

Canadian loans and Marshall Plan funds have gone by the board, and Great Britain is in greater difficulties now than ever before. The leader of one of her political parties has said that the field should be wide open so that money can find its own value.

While I agree largely with my friend from Toronto-Trinity, I fail to draw from his remarks, or from those of the senator from Inkerman, what is suggested in the way of a solution. It is so easy to utter high-sounding phrases about Great Britain, because of her part in the war, her sacrifices and the loss of her world investments, and to say that therefore we, or the United States should get behind her and put up the money.

Hon. Mr. Duff: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Haig: I am just stating what has been said on the subject.

Hon. Mr. Duff: What is the solution?

Hon. Mr. Haig: If my honourable friend will just have patience, he will hear what I think about the solution.

Canada faces a grave problem. It affects the western provinces and the Maritimes to some extent, but Ontario and Quebec are little affected. We in the West have one primary product—wheat. Up to the present time it has been largely sold on European markets. My friend from Inkerman (Hon. Mr. Hugessen) referred to the three-way system of trading. Although he did not say so, it would seem to follow from his argument, if one examines it closely, that what Britain received from the United States was used to pay us, and that we used that money to meet our debts to the United States. What he did not mention, though it is the fact, is that for very many years part of the money obtained by Great Britain from the United States was by way of return from investments; and of course large sums came also from investments in Canada. What I want from honourable gentlemen opposite—for the information of the farmers and fishermen of my province, the lumbermen of British Columbia and New Brunswick, the apple growers of Nova Scotia, the potato growers of Prince Edward Island, and other Canadian producers—is a statement of what they propose as a solution of the problem we have run into.

I have listened over the air to many addresses and I have read the very able press of my own city; prior to the 1st of May I heard many discussions in this house and in another place, and later I listened to the campaign speeches of the parties; but as yet I have never heard from the government one suggestion as to how they are going to meet this difficulty. What they say amounts to this: "We have got through crises in the

past. Trust us to get through them again." And the people have done so. Now this crisis is upon us, and I want to know how the government are going to meet it.

As the honourable senator from Peterborough (Hon. Mrs. Fallis) said today, the government told us on the platform, in the press, over the radio and in the other place that they would never devalue the money of this country. My honourable friend from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck)—to whom I give the most credit—followed very closely by myself, criticized the government for fixing our dollar at par in 1946. We told them they should have "held the line" at 90 cents. They pooh-poohed the idea; they laughed at us. Well, within two and a half months of the election they have depreciated our currency 10 per cent, and I predict that the bottom is not yet reached; they will have to come down some more. That is our situation. There is no point in using high-flown phrases about what we are going to do for Great Britain. We could spend our time more profitably in trying to decide what we can do for ourselves. That is the problem we have to face.

I am not going to formally object to any of the estimates; it would not have any effect if I did. I would only point out that the estimates before us are on the same fine scale of spending that has prevailed for the past eight or nine years. While the world was a buyer's market and people had to have goods and would pay any price for them, it was easy to drift along.

This afternoon my honourable friend from Northumberland (Hon. Mr. Burchill) criticized the representatives of the West for kicking about the wheat agreement. It may be true that our farmers have done very well, but they were entitled to do a lot better. I realize that it is not necessary to warn the Maritimes, Newfoundland, and the three western provinces that we have got to find some way to sell our primary products. British Columbia, although in a rather different position, is also largely affected. The people of Ontario and Quebec have had cheap living at the expense of the rest of Canada. They need a better understanding of the producers' problems, and the sooner they realize that the better.

We are now faced with the imminent disappearance of the principal markets for our primary products. I protest most vehemently against the attitude of a government who assured us on May 21 that they will not depreciate money and within six months proceed to devalue it. In my judgment the end is not yet. Something is wrong. The government should have a long-term policy and tell the people of Canada what it is.