

the American market could be secured for nothing? Time has proved the accuracy of this argument.

Since 1911 the Underwood tariff bill has been put into force, which gives Canada practically all of the concessions under the Reciprocity Pact, and in addition goes much further. Cattle, swine, sheep, rye, cream, eggs, milk, fish, salt, buckwheat, etc., to be free under the old Pact, are free under the new tariff. But the free list is greatly extended, and includes such things as flax straw, flax dressed and undressed, condensed milk and cream, sheep skins, wool, meat fresh or salted, bacon and hams, meats preserved, lard, canned meats, cornmeal, buckwheat flour and rye flour. All of these concessions were obtained without any sacrifice of the Canadian markets, and with no obligation of any kind on Canada.

The Liberals profess now to be in favour of free agricultural implements. But it should be recalled that in 1911, when the Liberals were making but slight concessions of from 5 to 2½ per cent. in the reciprocity pact, they declared that that was all that they would do, and that they were determined to go no further. Here is the proof. Mr. E. W. Nesbitt, M.P. for North Oxford, in a speech at Woodstock during the 1911 campaign, is quoted in the Toronto "Globe" of March 4 as follows:—

"He could assure that the manufacturers would be touched very much, as for articles manufactured in Canada were affected. He was sure the Bain and Woodstock wagon companies would compete in the world's markets even with 2½ per cent. reduction in the tariff. He thought the manufacturers opposed reciprocity because of what might follow, the 'thing end of the wedge,' but he had been assured by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding that nothing of the sort would follow. They had gone as far in the farmers' interests as they would."

Later on, on the floor of the House, Sir Wilfrid Laurier was challenged by Sir George Foster as to the truth of Mr. Nesbitt's statement. On page 5742 of Hansard, 1911, the Liberal leader, in answer to this challenge, made the following statement:—

"The statement made by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) was quite consistent with our policy, it was nothing new, and he had perfect authority, not only he, but every member of the Liberal side, to make that statement."

"Mr. Foster: Did the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance authorize the member in question to make that statement?"

"Sir Wilfrid Laurier: I have answered that already. It is perfectly true. The hon. member for North Oxford and every Liberal member had such authority, he was not kept in ignorance of our policy in this matter and knew it well. He only stated what is our general policy."

This was the reply of the professed believer in free agricultural implements. In 1911 the Liberals were not prepared to go as far as the Conservatives have since gone. It shows that their professed new adherence to the free implement faith is a myth. They broke all their pledges after 1896. They promised free agricultural implements before 1896; they gave only a 2½ per cent. reduction, and that only after eleven years of office, and negatived the value of this by increased valuation. There is no reason to believe the Liberals would keep their promises again any more than they did in 1896.

The Government now in power can be depended upon by the Western farmer to do what it promises—and that is what the Western farmer