agreed to the devaluation remove the possibility of the United States taking dumping action aaginst such an extreme devaluation? As I say, I have not been able to find the answer, but from my reading I am inclined to think that in the case of any devaluation in excess of 20 per cent—

Hon. Mr. Haig: In excess of 10 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: I am speaking of devaluation of over 20 per cent. I understand that even with the consent of the fund, should the United States, for instance, protest that the price at which goods were being shipped to her constituted dumping, she would be entitled to ask for and make new agreements with respect to the devaluation of more than 20 per cent. I do not express that as a final opinion on the matter; I merely call the attention of honourable senators to the fact that the whole Geneva Trade Agreement contemplates some control of currencies, either through the medium of the International Monetary Fund or by separate agreement.

It may interest honourable senators to know that at the moment there are 46 countries represented in the fund. I know of only three countries which currently are not members—Burma, New Zealand and Southern Rhodesia. The fund has a large membership, and apparently contributes to a general world currency stabilization.

Concerning the question of whether or not we should control our foreign exchange, I would say that under the extraordinary conditions which we faced following the recent war, and which we may now face, the collective opinion of a great many countries seems to favour control.

Hon. Mr. Farris: Is it true that if Canada withdrew her support from the Canadian dollar, she would either have to withdraw from the International Monetary Fund or get its consent?

Hon. Mr. Robertson: Yes. I think the actual agreement covers capital movement and not moneys used currently. There are one or two alternatives open to Canada. If she remains a member of the International Monetary Fund she must undertake to control her foreign exchange. Should she withdraw from the fund, and wish to enjoy certain benefits extended by other countries, she must enter into agreements which require her to do practically the same as if she were a member of the fund.

Hon. Mr. Haig: As I understand it, South Africa belongs to the monetary fund?

Hon. Mr. Robertson: I think so.

Hon. Mr. Haig: And she is now selling gold at very much above the average price. The United States, I understand, wants her to stop doing so, but South Africa refuses to change her policy in this respect. Is any machinery provided for taking action in such a situation?

Hon. Mr. Robertson: I thank my honourable friend for the question, because by it he gives me credit for knowing a great deal more about this complicated question than I actually do know.

Hon. Mr. Haig: I was not trying to catch my friend.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: I do not know the answer. I would point out that this whole question and its related subjects are of tremendous importance, and could very well provide an excellent ground of activity for one of our committees.

Hon. Mr. Euler: I am reluctant to ask a question which the honourable leader might not be reasonably expected to answer. Of course it is quite all right if that is the case. I would refer again to what the honourable senator from Vancouver South (Hon. Mr. Farris) said. As England has devalued 30 per cent, and Canada 10 per cent, the Britisher gets an advantage of 20 per cent in the Canadian market. May Canada, if she so desires, compensate herself for that differential by an increased tariff?

While I am on my feet I might also ask another question. I am informed that Britain subsidizes some exports to this country. One of these products is leather; there may be others. Could we under these circumstances provide for a dumping duty? Or, as I have said, can the tariff be increased to compensate for that difference of 20 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Robertson: Realizing my responsibility for what I say in answering the honourable senator's question, I should like to make it clear, that I am giving only my own interpretation of the provisions.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Perhaps I should not have asked.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: I am loath to give toc positive an opinion because, as anyone who reads them will find, the provisions are very involved. But as I understand them, the right under the agreement to take action arises only when the difference is over 20 per cent, and therefore, since we devalued 10 per cent and Britain 30 per cent, it would not apply in the case my honourable friend refers to.

Hon. Mr. Euler: But would it not apply if the British manufacturers receive a subsidy?