

the true reason lies in the teacher's being afraid to take hold of a subject, such as the one now advocated. They either acknowledge that they don't see anything to talk about in a handful of earth, a piece of stone, a common bird, a "bumble-bee," or a "polly-wog," or else they confess they "care for none of these things," or, caring for them, don't know what to say. Now, it can readily be shown that each of these objections is groundless. Let any number of persons—they need not be teachers—have an opportunity of visiting a menagerie, a museum, or a botanic garden, how many will pass by on the other side? Perhaps, not one. Should any do so, however, or should any feel that with the opportunity, he would do so, then it is not going too far to say, that, accepting the position of teacher that person has sadly mistaken his calling.

That curiosity which prompts us all to see "sights," is one of the principal motives actuating the scientist in his investigations. A close examination of the commonest object reveals to him beauties undreamed of by the cursory observer, and it is just because we are all too apt to be mere cursory observers that the study of natural science is advocated in public schools. It is really astonishing how many of us "have eyes and see not," and, it might also be added, "ears and hear not." Let any teacher whom I now address, ask himself, and then put to his pupils, the following questions: Do swallows usually reach this neighborhood before or after the Queen's birthday? Do horses and cows rise from the ground in the same manner—if they differ, how? Is there any difference between the eyes of these animals? How many toes has a dog on each foot? Has it the same number before and behind? Have all dogs the same number? What is peculiar about the action of a goose when entering a

door—say a barn door? How many legs has a mosquito?

These questions are remarkable for their simplicity only, and easily as the answers may be obtained, it will be something unusual if many teachers or pupils can be found who will give them readily, and with certainty. Of course, it may be said that the ability to answer frivolous queries like these, is of very little value. This is quite true, in a sense, but will any one deny that he who has noticed such things so closely as to be able to reply correctly at once, is gifted with a more exact knowledge of things in general than he who cannot? Is it not such as he who makes the best artist, artizan, or farmer—the most successful lawyer, physician, or teacher? This is our answer to the irrepressible "What good?" which hangs forever on the lips of those who can see no utility in anything unproductive of dollars and cents, that the cultivation of the observing faculties, arising from the study of the natural sciences, is calculated to produce a superior class, whether of mechanics, agriculturists, or professionals, to those who have imbibed the sum-total of their information at second-hand, from text-books and the mouths of preceptors.

President White, of Cornell University, says:—"A most important means of discipline and culture is to be found in the natural sciences. On these much industrial and general progress depends. They discipline the power of observation, and reasoning upon observation. They give, too, a culture to the sense of beauty in form and fitness of adaptation."

To most teachers, perhaps, the chief inducement to teach natural science will present itself in the fact that it enables many pupils to pursue other studies with greater facility. For example, the boy or girl who has been trained to note carefully the