Alleged Failure to Reduce Unemployment have this added capital.

Where would this added capital come from is a question that has been asked in this house. It would come from the same market in which the government has to raise its capital. Everybody in the Conservative party and in the Liberal party thinks there is nothing wrong with private insurance companies and private loan companies getting more capitalization. There are companies whose services are not indispensable to the people of Canada, whose services really result in straitjacketing more people into a long and binding debt position from which they will never emerge. But when you say to the government and other hon. members of this house that it is necessary for the government of Canada directly to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in order to build factories, in order to build secondary industries, in order to build tertiary industry to provide employment for the people of the Atlantic provinces, you are a raving mad socialist. Well, if that makes me one I am glad that I am one.

In my opinion you cannot control inflation in this country unless you are prepared to have the courage and the imagination to take some direct action, subject to the problems of the constitution which of course I know about, to say to the large corporations which increase their prices to no purpose that they must invest for social purposes also.

There is not a single corporation of any importance in Canada at which I have looked whose profits have not been immense in 1968, large in 1967, too large in 1966, and whose profits will probably be just as large in 1969. From where does this profit come if it does not come out of unjustifiably increased prices?

I am sure that my injunction is not going to stop anyone in this house rising in his seat to say that this was the hon. member for York South spouting the old cliches of the socialists. I say they are not old cliches. I say they are as valid today as they have ever been. Indeed, the need for public responsibility, for public investment and public involvement to meet problems of unemployment and problems of regional disparity is greater than it has ever been before. There is no other way in which these problems can be solved.

I do not want to give the impression, because I do not intend to, that I would be able to solve all these problems by waving a wand and in 24 hours implementing some of

[Mr. Lewis.]

established parties are prepared to let them then the economy of the country would fall into place. This of course would be totally irresponsible. I appreciate that the development of these policies would require time but I am struck by the fact—and this is my final point before I move the amendment I said I would move-for example that there is one agency which the Liberal party has suggested to the country is necessary. I may say, too, Mr. Speaker, this is an agency that the N.D.P. proposed at its founding convention in 1961. The one agency which the Liberal party has suggested to the country is necessary in order to garner savings and in order to promote proper investment, namely, the Canada Development Corporation, was first proposed in 1963, if I remember correctly and correct me if I am wrong. The reference to this agency has appeared in every throne speech that successive Liberal governments have presented since 1963. We have again been promised such an agency this session, but we have not seen it yet.

> The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that one of the major ways in which it would be possible for the government to meet the problem of unemployment and to meet the problem of regional disparity over a period of time would be to set up some kind of organism through which the government would garner the savings of the people. Then, through that agency if necessary, the governmen't could compel existing lending and investing institutions to invest some portions of their available funds in that agency so that the government would have at its disposal a large pool of investment capital to do the things that need to be done for the people of Canada.

• (4:30 p.m.)

This is characteristic of the Liberal party and its government. The new government has made no change so far. One of the most important policies it had to present to the people of Canada is still on the shelf. I suggest it is on the shelf because the implementation of that policy would mean a challenge to the seats of economic power in Canada and this Prime Minister's government is no more ready to challenge those seats of power than was the preceding prime minister's government.

In conclusion, I should like to say that I think the unemployment situation in Canada can be explained only by the insensitive unconcern of this government. I say it is the result directly of the government's policy and the policies I have sketchily outlined, or that that the government has deliberately planned