fifth sternite with a broad shallow posterior emargination, a number of long bristles on each side at base of emargination, the lateral projections bare. Fore tibia without median bristle; mid femur gradually thickened to beyond middle, then rather abruptly attenuated to apex, a group of strong bristles at apex of swollen part on antero-ventral surface, and two or three bristles near base on postero-ventral surface; mid tibia slightly distorted, with about a dozen strong bristles on basal half of posterior surface, a small tubercle one-third from apex on same surface, and dense, short bristles on ventral surface from base to and covering the tubercle; hind femur slightly curved, slender basally, with a number of long bristles on apical half of antero-ventral surface; hind tibia very slightly curved, antero-ventral surface with about 9 short bristles, antero-dorsal surface with five or six short bristles, the posterior surface with about eleven long bristles on apical three-fifths. Third and fourth veins much divergent apically. Lower calyptra about twice as large as upper.

Length 9 mm.

Type.—Rigolet, Labrador, July 18, 1906.

This species has the hind tibia armed almost as in *pectinata* Johannsen, but the peculiar mid tibia separates the species from it and all other species known to me from this country or Europe.

This specimen was sent to me by Mr. C. W. Johnson, and pending its final disposition the type is in the collection of Illinois Natural History Survey.

A PLEA FOR MORE ACCURATE TAXONOMY IN MORPHOLOGICAL AND OTHER STUDIES.

BY MORGAN HEBARD, CHESTNUT HILL, PA.

It has been noted by the author that morphologists and students interested in specialized studies of certain species are often inclined to give imperfectly or inaccurately the necessary taxonomy for the material treated.

This is understood only when we realize that the subject treated is of great interest in such papers, the proper name for the material studied often of little or no interest to the morphologist.

That the correct name is of very great importance it would seem must be admitted by all, when it is pointed out that from different species, though sometimes apparently very closely related, different results are often obtained, even from morphological studies.

It is true that the systematic work of the past has often left much to be desired, and many changes have been necessitated thereby. That, however, should not warrant slurring systematics any more than that equally unsatisfactory past work of morphologists and reversal of conclusions should cause interest in morphology to wane. The advance of all science is built in part upon the correction of past errors.

Another excuse for lack of proper taxonomic assignment is that it is often difficult to secure the required names from a systematist. This is indeed sometimes true, but, in the great majority of cases, one fiftieth the time and effort expended in preparing the material in question for study, would have secured the necessary determinations.

As a concrete instance, we would note Mr. E. Melville Du Porte's recent article, "The Propleura and the Pronotal Sulci of the Orthoptera."(1)

(1) Can. Ent., LI, pp. 147 to 153 (1919).