

Mr. Martineau: Four.

Mr. Lewis: —or four-year forecast of how their plan would affect each industry and every section of each industry in the country. That plan is the one that goes to the cabinet.

In our submission, however, for effective, useful and productive economic planning, more than merely the right agency is needed. In order for those plans to have any meaning there has to be a much larger share of public investment in the total investment of a country. One of the reasons why French planning has been successful is that about a third of all gross investment in that country has been public investment, investment from government funds. If you add to that those parts of the economy and those parts of French investment which are controlled directly or indirectly, as well as owned, by the government, then more than one half of the gross investment of France is under public guidance either direct or indirect.

Beyond that, it is of no purpose to make a plan for government to approve if there is not some integration of private planning with public planning; if there is not some integration of private activities in the economy with public activities in the economy. In France, therefore, as part of their total planning mechanism there are not only fiscal incentives to private industry to mesh in with the public plan, but there are actually penalties to industry which does not fit in with the public plan. There are, in addition, selective credit controls for the same purpose. If the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys has studied the French plan he will recall that any medium term loan—that is, a loan for a period of no more than five years—is subject to control by the bank of France, which is publicly owned, through rediscounting of the notes, and they must consult with and get the permission of the commissariat général du plan for any loan over 1,000,000 francs, or roughly \$200,000, for investment purposes.

When you deal with a long term loan for investment, involving a loan for a period of more than five years, then if it is for more than two million francs, I think it is—I am quoting this from memory; it is 2 or 2½ million francs, or about \$500,000—they must consult with and get the direction of the general commission of planning in France. It is by these agencies of consultation, agencies of integration of private and public plans; it is by the penalties as well as incentives to private industry; it is by the guidance of private investment as well as public investment, and above all it is by the provision of public funds for investment purposes, that

the power to sit down and plan, and come to the cabinet with all the various elements of the economy having been taken into account, and not merely a survey and some kind of a report which is put in somebody's waste basket or on somebody's shelf.

Mr. Sevigny: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question? Will the hon. member tell us whether he knows of one instance when a government appointed commission, or a body similar to the one which we are talking about and which is the object of the present debate, has ever instituted a law of its own. Can he tell the house whether he knows of one case when such a board has taken the law within its own hands?

Mr. Lewis: I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the question of the Associate Minister of National Defence, after the exchange between the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys and myself, baffles me somewhat. How a member of the government, who could not follow a simple exchange of the sort that the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys and I had, will be able to plan the economy of Canada, or take part in it, baffles me too. I have already said, and I say again, that no one in this party or in the C.C.F. ever suggested that a planning board would have the authority to make a law or a rule, or to implement the plans. No democratic socialist anywhere in the world has ever suggested that. We have always taken the position that the only way to maintain democracy is for planning boards to present their plans to government, which will be responsible for implementing them, subject to the authority of parliament. That is the way our kind of country functions, and we have a passionate belief in that democratic procedure and in representative and parliamentary government. Let no questioner here try to take me from that track, because he will not succeed.

I repeat that a board, if it is to do the job, must have the authority to plan and to come to the government with a blueprint of what is proposed, in which every section of the economy has been consulted and in which the affairs and interests of every part of the economy play a part.

In France—I come back to this, because so much reference has been made, by the Liberals especially, to that country—they have, as I am sure the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys has seen, and if he has not I would invite him to look at it, what they call—

Mr. Martineau: I have, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Lewis: —input and output tables. They actually attempt to present a three-year—