

On May 26 a breeding male Hermit Warbler (*Dendroica occidentalis*) was collected ten miles north of Garberville, elevation 1000 feet, on the south fork of the Eel River, Humboldt County. This male, number 1268, coll. A. H. Miller, and one or two others were stationed as for breeding in small isolated groves of yellow pines amid Douglas fir and madrone and across cañon from an extensive redwood forest. The bird collected was singing continuously in a restricted area; its gonads were greatly enlarged. This breeding station is thirty-five miles west of the Yolla Bolly Mountains and a similar distance south and west of South Fork Mountain, Trinity County, where Hermit Warblers have previously been found breeding in the yellow pine forests (specimens in the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology). It is significant to note this species following the yellow pines to low elevations and into a region close to the coast and forested primarily with redwood.

The California Shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus gambeli*) is a permanent resident in parts of southern and interior Sonoma County, as for example at Valley Ford, Bodega and Santa Rosa. It has not been known heretofore from farther north on the California coast, except for Townsend's report (Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., 10, 1887, p. 222) of occurrence in December of 1885 at Humboldt Bay. This indefinite and somewhat unsatisfactory record, if it applies to this form, probably represents a single stray bird. On August 26 of this year I watched a California Shrike for several minutes while it perched at close range on a wire over a farmyard, one and a half miles south of the mouth of the Gualala River in extreme northwestern Sonoma County. It was a very dark-colored individual, both above and below. At this locality there is a narrow coastal plain that is free from forest. This bird may represent a post-breeding season dispersal that often occurs in August in this species; yet it is not impossible that occasional pairs of shrikes breed here, as this coastal plain, though narrow and restricted by forests, is not entirely cut off from similar shrike-inhabited country near Bodega, thirty-five miles to the southwest.

The observation of a Road-runner (*Geococcyx californianus*) on August 27 on the Navarro River, central Mendocino County, ten miles from the coast, occasioned considerable surprise in my mind at the time, since the bird was flushed from roadside cover in a fairly dense forest of redwood and Douglas fir. The key to its appearance here probably lay in the presence, a few hundred yards above the forest, of a brushy, lumbered hillside dotted with low stump sprouts of the redwoods. Grinnell (Condor, ix, 1907, pp. 51-53, map) reviewed the distribution of Road-runners in California and showed that the known northern limit of the species in the coastal area was at Sebastopol, Sonoma County (Belding, Land Birds Pac. Dist., 1890, p. 56). No published records since then have extended the known range in this sector. The Navarro River is sixty-five miles in an air line northwest of Sebastopol. Upon searching through the notebook of Dr. W. P. Taylor, written while in the field for the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology in 1913, I find that when his party was stationed at the mouth of the Gualala River, extreme southern Mendocino County, residents there told him that Road-runners occurred in that vicinity. Further, while at Covelo, Mendocino County, Taylor learned through similar sources of Road-runners occurring "not far below Willits," Mendocino County. In view of this information in connection with my recent observation, it seems proper to conclude that Road-runners occur regularly, though doubtless in small numbers, northward well into Mendocino County, on suitable brush covered tracts of land.—ALDEN H. MILLER, *Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, Berkeley, California, September 9, 1932.*

**The California Condor in Texas\*.**—Among some avian bones collected, together with prehistoric human cultural remains, in a cave on the south peak of Mule Ears Peaks, ten miles north of the Rio Grande in Brewster County, Texas (approximately 29°10' n. lat., 103°25' w. long.), by Mr. F. M. Setzler, Assistant Curator of Archeology, United States National Museum, during the spring of 1932, are twenty-seven bones and fragments of bones of the California Condor, *Gymnogyps californianus*. These represent at least three individuals and possibly more. The best preserved specimens are four tarso-metatarsi, three of which are in perfect condition while one lacks the upper articular surface. One toe phalanx is also in practically perfect condition, but the other bones are fragmentary; they include the following: three humeri, two femora, three ulnae, two coracoids, six tibiotarsi, one pair of clavicles, one radius, one

\*Published by Permission of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

metacarpal, and three fragments of long bones (possibly tibiotarsi). One metatarsus is from a young bird barely old enough to fly—indication that condors nested in this vicinity. The age of the deposit is estimated from the archeological remains at from 1500 to 3000 years. Mr. Setzler informs us that there was another, but inaccessible, cave one hundred or more feet above the one that yielded these bones, and that it appeared to contain an extensive deposit also; it is quite likely that it may eventually be found to contain more condor material.

The present record is another link in the evidence of the transcontinental range of the condor in ancient times. Known at present in the living state only from the mountains of southern California and northwestern Lower California, it has been recorded on the basis of two fragmentary osseous remains from a cave fifty miles west and somewhat north of Carlsbad, New Mexico, by Wetmore (Condor, xxxiii, 1931, pp. 76-77), from Conkling Cavern, New Mexico, by Howard (Science, April 4, 1930, p. xiv), from Gypsum Cave, near Las Vegas, Nevada, by Miller (Condor, xxxiii, 1931, p. 32), and recently by Wetmore (Smiths. Misc. Coll., vol. 85, no. 2, 1931, pp. 25-26) in fossilized condition from Pleistocene deposits in Florida (Hog Creek near Sarasota, and the Seminole area). The present lot of bones comprises the first indication of the former existence of this bird in Texas, and it is the largest number of specimens yet taken anywhere outside of the present range of the living bird. The abundance of the bones clearly indicates that the species was no mere incidental visitor in the big bend region of Texas a couple of thousand years ago.

With these bones were found a sternum of the bobwhite, *Colinus virginianus*, a broken humerus of the caracara, *Polyborus cheriway*, a fragment of a tibiotarsus of the great horned owl, *Bubo virginianus*, and a flank feather of the last species.—ALEXANDER WETMORE and HERBERT FRIEDMANN, U. S. National Museum, Washington, D. C., November 23, 1932.

#### A Way to Distinguish Young Buffle-head Ducks from Young Golden-eye Ducks.—

Groups of young ducks are observed commonly to be composed rather indiscriminately of birds from more than one nest or even to include more than one species. This habit necessitates more than usual caution in identifying certain kinds of ducklings. The close relationship of the buffle-head and golden-eye ducks is known to be reflected in close similarity of young in down and is likely to result in confusion in attempts to identify specimens of downy young unless some sure way of distinguishing them is known. This is especially true in regions where two species of the group are known to nest. For example, now that both the Buffle-head (*Charitonetta albeola*) and the Barrow Golden-eye (*Glaucionetta islandica*) are known to nest in California, it is desirable that a way be known by which the downy young of these species could be identified. Such knowledge would make it possible to make determinations more certain in instances where opportunity may come for handling the young ducks.

Concerning the young in down of the buffle-head, Phillips (A Natural History of the Ducks, 1925, III, p. 335) wrote as follows: "I cannot see any difference between the young of this species and the Golden-eye except, of course, that at similar ages the Golden-eye is much the larger. Millais speaks of a difference in the shape of the white patch on the 'sides' but I fail to detect any in the very large series now before me."

Brooks (Auk, xxxvii, 1920, p. 363) has pointed out features of size and shape of nail on the bill useful as aids in distinguishing various adult stages of the American Golden-eye (*Glaucionetta clangula americana*) from corresponding stages of the Barrow Golden-eye. However, I do not know that this character has been used to separate the downy young of either of these species from the young of the buffle-head.

A casual examination of adult birds of both sexes shows that the nail on the bill of the buffle-head is relatively, as well as actually, much smaller than the nail of the Barrow Golden-eye. Furthermore, this difference applies to young birds in down just as well as to adults. The tabulation given below shows the measurements of length of culmen and length of nail in four adult males and three adult females of Barrow Golden-eye and an equal number of buffle-heads from the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, as well as of all the available specimens of young of both species. Also, the ratio between these measurements is shown for each specimen and the average for each sex. Weights of the young individuals are given as indicators of sizes and ages.