

description is a very good one of the type seen by me. The peculiarity about the specimen is that it was very fresh when caught, and the wings, apparently, had not become entirely hardened. When placed upon the spreading-board they broke near the base and formed a little shoulder, such as almost every one who has ever spread insects has found himself compelled to deal with. The insect was well spread in other respects, and the little break of the wings was almost concealed by the heavy vestiture of the thorax. With its bright colours and the comparatively broad, short wings, produced by the imperfection just mentioned, the specimen has quite a distinctive appearance, and it was in seeking to locate just exactly what this distinction consisted of, that I might place the species into its proper place in a synoptic table, that I found that it did not differ in any respect from *olivacea*. I have in my collection at the present time a specimen which agrees in brightness of colour and general appearance with *comis*, but being fully matured and with the wings at full length, shows its relation to *olivacea* at a glance. I would again call attention to the extreme desirability of verifying Mr. Grote's statements before accepting them when they involve a change in nomenclature or in the synonymy.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO MY 1894 LIST OF
WINNIPEG BUTTERFLIES, WITH NOTES FOR
SEASON OF 1895.

A. W. HANHAM:

Argynnis ciprois, Edw.—One specimen taken August 4th. Kindly identified by Mr. James Fletcher.

Phyciodes carlota, Reak.—One specimen. June, 1894.

Phyciodes, sp.—Five specimens taken June 17th to 24th, 1894, and recorded as *Nycteis* in error in my 1894 list.

Phyciodes nycteis, Db.—Hew.—June 30th to July 10th. Common in a new locality visited this year. Not taken in 1894.

Colias eurythyme, Bdv.

var. *eriphyle*, Edw.—August 4th, etc.

var. *keewaydin*, Edw.—August 4th, etc.

Colias philodice, Gdt.—This species may not occur here; *C. eriphyle*, Edw., being mistaken, most likely, for it.