

expressed by countries where we have Canadian-owned and controlled corporations.

There is another thing about this bill which gives me reason for concern, and that is clause 3. We find that by definition, a Canadian branch business is one that is incorporated elsewhere than in Canada and that operates from premises to which persons employed in connection with that business report for work. This is either a further example of the fuzzy headedness that exists in the present government's approach to legislative writing or it is an attempt to convey an impression that is completely false.

• (1730)

Any company or business that operates in Canada must be incorporated under the laws of our country and under the laws of the provinces in which such a company maintains premises. An example is the Ford Motor Company of Canada Limited. This company is a limited company incorporated in Canada under both federal and provincial statutes, and is subject to the same laws and regulations as any other limited company in Canada, whether the investment capital comes from Canadian or foreign sources. The stock in Ford of Canada Limited can be purchased by anyone who wants to buy it, whether he is Canadian, Japanese, German or of any other nationality. All anyone has to do, if he feels that stock in a particular company should be owned by Canadians, is to call his broker. I offer this advice to everyone who feels strongly about ownership of companies operating in our country. Do as people do in every other country, call your stockbroker and place your order. I am not advertising Ford shares because I do not have any of that stock, but those shares can be purchased by anyone who wants to buy them.

If Canadian banks and insurance companies, as well as Canadian individuals, had been willing to invest in the high risk ventures in our resource and manufacturing sectors, there would not have been so many opportunities for such investments by foreigners. It would serve us ill at this point to lump them now in a general grouping, label them culprits and castigate them for investing in our country. At least let us make a proper assessment of the situation and determine whether or not they represent an undesirable situation. Before we launch ourselves along the path of precipitate corrective action, let us first identify the problem. That will be the job of this House through its committee work in the days immediately ahead so that we may come up with something that will be good for Canada and her economy.

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, contrary to the opinion expressed by the previous speaker, it is my view that the erosion of our national independence has reached alarming proportions. Canada has become an economic satellite. It has allowed itself to drift into a position of military, economic and cultural dependence upon the United States. In this situation political absorption becomes irrelevant. I say that the Canadian public have become acutely conscious of the danger and realize that unless effective and decisive measures are taken immediately to reverse the trend of the foreign control of our economic life, the consequent loss of meaningful independence will soon reach the point of no return. To this

#### *Foreign Takeovers Review Act*

crisis of Canada's sovereignty and independence and to the growing public demand for action the government has reacted with Bill C-201 providing for a screening process of certain takeovers by foreign interests. This is a feeble and inadequate response. It is less than half a measure. It is the very minimum. It is a gesture which tackles a small fraction of the problem and tackles it inadequately.

However, we ought not to be surprised by this. It is consistent with the whole record and philosophy of the party in government at the present moment. The economic independence of Canada is closely linked with the political independence of our country. The government has clearly indicated this philosophy which inevitably leads to the continentalism which has brought about the present situation.

In "Foreign Police for Canadians", a series of statements issued by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) in 1970, the government spelled out its approach and its priorities in the field of international affairs. It set out six themes of national policy and amongst these it gave priority to economic growth.

On page 32 of the first main pamphlet on foreign policy, the following statement appears:

After considering these and other alternatives, and having in mind its determination to emphasize what Canada can do best in order to promote its objectives abroad, the government is of the view that the foreign policy pattern for the 70's should be based on a ranking of six policy themes which gives highest priorities to economic growth, social justice and quality of life policies. Peace and security, sovereignty and independence will be placed "in a new pattern of emphasis".

We in this party do not accept these priorities. Of course, economic growth is a desirable objective, but in our view the sovereignty and independence of Canada come first and peace and security in a nuclear world should rank ahead of economic growth. As we are guided by this philosophy, we are not prepared to sacrifice the sovereignty and independence of Canada in the hope of promoting economic growth. Indeed, we believe that it is not necessary to surrender to foreign control of our economy to promote the economic expansion of Canada. In our view, Canada has the resources and the means of financing her own expansion.

Our attitude is not based upon any narrow nationalism, chauvinism or anti-Americanism. I, for one, consider myself an internationalist, but I believe that Canada's distinct contribution to peace and security, and the building of a world community, depends upon her maintaining her sovereignty and independence and, above all, independence of mind. I believe this sovereignty and independence cannot be preserved unless vigorous steps are taken to control the Canadian economy.

The facts as to foreign ownership are well known and have been set out in a number of authoritative reports, namely, the Watkins report on foreign ownership, the Gray report, and the report of the Committee on External Affairs and National Defence on Canadian-American relations. Numerous books have spelled out the problem in all its gravity. One of the best of these is called "Silent Surrender" by Professor Kari Levitt of McGill University.

As has been made clear in this debate, the present legislation deals only with a limited number of takeovers