been more general than with the rest and may possibly have been caused by hostile influences in the southern ranges.

The data upon the Yellow-breasted Chat in Michigan is not very voluminous, but as a matter of record it may be well to place what can be gathered in an enduring form for the benefit of further workers. In the compilation of the following I have been assisted by the various people whose names I mention below. To these and to Dr. Ned Dearborn, Mr. Ruthven Dean and Prof. W. B. Barrows, who has kindly assisted me with the benefit of the notes he has gathered on the subject, I must extend my sincere thanks for their coöperation.

The first record of the bird's occurrence in the state that I can get track of occurs in Gibb's MS. of 1881, in which the following note occurs: *"Icteria virens.* First taken Aug. 12, 1876, quite common until Oct. 2, '76, and not seen since.—Dr. Atkin's MS. Birds of Ingham Co." Unfortunately the MS. of the late Doctor has completely disappeared, and this is the only authoritative record of his that we have on this subject. Prof. A. J. Cook had access to it when he wrote his Birds of Michigan in 1893, and he quotes the following : "Exceedingly rare, occasionally quite common" (Dr. Atkins). However, the many misquotations in this work throw doubt upon all the rest that cannot be confirmed through other sources, and render complete acceptance dangerous.

The next observations on the species were made by Jerome Trombley, of Petersburg, Monroe County, who found the birds, and took two nests, May, 1877, one of which, dated the 26th, is now in the Museum of the Agricultural College. Of

these Mr. Trombley writes me: "These nests were all taken by me in the same locality, and were the only birds seen that year, and were the first Chats I ever saw here. After 1877, and until 1881, a few individuals were occasionally seen every year. After 1881, for a few years, they seemed to have decreased, so much so that I failed to detect any in their old haunts." In 1894 the same observer took two birds, May 3 and 17, as is recorded in Butler's Birds of Indiana, and the following month, in company with Mr. A. B. Covert and Dr. Robt. H. Wolcott, the writer found several pairs on the edge of a black ash swamp about four miles south of Ann Arbor, Washtenaw County. Three or four birds were taken in this instance and the following year they were found breeding in the same locality by Prof. D. C. Worcester and Mr. Covert, and the nest, eggs and the parent birds were taken, collected and deposited in the Museum of the University of Michigan. Since then, they have not been seen in this locality.

Mr. Swales, in his List of The Land-birds of South-eastern Michigan Bull., Mich. Ornith. Club, V. p. 40, records two nests of the bird in Wayne County, both at Grosse Pointe, dated May 29, 1898, and May 30, 1903, taken by W. A. Davidson and Chas. E. Wisner respectively. Sept. 28, 1904, I heard a bird whistling in some dense shrubbery to the north of the city of Detroit. The most diligent work failed to discover sight of the vocalist, but I had no difficulty in recognizing the voice of the Chat. Had this been the only record of the bird's occurrence here I should hesitate to record it here as such. Subsequent developments, however, substantiated the identification and renders the conclusion safe. May 20, 1905, I heard and saw one bird near the same place, and again, on the 23d, when I saw several, but failed to secure any specimens. Subsequent efforts in the same locality on June 4 and 24, and July 1 and 4, proved equally futile and they baffled all the efforts of Mr. Swales and myself, though we saw the birds often and positively identified them. There were at least three pairs in the vicinity and probably more. At the time of the last date their song season had passed and the birds were so quiet that it was impossible to find them and we had to give up the attempt for the season.

Strangely enough, on the same date that I found the first one this year (May 20), Mr. Swales and Prof. Barrows heard sounds that they were very sure came from the bird on Chandler's Marsh, Ingham County. Prof. Barrows is well acquainted with the species from experience with them elsewhere, and Mr. Swales had just returned from Point Pelee, Ont., where he became acquainted with their eminently characteristic calls. He afterward studied them on the above mentioned occasions and is well satisfied as to the correctness of the first supposition.

Mr. Trombley, under date of July 12, 1905, tells me, "A pair nested here (Monroe County) last year. It does not apparently gain or decrease in numbers." And again, "I regarded the Chat, at my first discovery, in 1877, as purely accidental, at the time, but subsequent observation leads me to think that it will be found sparingly in Monroe County every year, were all the localities carefully searched that are favorable to it. Of late years, I have noted it several times and I have come to regard it as a rare but regular summer resident of Monroe County."

In the adjoining territory to Michigan some interesting data is to be gathered.

In Ohio, Prof. Lynds Jones, Birds of Ohio, lists it as a common bird in the southern counties of his state, but becoming less so to the north until it becomes almost rare on the Lake Erie shore.

Across the Lake at Point Pelee, Ont., Mr. W. E. Saunders found it in 1884, and in May, 1905, he, together with Mr. Swales and the writer, found several pairs there.[1]

In Indiana, Butler lists it as common in the southern parts of the state to rare in the northern sections, and adds, "Prior to 1893, it was unknown in the north-western part of the state, and the same may be said along the northern boundary in both Indiana and Michigan." From the data I have from Illinois about the same conditions have prevailed. It seems to have appeared about Chicago in 1894; since then it seems to have been a more or less regular summer resident, especially in the Calumet region and about the Skokie Marshes, but not regularly common and rather local.

Kumlien and Hollister record it as a regular summer resident in the southern part of Wisconsin, where it breeds in favorable localities rather commonly. They neglect to state how long it has been so, but it has probably come into this state at a comparatively recent date as it has in the adjoining ones.

A comparison of the foregoing leads one to the conclusion that the extension of its range about 1893 and '94 was of pretty general distribution, and must be referred to general and not local conditions. In most places it now appears to have made almost permanent settlements and we can hope that this species will become firmly settled and form a welcome addition to our avi-fauna.

[1] Since writing the above, Dr. Wm. Brodie, of Toronto, writes me that he met with an individual of this species on Point Pelee in July, 1879. He examined the dead bird in the flesh, so there can be no doubt as to the identification.—P. A. T.

A TAGGED FLICKER.

Readers of the ornithological magazines may remember a scheme proposed by the writer a couple of years ago for tagging birds for the purpose of studying migration. The idea was to put aluminum bands upon the tarsi of nestlings and all other birds it was possible to capture. These bands were to be inscribed with a number, and the words "Notify the Auk, N. Y." For the last two summers I have been doing this on every occasion and have been furnishing others with the materials for following my example. Strict notes have been kept in regard to each tag used, and this winter, the first fruit of the work has been reaped.

May 29, 1905, Mr. Chas. Kirkpatrick attached tag No. 123 to the leg of a half-grown Flicker at Keota, Keokuck County, Iowa. Christmas day this bird was shot by Mr. J. E. Ross, of Many, Sabine Parish, La., about six hundred and fifty miles south of the breeding grounds. The bird was not saved,[1] unfortunately, but I have positively identified the tag used, so there can be no doubt as to the accuracy of the record. This gives us, I think, the first absolute data on the extent of the individual migration of this bird, and as such, is of much in-