

ON THE SPECIES OF *EUPITHECIA* OCCURRING AT CALGARY, ALBERTA, WITH DESCRIPTIONS OF FOUR SUPPOSED TO BE NEW.

BY GEO. W. TAYLOR, WELLINGTON, B. C.

Through the kindness of Mr. F. H. Wolley Dod, I have now in my cabinet specimens of 13 species of "Pugs" taken by him in the neighbourhood of Calgary.

Three of these belong to well known and widely-distributed species, viz: *Eupithecia cretacea*, Pack.; *E. ravocostaliata*, Pack.; and *Eucymatoge anticaria*, Walker.

All the others presented difficulties at first sight, but I have at last identified five of them, I hope correctly, and I herewith offer descriptions of four which I suppose to be new to science. The remaining species is certainly different to any of the others, but I have only seen a single specimen, and therefore think it desirable to defer characterizing it.

The five species already described, in addition to the three named above, are:

*Eupithecia nimbicolor*, Hulst.—I determined this species from Dr. Hulst's description, but I have since had the opportunity of seeing a specimen which Mr. Wolley Dod thinks was returned to him by Dr. Hulst as conspecific with the type of *nimbicolor*, which was also a Calgary specimen. There is not much doubt, I think, but that we have this species correctly identified.

*E. multiscripta*, Hulst.—This species was described from Colorado. Dr. Barnes has the type, and he has kindly given me a specimen agreeing therewith. Mr. Wolley Dod's specimens are larger and more heavily marked, and have the margins of the hind wings rather more rounded out, but I should not like to separate them specifically from *multiscripta* without first seeing a larger number of the Colorado form. I may say here that the specimens from Kaslo which are recorded by Dr. Dyar (Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., XXVII, 890) under this name are, in my opinion, clearly distinct, and I propose for them the specific name *Dyarata*.

*E. borealis*, Hulst.—This species was described from Winnipeg, and I have seen a specimen in Mr. A. W. Hanham's collection so named by Dr. Hulst.

The published description, however, does not fit the insect at all well.

I have good specimens from Mr. Wolley Dod which do not differ in any respect from those taken at Winnipeg by Mr. Hanham.

March, 1906