

country which will benefit the country. The debate is not about that.

It is not a debate about whether the Cabinet should have to consider popcorn dealers in Edmonton. It is quite possible for procedures to be set up at any time by any government which will ensure that cabinet looks only at the most important and significant investments in terms of the process itself. It is not a debate about cabinet process.

It is not a debate about whether FIRA is perfect. We in this Party have had passionate criticisms of FIRA in the last ten years. We have seen FIRA as a closed and secretive agency which has not been prepared to be upfront with the Canadian people and with communities that have been damaged by companies that have not fulfilled their commitments. We have criticisms of that agency and would be pleased to support changes in the way that agency operates. In fact, we have suggested some changes.

There are three basic issues involved in this debate. First, with so much of our economy already in foreign hands, is there reason to be concerned about direct foreign investment and should we try to offer some alternatives to it? That is the first issue.

● (1230)

Second, does it make economic sense to have a review process to try to deal with some of the problems of foreign investment?

Third, is promotion of direct foreign investment from abroad the way to make Canadian investment and entrepreneurship more dynamic?

I want to deal with each of these real issues in the debate and leave aside the bogus issues that I think have been too much at the centre of what we have been talking about so far.

The first thing we have to recognize is the incredible proportions of foreign control here in our economy. We have data, the most recent available from Statistics Canada, which lay out the position very clearly. If we take all manufacturing, 51 per cent of our manufacturing industry is foreign controlled, as is 98 per cent of the rubber industry, 51 per cent of agricultural machinery, 92 per cent of transportation equipment, 70 per cent of electrical apparatus, 71 per cent of chemicals, and 52 per cent of miscellaneous manufacturing.

We are not talking about bringing in some new small additions to a country basically under its own control. We are talking about a country in which the proportion of foreign investment is already massive and which no other industrialized country in the world can match.

**Mr. Deans:** Not that we want them to.

**Mr. Langdon:** There has been a drop since 1971 in the proportion of foreign control. It may well be that the existence of FIRA has helped that. If so, all I can say is halleluja! Thank God we are finally getting a little more sense of control over the direction in which we are going.

**Mr. Stevens:** Is it better to have people out of work?

### *Investment Canada Act*

**Mr. Deans:** Don't be silly. You don't listen.

**Mr. Langdon:** The argument that is commonly made by economists in countries throughout the world is to bring in some foreign investment as a leavening to a local economy, to bring in some technology to help spruce things up a little bit and to push domestic firms so that they are more competitive and more in touch with some of the changes in technology throughout the world.

Those arguments are made in economies that have 10 per cent, 15 per cent, or 20 per cent foreign control. The arguments are not sensible, they just do not make sense in an economy that has 51 per cent of its manufacturing industry already foreign controlled. Surely to God, Mr. Speaker, that 51 per cent foreign control will act as a mechanism to bring in new technology, new ideas and suggestions from outside. Our problem is not new foreign investment and new input from the outside, but too many inputs and too much of an overload on an economy to make it possible for ourselves to shape the future.

That is just not an argument relevant to Canada. In fact, our problem becomes a problem with the multinational companies that are already here. Again, the data are gloomy and spectacular on this point. If we look at the recent period of devastating economic difficulty in Canada, we see that out of the top 50 companies in Canada, those that were U.S. owned lost twice as many jobs in 1982 and 1983 as those that are Canadian owned.

**Mr. Deans:** Are you listening, Sinc? That is the answer to your question.

**Mr. Langdon:** All over the globe multinational companies are rationalizing, shaping their own business empires, as they must. They are run by business people and they have to do it on the basis of what makes sense for them as international entities. When that happens there is absolutely no guarantee at all that we in this economy will get a fair shake out of what those large companies are doing.

**Mr. Deans:** That is true.

**Mr. Langdon:** There is absolutely no guarantee at all. If we simply sit back and let it happen, we will have what we have had here in Canada in the last four years, namely plant shut-downs, American companies moving out and Canadian workers out of work. In short, we will have exactly the opposite of the picture which the Minister has painted for us. We will have a worsening of the economic crisis that we have rather than any improvement.

We simply cannot leave ourselves to the mercy of multinational enterprises. There has to be some kind of control, some input, for our communities as these companies carry out their game plans throughout the world.

Why, if there are problems and we need some mechanism to deal with them, do we have a review mechanism? I think first we have to recognize that a great many countries have precisely that kind of review mechanism. If we look, for instance, at