

The bird specimen is a small portion of the shaft of an ulna, the greatest diameter of which is 6 mm. There are four distinct papillae for the secondaries slightly to one side (probably external) of the ridge-like center of the anconal side, paralleled by another row of four, less distinct papillae on the opposite (internal) side of the anconal "ridge". Each papilla in this second (or internal) row appears to be slightly distal to the corresponding papilla in the more distinct (external) row. In the position of these papillae, as well as in the general contour of the bone, the specimen resembles the ulna of *Phalacrocorax auritus* or *Phalacrocorax penicillatus* in the region of the third, fourth, fifth and sixth papillae from the distal end. Comparisons were made, also, with the closely related genus *Sula*, as well as with various other groups. These comparisons only served to emphasize the similarity of the fossil with *Phalacrocorax*. Specific identification is, of course, impossible.

In September of this year, the author was privileged to examine two additional specimens of birds from the same deposit, belonging to the collection of the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History. These specimens were loaned to the writer through the courtesy of the Director of the Museum, Mr. Ralph Hoffmann, and the Curator, Mr. David Banks Rogers. One of these bones is a fragment of the shaft of a humerus, the other a tarsometatarsus, badly worn and lacking the proximal articular surface as well as the internal distal trochlea. Both are unmistakably corromant, though there was apparently no direct association of the bones in the matrix.

In general contour of the shaft, the humerus appears closer to *P. auritus* than to *P. penicillatus* as represented in the specimens at hand. However, it is unwise to attempt a specific identification of so small a fragment.

The tarsometatarsus appears to be that of a young individual, though it is difficult to be certain of the original texture of the bone, in view of its petrification and closely adhering, sandy matrix. However, this specimen does not have the firm texture of the humerus, or of the ulna collected by Mr. Strong, but appears roughened as in the incompletely ossified bones of young individuals.

In the character of the trochlea for digit 3, the tarsometatarsus resembles *P. penicillatus*; in this species, as well as in the fossil specimen, the trochlea has an abrupt proximal termination on the anterior side, with a small depression proximal to it. In *P. auritus* this depression either forms a continuation of the trochlea (in completely ossified bones) or is at least laterally bounded by its extended edges (in young, incompletely ossified bones) so that the trochlea does not appear to end abruptly. The prominence of the trochlea for digit 4 (another diagnostic character for separation of *P. penicillatus* and *P. auritus*) cannot be ascertained since this trochlea is well worn. As it stands, it is no more prominent than in *auritus*, but it is not unlikely that it may originally have been as prominent as in *penicillatus*.

The upper portion of the shaft is smoothly rounded and lacks the marked intermuscular lines found in adults of both *penicillatus* and *auritus*. In the young of these species, however, the lines are fainter. If the fossil specimen were of a young individual, as it seems reasonable to believe, the wear which the bone has evidently undergone since its deposition could have produced the rounded contour which the specimen now exhibits.

In anterior aspect the internal border of the shaft appears to project forward more prominently than in the modern species. Since the bone is broken at this critical point, it is impossible to be sure of the accuracy of this observation. Considering this fact, as well as the worn condition of the bone and its Pliocene occurrence, the specimen of tarsometatarsus, though seemingly similar to *P. penicillatus*, is only tentatively assigned to that species.—HILDEGARDE HOWARD, *Los Angeles Museum, Los Angeles, California, October 15, 1930.*

The Condor in San Benito County, California.—There is in the possession of Mr. B. F. Bacon, Pinnacles P. O., San Benito County, an egg of the California Condor (*Gymnogyps californianus*) taken by him from a cavity among the Pinnacles April 6, 1898. Mr. Bacon, who has lived in the region for many years, informs me that the Condor was common there in the early eighties, but that it gradually decreased in numbers, finally disappearing altogether. The last bird noted by him in the locality was seen about the year 1900.—G. WILLETT, *Los Angeles Museum, Los Angeles, California, September 30, 1930.*