

237. *Euxoa rumatana* Smith, = *Agrotis dargo*, Strecker, the latter specific name having preference by five years. I have three male co-types of *rumatana* from Volga, S. D., one of which I have labelled as being exactly like a type of *dargo*, from Loveland, Colo., in the Strecker collection, which is a trifle paler only. I have also compared the male and female types of *rumatana* at Rutgers College. I have Calgary and High River specimens of the same species. A male from Chicago is very similar, but darker in colour, with smaller orbicular, and less of dark border to secondaries.

238. This species is not *plagigera*, at least so far as I can at present discover, but has been described from Calgary as *Rhizagrotis perolivalis* by Smith (Journ. N. Y. Ent. Soc., XIII, 194). A male and female co-type are in my collection. Its nearest named ally appears to be *olivalis* Grt., from which it differs considerably in maculation, and structurally in having male antennæ ciliate instead of serrate-fasciculate.

239. *E. olivalis* Grt.—One of my Calgary specimens I have compared with the type, a female in the British Museum from Colorado. The *olivalis* of the Washington collection when I was there was *ridingsiana*. *Agema* Strecker, from Colorado, is in all probability a dark olivaceous specimen of *olivalis*, though I refrain from making the reference definitely at present. I am under the impression that nearly all the specimens I have seen in collections standing as *plagigera* have been *olivalis*. I do not know where Morrison's type is, nor whence it was described. *Oblongistigma* Smith, described from four females from Black Hills, Montana, is a browner, smoother form, but very much like *olivalis*, and not certainly distinct. Hampson figures Smith's species correctly from Colorado, though another Colorado specimen which I found associated with it in the collection was distinct. I have a long series from Stockton, Utah, which appear to grade through. I have seen four specimens labelled "types" of *oblongistigma*. Two females are in the Brooklyn Museum, and a male in the Henry Edwards collection in the American Museum of Natural History. Prof. Smith claims that the latter, though of the same species, cannot be of the type lot on account of its sex. A female at Washington from Nevada Co., Calif., bears the museum red "type" label, but, Prof. Smith tells me, erroneously so. That is fortunate, as it is a distinct species from those at Brooklyn, and nearer *quadridentata* G. & R. It may be what Prof. Smith has since described as *futea* (Trans. Am. Ent. Soc., XXXVI, 255, Nov., 1910).