

which the legislation was established. I believe that is the spirit in which it was administered.

I am aware that it had some very bureaucratic aspects and that foreign and Canadian capitalists are discouraged by red tape and screening requirements. However, although the potential for directing review is considerably reduced pursuant to this legislation, it still provides for an element of review. I believe the Government has done this in recognition of the importance of such a review. The Government realizes that we are an autonomous country and that we should have some kind of control over the flow of foreign capital into our country, whether it is to take over existing Canadian businesses within the meaning of the existing statute or proposed statute, or whether it is to establish new enterprises in our country.

What is troubling about Clause 2 of the Bill which Motion No. 1 seeks to amend is that it does not make that position very clear. Anyone reading the purposes of this Bill would not realize that a review procedure, however, reduced, attenuated and diminished, is still contained in the legislation of the new Government. The amendment proposed by my colleague, the Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), makes that clear.

● (1230)

I think that there should be the kind of review that is presently provided for in the legislation about to be repealed. I recognize that it has bureaucratic features. I know in the last two or three years efforts were made to streamline those procedures, but I think they can be over-streamlined. What this definition, the statement of purpose by the Government, makes me worry about is the general concern I have about the attitude which the present Government is taking toward the American Government and toward Canada-U.S. relations. Any political party in our country that came forward with an anti-American policy would be defeated in an election.

Mr. Lewis: That is what happened on September 4.

Mr. Kaplan: It would be defeated because this is not an anti-American country. While I have no doubt that there are people in our country who have anti-American feelings, they are such a small minority in Canada that they would never be able to elect anybody to this place.

Mr. Lewis: The NDP.

Mr. Althouse: We are pro-Canadian.

Mr. Kaplan: On the other hand, just because we are not anti-American, it is not our primary purpose to be pro-American either. We are not elected to serve the United States. We are elected in our Party not to be anti-American and not to be pro-American. We are elected to be pro-Canadian.

We know Canadians like the country to the south of us. We know that we are very fortunate to have the kind of neighbour we do and we are fortunate to have the kind of relationship that we do with that neighbour. I do not think this evasive statement of purpose contained in the Bill should be allowed to

stand. It conceals the fact that in a marginal way there will continue under this new legislation a kind of review of foreign investment. That is as it should be. We should review and take responsibility for and interest in all American policies that affect our country.

What worries me is that I do not think the Government of the day is doing it adequately. I do not think in the area of defence that the Government is adequately respecting the autonomy of Canada or that it is adequately respecting the fact that Canadians want their Parliament and Government to stick up for them and not as a primary objective be a handmaiden, an envoy, or a client of the United States.

Seeing the language stated in this statement of purpose and knowing what I do of the other kinds of policies that have been introduced by this Government, I might mention the area of defence and the united approach to multi-lateral relations as examples of what I am concerned about. One could also talk about the attitude that this Government has taken toward research-sharing projects and even about police exchanges where the treaties signed at the Shamrock Summit opened the Canadian door as wide to the American law enforcement authorities as it is open to Canadian law enforcement authorities. It is something I am uneasy about. I feel we should co-operate with the Americans but that we should co-operate on the basis of an autonomous and independent country whose citizens like the Americans and who want to have close relations with the Americans but whose citizens are not Americans. Our citizens are Canadians.

I have to mention also, in talking about the importance of the Government accepting the amendment contained in Motion No. 1, the experience in my own constituency with de Havilland. The de Havilland aircraft industry was foreign owned. In 1972 when it appeared that its foreign owner was not prepared to give it a world mandate to develop a STOL aircraft for a world market, the Government stepped in and was prepared to buy that company and see it develop, as it has developed over the years, two or three, perhaps even four, new products which are distinctively Canadian and particularly relevant to the Canadian environment, to Canadian market circumstances, to a traveller with less money in his pocket than the American traveller and to an energy-conserving world, which is the world into which Canada is moving rapidly and perhaps should be moving even more rapidly to develop world-class products.

I have heard the Minister who brought forward this legislation indicate his vision of the future of de Havilland. He would like to see it sold. When we on this side asked him for guarantees, the kinds of criteria we had in mind when we were talking about guarantees were the kinds of things contained in the Foreign Investment Review Act.

We are not against the idea of the de Havilland corporation returning to private hands. We are not ideologically committed to public ownership even of some very important industry, like a portion of the aerospace industry. We are not even committed that much to saying it has to be preserved 100 per cent in Canadian hands. But the Minister offered absolutely no assur-