

*The Address—Mr. Douglas*

makes it possible to provide these services in a modern and abundant society.

Sixth, we shall deal with a federal aid to education program which will set out the kind of assistance the federal government can give to the provinces so that they can develop citizens capable of meeting the demands of a modern, technological society.

Seventh, a member of this party in the course of this debate will discuss the constitutional framework within which a dynamic program can live and move and have its being without being restricted by the dead hand of the past.

I was interested, Mr. Speaker, in the Prime Minister's comments this afternoon and this evening to the effect that the matter of the constitution and its amending formula must be decided by parliament. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have never yet been able to get a satisfactory answer as to whether or not this amendment procedure is going to be sent to a committee of parliament, where we may call in constitutional experts and where members from all parties will have an opportunity to familiarize themselves fully with the effect of this amending formula. We are in great danger of having constitutional amendments by federal-provincial conferences. Now, federal-provincial conferences have a place, but it is rather strange that, at a time when the B and B commission are telling us that this country faces a crisis, the one group which is not going to have any real opportunity to discuss and analyse the constitutional amendment are the members of parliament. We are going to be presented with a *fait accompli* which has been worked out at a federal-provincial conference and approved by ten provincial legislatures. We want to discuss this matter, Mr. Speaker. We are in favour of the repatriation of the constitution. We are not in favour of putting the Canadian constitution in a strait-jacket.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we believe that this country can and should plan for abundance. We start with the positive conviction that change must be managed; it cannot be left to happen automatically. For this economic planning the initiative and responsibility lie primarily with the federal government. Private planning by individuals and corporations for their own welfare does not automatically contribute to the improvement of the general welfare. We cannot leave the adjustments which cybernation demands to the private sector of the economy. Man's destiny cannot be settled in the marketplace.

This has been illustrated by the fact that in the United States over one half of the new jobs which were created in that country between 1957 and 1962 were in the public sector, predominantly in the teaching profession. Of the 4,300,000 jobs created during that period, only about 200,000 were provided by private industry through its own efforts; the balance was in the services or in the public sector. This demonstrates that only government planning and government direction can create jobs, promote economic growth, retrain displaced workers and regain control of the Canadian economy.

We must plan for abundance. We must set goals and mobilize our resources to reach those goals. In this day and generation *laissez-faire* is dead. We cannot sit back and expect that somehow or other economic forces left to themselves will work out the solutions. Change must be managed. New Democrats believe that our economic, social and political institutions exist for the benefit of man, and that man does not exist for the maintenance of a particular economic system. Our belief is based on the conviction that governments are instituted among men for the purpose of making possible life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that democratic government is a positive and a creative instrument for attaining those ends. As we see it, democracy means a community of men and women who are able to understand, express and determine their own lives as dignified human beings. Democracy can only have meaning in a political and economic system in which wealth is distributed by and for the people and is used for the benefit of society as a whole.

It is true that economic planning is not as simple in a federal system as it is in a unitary form of government. However, the fact that we are a federation is a gain rather than a hindrance. It means that planning must be decentralized and tackled at all three levels of government, which is all to the good if we are to get more people involved in the planning process. But the responsibility for establishing goals and setting forth the priorities for their attainment lies with the federal government, and so far it has lamentably failed to do so.

The government of Canada is only playing at economic planning. Two years ago it set up the Economic Council of Canada. They have competent staff. But to date they have been used for two purposes—to gather data which will assess potential growth and describe desirable objectives. This is not indicative