

else in the New World. Here, in the last century, Peck studied the Cankerworm and the Slug-worm of the Cherry, and, in late years, *Rhynchaenus*, *Stenocorus*, and *Cossus*—all highly destructive insects. Here lived Harris, who cultivated entomology in its broadest sense, and whose classic treatise was the first important Government publication on injurious insects. Here, to-day, we have two associations for our work, consisting, it will be confessed, of nearly the same individuals, and not many of them, but meeting frequently—one in Boston, the other in Cambridge. Harvard acknowledges the claims of our study in supporting not only an instructor in entomology at its Agricultural School, but a full professor of the same in the University at large.

Harris attributed to Peck his special interest in entomology, and his first paper, that on the Salt-marsh Caterpillar, appeared in the *Massachusetts Agricultural Repository* only four years after Peck's last, in the same magazine, on Cherry and Oak Insects. How many of us have drawn our first inspirations from Harris? Yet probably not one of our local entomologists ever saw him. The general direction of Harris's studies doubtless arose from the predilections of his instructor; and the unprecedented growth of economic entomology in this country, where it flourishes as nowhere else, must be credited primarily to the influence of Harris's work. With every temptation which the wealth of new material about him could give, or which a very extensive correspondence with naturalists devoting themselves almost exclusively to systematic work, like Say, would naturally foster, he wisely followed the bent given his studies by his early training under Peck, and left a better example and a more generous and enduring influence.

In our own day, the spreading territory of the United States, the penetration of its wilds, and the intersection of its whole area by routes of travel, the wider distribution and greatly increased numbers of local entomologists, as well as the demand for our natural products abroad, have set also before *us* the same temptation to study only new forms and to cultivate descriptive work, to the neglect of the choicer, broader fields of an ever-opening science. It is this danger to which I venture briefly to call your attention to-day, not by way of disparaging the former, but rather in the hope that some of our younger members, who have not yet fallen into the ruts of work, may be induced to turn their attention to some of the more fruitful fields of diligent research.

We should not apply the term descriptive work merely to the study of