

A third area which I believe should be added to the bill—this perhaps will be more controversial for some members of the House—is the prohibition in certain areas of our economy of any new equity investment that would place effective control in the hands of a foreign individual or foreign concern. I suggest areas which should be considered include mineral resources, energy, water and power. I think all these things, and perhaps a few others, are vital to the future development of the Canadian economy. I feel these are areas in which there should be massive public ownership and certainly public control, because the resources are here for the Canadian people and not here for any profiteering by foreigners or multinational corporations based outside this country. That is another factor we will have to study.

There are a number of other items which I hope the minister and members of this House will consider. One is the provision of more information on the activities of the screening agency. There should be a regular report to the House within two or three weeks after a decision is made, whether it be a positive or a negative decision. There should be an amendment respecting fines as outlined in the bill. There should be a major amendment as to when this act shall come into effect. As it is now spelled out, the only part which comes into effect after royal assent is that which concerns takeovers. The other two portions of the act come into effect upon proclamation.

What does this mean? It may mean we will wait five months, six months, a year, two or three years before the act takes effect. The government may delay it indefinitely for five or six years. That is something I do not want to happen. I believe the act should take effect after royal assent providing, of course 50 or 60 days for the drafting of the regulations. I think parliament should make that decision and should be supreme, rather than the minister, the cabinet or the government.

There are a number of other amendments which I believe should be considered by this House. There is the one outlined by my leader yesterday concerning the definition of an eligible or non-eligible person. I believe we should revert to the definition in the legislation of last year, instead of selling out to some of the Conservative members, by increasing the number of non-eligible persons. More legislation is needed. I realize many other members have said the same thing. I hope that we will introduce very soon more bills to reverse the trend in this country toward foreign domination of our economy.

All one need do to recognize the problem is to look at a few of the statistics. We find that 57 per cent of our manufacturing, and 99.9 per cent of our petroleum and coal industries are in the hands of foreign concerns. In the extraction industries as a whole, in 1969 70.6 per cent was in the hands of foreign concerns. We lose jobs, we lose wealth and we lose some of the power to make important political and economic decisions for this country.

• (2020)

I should like to dwell for a few minutes on some of the consequences of foreign ownership in Canada and suggest five or six steps that I believe parliament and this government should be taking. First of all, in this situation we lose jobs and we lose the ability to plan our country

### *Foreign Investment Review*

industrially and economically. I have referred already to the fact that we export raw materials and import manufactured goods and thereby lose jobs. We should be doing more processing in this country and more manufacturing. We should keep the jobs right here at home for Canadians. We should also be doing more specializing in our economy. Canadians do not specialize in anything. We are not like the Germans, or the Japanese in particular who since the Second World War have specialized in the electronics industry, in automobile manufacturing and in other industries that are labour-intensive.

This is what Canada should be doing. One way of doing it is by regaining control of our economy. Unless we do this, we will continue losing jobs in Canada because the parent company has to close a plant here, because of more and more protectionism in the United States, and because world competition for trade is becoming tougher. This is why we must repatriate our economy.

I remember very well two or three examples of our losing jobs directly because we have branch plants in this country. Last year, when the DISC plan was introduced by President Nixon of the United States, I remember very well an article in the paper saying that a branch plant of a U.S. corporation in Ontario that was producing toboggans was closing down, while the parent company in California was expanding because of trade restrictions here and incentives in the DISC plan for expansion of the U.S. economy. This was a direct transfer of jobs from the toboggan factory in Ontario to the toboggan factory in California.

There is an example in my own riding where there is the largest potash mine in the world, the International Minerals Company of New Mexico. It is at Esterhazy. As we all know, there has been an oversupply of potash in the world and there is now more competition among the suppliers. What has happened? The mine must cut back on its production. It has two plants, one in New Mexico and one in Saskatchewan. In New Mexico they cut back to 90 per cent capacity, and in Saskatchewan to less than 50 per cent capacity; so it is we in Saskatchewan who lost jobs. If the mine had been Canadian owned, perhaps we would not have had to cut back to 50 per cent capacity and we would have had more jobs for Canadians.

There are examples of this in the field of research and development. Naturally, our scientists, our young people and our technicians are going abroad to where the parent plant is located, rather than doing research and development in one of the branch plants in our country. This situation could be changed if we had stronger legislation concerning foreign ownership in our country.

The second point I want to mention regarding the consequences of foreign ownership is that we are now losing more, in terms of exporting wealth and dollars, than we are gaining in new investment in Canada. I believe two years ago, or perhaps it was last year, the U.S. department of commerce issued a report saying that 94 per cent of the money invested by foreign and American-based corporations in Canada was Canadian money—in other words, 94 per cent of the funds that they invested in our economy was Canadian money—and only 6 per cent consisted of new funds that came in from the United States or elsewhere.