

the bill. On the contrary, it is altogether out of order. There is no rule that permits it. I want to appeal again to hon. members to try to deal with the business in the way in which the rules provide that it should be dealt with. It is not a pleasant thing for the Chairman to be obliged continually to call hon. members' attention to the rules. Every hon. member should try to assist the chair in seeing that the rules which are laid down for us are complied with. I think we should abide by them. I appeal again to hon. members to try to get on in an orderly way and deal with clause 1.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I should like to ask the minister a question.

This comes under the general heading. I do not think it will be out of order. This bill deals with the question of saving exchange.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I do not intend to deal with what is in the bill. I want to ask a question.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. The clause that is before the committee now is the short title; that is all. I think my hon. friend will find other clauses—

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Emergency exchange.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: —as we go along, under which he can deal with the problem he has in mind.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I have not stated it yet.

Mr. POULIOT: I abide by your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. POULIOT: I will not discuss your ruling, Mr. Chairman; I abide by it.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): —I have the floor.

Mr. HARTT: Who said so?

Mr. POULIOT: I am sorry, sir, but I think I have. We are dealing with the short title, which reads as follows:

This act may be cited as the Emergency Exchange Conservation Act.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): That is what I said.

Mr. POULIOT: This is the first time that I can repeat what has been said by St. Paul's without making a mistake. I would suggest to the minister that he change the short title so that it reads in this way: "This act may be cited as the barter act." Barter should be

a detour around United States dollars. The trouble now is that everybody is inclined to adopt new fashions. Why should we always stand by the United States dollar, speak only of the United States dollar from dawn to dusk and from dusk to dawn, and think only of the United States dollar as a means of exchange?

In the first place, the purpose of exchange is to correct the difference in a transaction which is made between two parties. Usually goods are exchanged and the difference is paid in dollars. But when we hear of the dollar as being the principal in a transaction instead of the accessory, one falls into the error of the Social Credit group. My suggestion to the minister is to trade by means of barter, to barter with all the countries that have not enough United States dollars with which to pay for Canadian goods. Only last year I made a practical suggestion to the minister regarding the income tax, namely, to replace the income tax by another kind of taxation that would not be so hard on the Canadian taxpayer. This time I suggest to him that he put aside the United States dollar and practice barter, and that he assist Canadian exporters and importers to barter with all countries of the world which have not enough United States dollars with which to make full payment for Canadian exports. That would be a way to recovery, and it would show the people of the United States that we may become independent of them.

Why should we always be subservient with regard to the people of the United States? There is no reason for it. South of the United States is a republic which is entirely independent of the United States. There are some United States investments there as there are some here; but they do their business with the United States and they can do so well that one official of the government—not a responsible gentleman, but one of the deputies—said not long ago that our trade with Mexico could amount to \$100 million a year. Is it possible for Mexico to pay us in United States dollars? I doubt it. But we could practise the exchange of goods. Therefore there should be an entirely different trade policy. We should have a trade policy that would mean something to the Canadian people. In this country we have primary products and manufactured goods that we could exchange for primary products and manufactured goods of any other country in the world. At the present time what is the plague of the United Kingdom? It is that they have not enough United States dollars. But those people from Cripps down to the last cabinet minister are devoid of imagination. When they start with the wrong