## TINGIDÆ.

Corythuca incurva, Uhler.—Temagami Lake, Temiskamingue, and Barrier River. I have carefully compared these specimens with an example determined by Dr. Uhler, and find them certainly identical. They seem to be sufficiently distinct from the smaller specimens of juglandis taken in Western New York and elsewhere.

## REDUVIDÆ.

Sinea diadema, Fabr.—One example taken at Klauck's. Mr. Palmer reports this as the only specimen seen by him.

Reduviolus ferus, Linn.—Temiskamingue and Nigger Point, Quinze Lake. This is an imported species that follows cultivation into every portion of North America. Here it seems to have followed up the Ottawa River almost in advance of civilization.

Reduviolus vicarius, Reut.—Taken in numbers along Quinze Lake. This is the species so determined in my list of Lake Placid Hemiptera, and list of the Hemiptera taken by Mr. Palmer at Lake Temagami. I sent specimens to Dr. Reuter, and he writes me that it is not the true vicarius, but a species very near limbatus, Dahlb. The latter species was, however, described as very close to limbatus; so, if the present species be not vicarius, it must be very near it. It seems to be boreal in distribution. I now follow the European entomologists in using the name Reduviolus for this genus in place of Coriscus, Schrank.

Reduviolus propinquus, Reut.—Quinze Lake, one example.

## CAPSIDÆ.

Miris dolobratus, Linn.—Taken at Temiskamingue only. This species is now placed in genus Miris, of which it is the type. Formerly listed as a Leptopterna.

Stenodema trispinosa, Reut.—White Rapids, Barrier River and Temiskamingue. This is the North American form, formerly determined as Brachytropis calcarator, Fall. Dr. Reuter now considers our American form as a distinct species, and has so published it. Brachytropis is placed as a synonym of Stenodema, formerly called Miris.

Stenodema affinis, Reut.—Apparently common everywhere Mr. Palmer collected. Mr. Kirkaldy gives the name instabilis, Uhler, priority, quoting Dr. Uhler's reference to Proc. Bost. Soc. Nat. Hist., 1871, p. 104, but as a matter of fact the species was not included in that paper. Its first publication was in the Bul. U. S. Geol. & Geog. Surv., vol. II, No. 5, p. 316, 1876, and, consequently, was subsequent to Reuter's affinis, which appeared in 1875.