

231. *F. venerabilis* Walk.—I had this species correctly listed, and Holland's fig. 26, pl. XXII, is correct, Mr. E. J. Smith adjusting his own error in Ent. News, XVI, 277, Oct., 1905. The explanation of my having likened this species to Sir George Hampson's figure of *volubilis* rather than of *venerabilis*, is that the figure of the latter is, so my notes tell me, bad and misleading. When I wrote my notes I had never seen *volubilis*, the Chicago specimens received under that name having been all *venerabilis*. Walker's type of this is a badly worn male from Nova Scotia, and happens to be an unusual form rather *volubilis*-like in appearance. *Venerabilis* has male antennæ strongly bipectinate, and *volubilis* serrate-fasciculate only, and as a rule the two are entirely dissimilar in appearance. But specimens of one very closely resembling the other undoubtedly sometimes occur, and I have such in my series.

232. *F. vancoverensis* Grt.—I have come across no more specimens here of the form I thus listed, but have four similar specimens from Field, B. C., taken by the late Dr. James Fletcher, and one from Windermere. The latter is dated July 12th, 1907, and the Field specimens July 5th, 1902. They are smaller, paler, and less strongly marked than *vancoverensis* from the B. C. coast, but may be a small race of that species. The *volubilis-vancouverensis* group is a difficult one, comprising some forms which seem locally constant, and requires studying in longer series than I have yet been able to compare. The specimen figured by Holland as *vancoverensis* is certainly not that species. It is stated in the text to come from Labrador. I cannot name it with certainty, but it is much more like *opipara* Morrison or *munis* Grote.

233. *F. obliqua* Smith.—I have the species from Mr. Baird, of High River.

234. *Porosagrotis retusta* Walk. is the correct name for this species, Dr. Dyar's *catenula* of the Kootenai List is the same. *Catenula* Grt. is prior to *Euxoa contagionis* Smith. As a matter of fact, I believe Prof. Smith would include Calgary specimens under his name *catenuloides*, but I cannot see that this is even a well marked variation. (Cf. Journ. N. Y. Ent. Soc., XVIII, 88, and Ent. News, XXI, 396-7, June and Nov., 1910) I have it from High River.

[236. The worn specimen I had listed doubtfully as *orthogonia* is not that species, nor in the least like it. It is near, or possibly identical with, the following.]