

whereby we shall never return to the old system of control by private enterprise to the detriment of the common people of Canada.

What is worrying me today? It is not the control bill; not at all, but the very fact that this government is shifting too fast from second gear to high gear in its decontrol policy. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that there are too many obstacles on our economic highway to justify too much speed. What is worrying the householders of Canada today is not this bill, but the very fact that a higher cost of living is around the corner. And higher costs of living will follow decontrol measures such as those announced in the house yesterday. I am afraid that a further rise in prices is inevitable. In many cases decontrol means higher prices and higher prices mean hardship, particularly in the lower income bracket.

Hon. members are aware of the fact that that is a consequence which may follow in years to come. World-wide shortage of basic materials and foodstuffs limit the supplies of commodities available in Canada. The immediate removal, such as suggested by some opposition members, of such controls would ensure inequitable distribution of goods and foodstuffs throughout our country and would overnight create dissatisfaction, confusion, if not disaster, and chaos in Canada. The needs of thousands of Canadians would not be met, could not be met. Hardship and a sharp reduction in living standards would follow. Of course, big business would speculate on the necessities of life as they did in the past, to the detriment of our farming, working classes, white-collared workers and other fixed wage earners. For example, if today rent and eviction controls were lifted, what would happen? We all know that there would be almost a revolution in Montreal and in other large cities of Canada.

It seems perfectly clear that the immediate removal of controls on a great number of commodities and manufactured goods would involve a disastrous price increase, which perhaps would meet the approval once again of big business but would surely not be to the advantage of the Canadian consumers. Scores of examples could be given, but I do not want to delay unduly the proceedings of the house. Take, for instance, milk. Milk was under government control and has now been transferred to provincial jurisdiction. That very fact contributed to a rise in the price of milk from ten to fifteen cents a quart in the province of Quebec, which means from \$8 to \$9 a month for every working-class family in the cities of Quebec using from six to seven quarts

of milk a day. Nine dollars a month means something to the working man's budget when the cost of living is already so high.

What is happening in gasoline? The government had control of this commodity and it was transferred to provincial autonomy. The automobile owners of the country entertained the hope that the three-cent war tax would be lifted, that they would be relieved of that burden, but that was just wishful thinking. That tax will remain. The government have not even withdrawn from that field. The provinces jumped on it and made it not a temporary wartime tax but a permanent tax. Federal respect for provincial autonomy, I contend, at least with regard to milk and gasoline, did not bring much relief to the Canadian people in the form of dollars and cents.

What about maple syrup? When this government controlled maple syrup you could buy the syrup last year at \$3.15 a gallon, and now we are asked to pay from \$6 to \$9 a gallon, an increase of from 100 to 200 per cent. These are not bed-time stories; they are the plain truth. This is the situation as we size it up today. And what is the result? Instead of contributing to the relief of thousands upon thousands of Canadian families, who are suffering from the sugar shortage, the bulk of our production of maple syrup is exported to United States tobacco manufacturers and candy shops.

Mr. HACKETT: Does the hon. member deny the farmer of the province of Quebec the high price he is getting for his maple products?

Mr. ARSENAULT: That is beside the point. I certainly do not deny the farmers of the province of Quebec a fair return for their product, but I will deny anyone, whether it be a farmer or a trust of any kind, the right to take advantage of the present situation; and, as regards maple syrup, I think that if the price is not stabilized at around \$4.50 a gallon very shortly, then this government should step in and impose a ceiling so as to regulate the export of that commodity.

Mr. HACKETT: Don't worry. They will not do it. There are too many constituencies that produce maple syrup.

Mr. ARSENAULT: Do you think they should do it?

Mr. HACKETT: No, I do not.

Mr. ARSENAULT: All right then. I will give one more example before I resume my seat. The automobile retail trade is passing through a crisis at the present time, particu-