

ments. I believe that our manufacturers have the trade in these machines at this time very well in their hands, except to a small extent, it may be, in the North-west. Canadian manufacturers have not had so long an experience in manufacturing for the prairie country as their competitors in the South, but this difficulty will, no doubt, be overcome before very long. It has been overcome so far as the old provinces are concerned, and we have implements well suited to our wants, and I think as good in quality as can be found in any country under the sun. The state of Canada in respect to farming implements might be compared to that of the children of Israel under the rule of Saul, the son of Kish. It is perhaps unnecessary to recite to hon. gentlemen, who are well acquainted with this little bit of biblical history, how in that time :—

There was no smith found in all the land of Israel. For the Philistines said lest the Hebrews make them swords or spears. But all the Israelites went down to the Philistines to sharpen every man his share, and his coulter and his axe and his mattock. Yet they had a file for the mattocks, and for the coulters, and for the forks, and for the axes, and to sharpen the goods.

We were not quite as badly off as that twenty or thirty years ago, but our condition approximated to it. We remember the extraordinary industrial development of the Israelitish nation under King Solomon when the temple was built fifty or sixty years afterwards. The change in Canada has, perhaps, not been so great, but it is very gratifying that we now find manufactured in our own country a line of agricultural implements well suited to our wants, excellent in their character and cheap in their price. I am not expressing any opinion whatever as to the rate of duty imposed on these articles, whether it may be reduced or otherwise. I am not in a position to express any opinion on that point at the present time. If these manufacturers are as well established as I believe they are, and can now maintain themselves with a smaller rate of duty, the farmers of Canada will hail the change with a great deal of satisfaction. I congratulate Canada on the showing made at the Chicago exhibition, and on the admission of the chairman of the committee of jurors and awards, that Canada had progressed well in the matter of manufacture of agricultural

implements since the Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia. Similar testimony was given by the commissioner representing the Austrian nation on that occasion to which I would also refer. While speaking on this subject, I may also say a word about the breach of comity on the part of the American managers of the exposition in regard to these very agricultural implements. It was most extraordinary conduct, according to the information I have obtained—the treatment which Canadian exhibitors of farming implements received at Chicago. It appears that Canada and even Great Britain had no representative on the committee of jurors. There were five American gentlemen upon that committee, and a representative each from Austria and Russia. Neither Britain nor Canada was represented upon that board of jurors: nevertheless awards were made to the Canadian binders, mowers, reapers, threshers, separators and all the different classes of implements. The awards were made, but were either changed after they passed out of the hand of the jurors, or suppressed afterwards, so that they have not been given to the manufacturers of Canadian goods. This is a matter of very great regret, for it is the only unpleasant thing and the only cause of unpleasant feeling that has arisen between the two countries in connection with this Chicago Exhibition. I might here refer to the examination of the Hon. Mr. Thacher, the chairman of the executive committee of the exposition, at a meeting of the National Commission held at Washington in September last, where he was asked some questions on this subject of awards to Canadian manufacturers. He said:

There are only three exhibits so far as I can understand, represented by foreigners of the class that were ordered into the field, and those exhibits were examined, but as I stated in my paper here, they did not receive an award—that is information which I perhaps ought not to give.

Q. Does that cover the entire ground that they will not receive an award?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then there will be no cause for alarm on the part of American exhibitors that foreign exhibits will be examined on the floor in any way to harm the trade of the home exhibitor at all?—A. No, sir.

Was it not outrageous that the management of the exposition conducted the matter in this way, intercepting the awards on their way from the committee of jurors to the manufacturers who had fairly won them, intercepting them in the interest of the