

Foreign Takeovers Review Act

dozens of years, have allowed foreign corporations in, hampered them with few rules and limitations, and allowed them to make profits which they have taken across the border.

In my travels to the United States and across this country, I meet many Americans. They ask me, "Why do you not curtail the high incidence of foreign ownership in your country?" They say that they would not tolerate this in the United States and ask why we tolerate it in our country. I am angry at our tolerating it and that is why I and over half the Canadian people, I suggest, want us to do something about this question here and now. Doing that, I suggest, is not anti-American. Anyone who suggests it is drags a red herring across this debate and is not intellectually honest.

In my speech I shall touch on four important areas of concern to the Canadian people: First, the field of social culture; second, the number of jobs we lose because much of our economy is foreign owned; third, the wealth that goes out of our country because we are a branch plant economy; and fourth, our loss of political independence resulting from so much of our economy being foreign owned and controlled.

Returning to the area of social culture, I suggest that the government in the past few years has provided some leadership in this field, especially in the area of broadcasting. Now, laws and regulations govern Canadian content in broadcasting. Regulations governing radio and television broadcasting provide that Canadian radio and television stations must be 80 per cent Canadian-owned. That is a stringent provision. Moves like that are good, and I think they should be followed in many other sectors of the economy, if Canada is to be a country of which we are to be proud. Not enough has been done in other fields of social culture.

The hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) suggested that the book publishing industry should be designated as a sensitive and important industry, important for the cultural development of Canada. I agree. I recall, as I went through the public school and high school system, that some of my fellow students were more aware of Lincoln than of Macdonald, of Jefferson than of Laurier, mainly because we used many American textbooks. Those books referred to American politicians and to important and prominent people of that country. The Canadian government must show much greater leadership in this field if it is serious about returning control of Canada to Canadians. Let us look for a moment at professional sports, and at hockey in particular. Look at the National Hockey League; that is controlled from the United States. True, many Canadian players are employed in hockey in the United States; nevertheless, the hockey league is dominated by American financial interests. I suggest that this is another area that has been completely ignored in the present debate. Apparently, foreign domination of our culture is overlooked.

There is one notable exception to this state of affairs in this country. French Canada is not dominated culturally by foreigners. In French Canada there is a specific culture; there, they speak their own language, watch their own television programs and their own movies, listen to their own songs and read their own writers. I am proud of

[Mr. Nystrom.]

this. I am happy that one part of Canada is distinctly Canadian and is not being swamped by American culture. I wish the same could be said of English speaking Canada, because if it could be, our country would be better and stronger. Fortunately or unfortunately, much depends on the laws our government will be prepared to pass.

Touching the second point, I want to refer to something of concern to many in my constituency, the question of jobs lost in the long run because of our dependence on foreign corporations. Several authorities have dealt with this subject. I am speaking of the Watkins report, the Gray report, and the hon. member for Duvernay (Mr. Kierans) who sat in cabinet for a number of months. These authorities talked of our dependence on American corporations. We are exporters of raw materials and importers of manufactured goods. The hon. member for Duvernay and others have told us of millions of dollars we lose every year in wages through our policies. For every \$100 worth of raw materials we export to the United States, we provide our workers with about \$6.50 in wages. For every \$100 worth of manufactured goods we import in return for our raw materials, we provide American workers, depending on the goods we import, with between \$30 and \$35 in wages. In such exchanges, we lose between \$20 and \$30 in wages. For reasons like these, the people of my constituency and all across the country, are most concerned about the extent of foreign ownership of our country and the government's lackadaisical attitude.

What is the result of our being a branch plant economy. What happened when the Americans introduced their 10 per cent surtax last August and the DISC program. What did American corporations operating in this country do? In some instances in which American companies operated branch plants in this country, when it became necessary to curtail research, they curtailed it in Canada and not in the United States, with the result that Canadian workers were affected. I remember there was a toboggan firm which had one branch in southern Ontario and another in California. The imposition of the surtax resulted in cutting back operations in southern Ontario, with the consequent loss of jobs for Canadians, and the shifting of production to California. That was a natural thing to do, and I do not blame the American firm. I blame our own government. If our government had developed an industrial strategy for Canada which would protect our people in the long run, this would not have happened.

In my constituency is to be found an example of the consequences, for working people, of foreign ownership. In my constituency there is one of the largest potash mines in the world, operated by International Mineral Company, at the town of Esterhazy. International Mineral is American owned, the head offices of the company being in New Mexico. We know that there is an over-supply of potash and that production of potash has been cut back. But let us compare what was done in New Mexico and in Saskatchewan. It is interesting to note that production in New Mexico was cut back from 100 per cent to about 90 per cent, whereas in Esterhazy, in my constituency, production was cut back to less than 50 per cent of capacity, with serious consequences for Saskatchewan workers in my constituency. The impact of such moves has been felt in towns like Esterhazy, Longerburg and