

the production of a female specimen that he had secured. We went at once to the place, with a view to procuring additional specimens, but the flock had departed, and were no more seen. A resident of the neighborhood informed us that they had continued about this locality for over a week.

This is the fifth record of the species in Ontario.—ERNEST E. THOMPSON, *Toronto, Canada.*

**Occurrence of the Evening Grosbeak in Fulton County, Kentucky.**—Upon becoming certain that the Evening Grosbeak (*Coccothraustes vespertina*) really had been seen by me in this State I wrote to Mr. J. A. Allen to know if its occurrence was of any especial interest. He wrote that its occurrence anywhere south of the Great Lakes was rare, and might be considered almost as accidental, and that he knew of no record of its occurrence south of the Ohio River, and asked for my notes on the species in full for publication in 'The Auk.' They are as follows: March 18, 1887, Mr. Robert Powell showed me a female he had found dead. He said it was a 'Paroquet.' On March 22, I killed a female and saw another but could not secure it. The next day I saw several and killed a fine male. On the 25th I saw a flock of seven, but they were in the city limits and I could not shoot any. Up to date (March 29) these are all my notes on the species. If I see it again I will report further.—L. O. PINDAR, *Hickman, Ky.*

**Winter Plumage of *Leucosticte australis*.**—During the month of January, 1886, I was so fortunate as to secure several specimens of *Leucosticte australis* in full winter dress, and as no account of the winter plumage of this species has, I believe, ever appeared, the following may be of interest.

*Leucosticte australis*, adult ♂ in winter plumage (No. 1513, Coll. A. W. A.; January 24, 1886, Gold Hill, Boulder County, Colo.). Pileum grayish black, darkest anteriorly, slightly paling to grayish on occiput; lores dull blackish; nasal plumes white. General color above and below light umber-brown, tending to chocolate on the chin and throat. Feathers of the back with darker shaft-lines and paler edges; those of the breast but slightly tipped with whitish. Hinder parts of the body, above and below, rich carmine-red; primaries, outer four secondaries, second, third, fourth and fifth rectrices edged, and lesser wing-coverts broadly tipped with same color. Wings and tail blackish, all of the primaries and secondaries broadly, and median pair of rectrices slightly, edged with dull white. Lining of wings white, edged with rosy. Bill yellow, tipped with black for one-fourth its length. Feet black.

Adult ♀ (No. 1510, Coll. A. W. A.; Jan. 24, 1886, Gold Hill, Boulder Co., Colo.). General color as in the male, but paler. Light edgings of the feathers of the breast and back slightly more conspicuous; rosy markings paler and duller, primaries and first secondaries very slightly edged with rosy; wing-coverts and inner secondaries edged with buffy white;

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