

for our thousands of low-wage earners. These are the people who should be considered first. I shall repeat what I was criticized for saying once before in this chamber, that the federal and provincial governments have got to give financial assistance to the municipalities to enable them to build housing accommodation for our low-paid workers. If this is not done, legislation should be passed to provide our workers with a basic wage which will enable them to build or buy houses at present-day costs. The government may take whatever horn of the dilemma it wishes; it will have to take one or the other.

I turn now to the subject of old age pensions. I was hopeful that an amendment would be introduced this year to provide for two things. The first is that the pensioner should be entitled to earn beyond his pension of \$40, without deduction therefrom, an amount proportionate to the amount that he was permitted to earn when the statutory pension was \$30 per month. I think the concession should be \$120 per year. This may not seem much to us, but it is important to the old age pensioner. I realize that I do not present the views of every member of my party, but I think the means test should be done away with. This may sound drastic, but my experience as a lawyer has taught me that the means test is most disagreeable to Canadian men and women who, after spending a lifetime in this country, have lost their savings in one way or another and are obliged to apply for old age pensions. In Manitoba we have found every case so clear that the means test is not really necessary. I must say to the gratification of my own province, that the committee concerned has always released the security. Just recently an eighty-four year-old woman who owned a one-third interest in eighty acres of land, half of which was under cultivation, wanted to give the property to her son. The government had a lien on the property, but when I placed the facts before the committee the land was released. The committee in Manitoba has followed this practice in every case.

There is nothing more I wish to say about the Speech from the Throne.

Honourable senators, these past two weeks have been important ones in world affairs. The government financial leaders of Great Britain, Canada and the United States met in Washington and, as was stated in the other chamber a few days ago, Canada's delegate stood second to none in these deliberations. I say quite candidly that he did a splendid job. A day or two following this conference of financial experts, the international committee on the Atlantic Pact held a meeting. Then, a few days later, there was a meeting of the representatives of the

International Monetary Fund. Our delegates occupied a difficult position at these meetings, but I am sure we are all proud of the able manner in which they represented Canada.

There is no use denying that Canadians are bound to the Mother Country by ties of sentiment. It is just as a man said to me the other day, "If I were born in Sweden, Norway, France or Italy and came to this country to live, I would not have the same sentimental ties with Britain that a person from Scotland or England would have." However, all those who have come to Canada and lived here for a lifetime have realized the contributions Britain has made to the world. They have realized how much Britain has contributed to our system of government and our system of justice. When Britain declared war on Germany in 1939, though Canada did not have to enter into hostilities, every member of this house and all but two members of the other house agreed that we should join Britain. That was an indication of the deep affection Canadians have for the Mother Country.

Britain has made mistakes. I think her people made a mistake when they elected their present government. But that is none of my business. I think other people, too, made mistakes when they elected their governments.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Oh, oh.

**Hon. Mr. Copp:** That is not your fault either.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** I just wanted to point out that our representatives at these various international conferences have had this rather delicate situation with which to contend. I have read everything I could about what happened at these meetings, and I am convinced that we would all support the decisions made by our representatives.

Britain has devalued the pound much more than I think anybody expected. Canada has followed by devaluing her dollar, and just here I want to pay a word of respect to my honourable friend from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck). I have always been in favour of a ten per cent devaluation, and every time I have spoken in this house on the Speech from the Throne I have advocated this policy. About three years ago my honourable friend made such an able speech on the question of devaluation that a year later I joined him in advocating that we should let the dollar find its own value. The dollar is a commodity on the world market, just as is a bushel of wheat, a bushel of potatoes, a case of salmon, a barrel of apples, or anything else that we sell. The very fact that the government has devalued the dollar on the market shows that money is a commodity. As soon as Britain reduced the market price of her currency we did the same with ours, as did nearly all