

List. Prof. Smith, in Journ. N. Y. Ent. Soc., XV, 153, Sept., 1907, takes exception to this view, but suggests that they may be races only. He states that *nevadae* is much brighter, more contrasting, and broader winged than *canadensis*. The latter was described from a unique male from the Province of New Brunswick, and the type, which I have not seen, is probably in the Thaxter collection in the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Cambridge, Mass. Dr. Dyar says that specimens from Wisconsin and from Kaslo, B. C., in the Washington Museum, are alike. I saw them there, and have no note that they differed. They stood, by the way, under *canadensis*, whilst Calgary specimens did duty for *nevadae*. The *canadensis* of Prof. Smith's collection was a badly worn male from Winnipeg, which I should call about typical *nevadae*. Last winter I examined a specimen from Hymers, Ontario, belonging to Mr. Winn, which I thought might be typical *canadensis*, as it almost entirely lacked the red shades of *nevadae*, though doubtfully distinct therefrom. But, according to the description, red shades exist in *canadensis*. At present I have no evidence in favour of distinctness, though it requires more material to permit of a fair judgment.

298. *M. invalida* Smith.—I have not taken this species here for some years, but it seems to be of more frequent occurrence at Banff, whence I have a few. I have no males in my collection, and I notice that an absence of that sex is complained of under the description, made from specimens from Sierra Nevada and Placer Co., Calif. I have seen a type at Rutgers College, another at Washington, and three are in the Henry Edwards collection, though I overlooked these. My Alberta specimens appear to be the same species. I have examined the type of Walker's *cristifera* in the British Museum, a worn specimen from St. Martin's Falls, Albany River, Hudson's Bay Territory. It is the specimen figured by Hampson, but most of the pale shades shown in the figure merely denote the worn condition of the specimen. He makes *lubens* Grt., "ab. 1," and *rufula* Morr., a synonym. Of the latter I know nothing, but *lubens*, of which the female type from New York is in the Museum also, is easily distinct, as pointed out originally by Grote in CAN. ENT., XXVI, 141-146, 1894, and latterly by Prof. Smith, who has suggested that *cristifera* may be prior to his *invalida*. I know nothing against the suggestion, and were it not that the worn condition of *cristifera* type leaves an element of doubt, I should say it was certainly correct.