shortly before the time of laying the eggs for the Summer brood of larvae. The eggs of this brood can be laid, therefore, on both deciduous and liveoaks with the happiest of outcomes. Perhaps it is just this successful outcome of the Spring’s essays in maternity that breeds in _Phryganidia_ that unwarranted confidence in the white oak that is annually attended with such fatal results to the Autumn young. _Phryganidia_ has already one serious obstacle to its increase in the person of one _Pimpla behrensii_, who makes a point of killing a large proportion of the _Phryganidia_ youth each year, and it will be well for our interesting moth to refrain from too many imprudences if it wishes to hold its own in the lively struggle for living.

On the genus _Meleoma_ A. Fitch.—The very interesting article by Mr. Banks in the _Ent. News_ for March, 1896 (pp. 95, 96), induced me to re-examine my material for this genus. I find two forms in four examples, all collected by the late H. K. Morrison and received by me from him. One specimen from Mt. Washington was seen by the late Dr. Hagen and bears his label, “_O. signoretii;_” another, from Mt. Washington agrees perfectly therewith, save that the antennae are paler; both of these agree structurally with _M. signoretii_ as defined by Mr. Banks. A third from Colorado, and the fourth, from Mt. Washington, agree structurally and otherwise with the description of _M. slossonci_ Banks, the only discrepancy between them being that in the third the black line on the sides of the face is continuous (as described), whereas in the fourth this line is broken up into two separate spots one on the genæ, the other on the clypeus (such a variation is very frequent in Chrysopideae). These two forms differ immensely in the structure of the apex of the abdomen, and were unhappily placed in my collection as _the sexes of one species_; such also was Dr. Hagen’s opinion according to notes he sent to me. Now, however, Mr. Banks says he has the female of _M. slossonci_, and that it differs from _Chrysopta_ chiefly in the antennæ of that sex being placed more widely apart. Amongst my numerous North American Chrysopideae I can find nothing that will answer to this description. That the two _M. signoretii_ and the two _M. slossonci_ in my collection are respectively of different sexes is, I think, certain. In writing these notes I would by no means imply an error of observation on the part of Mr. Banks, but the facts are sufficiently suggestive to warrant further inquiry.

While on the subject of North American Chrysopideae it occurs to me that several species have been lately described as pertaining to my genus _Nothochrysa_. I possess only one of these, from California. In _jacies_ it differs somewhat from the Old World species, and more resembles _Hyponchrysa_, and it is probably on the strength of such a suggestion somewhere published by me in years gone by that this latter genus has been considered North American. I think, however, its position is in _Nothochrysa_ rather than in _Hyponchrysa_. According to the description, _Chrysopta virginica_ A. Fitch, probably belongs to _Nothochrysa_.—Robert McLachlan.