

we do not want to bring them into effect we just choose to ignore them. It does not matter whether we are politicians, doctors, teachers, plasterers or painters, whether we are in the agricultural field or wherever else we work—except, of course, if we are on the old age pension or some other pension—the fact is that our salaries, through natural increases, are doubling every ten years. Somewhere along the line somebody will have to tie this whole thing into a bundle and bring us back to the world of reality.

It has been suggested that the introduction of controls would create a great bureaucracy. I am not prepared to accept that philosophy one little bit. I agree that past history seems to show that each time a minister is placed in charge of a completely new portfolio in the federal government or in the provincial government of Ontario or Quebec, he is no good if within one year he does not have 1,000 people working for him. History proves that to be the truth. My hon. friend from Quebec who sits on the front bench opposite would agree with that. He had 1,000 people working for him; he knows what it is all about. But this does not mean that in the serious situation in which we find ourselves—and surely every member would agree that it is a very serious situation—we cannot streamline the bureaucracy and instead of acting as Conservatives, Liberals, members of the NDP or Creditistes, for once, in a state of national emergency, we should start acting as Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whicher: When controls were brought in during World War II they were not brought in by the Conservative party or by the Liberal party: they were not brought in just by politicians but by all Canadians working together to win a war. Mr. Speaker, we are at war today. We are in a financial war, an economic war. If we do not do something about it, we are going to be swept under the table, not by countries where there is great inflation, not by countries like the United States but by great countries which in the next 25 or 50 years will really show the way, countries which have controlled economies such as China, Russia and countries of the Far East.

The old ways of controlling inflation simply will not work. Hindsight is a great thing. It is not with any feeling of bitter criticism that I look back on what has happened in Canada during the last three or four years, because I respectfully say that if my hon. friends opposite had been in power, perhaps they would have done the same thing. Perhaps they would have cut back and caused unemployment in order to control inflation. But with hindsight we know that this simply does not work.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I ask the government: If such cutting back does not work, then what will work? Are we just going to go along with the tide and end up, as one hon. member on the other side has suggested, in the year 2000 with the average house in Toronto costing a quarter of a million dollars? Are we just going to go along with this tide, or are we prepared to do something about it? Again I emphasize that when I say “we”, I mean the members of the House of Commons who represent the Canadian people—and they, in my opinion, desire controls; they are crying out for controls because they just do not know what to do at the present time.

Increased Cost of Living

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, in case I am criticized by some, and I expect I will be, but I do not mind constructive criticism at all—

An hon. Member: We will look after you, Ross.

Mr. Whicher: You fellows had better look after yourselves. I can look after myself. But in case I am criticized by someone immediately following me who asks what kind of controls the hon. member for Bruce is talking about, I want to say that I mean 100 per cent controls. I mean controls on wages, on salaries, on profits, on rents, on dividends and on prices.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whicher: There is no easy way. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) this afternoon. He is a member for whom I have the highest regard, but I think there is a bit of politics in the attitude of the Conservative party when they urge temporary controls for 90 days because—

Mr. McGrath: A temporary freeze.

Mr. Whicher: Or a temporary freeze.

Mr. McGrath: There is a lot of difference.

Mr. Whicher: In my opinion, a temporary freeze of 90 days would simply not be long enough. We may as well let the Canadian people know the truth right off the bat. There should be controls for two years anyway, because 90 days will not even let us get going. It will give us time to conduct a study, but it will not be long enough.

It has been said that we live in a democracy, that the average Canadian citizen is not ready for controls and that the average Member of Parliament, wherever he may sit in this House, is not ready for controls. I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes in a democracy you have to give up a little bit of freedom in order to keep democracy in the long run. In my opinion, the citizens of Canada have to give up a little bit of freedom and accept controls, and I am sure they will, in order that we may remain a democracy for many long years to come.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, if I believed that democracy could be saved by controls I would think more favourably of controls. But I should like to know of a single instance in world history where democracy has been saved by that route. That is the route not of democracy but of disaster and hysteria. There are times in a democratic society when controls are required, but let us not have any illusions about what those controls do over extensive periods of time. If I thought for one moment that controls of one kind or another would further the cause of democracy or assist our society, then as reluctant as I might be I would go along with it. But in my view, Mr. Speaker, there is no evidence to support such an argument.