

Those are example of regional pressure. I think the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) exercised some regional pressure with respect to the Toronto project.

A senior citizens' home for Port Hawkesbury, also in Allan MacEachen's riding

A \$30 million dock for Mulgrave, Nova Scotia, which also just happens to be in Allan MacEachen's riding.

There was a little regional pressure there.

The author of this book is not a political person. In fact, I think he says in other books that he is a believer in the NDP philosophy. On page 61 he writes:

... my vote goes to Jean Marchand, the Minister, as he then was, of Regional Economic Expansion. Who else would put out a colour brochure listing the \$270 million in federal grants pumped into his own area since 1967? Who else would put up a billboard to proclaim the coming of the "Jean Marchand Dam"?

I do not know if that dam has been built yet or not. I just point to these regional pressures that exert themselves in politics. We are all human. I suspect that if the government stays in power those same regional pressures will exert themselves with respect to the application of this bill.

What does the bill really do? Basically, it does three things. It gives the power to block or curtail new foreign money coming into Canada. It gives the power to limit the change of direction of foreign investment already in Canada. For example, I suppose Imperial Oil of Canada would be able to continue to operate in the oil industry here but would not get approval to go into any other line of business. Worst of all, the bill has the power to direct investment within Canada. Perhaps my suspicious mind is at work, but I think it might be said that if this agency is to deal with regional situations an application might be made to start a new factory in Alberta with German or Japanese or any foreign money and the agency might just say "Sorry, we cannot allow any more foreign investment in Alberta. It has too much already and we think it will significantly harm Canada, but you can invest it in some other area." That is where the regional pressures may be exerted.

● (1630)

I think the amendment offered by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay), which states that a majority of the panel hearing the application must come from the region to which the application is applied is a sound one. I remember when DREE was established the minister told this House in good faith that he knew of the political pressures and of all the porkbarrelling accusations that could be made, but he said he would try his best to administer the act in a non-partisan way for the good of the country. He tried his best and as Walter Stewart has said, he was able to publish a colourful brochure listing the \$270 million in federal grants that had been pumped into his own area since 1967. So, I do not believe his best is good enough, but it was human. I believe that the agency to be set up by this bill would be just as human and as subject to as many pressures. That is why I think the amendment should be supported.

Another area of the bill which gives me concern is the section containing the words "significant benefit to a part

Foreign Investment Review Act

of Canada". What particular part, Mr. Speaker? In other words, if the agency questions an application, the applicant must prove that his investment is likely to create significant benefits for Canada. It might well be said that Michelin was a tremendous benefit to the province of Nova Scotia, but it could be argued, too, by another region of Canada that it destroyed the Dunlop Tire Company in the city of Toronto. The words "significant to the benefit of Canada" are not good enough unless there is some regional representation when hearing the application. The wording would make some sense then. There is no doubt in my mind that Michelin would be of significant benefit to the province of Nova Scotia, but they must know that they have to compete with the other industries in Canada. If they want to move into the markets in central Canada, they know that they have to compete. I believe that term denotes that the part of Canada affected will be all right if it has political clout. If it does not have political clout, however, it will have to go begging and it may be heard or it may not. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that as a member of parliament I should assist the passage of legislation that forces people to go begging. Some criteria should be established for equal treatment and a fair hearing. As the representative of my constituents I can ask no more, but I do ask that and I am sure it is no more than any other member of the House asks.

I would like to go into the question of cost, Mr. Speaker. We are told that the whole purpose of this bill was to stop the sale of Home Oil to Ashland in the United States. If that is so, why play around with the figure of \$250,000? I think Home Oil sold for something in the neighbourhood of \$30 million, so if the object was to stop the sale of Home Oil it is not necessary to also stop all the little enterprises that may come into this country. By that I mean little, individual investments.

Back in 1909 many of my constituents came to this country as American or Japanese citizens. Indeed, many Japanese citizens were forced to move from Vancouver to my area during the last war. But if they came from the United States or Japan or Holland or Germany, they all became first class Canadian citizens.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner (Crowfoot): They made an investment here. I think the purpose of the foreign investment bill should be to give a board or an agency the right to examine large corporate investments in Canada, not individual investments. A lot of good automotive agencies would not be sold for less than \$250,000. There are even a few farms in some of the choice areas of Alberta that could not be bought for \$250,000. In my own area, where it is pretty dry, one might be able to get a toe hold for less than that.

Mr. Breau: I do not think so.

Mr. Horner (Crowfoot): The hon. member says he does not think so. Let us suppose for a moment that he is right. Who are we saving the land for, and if it is the sale of land that we are trying to block, are we not being unconstitutional? The hon. member shakes his head in a negative manner. I say that the federal government has no right to interfere with the sale of property within a province. Property belongs to the province. In no way would this