

the fossils belong to the genus *Labechia*, incrusting, in the first instance, and massive in the second.

Dr. Nicholson's description of *Labechia ohioensis* is based upon specimens obtained by him at Waynesville, Ohio, and the Cape Smyth specimens of *Stenopora Huronensis*, Bill., collected by Dr. R. Bell\* in 1859. Dr. Nicholson states that in the Cape Smyth specimens the structure is much better preserved than in those from Ohio. He also mentions (p. 14, Ann. and Mag. Nat. Hist.) that Mr. Foord had drawn his attention to the fact that "some of the appearances which he describes as characterizing *Tetradium huronense*, Bill., sp. are really due to the fact that the specimens of this coral which he examined were covered with a crust of *Labechia ohioensis*."

The same specimens are thus seen to have been used for the description of *Stenopora Huronensis*, Bill., *Tetradium Huronense*, Foord, and *Labechia ohioensis*, Nich., with, in the case of *ohioensis* the addition of the Waynesville specimens, so that these names are synonymous.

The writer is of the opinion with Dr. Nicholson, that Professor Ulrich's *L. montifera* (op. cit.) is specifically the same as *L. ohioensis* judging from the figure preceding the description of the former and from the two figures of its structure which are stated to have been made from microscopical drawings of a specimen from Waynesville, Ohio.

It would seem therefore that Nicholson's and Ulrich's species are identical with Billings's species. As the fossils described by Billings are not referable to the genus *Stenopora*, Lonsdale, but to *Labechia*, Milne-Edwards and Haime, they should be known by the name *Labechia Huronensis*, Bill.

---

\* In Dr. Nicholson's description of *L. ohioensis*, (Ann. and Mag. Nat. Hist. p. 145.) Mr. A. H. Foord is incorrectly stated to have been the collector of the Cape Smyth specimens.