

As hon. members know, the picture in the extractive industries is really frightening for the future of this country. Foreign corporations in the extractive industries account for 70.6 per cent of the assets and about the same proportion of all profits. In the mineral fuels sector, foreign corporation account for 82.5 per cent of the assets and 90.7 per cent of all the profits.

The picture in the total mining industry, again in terms of asset size, shows that corporations with assets of under \$1 million are only 33 per cent foreign controlled. That is high enough since it means one third of our mining corporations are foreign controlled. But when you move on to corporations with \$1 million to \$5 million worth of assets, the proportion of foreign control becomes 62 per cent; corporations with assets between \$5 million and \$25 million are 80 per cent foreign controlled; and those with assets over \$25 million are 88 per cent foreign controlled.

The point that disturbs me about the position taken by the Liberal and Conservative parties is this. Last Friday the minister and also the hon. member for Trinity argued that foreign control, foreign capital and foreign investment in the past have assisted our development. I would ask, whom did it assist? Whose development has this foreign capital assisted? From the figures I have already cited, and from many other figures one can lay one's hands on, I would suggest that this foreign capital has meant foreign corporations have been assisted in exploiting our natural resources mainly for their own profit, not for the benefit of Canadians.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Lewis:** The position taken by the hon. member for Trinity was that foreign capital has been useful and beneficial to Canada. Members of the Conservative party who have made interjections underline the fact that all of them believe that. They believe in that only because their concern is with the value and power of the corporations of this country and not with the value and power of the people of Canada. They are concerned with what the minister calls economic growth, without considering the consequences of that growth on present and future generations of Canadians.

The fact is that we have not needed foreign capital in this country for years. We have been selling Canada out with our own money. We have permitted foreigners to buy us out with our own dollars. In 1968, as all hon. members know, only 6 per cent of foreign capital expansion in this country was derived from parent corporations in the United States and other United States sources; 94 per cent came from Canadian sources, such as undistributed profits, from retained earnings, from various reserves, not least of which is the tax reserve that we permit these corporations to defer without interest for years on end, and from borrowing on the Canadian capital market.

I draw to the attention of hon. members, particularly Tory members in view of the comments they have made, that between 1960 and 1969 Canada had a net loss as a result of foreign investment in this country. In those 10 years, 1960 to 1969 inclusive, U.S. investments totalled in round figures about \$5.5 billion. But we paid to parent corporations that invested this money in Canada, \$6.25 billion by way of interest and dividends, and a further

### *Foreign Investment Review*

\$1.75 billion in royalties and fees of all sorts. Thus we paid out to United States corporations a total of \$8 billion in return for a total investment of \$5.5 billion in ten years. In other words, we paid out to American corporations \$2.5 billion more than we got from them in the form of direct investment.

Yet members of the Liberal and Conservative parties still claim that we need foreign investment. On behalf of the New Democratic Party I say that, except for the occasional area that may occur, we do not need foreign investment in this country. Canadian savings are sufficient to provide us with all the capital necessary to develop this country through the efforts and skills of Canadians alone. In view of this net outflow of \$2.5 billion in the space of ten years, I ask the minister and the hon. member for Trinity, where in heaven's name has there been any benefit to Canada from capital investment in this country during the last ten years?

This brings me to the bill which is before the House. I agree with the minister that this bill is a great improvement over the bill which we opposed last year, which we were determined to stall and did prevent from passing. It is obvious that this bill is a response by the government to growing concern right across the country about the issue of foreign investment and control of our economy. I dare to suggest—because I know it is true—that the improvements contained in the bill before the House are also a response to the New Democratic Party's objections to last year's bill and because the government knew that if they produced last year's bill it would not get our support on second reading. The bill, instead of dealing with a minor part of the problem as the bill last year did, with merely foreign takeovers, now deals with screening of new enterprises by foreign investment, and screening also of investments by existing foreign corporations into unrelated fields.

• (1530)

Because it has extended its purview, its area and concern, we will support the bill on second reading, but I want to make very clear to the minister that even this extension cannot satisfy members of the New Democratic Party. Indeed, I appeal to him that it should not satisfy him or his colleagues in the Liberal party either. It will satisfy the Conservatives who do not really want any limit on foreign investment.

**An hon. Member:** No, it doesn't. Don't speak for us.

**Mr. Lewis:** Their main concern, as the hon. member for Trinity showed us on Friday, is to make further concessions to corporations and investors in the hope that they will be Canadian corporations rather than foreign corporations. I say to the minister that if he meant what he said at the beginning of his speech last Friday, and if the Throne Speech means what it says, he ought not to be satisfied with the bill he has presented to this parliament. There are obvious areas for extension of that bill and we intend to propose these areas to the committee when this bill reaches that stage.

I want to make this appeal to the minister. What he has presented to parliament is not a bill prohibiting certain things. He has presented parliament with a bill for screen-