

but subsequent investigation showed that I was wrong. I have not, so far, seen *betulae* from western Canada.

Acronycta interrupta Gn. A single worn female.

Acronycta marula G. & R.

Acronycta lobeliae Gn. Two specimens.

Acronycta manitoba Sm. A series stood correctly named. Others stood under *hasta* Gn, whilst three rather large, but otherwise similar, specimens were separated as *telum* Gn. I attached the label to one of these specimens as evidence of what Smith claimed to have at last identified from Manitoba is "the true *telum* of Guenée."

Acronycta radcliffei Harv. Two specimens correctly, and a third rather small one, as "? *tarlarea* Sm."

Acronycta quadrata Grt.

Acronycta spinigera Gn. A single female, dated June 23rd, 1910.

Acronycta superans Gn.

Acronycta funeralis Grt. A female, June 27th, 1912.

Acronycta fragilis Gn.

Acronycta grisea Walk.

Acronycta falcula Grt.

Acronycta albarufa Grt.

Acronycta hesitata Grt. One specimen.

Acronycta inclara Sm. Smith admitted that the aggregate of specimens to which he first gave the name *inclara* (viz., the *hamamelis* of the Monograph) contained a mixture of species. He had made no type, but ultimately fixed Hampson's figure under *inclara* as representing the type of the species.* Unfortunately the figure is a poor one, but I have carefully compared it with specimens in the British Museum, and have not the least doubt as to the species represented. It appears to be fairly common in Manitoba. The Heath collection contained a long and variable series, of which some stood as *inclara*; others as *hamamelis*, and a few small specimens as *modica* Walk.

Acronycta impleta Walk. var. *illita* Smith.

Acronycta sperata Grt. I could see no justification whatever for the attempted separation of the "supposed new species very

*Ent. News, XXII, 309-318, July, 1911.