

the theory was not long in coming. To-day he is acquainted with those works that contain briefly the best information on the subject of agricultural chemistry.

I do not despise theory, but I do not think it is always wise to commence a course of instruction with it.

Circumstances must be reckoned with. With our farmer, we must shoot straight to the target; he must be shown the practical result, so that he can lay his finger on it. If you put into his hand a treatise on agriculture, very likely he won't read it; but if you tell him to look at the practical improvements in a neighbouring field, he will listen to the eloquent voice of the charmer.

I want the agricultural instruction in these farm-schools to be essentially practical. When an intelligent practice has once been established, there will not be much trouble about adding the theory.

One of the best books ever written on agriculture, Stephens' "Book of the Farm," was the work of a man who was educated on a farm.

What I am now saying, I consider as very important. When I was only a private member of the Council of Agriculture, I proposed one day the above system of practical instruction, and some one said to me: "You are going to make the pupils nothing but farm labourers." In spite of that, some of them adopted the idea, followed this road, began to practice, and they it is who to-day are the most successful of all; they who were not ashamed of starting as labourers, are now the princes of the occupation. (Cheers.) This Stephens, whose work I just mentioned, after having entered himself on a farm as a simple workman, raised himself by degrees, and ended by being decorated by Her Majesty as a laureate of agriculture. He leapt from the plough to that distinguished position. He began by the practice, and he ended by writing the best book on the theory of farming.

Work, personal observation, an individualistic habit of taking the initiative: these are the elements of success.

I do not mean to indulge in useless reprimand, but I must say of our agricultural schools, that they, in my opinion, have not followed the right road to success. It has not always been their fault; they had not a choice of pupils. There was no systematic plan to guide their choice. They lectured the lad who presented himself on agriculture, although he frequently showed indisputably, that his heart was far from being interested in that subject; they did not send him to work on to the land often enough to let him feel the annoyance of storm and tempest, the inevitable lot of the farmer; they did not submit him to the salutary test of