

than in that species. The apparent general relationship to *dislocata* and *calgary* led me to expect to find that these might have hairy eyes, but an examination of a considerable number of specimens has failed to reveal any.

622. **N. bairdii** Smith.—(Journ. N. Y. Ent. Soc. XVI, 84, June, 1908). Described from a single female taken at High River by Mr. Thomas Baird. I saw and took notes on it before Fletcher recognized it in Mr. Baird's collection as something strange and sent it to Smith. Smith says after the description: "There is no very near ally to this species. It belongs obviously to the *lubricans* series, and stands next *atricincta*, than which it is much larger, quite different in ground colour and without the obvious transverse lines. So far as they go, however, the lines in *bairdii* correspond in position with those of *atricincta*." I saw the specimen for the second time at Rutgers College, and noted that it was "rather like a large *digna*. Possibly an ally of *exuberans*. Certainly not *atricincta*." I have certainly never met with another specimen in Alberta that could be this species.

623. **N. vocalis** Grt.?—Banff, July 30th, 1910. N. B. Sanson. In 41st Rept. Ent. Soc. Ont. for 1910 (page 10 of the "Record") I erroneously recorded this specimen as *vernilis*. I corrected the error in Ent. News, XXIV, 361, Oct., 1913, and on page 360 I followed Dr. Dyar in citing *planifrons* and *congrua* as synonyms. From my notes I judge my No. 623 to have been *vocalis*, though I cannot be quite sure of it until I see the specimen again. It was most certainly not *vernilis*. (q. v. No. 618).

624. **Chorizagrotis boretha** Smith*.—(Journ. N. Y. Ent. Soc., XVI, 86, June, 1908). Described from three males and a female from Kaslo, B. C. I have seen a male and female type in the Rutgers College collection. A note after Smith's description states that it is allied to *terrealis*, and in a general way resembles *perexcellens*. I believe that the supposed relationship to *terrealis* was based on an erroneous identification of that species, and failed to notice any resemblance to *perexcellens*. I have two perfect females taken on my place here on Pine Creek, on Aug. 16th, 1901, and Aug. 27th, 1905, exactly alike, and beyond all doubt one species, which I have never yet succeeded in closely associating

*Breeding results have now shown that Nos. 225 and 244 of this list are one species, *sordida* Smith, and in all probability forms of *boretha*.