

are killed and sold in the British market; and to look at the carcasses then, as I have seen them, you would say they were diseased. They have been knocked about to such an extent on the boat that their flesh is all bruised and blackened, and I have seen meat hanging up there that I would not put on my table, though in the first instance, the animals were first-class Canadian cattle. They are killed too soon after landing and have not been given an opportunity to overcome the effects of the severe pounding they got on the boats. That is the kind of prohibition I object to. My hon. friend from Red Deer tries to be evasive, but he does not succeed. He says that the cattle can land alive, but how long do they remain alive?

Mr. CLARK: You cannot eat them alive.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: No, and you do not want to have them eat them alive, I presume, in their unfit condition. But nobody suggested that the hon. gentleman should eat cattle alive. Altogether, I think this is a rather lively argument which the hon. member for Red Deer has precipitated. Now, if the Fordney Bill becomes effective, who is going to pay the duty? I see the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) is evidently getting ready for something, and I want him to answer that question. If the Fordney Bill is put through, and a duty of 30 cents is placed on wheat, 15 cents on barley, \$3 per hundred on cattle, and \$2 per head on sheep especially, who is going to pay these duties?

Mr. FIELDING: Especially if the goods do not go over.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Oh, do not worry about the goods not going over. My hon. friends angularly opposite, Levites mostly—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: If these duties are put on, I want those hon. gentlemen to tell me who is to pay them? That is a fair question, and I think the member for Red Deer, as a man who debates all kinds of economic topics, should have shown us in his speech who was to pay the duty. Usually these gentlemen say that it is the consumer that pays it.

Mr. MAHARG: I will answer my hon. friend's question if he will permit me—exactly the same person who now pays the duty on the Cockshutt implements, the consumer.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Yes, the consumer. Well, I am very glad that my hon. friend has taken that position. I thought he was going to say that the farmer on this side would pay the duty, because when free wheat was advocated in the West, and the farmers from the West were asking us to get their wheat into the United States, they argued on the floor of this House time and again that the Canadian farmer paid the American duty—in other words, he paid it going and he paid it coming. That is the proposition. Now my hon. friend says the consumer pays the duty. But who is going to consume this stuff? The United States. Well, if they are going to pay the duty what are you squealing about, why are you squealing? If the Fordney Bill is enacting duties and the consumer—in other words, the United States public—is going to consume these goods he is going to pay the duty, so there is nothing at all for my farmer friends to squeal about in that regard. Let it go on I say. They will be punishing themselves as much as my hon. friend says he is punishing himself in paying duty on implements. The farmer usually has admitted that the duty was paid by the consumer and I presume he still takes that view. But if that is the case what is to be gained by the policy advocated by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's, which proposes taking the duty off these items? My hon. friend says this Bill is going to do the farmers of this country immense damage. How is it going to do the farmers of this country immense damage when the American farmer and the American consumer has to pay the duty? It is a beautiful proposition—a proposition, I would say, for the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). It is a pity that the hon. gentleman did not think of that when he was on his feet; he could have told us who would pay the duty. He comes from the finest agricultural county in the Dominion of Canada, I understand. The wonder is, Mr. Speaker, that so fine a county should have so small a population as 13,000 people. I wonder that my hon. friend has not brought in more. It only shows my hon. friend that his free trade panacea has not yet made it possible for the county to grow and blossom like the rose, even though the farmers are so prosperous. I think I punctured the proposition pretty severely when I pointed out to my hon. friend that these duties, which he says are going to injure the Canadian farmer, are going to be paid