

THE CANADIAN AGRICULTURIST

AND

Transactions

OF THE

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE OF UPPER CANADA.

VOL. V.

TORONTO, NOVEMBER, 1852.

NO. 11.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURE.

[From the *Quebec Gazette*, October 6.]

Last night the second reading of Mr. Cameron's bill to provide for the establishment of a Bureau of Agriculture, came off. As was expected, from the tone of certain of the Upper Canada journals, considerable opposition was evinced by some of the members, though we were happy to find that the agriculturists of the House, the men who are most interested in the matter, and who are best able to judge as to the requirements of that portion of the community, were unanimous in their support of the measure. The class of opposition against this bill, the style of argument made use of by its opponents was certainly below what we should have expected, as we had been led to understand that several members had come down to the House, brim full of reasons, and only wanting an opportunity to completely annihilate the government on the subject. One of the main arguments adduced was, that the agriculturists of Upper Canada were opposed to the Bureau, that the present arrangement for the encouragement of agriculture was ample for the requirements of the people, and that any other arrangement would certainly prove abortive. — These reasons, if based on anything more than mere assertion, must have had great weight with the House, but our readers will perhaps be astonished to learn that the proof adduced in support of the statements was, that at the meeting lately held in St. Lawrence Hall, Toronto, during the Provincial Exhibition in that city, the hon. Malcolm Cameron, the present head of the Bureau, was greeted by certain persons with groanings and disgraceful names on entering the Hall, where it was announced that he should give explanations as to the views and intentions of the government on the subject of the encouragement of agriculture, and the establishment of a Bureau. The reception of Mr. Cameron at that meeting was, strange to say, (perhaps not, for of late we are prepared to hear any thing from that journal,) by the *Globe* proclaimed as evidence that the farmers of Upper Canada were opposed to the establishment of this office. The argument, however, had not the shadow of truth about it. A larger and more enthusiastic meeting was never held in the City of Toronto, and never was a

speaker more warmly greeted, than was Mr. Cameron. It is true that one person, a painter by the name of Orr, who, we believe, was rather more than "three sheets in the wind," did attempt to get up a noise, but the attempt was a miserable failure, and his single voice only, was heard articulating sounds, which few persons, if any, could understand. But even if the meeting had been quite as noisy as the *Globe* represented it to be, even if Mr. Cameron had been greeted by hisses and groans, that would be no proof that the people of Upper Canada are opposed to the Bureau over which that gentleman presides. — The editor of that paper will probably remember the Clergy Reserves meetings held in the same room in 1851, and the noise and tumult there got up by a few persons "friends of religion, to prevent an honest expression of opinion on the subject." He will probably recollect the evening when he and others were obliged to give up the platform to a band of rowdies, calling themselves gentlemen, when even age and the sacred office of the ministry was no protection against the low vulgar abuse of those said rowdies, and when a meeting called expressly for the purpose of eliciting an opinion in favor of the secularization of the Reserves, ended in mock resolutions in favor of their present settlement. Now we would ask the *Globe*, or the member for Kent, what would they have said, if that demonstration had been taken as an expression of opinion on the part of Upper Canada against the secularization of the Clergy Reserves? And yet, would it not have been quite as just as it is now, to proclaim the demonstration lately made of low, abusive, and vulgar language at the meeting in Toronto, as an expression of the farmers of Upper Canada against the Bureau of Agriculture? It is disgraceful then, to libel the people of Toronto, or the farmers who were at that meeting, because one single individual did not know how to behave himself. We believe, and we think that we are sustained in that belief by the state of the case, that the Bureau of Agriculture had nothing to do with the noise at the Toronto meeting, but that to Mr. Cameron's well-known opinions on political topics, to a connection with a party known to be in favour of progressive reform principles, and mainly to his determined hostility to Church endowment, and to these alone to be attributed the conduct of the individual who endeavoured to