

at Guelph, and the East wished the Provincial Fair.

Mr. BALFOUR could not agree that there was any great demand for the abolition of the Provincial Exhibition in his constituency. If there was a need for \$5,000 for the Farmers' Institutes, then let them have the money and the Provincial Fair the money too. He was in favour of the continuance of the exhibition and its going East more frequently if need be.

Mr. RAYSIDE was unaware of the cause of decline, but from personal inspection was satisfied that the Provincial Exhibition held in Ottawa last autumn did not compare with the Fair held under the Association's auspices in London fifteen years ago. The last Exhibition did not fairly indicate the Province's agricultural development for the last decade. He believed that a financially successful Exhibition had never been held in Ottawa. The Fairs held in the eastern section did not give the farmers a chance to see the best grades of live stock from Western Ontario. He would like to see a Committee appointed to enquire into the advisability of continuing the Provincial Exhibitions.

Mr. MCKAY was not in a position to say whether the grant should be continued or not, as he had not heard the matter discussed. He did not know what the grant should be applied to if it were discontinued, but he thought his constituency did not get any benefit from the Exhibition.

Mr. ROBILLARD thought the amount voted was hardly worth talking about. He thought the East had never got its share, as when Ottawa had had the show Toronto had taken good care to have a show at the same time, and thus they did not get the full share of benefit. There was too much exhibition; there were township exhibitions, district exhibitions, county exhibitions, and exhibitions too numerous to mention. He was in favour of dividing the money among the counties.

Hon. A. M. ROSS—I am glad, indeed, to have had the benefit of the discussion that has taken place to-day. Surprise has been expressed that the Government has not come down with a policy upon this subject. I think any person who considers for a moment the great interests involved in this question, the diversity of opinion with regard to it which has been expressed, will see that the Government ought to be slow in dealing with this matter until they are aware of the feeling of the people of this Province. The Government desire nothing further than to devote the money in accordance with the feeling of the farmers themselves. If the farmers are generally of the opinion that the exhibition has seen its best days, and that it

SHOULD BE ABOLISHED

the Government would be prepared to give emphasis to that opinion by doing away with it, and devoting the money to some other agricultural object, because we think all parties will recognize that if this money is withdrawn from the Provincial Exhibition, it ought to be devoted to some other purpose in which the farmers are interested. It is questionable whether some better way might not be devised for spending this money. The main arguments advanced in favour of doing away with the Exhibition were:—That in regard to agriculture the Eastern portion of the Province is not so far advanced as the West, that many of the Exhibitions which have sprung up have now become large institutions, and are taking the place of the Provincial Exhibition, and that some places actually refused to have the Provincial Exhibition at all. It has been said that when the Exhibition goes to the East it is not successful, but that it ought not to be done away with altogether, because of its educational benefits; that it is really doing a benefit to the East by the holding of it there every four years, and that consequently it might be well to hold it every four years; but there seems to be a difference of opinion as to whether it should be done away with altogether or not there. Now, the whole amount of \$10,000 which we give is not devoted to the Provincial Exhibition. I believe, under the management of the Agricultural and Arts Association, only about one-half is devoted to that purpose. The other half has been applied to other agricultural objects of late years, showing that the holding of the Provincial Exhibition is not the only way in which the Association can work in the interest of the farmers. They have taken up the matter of

PRIZE FARMS,

stimulating our farmers to improve their farms. They have also taken up other branches, such as the holding of ploughing matches and the getting up of prize essays, by which means they have succeeded in bringing out the views of agriculturists themselves. In all these branches they have done good work. It is a question whether they might not go further and abolish the exhibition altogether. As regards this year the grant could not be withheld. Certain steps have been taken to open the Exhibition in the City of London, and the Association must go on with it. As to what might be done with the grant if withdrawn from the Provincial Exhibition, a good deal of force, as I think, is to be given to the suggestion that has been made that this money might be devoted to grants to the Farmers' Institutes. Our experience with these Institutes this year has been eminently successful—(hear, hear)—and the high appreciation of the farming community of their advantages has been evidenced by the

number of applications which have been received since the recent Institutes were held to hold them in other localities. One of the professors has informed me that they have received upwards of twenty-five applications, from places in which these Institutes were not held this year, since last January. In starting these

FARMERS' INSTITUTES,

there was no new innovation. In Michigan I saw they had done good work. In this Province they seem to have been attended by farmers from long distances. There seems to have been no move that has been taken which has created so deep an interest among the farming community, and it might be taken into consideration if the grant now given to the Provincial Exhibition might not perhaps do as much in the way of stimulating the advancement of agricultural education if it were divided among these Institutes in different parts of the Province.

Mr. MEREDITH—For what purpose would the hon. gentleman propose to apply the money?

Hon. A. M. ROSS—In connection with the Institutes. Anybody who has had experience in getting up associations of this kind knows that the great bulk of the expenditure devolves on a few, who have to put their hands in their own pockets for the purpose of paying the expenses. My view is that these Institutes ought to be organized, not merely for the purpose of getting the Professors to address them once a year, but that they should be permanent institutions, conducted on the same principle as the teachers, associations. The teachers have formed themselves into permanent institutions, and meet several times during the year for the purpose of discussion. I think the Farmers' Institutes might meet not merely once a year, but four or five or half a dozen times, to exchange views on agricultural matters, and discuss all the new phases coming up in regard to their profession. The expense of bringing the professors from a distance, if they were to be met by those interested in bringing them to a particular locality, has to fall on a few, who soon tire of this, and very often the institution falls off altogether. A grant of \$25 to each electoral district for this purpose might be a very fair way of dividing this money. I do not think the Government have come to any conclusion about the Provincial Exhibition, but from the views expressed here to-day in favour of doing away with it, I judge that there is a considerable feeling in favour of that course, and if the grant is to be taken away from the exhibition, it is a question whether this might not be as good a way of devoting the money as any other. It would be

AN EQUITABLE WAY.

Another way of distributing the money, which has been suggested, is to give it to the existing agricultural societies. I do not think that would be of any great benefit. Almost all our electoral district societies are successful now, and the amount of money which we would be enabled to divide among them would be small—perhaps only about \$50 apiece. Then, I know myself, that there are jealousies among the agricultural societies, even in their own electoral districts. There are exhibitions now conducted for the benefit of one locality out of the whole electoral district. The granting of this money would be an addition to the revenue of that society, which is carrying on its work not for the benefit of a whole electoral district but of one locality. But if, on the other hand, a grant were given to each district for the holding of Farmers' Institutes periodically in different parts of the district for the purpose of discussing agricultural subjects, it might perhaps be a good thing and money well applied. The opinion has been expressed also that it might be advisable to do away with the grant to the Exhibition for a year or two, and then make a larger grant. This is a question to consider. The hon. gentleman has accomplished, in bringing forward his motion, a good deal in drawing the attention of the House to the matter, and I would suggest that, having accomplished all he desired—I do not think it would be desirable to commit the House to a definite proposal that the exhibition should be closed and the grant abolished—the hon. gentleman withdraw his motion, and it will induce members and others, who are not present in this House, to discuss the subject in the press and the agricultural periodicals.

Mr. DRYDEN, with the consent of the House, withdrew his motion.

THE BRIBERY CASE.

Mr. AWREY moved for a return furnishing the full text of the judgments of the judges of the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice on the demurrer in the case of the Queen v. Bunting and others. Carried.

THE PAYMENTS.

Mr. MEREDITH moved for a return showing what sums have been paid to George R. Patullo on any account whatever since January 1st, 1883, with the dates of payment thereof, and the purpose for which such payments were made. Carried.

SESSIONAL PAPERS.

Mr. CARNEGIE moved that sessional papers No. 109, No. 110, and No. 111 of 1884, and presented to the House on the last day of last ses-

sion, be referred to the Committee on Printing. Carried.

Mr. FRENCH moved the second reading of the Bill to confer on notaries the power of Commissioners. He explained that the Bill proposed to give notaries public power to receive all affidavits, and he would make them officers of the Court, and therefore liable to its summary jurisdiction. He thought the bounds of a county should not hinder a commissioner receiving any affidavit. It was an anomaly that the affidavits sworn before foreign notaries should be accepted and not those of our own.

Hon. O. MOWAT thought there was no anomaly, but complete analogy, as while Canadian Courts accepted the affidavits sworn before foreign notaries public, the affidavits sworn before our notaries public were accepted in foreign countries. He thought there was no difficulty in a notary public obtaining a commission if he got a certificate from a county judge that it was needed.

Mr. MEREDITH suggested that the Bill should be allowed to pass and be referred to the Special Committee.

Hon. T. B. PARDEE thought there was some reason in confining a Commissioner to his county as a preventive of fraud.

The Bill was read a second time and referred to a Special Committee.

SECOND READINGS.

Mr. Ermatinger—To amend the Municipal Act, making the qualifications of reeves, deputy-reeves, and voters in incorporated villages the same as in townships.

Mr. DILL—To amend the Municipal Act, making the qualifications for councillors apply to incorporated villages as well as to townships.

Mr. Waters—To amend the Act respecting the Tile Drainage Act. It was to enable councils to issue debentures without advertising, and to compel the councils to issue the debentures when requested by the parties.

The House adjourned at 5:45.