

with an authority that few will dispute. I find in an address of his, reported in the *Montreal Weekly Witness*, of 2nd April, last, the following:—

“He (Professor Robertson) suggested, for the rural school, practical lessons in preparing the plot, sowing the seed, learning what the seed is.”

Surely, with the weight of these men's authority in favor of such teaching, and of its practicability, it cannot be contended that agriculture cannot be taught, both as an art and as a science, in our schools. It cannot be so taught, under present conditions. It can be taught in the amalgamated schools.

This most important subject cannot be so taught, under present conditions; but it could readily be taught in the suggested large, consolidated schools; and, with an acre or more of ground, the “art” might be brought in to illustrate the science. It would require very little time, and very little ground. For instance, let the children take a handful of beans and plant them. Then, let the youngsters dig up and examine one each day, to see how they are progressing, how the seed is changing; and, when the remainder appear over ground, watch their daily growth.

The fact is that Nature, since Adam's time, has always been trying her utmost to teach her lessons in this way; in fact, has been trying to force the children to so learn, and their parents, or others in authority, to so teach; but we of the 19th and 20th centuries, as of all other centuries, refuse to allow her to have her way. Why is it, that if a child puts a few seeds or plants in the ground, it wants, almost at once, to dig them up, to see how they are growing, or what is happening to them? This desire is usually attributed to the child's natural propensity for mischief, or destructiveness. It is nothing of the kind. It is an instinct, implanted by the Creator, in the child's disposition, to make it learn the “why,” the “wherefore,” the “how.”