emerge, with no trace of either eggs or egg-case. The significance of this exceptional fact is that the extrusion of the eggs in a compact oötheca is supposed to be one of the distinguishing features of the family *Blattidæ*, and such cases serve to show how difficult it is to lay down any rule in reference to the characteristics of any group that may not involve exceptions. So far as other family characteristics are concerned there is nothing peculiar in this species of *Panchlora*. It is a rather soft-bodied species, with ample wings. I would call attention, however, to the fact that the young have either lost or never had the green color of the parent. They are pale brownish, and are further peculiar in that the body broadens posteriorly, the abdominal joints being strongly contracted and telescoped into each other—the eighth and ninth so strongly drawn into the seventh as to give the abdomen an unnatural, foreshortened, truncated appearance. Whether this feature is due to the alcohol, or is normal, it is impossible to say; but there is no evidence of any other portion of the body having shrunken or contracted on account of the preservative liquid.

Prof. Riley gave an account also of his additional study of *Platypsyllus*. He said that since his former communication he had been particularly anxious to secure other specimens of the ultimate larvæ and also specimens of the pupa of this insect, and had had two or three persons at work in different places with this end in view. In all some twenty Beavers had been examined, and additional larvæ and adults had been secured, but no pupæ. He had, however, been able to add quite a list of insects, etc., which are associated with the Beaver, either accidentally or as parasites or guests. These are: a Mallophagan of peculiar form (*Trichodectes* near *crassus* Drury); four genera of mites; seventeen species of Coleoptera (Staphylinidæ, Histeridæ, Silphidæ and Elateridæ), none of which are supposed to be at all parasitic; a *Julus* and a *Geophilus;* Bibionid and Culicid larvæ; a Cricket; a *Tettix;* three spiders; a Trombidium and a small roach.

Mr. Schwarz asked how the insects associated with the Beaver had been found, many of the forms mentioned being such as would occur in masses of rubbish, dry leaves, etc.

Prof. Riley said that most were taken in the Beaver dens or houses, which always contained a mass of material which might attract the insects in question, and they were sifted either from the material of the nest or the earth underneath it. He said that the dens and nests were commonly connected with the banks of the stream under water, and with the air at some other generally hidden point, thus affording opportunity for the entrance of the insects, or that these might also be introduced with the material used in the construction of the den. With reference to the pupa of *Platypsyllus* he said that he was forced to the opinion that this stage is passed underground, in which belief Mr. Schwarz coincided.

Prof. Riley said, also, that the Mallophagan and the mites were found on the beavers themselves.

Prof. Riley also called attention to the Minutes of the Proceedings of the London Entomological Society for October 1, 1890, as published in the *Entomologist's Monthly Magazine* for November, 1890, and elsewhere. It is there stated that Mr. C. J. Gahan exhibited a "curious little larva-like creature" found in the mountain streams of Ceylon, and that there was a discussion as to what the larva was. From the brief characteristics given by Mr. Gahan it struck Prof. Riley that the larva referred to is that of some species of the Dipterous family *Blepharoceridæ*. He stated that good figures of a South American species, genus *Paltostoma*, have been published by Fritz Mueller, and that he (Prof. Riley) is familiar with the larvæ and pupæ of two North American species and has for many years had drawings of the same, which are not yet published.

He also called attention to an article in *Entomological News* for October last, in which, under the head of "What can it be?" Mrs. Julia P. Ballard, of Easton, Pa., describes a larva which has puzzled her because, while having some of the characteristics of *Citheronia regalis*, with which she is quite familiar, it nevertheless materially differs from that species. Her description leaves no doubt that the larva which so puzzled her was that of the only other congener, namely, *Citheronia sepulchralis*. This larva is not uncommon in the vicinity of Washington and along the lower Potomac, where it feeds