

and that months or a year after two or three more do the same thing, and that these all find their way to Dr. Wittfeld's collecting box. As my friend W. J. Florence would say, this is T. T. (too thin). It seems more reasonable to believe, as I honestly think is the case with the species in dispute, that a few individuals have established themselves upon our limits, and that they are now gradually taking up new localities and spreading over a larger area. Mr. Smith alludes to *Erebus Odora*, and says that "because it has been found in Canada, it would be an absurdity to call it a Canadian insect." Now I think he is unfortunate in this statement. We do not yet know the food plant of the larva of this species, but because we are ignorant of that, it is no reason why it should not breed in Canada, and the evidence is in favor of its doing so. I have examined at least forty specimens of *E. Odora*, taken severally in New York, Georgia, Arizona, California, Vanc. Island, Canada, Michigan, Illinois and Ohio, some of them in absolutely perfect condition, and as fresh as bred specimens, and I am in my own mind quite sure that this species at least has taken up its abode with us, and is as much a resident of the U. S. as *Vanessa Antiopa* or *Pyrameis Cardui*. As to Mr. W. H. Edwards having "separately called attention to species occasionally found in but not really belonging to our fauna," I respectfully submit that this is a mistake. Mr. Edwards has done nothing of the kind. He has *discarded* from his Catalogue a number of "species for some time accredited to our fauna, but omitted for want of authentication," which is but saying in other words that had the statement of the capture of the species within our limits been given on undoubted authority, they would have found their place in his Catalogue. He has included indeed *Parnassius Eversmanni*, *Callidryas Philea*, *Diadema Misippus*, and others, which certainly are not parts of our fauna, but Mr. Edwards holds the same views as I do on the subject, and I claim no more for the three species I alluded to than is claimed for the diurnals I have just mentioned, and that is, that they have been found within our limits, that there is no evidence before us to show that they do not breed therein, and that therefore, when I change, as I am willing to do, the heading of my article to "our lists" in the place of "our fauna," the three species to which I called attention should be recorded in our catalogues.