

he said. It does have practical value, for the reason that it puts in the hands of parliament the decision which parliament must take. As the bill stands at the present time, if it is not amended the government tomorrow may pass an order in council throwing out the wartime prices and trade board altogether. I am not saying they will do that tomorrow, but they could. The reason we should like to see this matter decided in parliament rather than in the cabinet itself is that there are members on the other side of the house who are not in agreement with what the government is doing at the present time in the matter of decontrol.

When the minister says that a vote on this amendment may amount to a vote of censure, he may be perfectly correct.

Mr. ILSLEY: Excuse me: I did not say that, and I do not say that. I am saying that the language of my hon. friend almost asks that the vote be considered as such, and I do not accept that for one minute. Hon. members may vote as they like on this motion, but the vote will certainly not be regarded by the government as any criticism whatever of the course the government is taking.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: The minister is welcome to take any interpretation he likes.

Mr. ILSLEY: So long as I may, that is all right. I do not want any question of bad faith arising.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I want to point out clearly that it is not a question of party politics; it is not one particular group in the house urging some point raised by that group, because I have in my hand a copy of the debates of April 2 in which the hon. member for Bonaventure, speaking on this bill, used these words—and if it cannot be taken as censure I do not know what it can be taken as. At page 1978 of *Hansard* he said:

Not only does it mean the retention for the time being of such controls as we know to be beneficial to the Canadian people in order to hold and stabilize our post-war economy, but in many cases it also means the reimposition of some of the controls which have been lifted. I shall go still farther—and I am in good company, along with the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) and many other hon. members—and say that I believe that it is possible—it should be possible—to devise some means whereby we shall never return to the old system of control by private enterprise to the detriment of the common people of Canada.

That is what he had to say so far as price controls were concerned, and it is certainly not in line with what the government is doing at the present time.

[Mr. Zaplitny.]

Speaking on April 17, as found at page 2143 of *Hansard*, the hon. member for Fraser Valley used these words:

I agree with the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar when he said that this government and no other government dare take off these controls, but they are taking them off bit by bit and we see the profits that are being made as quoted by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar yesterday and as quoted in the *Star* today. The United States is admitting that they cannot control prices as the present time.

Further on he said this:

I want these controls to be more effective. I want some controls to be restored.

These are two members sitting on the government side of the house who spoke plainly in opposition to the present stated policy of the government. They said in their speeches that there were many other hon. members—I do not know whether they meant many hon. members on this side of the house or on the other side of the house, but I presume they meant their colleagues on the other side—who took the same attitude. If that is so; if there are many private members on the other side of the house who feel as these hon. members did, then there is a good reason why the final decision must be left to the house as to the length of time during which the wartime prices and trade board shall operate. A vote of this sort—and I should be very happy if all hon. members were in their places to take part in it—would reveal to the government a rather different type of attitude from the one they are taking at the present time on the question of decontrol. I therefore urge strongly that every hon. member be available to express his opinion on this amendment.

Mr. SHAW: I should like one or two matters cleared up. Am I correct in assuming that even though the committee may pass this amendment, legally it does not bind the government in any way whatsoever? Is that correct?

Mr. ILSLEY: It does not deprive the government of freedom to decontrol, because within the framework of the existing orders in council, board orders, administrators' orders and controllers' orders may be made which will carry out the process of decontrol. The only things that must remain are the orders in council themselves, which will stay there until voted by the presentation of these addresses. I made careful inquiries to ascertain whether there would be any real restriction upon freedom to remove ceilings, for example, or to raise ceilings, or to take any other step in the process of decontrol, and I