

- MacDougall, A. P. 1926. An American species of the genus *Pachypappella* Baker (Hom. Aph.). Bull. Brooklyn Entomol. Soc. 21(3):119-123.
- MacGillivray, M. E., and G. A. Bradley. 1961. A new subgenus and species of *Toxopterella* Hille Ris Lambers (Homoptera: Aphididae), from *Sorbus*. Canad. Ent. 93(11):999-1005.
- Wilson, H. F. 1919. Some new lachnids of the genus *Lachniella*. Canad. Ent. 51(2):41-47.

BOOK REVIEW

THE MOSQUITOES OF CANADA

D. M. Wood, P. T. Dang and R. A. Ellis. 1979. Publication 1686. Research Branch, Agriculture Canada, Ottawa. 390pp., 75 plates and maps, 203 text figs.

This book, the sixth in the praiseworthy series of Insects and Arachnids of Canada, has already received several favourable reviews. Since it introduces a number of innovative and some controversial ideas, no apology is needed for reviewing it again with particular reference to our fauna in British Columbia.

The seven introductory sections are packed with information that any entomologist should find useful. My only serious criticism of the volume begins in the part dealing with anatomy, where five essential diagrams, showing the positions of taxonomically important setae, are crowded into a space of 12 x 17cm. Admittedly, the format of the series is octavo (15 x 23 cm), but most of these diagrams could have covered a full page to advantage. The plates showing parts of the larva, the adult thorax and the male terminalia of each species could also have been larger; I believe such accurate and artistic work deserves a full quarto page in the style of Carpenter & La Casse. Special praise is due to the airbrush expert who transformed the photographs of tarsal claws into works of art. There is no explanation of why *Aedes nigripes* is singled out to have its thoracic setae drawn on P1. 37. This may confuse someone comparing it with *impiger* which, although blessed with a similar crop of these outgrowths, appears naked on P1. 31. I was interested to see several well-known taxonomists turn the book upside-down to study Figs. 10 & 11 where the male terminalia are drawn with the anterior at the top of the page for the first time in over a century. Some of the terminology applied to the sclerites of the thorax is new and is being generally accepted, but I wish the authors had also revised the terms, hypostigmal and subspiracular that refer to different areas of the mesothoracic anepisternum. It has never been clear to me why the Greek area should be immediately, and the Latin some distance, below the spiracle.

For British Columbian users the keys work satisfactorily. The use of "hand lens only" characters for the larvae is admirable and, for the first time, I have found it possible to identify field-collected female aedines with reasonable confidence, although in the lower mainland it is still possible to confuse *punctor*, *aboriginis* and *hexodontus* without a reference collection of reared adults.

An errant numeral in the key to male aedines was pointed out in the Bull. Ent. Soc. Can.: couplet 13 should lead to 14 & 19 not 14 & 18 and couplet 17 should lead to 18 not to *fitchii*. Some other inconsistencies should also be corrected; for example the numbering of the wing veins. They differ in the initial description (p.34) and in the similar aedines, *dorsalis* and *melanimon* which have acquired two extra branches of the Media. References to mesothoracic seta 1-M being branched only in the larvae of *campestris*, *dorsalis* and *schizopinax* are misleading. There are other species in which this seta is branched, but in no other is it as long as head setae 5 & 6-C. In *melanimon*, the description of siphon seta 1-S does not correspond with the figure and in *spencerii* both its description and figure differ from Table 3. Also in Table 3, the lengths of seta 3-M and 4-P appear to be reversed and there are a few other typographical slips where setae S, X, M and P are confused; in context, however, their meaning is usually clear. The correct reference is given for Hearle's description of *A. pacificensis* but the date is misprinted on p.151. There was perhaps some difference of opinion between the authors on the spelling of the name Degeer, which Ellis & Brust (1973) defend. All references in this book are to De Geer, including, wrongly, that to the above paper.

Peter Belton
Pestology Centre, Biological Sciences
Simon Fraser University