

dicotyledonous genera decreases from our section of the continent southward. Thus, in Ontario and Quebec monocotyledons are to dicotyledons as 1:3.46; in the Northern States as 1:3.61, and in the whole of the States east of the Mississippi as 1:4.13. The numerical relations of filicoid to phænogamous genera present much more marked differences. In the Provinces the proportion is as 1:24, whilst in the Northern States it is as 1:28.9.

The relative positions of the orders with respect to the number of genera in them vary to some, though not to any considerable, extent in the two countries. In the Northern States and the whole Union these relative positions are not much different. Compositæ and Graminæ, however, assume the precedence there in each case as well as here. Arranging the large orders represented in each country according to priority in point of number of included genera, the following results are presented:

In Ontario and Quebec.

Compositæ.....	56	Filices, Liliacæ and Umbelliferae, each	19
Graminæ.....	47	Cruciferae and Rosacæ,.....	17
Labiatae.....	24	Ranunculacæ and Scrophulariacæ, "	15
Ericacæ.....	22	Orchidacæ.....	14
Leguminosæ.....	21	Caryophyllacæ.....	12

In Northern States.

Compositæ.....	86	Umbelliferae.....	27
Graminæ.....	67	Scrophulariacæ.....	25
Leguminosæ.....	39	Filices.....	22
Labiatae.....	33	Ranunculacæ and Cruciferae, each....	20
Liliacæ and Ericacæ, each.....	28	Rosacæ.....	18

Of the 576 genera in the two Provinces, 291 or rather more than one-half, are referable to the twelve orders which take precedence in the first of these lists. The aggregate of the genera in the second list barely attains the half of the whole number of genera which have representatives in these States.

The largest interest is of course invested in the species which occur within our geographical limits, and in the numerical relations of the orders and genera with regard to the species which they embrace. The details given with respect to them will be less wearisome.

Recent discoveries have confirmed the occurrence in Canada of several species whose previous claims to a place in our flora rested solely on the authority of Michaux or Pursh. I have therefore experienced a reluctance to exclude any of their species—unless the occurrence of the plant is very improbable—on the mere ground that it has not been noticed by subsequent observers. This reluctance is increased by the circumstance that the Lake Superior and lower St. Lawrence districts, where many, if not