

faculties are more developed than his own. As soon as he begins to think out things for himself, he begins to be scientific, though he may not know it, but he is handicapped because he was not started on that scientific road in his school-days and is now groping his way. We have a number of scientific farmers on this Island, but they have learned their science after they reached manhood, and nine out of ten of them do not know now that they are scientific, but they are, and they are the best in P. E. Island. Had these men had a fair start in childhood, it seems to me inconceivable that they would not have reached a greater standard of excellence even than that to which they have attained.

This is really the reason for the establishing of Agricultural Farms, Colleges, Farmers' Institutes, &c. I never heard of an Agricultural College or Model Farm, if it was any good, that paid its way. If I did hear of one such I should have grave doubts as to its usefulness. They are largely devoted to experiments, which cost money, but the public reap the benefit of these experiments, whether they be successes or failures. But it is not necessary for the private agriculturist, who combines the science with the art, to conduct his farm as an experimental station. The "Art" is the knowledge of "How?" the "Science" is the knowledge of "Why?" It is put very forcibly and tersely by Mr. James, Deputy Minister of Agriculture in Ontario, in the opening sentence of the preface to his excellent elementary work on agriculture used in the schools of that Province. He says:—"The purpose of this book is to aid the reader and student in acquiring a knowledge of the *science* of agriculture as distinct from the *art* of agriculture; that is, a knowledge of the "why," rather than a knowledge of the "how."

Now, if a man combines in himself a knowledge of both the "why" and the "how," is it not a self-evident propo-