

Investment Canada Act

architect of that was pro-foreign investment as long as that foreign investment was pro-Canada. There is nothing wrong with that kind of attitude. There is nothing wrong with suggesting that when we look at foreign investment we need to look at it through the eyes of Canadians and Canada first, that we place our country before the interests of the board rooms of New York. We should be recognizing that that kind of attitude and philosophy is one that is suddenly in practice and in vogue with other countries throughout the international scene. When this Government begins to say we have to know how to compete with other countries, be competitive with other countries and be competitive in terms of our products and marketing them, then I think Investment Canada does not speak to that competitiveness. Investment Canada does not suggest that the Government knows the game and the rules to the game.

In addition to perpetrating a number of incorrect fallacies about foreign investment in Canada as it relates to FIRA and our Party, I think the Government has a block in terms of the Tory mind-set, Mr. Speaker. FIRA was a part of building this country. It was, is, or should be part of the building block toward building an independent, strong, and mature Canada. It was the same Party to which we can draw analogies to FIRA that blocked other initiatives that were worthy and contributed tremendously to the evolution and economic growth of Canada. It was the same Party that was against having our own independent flag. It was the same Party that was against having our own independent national anthem. It was the same Party that was against having our own constitution. FIRA was in the same category. FIRA was up there with the flag, with the anthem, and with the Constitution that suggested this country is old enough, mature enough, independent enough and has vision enough to suggest ways of building Canada on our own terms for our own people and for our own future. There is nothing wrong with having that kind of attitude. There is nothing wrong with trying to have a vision of that kind of future.

Unfortunately we see once again that the same opposition which handicapped this Government in the flag debate, in the anthem debate, and in the constitution debate is again handicapping the Government when it comes to economic growth.

Mr. Brisco: That is hogwash.

Mr. Marchi: The Tories have no sense of nation building. They have no sense of putting Canada first. They have no sense of being pro-Canadian.

Mr. Brisco: You brought on the national energy problems.

Mr. Taylor: Who sold out western Canada? It was the Liberals.

Mr. Marchi: The Tories are basically saying Canada is up for sale. Come in and get it. We cannot afford that. We could not have afforded that kind of opinion when we were discussing the flag, when we were discussing the anthem and discussing the Constitution and we cannot afford that sense of debate

and priorities in this debate in 1985 with respect to Investment Canada.

It is that same mind-set and regressive unCanadian policy that we also see permeating the evolution of the Tories' immigration policy.

Mr. Brisco: Explain that.

Mr. Taylor: Explain that.

Mr. Marchi: It certainly ties in to the whole sense of the foreign investment debate right now. I hear Members saying "explain". If they would be patient and listen, that is exactly what I am going to do in the next four minutes that are allotted to me.

At the beginning of this month Members of the Conservative Party, of that Government, on the Labour, Employment and Immigration Committee suggested that increases in immigration for the next year and for several years should primarily consist of entrepreneurs. Essentially this means in ordinary English for Members across the aisle that only wealthy entrepreneurs need apply.

Mr. Brisco: Hogwash.

Mr. Marchi: That is the same philosophy we see permeating this Investment Canada Bill. The Tories' mind-set is blinding them because they cannot see, recognize or admit that thousands of average Canadians of different persuasion came to this country without the millions of dollars that the Tories are suggesting. These people made a life for themselves. They became success stories in Canadian terms. Thousands of average and poor immigrants came to this country and worked at jobs other Canadians did not want to do. All immigrants also brought with them trades and skills without the benefit of having the millions of dollars being suggested by this group of right-wing Tory members. All immigrants, regardless of economic status, and regardless of the fact they do not have the prerequisite of the chairman of the committee, who suggested that the ideal immigrant would be an individual who can start up his own business and have \$500,000, or an immigrant who can come to this country and add to the economic growth, are first consumers, and second, they are willing to work. To suggest that economic growth cannot be contributed to by these people is a disgrace, first to the people who came here to work, and second, to other potential Canadians who wish to learn and live that same kind of life.

There is a tremendous resemblance between the philosophy which is dictating the immigration policy and the philosophy we see permeating this Investment Canada Bill, Mr. Speaker. It is a regressive philosophy. It is a philosophy that this Government will regret one day, because Canadians will suggest that we should be searching for foreign investment and we should be getting entrepreneurs to add to our economic growth, but we should not be doing it to the detriment of Canadians.

We should not be putting the United States first. We should learn that other countries are protecting their turfs. We should