Mr. Scudder writes October 10th, 1874, as follows:

"I formerly believed this to be Pembina, having received it from Edwards with that determination. I therefore named some of your first lot (as Mr. Mead says) Pembina. Afterwards I received a lot from your subsequent journeys, sent me by Grote. The specimens were poor and much rubbed, and I thought when I determined them to be distinct from the so-called *Pembina*, that 3 and 2 alike had a broad marginal band. Mr. Edwards was the first to discover his own error, and drew my attention to it. We do not know Pembina; it is temporarily lost to science, but it will turn up one of these days. From Edwards' description and the context, it is plain that your butterflies are not Pembina. After Couperi was described, I saw many other and fresher specimens, and then discovered my mistake (accepted and published by Grote) about the distinction between your two lots of butterflies, and found that although Grote was in error in describing Couperi as distinct from the so-called Pembina, the name must stand because the first one, apart from Pembina, was given to an insect which was not Pembina.

"There are but two known species of Glaucopsyche in America:

- "1. Lygdamus of the South.
- "2. Couperi of the North, long supposed to be Pembina Edw., which however belongs to a distinct group."

PAPILIO BREVICAUDA, Saunders.

I have received specimens of this butterfly from Percé, district of Gaspé, the north shore of the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

WM. COUPER, 67, Bonaventure Street, Montreal.

COLIAS PHILODICE.

DEAR SIR,-

Mr. W. H. Edwards informs me that Mr. Mead has determined by experiment that this species becomes crimson on the contact of the wings with cyanide in the collecting bottle. This accounts for a supposed variety of *philodice* sent me by an Entomological correspondent in good faith as having been collected by her. The lady reported that she had not particularly noticed the specimen at the time of capture, but on setting