

*National Economic Development Board*

You must find ways and means in a democratic nation to make the planning sequence and the planning activity as democratic as humanly possible. For that purpose we have proposed over and over again that the central planning board should have at its hand a consultative council representative of every element in the country—business, labour, agriculture, co-operatives, consumers, and all other segments of the people of Canada and every other economic interest. Furthermore, it should not merely be representative in the sense that the government appoints the people who it thinks should represent others, but representative in the sense that the organizations of labour, agriculture, consumers and co-operatives themselves nominate the people they want on the consultative council. In this way there will be genuine voices from the various segments of the Canadian people participating in the planning activity and in the final conclusions which the planning board will arrive at.

In addition to that, it has always been my concept of planning as we have proposed it, which concept I am sure is shared by my leader and every other colleague in my party, as well as every member of my party across the country, that the planning agency would in every day of its work be consulting with the various elements of the Canadian economy—industry, finance, labour and agriculture—not only at formal meetings of the consultative council, but as a necessary and integral part of its day-to-day activities. Because we who have studied history have learned that no law passed in a democratic country can possibly be successful and effective merely by coercion. It can only be an effective and good law if it has the consent of the people. That is why this consultative machinery is necessary. It is not in order to be able to answer supposedly needling questions such as the minister asked a moment ago, but is intended as a genuine contribution to the machinery of planning and to the democratic work of that machinery. May I add, as I have been reminded, that there is nothing in the legislation now before the house that suggests a consultative council of the kind I have described, where the organizations concerned will themselves nominate and appoint the people who will represent them on that council.

Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the only way to deal with the growing threat of foreign control of Canada's economy is by the kind of planning we are suggesting. Because only if you have a national development fund, a source for public investment, can you carry on the kind of activity which will generate Canadian capital for investment purposes, instead of our economic development requiring the capital of investors from outside the

[Mr. Lewis.]

country, as has been the case in the past. It is my conviction that while there may always be need for foreign investment in Canada, while it is wrong ever to close the doors to foreign investment, Canada's economy has advanced sufficiently far and the Canadian people have reached a sufficient understanding of what economic matters mean, that we can generate in Canada the capital required for planned Canadian production, and therefore would have no need for the foreign investment which has taken place in the past and which has been such a drain on the foreign exchange of our country.

When the kind of planning which I am discussing is proposed, another thing which people often throw at us is that we would take away the choice of the consumer. Again that makes me chortle. What choice has the consumer in modern society, particularly in modern North American society? Production no longer takes place as a result of the choice of the consumer. Millions of dollars are spent to create demand for things which people do not need, not to produce things which people do need. For example, you sit in your car and listen to the radio. At one moment one company is advertising one kind of toothpaste, and then another kind of toothpaste is said to be better than the one just advertised, and you find that it is the same company advertising it. So that money is spent by that company in order to compete with itself.

**Mr. Douglas:** It may be the same toothpaste.

**Mr. Lewis:** Yes, it may be the same toothpaste, probably not more useful than the other. But all this money is being spent and is added to the price that the consumer must pay in response to the choice of the consumer? Fiddlesticks, Mr. Speaker. It is in response to the greedy grabbing for profits by the corporation which thinks it can make a little more out of toothpaste B than out of toothpaste A, even though it manufactures both, and which, as I have learned in my professional capacity, is produced very frequently on the same assembly line in the same plant.

No, Mr. Speaker, all these things are shibboleths which blind man's mind in our North American society, and which prevent the reasonable, the logical, the sensible and the practical measures to make our economy function in the interests of the Canadian people and in the interests of hungry and needy people the world over. We throw down the words "state control" and close our minds. We throw down the word "planning" and close our minds. We talk about consumers' choice and close our minds. We talk about state interference and close our minds. All the time our economy produces unemployment.