

on the coast of the Island of Chtagaluk, under sea drift. When Dr. Leconte reviewed the genus (Tr. Am. Ent. Soc., VIII., 177,) there was before him a small male example from Unalashka, also a male from the coast of Mendocino, Northern California; and on the latter a species was erected, the two forms being separated thus:—

“Head not wider than the prothorax, which is feebly narrowed behind, and not sinuate on the sides; basal angles obtuse, rounded, length 2.7 mm. [that of type 2 lin=, 1775 *inch.*]—*brevipennis.*”

“Head wider than the prothorax, which is strongly narrowed behind, with the sides subsinuate near the base; basal angles rectangular, very slightly rounded; 3.6 mm.—*cordicollis.*”

There are before me 3 ♂ and 2 ♀ examples of *brevipennis*; one of the males has the head scarcely as wide as the thorax, another subequal to and a third greatly wider; in this example the thorax is narrowed to two-thirds at base, with the angles somewhat rectangular; in the others as well as in the females it is more or less narrowed, with the basal angles varying from obtuse to strongly rounded. The females have the head and thorax subequal and the last ventral segment rounded. In both sexes the dorsum of the thorax is widely arcuate, and more or less deeply concave from the base to the middle. The characters relied upon by Dr. Leconte to establish his species seem to be inherent also in Mæklin's. These examples are from the Queen Charlotte Islands, the fauna of which, judging from the portion of it seen, or lately recorded, appears to be identical with that of the neighboring Alaskan Islands.

*Dendrophagus glaber*, Lec.—An example of this wide spread northern species occurred here in April of this year, and I saw another taken near the same time in Elk County, Pa.

*Brontes dubius*, Fab., *truncatus*, Mots., and *debilis*, Lec.—Mr. T. L. Casey (Tr. Am. Ent. Soc., XI., 99) says of *debilis*: “This is the common northern species, while *dubius* is more plentiful at the South.” This remark, which is probably a clerical error, is occasioning trouble among a certain class of collectors who have Mr. Casey's paper. The fact seems to be the reverse. While *dubius* is excessively abundant here and northward, *debilis* has not occurred, neither is it on any of the northern catalogues, with one exception, which examples from its author show to be an error. I cite Leconte in Agaz. Lake Sup., No. 61 (Hamilton and Henshaw's Cat.); Harrington, No. 34; Brodie and White, No. 12;