

cultural methods and agricultural life, we shall be looking to the best interests of the pupils and the country as a whole. I am of the opinion that a course of agriculture can be given in town and city schools that will be interesting and beneficial, and that will be in harmony with the best educational methods or system. I would put a course in the science of agriculture within the reach of every pupil in all of our schools, and I would therefore begin the work in the public schools, rural and urban alike. In the schools of France, where agricultural education has been most fully taught, instruction in this work begins in the primary schools in the elementary course, with pupils from seven to nine years old, and is followed out through the middle course, nine to eleven years, and the superior course, with pupils from eleven to thirteen years old. It might be best to begin the work here by making agriculture a compulsory subject in the 4th form of our Public Schools, and from this as a starting point work out in time a system of instruction adapted to our conditions, prefacing it first by a simpler course in the third form, and adding an advanced course to our High School work.

I believe that agriculture can be taught just as well to the Public School pupils as are some of the subjects at present on the course, and I believe that the pupils themselves will come to the subject with as much eagerness. I do not care to particularize or to make comparisons, but perhaps you will permit one remark, viz. : If Public School pupils can master the subjects of physiology, hygiene and temperance, they are well able to take hold of the subject of agriculture, and I think it can be made more intelligible to them.

3. *What can be Taught and How should it be Taught?*

This is the most important of the three questions ; it is that upon which

the whole argument turns. I think that delay in introducing agriculture into our schools has occurred principally because of the difficulty, in fact, the present impossibility, of introducing into our schools instruction as to how to farm. Our schools could not be equipped for training in the practice of agriculture except at an enormous cost, and our Public School teachers could not be expected to teach the young how to farm even in the crudest manner. Here is the point—any instruction now given in our schools should deal simply with the *science* of agriculture ; the practical application of the scientific principles may be left to the home training and to such specially equipped institutions as our Agricultural College. It is quite possible that in time something may be done for our rural schools, as has been done in France and other European countries in the way of adding small gardens and plots wherein some of the lessons of the schoolroom may be applied, and where illustrations may be found in the growing trees and shrubs and the development of seeds sown by the hands of the pupils themselves.

This mistake of confusing the science and the practice of agriculture is quite general, and some of the textbooks placed in the hands of young pupils have no little responsibility for continuing the mistake.

I consider the science of agriculture eminently adapted for school instruction, and a future student of natural science could not lay a better foundation for his future work than by first mastering the general principles of the various sciences which together form what we call the science of agriculture. Let us note briefly what it includes.

Agriculture consists mainly in the growth of plants, the feeding of these plants to animals, and the working over of the animal products resulting