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.

MEASUREMENTS IN MILLIMETERS OF CULMEN AND NAIL AND RATIOS BETWEEN THEM IN BARROW GOLDEN-EYES

Sex and age	Specimen number	Weight (grams)		Length of culmen	Length of nail	Ratio of nail to culmen
Male ad.	41835	.....		33.0	13.8	.42
Male ad.	41836	.....		34.4	13.4	.40
Male ad.	44637	.....		35.8	13.5	.38
Male ad.	50602	.....		34.4	13.6	.39
			Average	34.4	13.6	.39
Female ad.	50603	.....		30.8	11.2	.36
Female ad.	39707	.....		33.2	11.7	.35
Female ad.	43997	.....		29.7	11.2	.38
			Average	31.2	11.4	.36
Male yg.	44642	360		22.5	8	.35
Female yg.	44641	316		22.8	8.2	.36
Male yg.	44640	201		19.1	7.1	.37
Male yg.	44639	175		17.3	7.0	.40
Female yg.	44638	165		18.3	7.2	.39
Female yg.	48429	43		12.7	5.2	.41

MEASUREMENTS IN MILLIMETERS OF CULMEN AND NAIL AND RATIOS BETWEEN THEM IN BUFFLE-HEADS

Sex and age	Specimen number	Weight (grams)		Length of culmen	Length of nail	Ratio of nail to culmen
Male ad.	4843	.....		26.5	7.0	.26
Male ad.	24638	.....		25.4	7.1	.28
Male ad.	56339	.....		28.6	6.5	.23
Male ad.	29598	404		26.2	7.3	.28
			Average	26.7	7.0	.26
Female ad.	4844	.....		24.4	6.1	.25
Female ad.	70	.....		24.1	6.3	.26
Female ad.	45959	.....		21.5	5.8	.27
			Average	23.3	6.1	.26
Male yg.	45963	170		18.3	4.9	.27
Male yg.	45961	168		17.9	4.9	.27
Male yg.	45960	163		17.9	5.0	.28

The measurements listed above show that the difference between adults of these two kinds of ducks in size of nail as indicated by its linear dimension also serves to distinguish the young. The smallest individual of downy young Barrow Golden-eye has a larger nail than a buffle-head of four times its weight. The ratio of length of nail to length of culmen changes scarcely at all with increase in size and age. Moreover, this ratio appears to be fairly constant for each species, but the difference between them is relatively great. The simple determination of ratio of length of nail to length of culmen seems to provide a certain means of distinguishing downy young of these two kinds of ducks at any age.—JEAN M. LINSDALE, *Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, Berkeley, California, January 3, 1933.*

A Long-lived Wren-tit.—In a previous issue of *The Condor* (XXXIII, May, 1931, p. 128) I told of the capture of an Intermediate Wren-tit (Gambel's Wren-tit by the new A. O. U. Check-list), *Chamaea fasciata fasciata,* bearing band number 91519. This bird had been banded in Strawberry Cañon, Berkeley, on March 22, 1925, by E. D. Clabaugh, and was recaptured by me February 3, 1931. It repeated six times in February and once in March of the same year. It returned on February 27, 1932, and again on December 3, 1932, each time within a few hundred feet of the location where Mr. Clabaugh first trapped it. As this bird could not have been hatched later than June, 1924, it must have been at least eight and one-half years old when last recaptured.—E. L. SUMNER, SR., *Berkeley, California, December 7, 1932.*

Off-shore Migrants over the Pacific.—The Templeton Crocker Expedition of the California Academy of Sciences sailed from San Francisco on the yacht *Zaca* on March 10, 1932, returning to the same port on September 1 following. As ornithologist of the expedition I was occupied with bird collecting and observation wherever possible. The most important ornithological work was accomplished at our southernmost objective, the Galapagos Archipelago, but worthwhile observations were made also on our way along the western coast of Mexico. In particular, migrating North American species were seen at various times and places on the Galapagos and elsewhere, deserving of explicit record other than as part of a general account of the birds of the Galapagos Islands.

Mr. Crocker himself, personally conducting the expedition, took a most lively interest in the bird work. He shot most of the specimens that I prepared, leaving me happily free in my field work to follow such special lines of inquiry as seemed desirable. A large proportion of the following records are results of his activity.