

But the general course prescribed advises the teacher not to confine his attention to *one* division of nature alone, as if there were nothing of interest or value to be learned from any other division. Such specialization may be necessary at a later date in the university, or in preparation for the special occupation of life, or in amateur research work. In school life, the most salient features of nature on every side touching human interests, should, as far as there is time for it, be objectively and co-ordinately studied. A person who has not thought over the matter with some experience to guide him, might say now, "Is it not a 'smattering' of all the sciences you are attempting to give? Would it not be better to be intensive and confined to one narrow line?" Most certainly not, in the common school. Elementary comprehensive study is as genuine as intensive university work, if truly objective. In fact the narrow and intensive study at this stage would be (1) unscientific, and (2) the creator of a false general conception of nature. It is philosophically unscientific because it assumes that nature should be studied only in a narrow tunnel reaching down into the depths of the earth, far from the plane in which is the abode of human interest which the tunnel only intersects. Philosophically considered, it is just as sound to study the superficial plane which is the locus of our life, where we come into contact with the common mineral, plant, and animal; mountain, wood, and water; sunshine, air, and cloud. Practically considered, it is very much more profitable. It also tends to give a truer conception of the laws of nature. The pupil is not so likely to think merely as a mineralogist who imagines the law of the universe to be that of crystalization, or a biologist who sees nothing in it but cell division, or the physicist who sees nothing in it but the effects of molecular motions, or a mythologist who sees nothing but the pranks of very human or bestial deities in it. Such teaching cannot be done by the purely professional mineralogist, or geologist, or botanist, or zoologist, or chemist, or physicist. It can be done only by him who has an intelligent appreciation of the co-ordination of the common things around us, and who has the tact to open the eyes of his pupils to the nature of their surroundings. Nature is one. The artificial division of it is merely for the specialization of labor for its more complete exploration. But although children should follow the exploring method, they should not be confined to the simple tunnel of the laborer. That, with its one-sided wear, will come soon enough. *Report, 1894.*

The full development of the "Nature Lessons" in the school, is likely to be very many times more useful and pleasant in laying the foundation for scientific Agriculture, than the prescription of a book on the subject for the common schools, as is being proposed in other provinces, and also by some people in our own province. The book would mean cram for the pupils and an easier time for their teachers in many schools, and the whole would pretend to be of use to the farmer alone. The proper style of objective nature lessons will be much more useful as a stimulus to love and prepare for the farm, and will be equally useful to every other industrial class, as well as to the future literary and professional people.