

consideration the appearance the young Seals presented on the ice in 1861, they did not approach the numbers reported to have been seen by sealers in many previous years. The South-Sea "fisheries" became extinct in fifteen years, and, making all allowance for the protection afforded to the Greenland Seals by the ice, and supposing the sealing prosecuted with the same vigour as at present, I have little hesitation in stating my opinion that, before thirty years shall have passed away, the "Seal-fishery," as a source of commercial revenue, will have come to a close, and the progeny of the immense number of Seals now swimming about in the Greenland waters will number but comparatively few. This event will then form another era in the northern fisheries.

3. Note on the Alleged Occurrence of the Rhinoceros in Borneo. By ANDREW MURRAY, F.L.S.

It is only lately that I have seen Dr. Gray's paper on the Rhinocerotidæ, published in the third part of the 'Proceedings' of this Society for 1867; and I should wish to be allowed to enter my caveat against the reception of one statement in it which is, I think, likely to mislead, namely, that the Rhinoceros is a native of Borneo.

Some time since I was informed by a friend that the theory by which I had attempted to account for the remarkable absence of all large Mammals, and the great scarcity of all but arboreal, aquatic, or aërial animals, in Borneo, was knocked on the head, for the Rhinoceros had now been actually found in it, and that all doubt as to the locality was set at rest by specimens having been sent to this country which, on examination, were found to belong to a new and distinct species. They not only had specimens of it, but, as Prince Hal said, "we can show it you here in the house"—the British Museum, to wit.

Of course in the face of such a stunning fact I had nothing for it but to eat my leek in silence, abandon my position, and endeavour to rally my disbanded and scattered ideas to the best of my ability.

The perusal of Dr. Gray's paper, however, not only reveals the source of my friend's information, but satisfies me that I have been too hasty in accepting it as correct.

Literally my friend's statement is quite borne out by Dr. Gray's paper. Dr. Gray says everything that he said; but I look in vain for any proof in support of it; and as any statement coming from a man of Dr. Gray's authority is likely to be accepted as *probatio probata*, I think it the more necessary to point out the insufficiency of the grounds on which his statement rests.

In the first place I observe that the sole evidence offered is that of a skull which "was purchased of a dealer, who said that he received it direct from Borneo." It does not follow, supposing the statement