

meetings, and the hundreds of meetings of farmer's institutes, have quickened the minds of workers. Supplementing these meetings, reports and bulletins have been distributed, by the hundreds of thousands, in the past ten years. But the point that I wish to make here is, as I said before, that the persons principally benefitted by this work are the men and women of mature years. This is all very well, in its way. These men appreciate thoroughly what is being done. They recognize the importance and the necessity of this instruction; but is it not beginning at the wrong end? Why should the farming class of this country have to wait until they become men, before they learn that there is a science underlying their practice? If it is a good thing to educate a grown man, or a grown woman, in the principles of agricultural work, it is still more important, as far as practicable, to give the boy and girl some training in these principles, early in life, at the time when they will be of the most permanent benefit. I, therefore, have no hesitation in answering my first question by saying that agriculture, in some form, should be taught to the pupils of our schools."

Mr. James was speaking of Ontario, when he wrote this; but the sermon he preaches applies to P. E. Island, as well as to Ontario.

He goes on:—

"WHEN AND WHERE SHOULD IT BE TAUGHT?"

"Most persons, I think, are of the opinion that some instruction in agriculture should be given to pupils in rural schools, since they assume that these pupils are to be the future farmers. They are not, in general, of the opinion that the teaching should be given in town and city schools, because the pupils of such schools are likely to move out into professional pursuits, become school teachers, enter mercantile life, or follow some one of the many manufacturing lines. They are not quite sure that even all pupils in rural schools should be taught agriculture, as so many are yearly coming from the country to the town to re-inforce the struggling city classes with new blood and new physique. Right here, I would present a debatable proposition: If agriculture can be taught in our public schools, in a manner such as I will suggest in my next division, I am of the opinion that it should be on the course of study for town and city pupils, as well as on the course for rural pupils. Perhaps, in city and town schools, it might be made optional; but, in rural schools, it should be obligatory.

"If we can, by altering or re-arranging our system, keep more of the best rural pupils in touch with agriculture; and if we can, at the same time, arouse in some of the town and city pupils a sympathy for agricultural methods and agricultural life, we shall be looking to the best interests of the pupils, and of the country, as a whole. I am of the opinion that a course of agriculture can be given, in town and city schools, that will be interesting and beneficial, and that will be in harmony with the best educational methods or system. I would put a course in the science of agriculture within the reach of every pupil in all of our schools; and I would, therefore, begin the work in the public schools, rural and urban alike. It might be better to begin the work here, by making agriculture a compulsory subject in the fourth form of our public schools, and from this, as a starting point, work out, in time, a system of instruction adapted to our conditions, prefacing it, first, by a simpler course in the third form, and adding an advanced course to our high school work. I believe that agriculture can be taught just as well to the public school pupils as are some of the subjects at present on the course, and I believe that the pupils, themselves, will come to the subject with as much eagerness."