with the Fraser Institute, would it not be a drosus? elegans, and at the close of this descripgood move on the part of the Council of the Natural History Society to make the same offer to the authorities of McGill University? By so doing, the collections in the Peter Redpath Museum would at once become most extensive, and doubly instructive, in fact the best on this continent. The Geological Museum at Ottawa could not make a comparison with it. We throw out this hint that the matter may be ventilated by those who are interested in it. Unless something of this nature takes place it is seemingly evident that the dissolution of the Society is merely a matter of time. The new museum is only a short distance from the old. The former will be visited by thousands of the inhabitants and visitors to the city, while the old Society must continue to charge for membership and the entrance of strangers. Then we say that the Natural History Society of Montreal should cast away its tossil condition and join an institution with some vitality in it.—C.

Correspondence.

ENTOMOLOGY.

To the Editor of the Canadian Sportsman and NATURALIST:-

Sm,—I have received the November number of your valuable journal, containing a very friendly and favorable notice of Transactions No. 2 of the Ottawa Field Naturalists' Club. In this review exception is taken to names of two weevils which are mentioned in my paper on Coleoptera, injurious to the Pine. The first complaint is that Polydrosus clegans, Couper, is given as Seythropus clegans, Comper, according to Crotch's revised Check List. As this list gives the Rhyncophora according to recent classification, and was issued under the supervision of LeConte and Horn, the blame, if any, of changing this beautiful beetle's generic name, must rest upon their broad shoulders. I may say, however, that in your description of this beetle (published in Canadian Naturalist, 1865,) you give it as Poly-

tion add that LeConte does not think it a Polydrosus. As regards Hylobius Stupidus, Sch., my defence is equally simple. The species is given in the printed lists of the Entomological Society as found in Canada, and my beetles were named by careful comparison with a specimen so labelled, in the collection in possession of the Ottawa Literary and Scientific Society. This fine collection was arranged by Mr. Billings, with, it I mistake not, the assistance of Mr. Pettit and yourself. I have failed to find in THE CANADIAN NATURALIST YOUR description of II. pinicola, or I should have compared my beetles with it. You state that it is strange that the species should lie dormant so long when such experienced entomologists as Mr. Billings and yourself collected together for three years around Ottawa. This certainly shows the beetle to be very rure, but does not prove its non-existence. I collected actively for three years without finding it, and have since obtained but three specimens. Fletcher during a similar term of years has not succeeded in finding one specimen. I hope shortly to have all undetermined and doubtful species named by competent authorities; until I am able to do so this beetle must rest in my collection as II. Stupidus.

W. HAGUE HARRINGTON.

Ottawa, 15th Dec. 1881.

Note.—I am satisfied with my colleague's statement regarding Scythropus clegans, Couper. If Dr. LeConte removed it from the genus Polydrosus, the matter is settled. would, however, be pleased to have a five minntes' glance at Hylobius Stupidus, Sch., as at the time I described II. pinicola in Transactions Literary and Historical Society, Quebec, —New Series, part 11, p. 85, 1865—I remarked that another of the same size was found in Western Canada, but with marked difference in elytral characters. I had not the Western insect to compare with my Quebec specimen. II. pinicola is allied to II. arcticus of the other continent. I have no knowledge of II. Stupidus, hence the remarks which led to this correspondence. I was wrong in saying that I described pinicola in the Canadian Naturalist and Geologist, published at Montreal.-C.