I believe we cannot foresee the day when we shall not have to have exchange conservation acts. And to call this an emergency, or to refer to it as an emergency—well, it is an emergency, but it is more chronic than emergent. To refer to it as an emergency, and to suggest that it will remain such, merely makes the operation of the act more unsettling than it normally will be. From that fact it upsets people who are growing vegetables and producing other embargoed goods. The very word "emergency" makes the operation of the act more hazardous, and adds greatly to the uncertainty of the situation.

We have a problem which will be with us for a long time. The very action that is taking place in the commodity markets and the stock markets of the world in the last week shows that what has happened has intensified our problem. The matter is of the utmost seriousness. It is, in very truth, an emergency; but to call it an emergency and to assume that it is of a temporary nature is, I think, unwise and unsound. The Canadian people should realize the true situation we are in. Therefore I have pleasure in moving this amendment.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): Would the hon. member be good enough to tell us the last time he warned the house about what would happen? I should like to read it.

Mr. ADAMSON: On the last day of the last session I said that you have to get down to devaluation, that it would start before you came back here. France devalued, and England will devalue—she cannot help it. I also said—

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): Would the hon. member—

Mr. ADAMSON: You asked me a question; let me answer it. I spoke on the budget last year and, although I have not the copy of *Hansard* with me, I said on July 17 that there were three courses of procedure open to the minister. He had to take them and he had better take them before he ran out of hard currency and gold. He could put embargoes on, raise tariffs right across the board, put on restrictions with regard to United States dollars and hard currency, and devalue the dollar. There are three weapons you can take to overcome the hard currency deficit. He has taken two and a half of them. I feel that the third one will be essential.

That was said last summer. And speaking during the second session I said virtually the same thing, namely, that our monthly deficit of hard currency was rising and that the nest-egg of $1,600 million would run out, I estimated some time this spring.

The true state of our position with regard to gold and United States currency was asked from the minister recently. He gave a general statement, but he did not bring out the difference between gold and hard currency, and United States dollars. We do not know how much British gold and gold from other sources was shipped in and earmarked. We have just the general overall figure of the gold and hard currency held.

I suggested a year and a half ago that we would run into the impasse we are in today. We are in it now and, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the government, we shall be in it for a long time to come. And if we are not prepared to face the facts, then the whole bill is just wishful thinking and a palliative, and we are in for a worse time than this government ever contemplated.

Mr. ABBOTT: Just a word in answer to the hon. member. I do not know how serious he is in suggesting his amendment. He admits that this is an emergency, but suggests that the use of the word "emergency" in the title suggests that it is for a short time. I do not know that I agree with him on that.

It is true that he has been an advocate of devaluation for some time, and there are a great many people in this country who would like to see the devaluation of the dollar. They would benefit by it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes, they would; I know they would; make no mistake about that. There are advocates of devaluation, because, among other things, it would benefit some lines of endeavour that they would be in.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ABBOTT: I seldom interrupt other people. I am not questioning the fact that the hon. member for York West has advocated devaluation for a long time; but I do not agree with the assertion which is made here that devaluation is inevitable. I see very little useful purpose in putting it forward. And when he suggests or implies that the position of France is the same as that of Canada and that because France found it necessary to devalue Canada should, in my judgment he is talking nonsense. The situations are not comparable at all. France was not in a position to export because her prices were too high; the goods were too high. That is not so with Canada.