

*neotelis* look to my eye very nearly exactly alike, and co-types of some of the names seem equally like types of the others.

It is necessary that I should here refer to that much maligned type, *Mamestra insulsa* Walker. It is of course, as all are agreed who have seen it, not a *Mamestra* at all, but of the Agrotid genus called *Euxoa* by Hampson and Smith. It was first referred by Smith in his Catalogue to a species apparently very widely distributed and common throughout the temperate portion of this continent, which has long stood under that name in probably all carefully named collections, but which should henceforth be known as *declarata* Walk., of which *decolor* Morr., probably, and *campestris* Grt., certainly, are synonyms (No. 261 of this list). But Sir George Hampson in his Catalogue, Vol. IV, puzzled some of us much by quoting *insulsa* as a synonym of *messoria* Harr. Prof. Smith, in Journ. N. Y. Ent. Soc., XV, 142, reviewing Hampson's work, states that, after re-examination of the type he concludes that his own reference to the *campestris-decolor* series was correct, and that "*insulsa* has nothing to do with *messoria*." The reference of the name by two different men to such distinct and dissimilar species led me to conjecture that either the type must be a badly rubbed specimen, or the available daylight in the British Museum bad. During my visits there in February and March, 1909, I was much surprised to find that neither was the case. The light at the table where I studied was, on a clear day, distinctly good, as is also the specimen, a female, labelled "W. Canada, Orilla, Bushe," from which the description was presumably taken in 1856. Bearing Prof. Smith's notes in mind, I studied it long, in different lights, at different angles, on different days, and even re-examined it after an interval of several weeks. I never for one moment could associate it with either *messoria* or *declarata*. But what I did associate it with, both at very first sight and always subsequently, was the species at present under discussion, my numbers 256, 264 and 265, which I have long been in the habit of calling the "*focinus* group." Yet I felt sure I had never seen anything to quite match it, but believed, and still believe, that it will ultimately be declared to belong here, in which case of course it will have preference. I have been on the lookout ever since for something to match the type, according to the impression it made on my mental vision, and have hunted specially amongst Ontario material of the *tessellata* series, but without success. My notes taken on the spot say: "It looks to me much more like *focinus* Smith (? = *tessellata* Harr.), of the uniform type, with no black at all, and pale s. t. line. It is a good specimen, and perhaps best matched with