

these deals. However, he made this pertinent observation and I quote him again:

This may fit into the philosophy of governments prevailing in other countries.

That is exactly my point. We have no control over those other governments, but if they are our potential customers I think we should fit in our policies with their policies in order that we might trade and survive. If one studies and follows this excellent periodical *Foreign Trade* one must come to the conclusion that almost every country in the world except Canada and the United States controls its international trade in this or a similar manner. They are forced to do so. They are forced to form customs unions like that about to be formed in the near future by France and Italy.

In the March 26 issue of *Foreign Trade* we read that a five-man commercial mission left Peru for London early in March at the invitation of the British government to discuss ways and means by which exports from Britain to Peru could be increased. Almost every week similar items pertaining to world trade and to barter deals, as we call them, are to be found in *Foreign Trade* and also in the daily press. This is all done with the idea of getting world trade moving because it will not move under the old system.

It has been mentioned in the house that co-operatives and even private traders have endeavoured to conclude deals in foreign countries for the exchange of goods, as is suggested in *Foreign Trade* of March 19. I cannot see why, without any great interference on the part of the government, organizations such as co-operatives or even private traders could not make deals of this sort. I think it is worth a trial. The government has elaborate machinery in the Department of Trade and Commerce, which I think is an excellent department. There are trade commissioners spread over the face of the globe and we also have the Canadian Commercial Corporation. The machinery is there whereby the government could assist co-operatives, provincial governments if you like, private traders or any person to make barter deals with some of these countries which do not trade today in any other way.

I realize of course that there is the non-discriminatory principle of the Geneva agreement, but that agreement has many escape clauses. Those escape clauses are being taken advantage of today by almost every country that signed the treaty except Canada and the United States, I was going to say. Even in the United States they have taken some advantage of the escape clause I mentioned a year ago.

The Geneva agreement is trying to take us back to pre-war conditions, and while I am

The Budget—Mr. Blackmore

generally in accord with its provisions and its aims, since I was taught that free trade is the proper way to carry on world trade, I believe that, while an agreement like that would have worked wonderfully twenty-five years ago, it will not do today what its sponsors hope it will. Members of the Atlantic union being pledged to economic co-operation are likely to succeed more satisfactorily among themselves, and I believe that the members who signed the Atlantic pact will have more success by economic co-operation, even if they should leave out Canada and the United States, as they are doing at the present time. I think we in Canada cannot afford to stand aside. I think we must make a trial in view of the prospects for foreign trade at the present time, and that some consideration should be given by the government to the question of barter deals especially since a trial seems to be recommended in the article on foreign trade that I have just read.

Mr. J. H. Blackmore (Lethbridge): For a few moments I desire to direct the attention of the house to another type of subject. World war I veteran, Lieutenant Stuart Brown entered Shaughnessy hospital to be treated for neurasthenia and gunshot wounds, a disability that would be pensionable if proven to exist. I should like to have the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Gregg), or anyone else who feels competent to perform the task, find out and tell the house and the country who are the men whose signatures committed Lieutenant Stuart Brown from Shaughnessy hospital to Essondale insane asylum, thereby nullifying Lieutenant Brown's title to pension.

While they are about it I should also like them to say who are the men whose signatures later committed world war I veteran Brown to Colquitz mental home where at that time only the permanently and criminally insane were lodged. All being well, I shall have more to say about Colquitz when and if at some future time I speak again concerning Lieutenant Brown. I believe the house and the country would like to know upon whose orders or consent or acquiescence these outrages were committed against veteran Brown, a free Canadian with no criminal record, a man sane then, sane ever since then, and sane now. I think every normal Canadian would also like to know who it was who wrote into veteran Brown's record two monstrous falsehoods, first that veteran Brown had been in an asylum prior to the war, and second that veteran Brown had been arrested and charged with an offence against children, these falsehoods never having had the slightest foundation in fact; the existence of these falsehoods in his records being utterly unknown to veteran Brown until a legion committee examining his records later found them there;