

drudgery is as great as on the farm, but where there is some relief from the wearisome monotony of every-day farm life, which is largely due to the lack of scientific agricultural teaching in our common schools.

In discussing this question with some of our best teachers, I have been met by this objection. They say that the boy, particularly if he is the son of a first-rate farmer, knows as much and frequently more about farming than his teacher does and that the boy's father could teach the teacher a lot that the teacher knew nothing about. This, I have no doubt in the world, is perfectly true, but it does not affect the question and is no argument against such teaching in the schools. The fallacy of this argument or objection arises from the fact that the objector fails to distinguish between Agricultural *science* and Agricultural *art*—the youngest science and the oldest art.

The boy and his father may be most excellent farmers, in the sense that they understand the *art* of farming, but how many of them have the faintest conception of the *science* of that part of their profession that appeals to their intellect—to their thinking powers, and which would convert the *hum-drum*-practical into the *interesting*-practical.

The study of the science would develop the thinking faculties, and the man who, to his practical knowledge of the *art*, adds a knowledge of the *science*, will not only be a better and more contented farmer, but he will have within himself the power of progression and improvement. He would be a better citizen and a better man, because owing to his faculties being trained and developed, his intelligence would be greater. The *art* consists in doing what some one else has done; in fact, and roughly speaking, it consists of imitation, and the man who simply knows the art, or in other words is merely a practical farmer, can only improve by observing and copying from others who are more scientific than himself, or to put it in other words, whose