

reaching a living plant and is hence endowed specially with the power of motion. But what will this little plant do if we remove a large number of plants in its immediate neighborhood and provide it with props of all kinds of inorganic matter (glass rods, pins, matches, etc.)? It grows towards these obstacles but turns away scornfully after realizing its error, and continues its life crawling about until it has succeeded, as it generally does, in discovering the living plant, or plants. Is this also nature, this intellectual power of discrimination? Then, dear reader, if you answer in the affirmative, give your reasons and explain nature, instinct, intellect! An infant beginning to walk eagerly catches hold of anything to support itself, but when having mastered a few steps it indignantly refuses support—this not being needed becomes dispensable. Plants like *Ampelopsis* or *Clematis* attach themselves by means of haustoria or tendrils for support. This function becomes immediately arrested if we provide them with supports by tying them up. The plants having achieved their purpose consider it unnecessary to support themselves and haustoria and tendrils remain inactive. Several genera of Amaryllidaceæ have the power, under given conditions, of moving their anthers towards the style, but they only so exert themselves when no insect fertilization is likely to take place.

I have chosen here examples which strikingly illustrate these points, they exist in hundreds of others, and probably in all plants; only far less readily perceptible. We strangely hesitate to regard plants as being possessed of anything more than spontaneous, responsive, actions. We disregard the fact that plants, being confined to their place of growth, cannot display their intellectual powers like animals capable of moving about. The movements which I have referred to certainly are intelligent, we cannot deny this. Within comparatively recent years botanists have begun to pay attention to such phenomena. And, if the physiologist has an explanation for many phenomena, yet not all are satisfactorily explained, and whether we have psychological functions besides, is a question the study of which will make botany one of the most interesting of the sciences. Charles Darwin, the great natural philosopher, the distinguished geographer, geologist, mineralogist, zoologist and botanist, also advanced our knowledge of psychology more than is generally acknowledged. His observations directed our thoughts into these channels. Those who are unfamiliar with his works—"Climbing Plants," "Movements in Plants," "Insectivorous Plants"—should read them and they will get a glimpse of this marvellous man's mind. He has left, in his son Francis, a powerful observer who goes further than his father, who refers