

Oral Questions

say that at all. In fact I said that the \$1 billion will increase quality. I said that it will increase the salaries of child care workers. I will explain it to the Hon. Member again.

The money for 1988-89 flows as of April 1, 1988—April 1, 1988. We are in July now and April was a few months back.

The point I make is that the provinces can sign on. It is more money for this year than even the NDP wanted.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, the Minister can surely not deny that it is money on paper. There is no money in place yet. Again, I say that. It is not just New Democrats who are saying it but experts across the country are saying that the money is being used in the wrong way. The Minister has said in the House, when I questioned him before, that accessibility, affordability, and quality are important national child care objectives. We agree with that. However, he knows that his plan will not achieve these goals. Two hundred thousand spaces will not even begin to meet the need over seven years.

Will the Minister act on his child care promises to Canadian families? Will he show some good faith by putting some money in now before an election? Will he provide emergency funding while he redesigns a workable national child care program, and go to the electorate with it?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I have showed good faith. The money is available as of April 1, 1988. The money is there. The federal-provincial agreements will be signed.

Ms. Mitchell: Will be—not now. Not one cent has gone.

Mr. Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I finished saying that the money is available April 1, 1988. If the Hon. Member knows anything about social policy—anything at all—she will know how to take a look at the adjustment over each fiscal year to see how the adjustments are made. The money is available as of April 1, 1988.

The point we are really debating is this. We wanted to give Canadian parents a choice. What the Hon. Member and the NDP want, and something which the Liberals joined in yesterday, is for the Government to drive everything. They want the parents to be told by government how to have care and how to access it. We oppose that. We reject it. That is why we have a plan which was agreed to by other provinces, the federal Government, and by parents who want a choice.

ENTREPRENEUR IMMIGRANTS—MONITORING SYSTEM

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

Since the Government assumed office in 1984 not only has it doubled and tripled its levels of entrepreneurial immigration to the detriment of other classes such as the family and assisted-

family classes, but as Toronto newspapers have been demonstrating for the last several weeks, by failing to implement a comprehensive monitoring system and by lowering the standards, thereby making it easier for business immigrants to get into the country, the Government has created a huge incentive for widespread abuse.

Since the Government's own study in 1985 indicated that it could not even locate over 40 per cent of all business immigrants entering the country, or those who were supposed to have entered, why has the Government refused to establish a monitoring system that would ensure that promises for investment and job creation be fulfilled? If the Government is not prepared to do so now, will it at least re-evaluate the entrepreneurial program within the Government's immigration policy?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I remind the Hon. Member of three things. First, this program has been in place since the late 1970s. Until we got here there was not a finger lifted even to review what was going on under this program, let alone monitor it. My predecessor introduced a review of this system. I said as soon as I took this portfolio that I would be instituting a monitoring system, and that there would be a private sector advisory committee on how to do it. I will be announcing that very soon.

It is this Government and this Party which have aggressively expanded the Government's sponsored refugee program, family reunification, and the independent immigrant program.

ENFORCEMENT OF LEGISLATION

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that it was this Government that tripled the number of business immigrants, and expanded the program to make it easier to qualify. It is now being irresponsible in not following up and ensuring that, if there is a priority for rich immigrants, they at least be followed up on their promises to invest and create jobs for Canadians.

I ask the Minister again why she permits a double standard to continue whereby family or assisted-family class cases are meticulously screened and refused for the slightest of oversights while the rich are not only able to buy themselves into the country more easily but many of them who do so do so free of charge? Will the Minister apply the force of our Immigration Act equally to all its applicants without accounting for the size of people's wallets?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the important part about the lowering of the amount of investment required is because of a bilateral agreement with provinces that have very little capital investment. That does not apply all across the country. It applies in provinces that need investment and, indeed, it was at their request that we did this. So we are now balancing the business immigration program—