

I consider the two specimens taken in quarantine and recorded by Kempf (1958: 134) as *C. wheeleri* to be examples of *C. insularis*; both were from unknown localities in Mexico. These two specimens have been examined and compared with my material of *C. insularis*, with which they agree quite closely. In all the characters discussed above, they coincide with *C. insularis* rather than *C. wheeleri*. The removal of these specimens from the records of *C. wheeleri* leaves only the original type series to represent that poorly known species.

The following key is intended to supplement that of Kempf (1958) in securing separations of the three species involved, since he was unable to include *C. insularis*.

KEY TO MEMBERS OF CRYPTO CERUS WHEELERI COMPLEX

- 1. Majors 2
 Minors 4
- 2. Lateral projecting lobe of mesonotum angulate or dentate; rim of cephalic disc without projecting setae..... 3
 Lateral projecting lobe of mesonotum broadly rounded, not angulate or dentate; rim of cephalic disc with fringe of projecting setae.....
*C. rohweri* Wheeler
- 3. Seen from above, floor of cephalic disc strongly humped in middle; transverse pronotal carina lacking distinct median excision.....
*C. insularis* Wheeler
 Seen from above, floor of cephalic disc flat, not at all humped in middle; transverse pronotal carina sharp, strongly excised medially.....
*C. wheeleri* Forel
- 4. Genal area longitudinally striato-rugose; frontal carinae testaceous and semitranslucent 5
 Genal area reticulate-rugose; frontal carinae thickened, partly infuscated.....*C. rohweri* Wheeler
- 5. Maximum head width, at upper margin of eyes, slightly less than maximum length (mandibles excluded); rugulae of promesonotum regularly spaced, parallel, not convergent anteromedially.....*C. insularis* Wheeler
 Maximum head width slightly greater than greatest length (mandibles excluded); rugulae of promesonotum more irregular, not essentially parallel, distinctly convergent toward anterior middle.....*C. wheeleri* Forel