

by the American public according to the testimony of my hon. friend from Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg). I am glad my hon. friend chooses one horn of the dilemma because he has to take it one way or the other; he can hardly take the ground that the farmer pays the duty coming and pays it going. Yet I have heard farmer members of the House place themselves in that preposterous position.

The hon. member for Red Deer has quite a number of similes, and strange to say, though we differ in opinion, he and I have somewhat the same kind of simile—that is a very strange coincidence. The hon. member this afternoon pointed out that trade was something like a river with a dam crossing it, and he made the somewhat astounding statement that the dam would not permit the water to run either way. Well, it is some river, I should say, if the water does not run either way.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I said "stream."

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Well, I think the illustration of a "stream" is worse because a stream is supposed to be moving and if it is moving it must be going in one direction or the other. If it does not move either way it is a strange "stream" or a strange "river." However, I am going to make a different argument about my river than that which my hon. friend advanced. I want to put my argument before the House and I think it is an argument my farmer friends will appreciate. Suppose we have trade like a flowing river and a tariff is put on—as my hon. friend would say "an obstruction is put in the stream," or in other words a dam is placed across it. According to my hon. friend from Red Deer we have destroyed the river—the water is being destroyed, it is being put out of business. On the other hand, according to the protectionist, according to the man who understands things properly, if that dam is holding the water back there is being laid up in this country a latent energy that will turn the wheels of commerce round, and not one single drop of the water in that river, or "stream" as my hon. friend calls it, is destroyed by the use of that dam. I think any man who has any conception of what happens in streams and rivers through the construction of a dam will see that is pretty sound policy. So that my hon. friend has really given me an opportunity to compliment him on using a simile, but the trouble is that he considers that a dam

[Mr. Cockshutt.]

would not permit the water to run either way. I say the dam permits the water to run both ways. According to the country in which the "stream" flows and in which it rises—the stream flows in and the stream flows out.

My hon. friend also says that protectionists will not buy. He knows that is not true. We know, Mr. Speaker, that we have to buy, we do buy and we propose to buy; what we do say is that we are not selling enough; and I want to draw the attention of the House to the frequent repetition of an expression used by my hon. friend this afternoon. He accused the Minister of Finance, I think, of saying that we trade too much with the United States. I did not understand the Minister of Finance that way. I want to draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that he used the word "trading" whereas the minister used the word "buying." Does my hon. friend see any difference between trading and buying? I do, I see a large difference between trading and buying.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I took down the minister's words, and they appear in my notes. He asked "Are we not trading enough?" "Buying" is not the word he used and I think Hansard will bear out my statements.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I accept the correction of my hon. friend. At any rate the hon. gentleman used the word "trading." What we say is that we are buying too much from the United States. Does my hon. friend see the difference? We propose to sell more and buy less. I think that is plain. That is the way to correct a balance of trade and the way to correct the exchange situation; and it cannot be corrected, as my hon. friend proposes to do it, by buying more on the American market when we are already buying a great deal too much. There is a great deal of foolish talk under the head of economics in this House; and my hon. friend from Red Deer—though he uses that word "economic" very frequently and very freely and has read a great deal of Cobden, Bright, and Adam Smith, as well as all those Old Testament worthies that are so highly spoken of in the Scriptures—is a long way off the trend of modern times in thinking that we can learn anything from Adam Smith, or Cobden or Bright. We are too "bright" already in that respect to have to go back fifty or seventy-five years and start in on free trade. It is not a new