

outline of the fore wings. He marks it "Var. b.," evidently considering *erythrostigma* as "Var. a.," though it is not so quoted.

Did Speyer describe a new species by this process? He specifically declares that he does not, and states positively that the characters noted by him are not constant. In the latter point he is correct, for, based on his description, the name has absolutely no standing.

Of this opinion was Mr. Grote, for in his list of 1882 he cites *nictitans*, Bkh., with two varieties—*erythrostigma*, Haw., and *lucens*, Tr. Speyer's *Americana* is not cited at all, hence it was evidently considered a synonym, for Mr. Grote certainly knew of Speyer's paper.

In 1899, after a thorough study of the species of *Hydroecia*, I pointed out a positive structural difference between the *nictitans* of Europe and the form that had received that name here. I was the first to claim specific standing for the American form, and the first to point out its characters. Why am I not entitled to the species? To call it by Speyer's name would credit him with something he never did, and would give him a species he never recognized, based upon the work done by me twenty-four years later.

The rule of priority is a great thing, but a little justice in its application is not entirely undesirable.

I am aware that this position is not entirely in accord with Canon XXVII. of the A. O. U. Code, but it is nevertheless a fact that my name *atlantica* is the first ever applied to the American species resembling the European *nictitans*.

JOHN B. SMITH.

A FEW NOTES ON THE LEPIDOPTERA OF 1901 IN SOUTHERN MANITOBA.

BY E. FIRMSTONE HEATH, CARTWRIGHT, MAN.

It is very curious and interesting to observe the waves of insect life that annually pass over this district. For instance, some four years ago the genus *Acronycta* was strongly represented in some ten or twelve species. The following season that genus almost disappeared, and its place was taken by the old genus *Agrotis*, with its now numerous subdivisions. Last year the various species of the genus *Carneades* were certainly in the ascendant, and occasionally there comes a year like this, when perhaps only an odd species or two show up in any quantity, as was the case more particularly with *Carneades pitychrous*, and while most of