

some time I have conjectured it was the same as *Eubolina Stylobata* Harvey. With regard to the genera separated from *Homoptera* by Gueneé, I have merely insisted on the validity of *Zale* in former papers. But I am averse to throwing them together until we know the early stages upon which Gueneé seems to have relied, using Abbot's drawings. Another reason with me has been (as I have pointed out) that *Homoptera* is a term used in another Sub-order of Insecta. Probably *Pheocyma* will have to be adopted, as the insect I have identified as *Lunifera* (figured by Gueneé) does not seem to me to differ generically from our other species arranged under *Homoptera*.

The type of *Eubolina Impartialis* recalled to me the *Homoptera Stylobata* and *Mima* of Harvey, by the less completely lined secondaries, and I have grouped the species near *Homoptera*, where I am satisfied they are better placed, though probably higher than *Homoptera* and leading to it. Unfortunately I made no study of the genus and cannot be certain that the forms are correctly associated. *Impartialis* will probably occur in Texan collections; when I receive a specimen I shall examine it with a view to settle its relationship with *Campometra* and the species referred to *Eubolina* in the "New Check List." Among the genera I have never seen and which I cannot form any opinion upon from the descriptions are *Thaumatopsis* and *Homophoberia*. Although Mr. Smith does not mention *Cilla Distema*, I do not think this can be the former. Mr. Smith seems to have published his "Synopsis" without knowing a large number of my generic types. But he seems to have all of Mr. Morrison's, and, while following my reference of *Eutricopsis* to *Melideptera*, he rehabilitates *Eucalyptera* as distinct from *Scolecocampa* on the position of the labial palpi; this did not seem to me essentially different, and the two insects have as close a general resemblance as *Plagiomimicus* and *Polenta* and agree in other characters almost exactly; I cannot now re-examine them, but as the claw on the front tibiae of *Tepperi* is overlooked by Mr. Smith, and the exposed cup-like clypeal structure of *Plagiomimicus*, I feel certain that the "Synopsis" is both unreliable and partizan, and the determined use of Boisduval's and Treitschke's genera when they have not the sanction of priority, confirms my belief that it is written with a bias. Every omission to make a complete and faultless diagnosis on my part is made much of, while the generic descriptions of other writers, wanting in every point: such as accuracy of statement, circumstantiality, completeness, comprehension of the real affinity of the type (e. g. *Polenta*, etc.) are