species in this group excluding *cærulea* and *conspicua*. Slingerland gives us to understand that there are some very marked differences in the male genitalia. Careful examination of numbers of these might give enlightenment, and, in addition to breeding, the forms require to be studied almost by the hundreds from various localities.

420. D. annexa Hy. Edw., syn conspicua Smith.—Edwards' type is a male in the British Museum, labelled "West U.S.A., Walsingham," and is the conspicua of Smith. It appears to agree structurally with distincta, and has all the tibiæ spined. It differs in several points of structure from cuspidea. My series has been reduced to two pairs, and I have no recent captures, though I occasionally notice it in the spring. I have seen it from Similkameen River in the collection of Mr. E. M. Skinner, of Duncans, B.C., and there is a specimen in the British Museum, taken by Mrs Nicholl in the Upper Kéremeos. Both of these localities are in Southern British Columbia, near the border of Washington. It occurs at Banff.

421. Euclidia cuspidea Hbn.--I have a specimen from Edmonton, taken by Mr. F. S. Carr.

422. Syneda hudsonica G. & R.—The species is not limbolaris, which is correctly figured by Holland. No. 422 stands correctly named in the Neumœgen and Henry Edwards collections. It was described from the Hudson Bay Territory. I have not seen any type, but both sexes are figured with the description, and appear to be this species. This is not the form figured by Holland as hudsonica, which is referred to under No. 424. The female is quite unlike the male, having the primaries much more evenly grey, sometimes quite a blue-grey, with the maculation blurred, indistinct. In this respect it differs strikingly from No. 424, formerly listed as hudsonica, and in which the sexes are superficially alike. It is not uncommon on the prairie, and occurs in Manitoba, but I do not seem to have met with it here in the hills. A day flier.

(To be continued.)

Mailed July 8th, 1913.

244