3. The Kerguelen or South Indian Region six, all from the neighbourhood of Kerguelen Island, and from depths varying from 20 to 500 fathoms.

4. The Australian Region twelve, all, with one exception (*Cellepora solida*), from depths varying from 2 to probably not more than 40 fathoms. The exception is a very aberrant form and only doubtfully referred to the same genus; it was procured from a depth of 2600 fathoms.

5. The North Pacific region furnished four species, at depths varying from 10 to 30 fathoms.

6. The South Pacific, only two, one from a depth of 45 fathoms, whilst the other appears to have been brought up from 1325 fathoms, near the western coast of South America. A curious circumstance, since the same species, *Cellepora eatonensis* (var. *magellanica*), occurred near the Falkland Islands at a depth of not more than 5 to 12 fathoms.

On the whole the genus as represented in the present collection would appear to belong to comparatively shallow water.

§ 1. Operculum suborbicular or semicircular with a nearly straight lower border; avicularian mandibles with a short median columella.[1]

§§ *a. lobate, branched, or massive.*

(1) *Cellepora hastigera*, n. sp. (Pl. XXIX. fig. 1, and Pl. XXXV. fig. 8).

Character.—Zoarium erect, expanded, lobate. Zoœcia deeply immersed, surface entire, dull. Orifice (primary) suborbicular, with a slightly sinuated lower border and no spines. Pre-oral rostra of two kinds, one very stout and subconical, supporting on the posterior face, either at or near the apex or lower down, an avicularium with either an acute or a duck-bill shaped mandible, and a toothed beak; the other slenderer and very acute, with a small lateral semicircular avicularium at the base overhanging a notch.

Habitat.—Station 162, off East Moncœur Island, Bass Strait, 38 fathoms, sand and shells.

In some respects the characters of this form render it doubtful whether it may not be a variety of *Cellepora bispinata*, Brit. Mus. Cat., or *Cellepora* (*Discopora*) *albirostris*, Smitt, Florid. Bryoz., but the total absence of any sign of the two long slender oral spines, present in those species, and the different form and proportions of the pre-oral rostral processes, render them, in my opinion, sufficiently distinct.

[1] *Vide* note, p. 190.