

margin elevated; disc irregularly punctate, a rather large fovea in front of the scutellum. Scutellum yellow. Elytra distinctly scabrous, subopaque to the naked eye, shining under a lens, finely sparsely pubescent; costæ faintly indicated. Body beneath alutaceous, very finely scabrous, the meso- and metathoracic regions rougher than the rest. Legs yellow, knees, tips of tibiæ and tarsi blackish. Length, 10 to 12 mm.

Eight specimens are before me, all taken at Pierre, South Dakota, by the late P. C. Truman. The principal variation in markings consists of a tendency to loss of the elytral stripe, although one strongly-developed specimen, with the vitta well marked, has the suture dark for the greater part of its length. The under surface of the body is always more or less blackish, sometimes almost entirely so except the prothoracic region, which remains yellow. In one case, the anterior tibiæ are blackish to base. By the form of the head, this insect is allied to *P. insulata* and *P. Germari*, being close to the latter in several respects, but *Dakotana* has shorter and thicker antennæ. The style of ornamentation and the opacity of the elytra will at once distinguish it from *bilineata*. The maxillary palpi are not deformed in the male, the last joint being but slightly modified.

### MY LAST REPLY TO MAJOR CASEY.

BY E. WASMANN, S. J., LUXEMBURG.

In Dr. David Sharp's "Zoological Record, Insects," 1901, I find in the list of my publications of that year, under the title, 1449, "*On some genera of Staphylinide described by Thos. L. Casey*," the following note: "*Casey replies to this, l. c., pp. 312, 313.*"

As I do not receive American journals here, I tried to get the respective nos. of the CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST from one of my friends. Being informed now of the contents of Major Casey's "reply," I understand why he did not send it to me, although I had sent him a copy of my critic paper "*On some genera of Staphylinide*" already, Nov. 2nd, 1901.

The manner in which Major Casey has treated our scientific controversy differs far from my own in the article cited above (CANAD. ENTOM., Sept., 1901, p. 249-252). In an angry tone he reproaches me of "disingenuousness," "narrow-mindedness," etc.; he even tries to misinterpret my own personal correspondence with him in a way quite new in scientific discussion.