

publicly because of the kind of system we have, is that we should strengthen as well the rules and regulations which govern foreign investment in our country. I know that these Conservative back-benchers are becoming very frustrated.

An Hon. Member: Show me one.

Mr. Nystrom: There is one across the way who just spoke out. I think he is very frustrated and other Hon. Members are very frustrated. They cannot speak up in the kind of system we have because they are afraid of the Prime Minister. In fact, the Prime Minister is trying to emulate Mr. Reagan. He is becoming more and more of a Republican in the way he governs this country right down to the podium, Mr. Speaker. They are afraid to alienate the Prime Minister's Office for fear they may not get to be a Cabinet Minister or parliamentary secretary or chairman of a committee.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the Member from Quebec would agree with me now. He is not at all pleased about the course taken by the Government of Mr. Mulroney. He does not agree at all because his boss, the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, spent most of the election campaign talking about job creation—jobs, jobs and more jobs—and yet the unemployment rate is now exactly what it was six, eight or nine months ago. There are still 1.5 million unemployed Canadians in this country. The situation is the same as it was when Mr. Trudeau led the Government. I know that my friend over there is very disappointed by this Government and I hope he will speak openly and strongly in the House, Mr. Speaker.

● (1630)

[English]

I notice, Mr. Speaker, you are about to call me to order; I was getting a little bit off base there. However, I think it is important for these Members across the way to speak out, to stand up for their country and its sovereignty and say we are going to strengthen these particular clauses which deal with the power of the Minister. We want greater public co-ordination and planning in the investment process. We can get that by accepting this package of amendments.

I know the Canadian people also want broader-based input into decision making. My colleague from Essex-Windsor (Mr. Langdon) and others who travelled across this country a few months ago on the issue of jobs found that the main thing people wanted was more participation in the decision-making process at the local level. They wanted more economic democracy, more self direction from their local community, and more direction of the economy in general. There was a lot of criticism of some of the megaprojects which have been directed from Ottawa or by big companies. They also want greater Canadianization of our economy. They want the money made in Canada to stay in Canada. They want to ensure that the research and development which was paid for with money provided, in effect, by the workers of this country will stay in

Investment Canada Act

this country. Most research and development is not done in Canada but elsewhere.

These are things that the Canadian people want and all we are saying in this series of amendments and motions is that we should strengthen the hand of the Minister and the federal Government in the decision-making process and not leave it to the so-called open market. I find this all over the place. In my own Province of Saskatchewan we have a small population base. Back in the 1930s the province was in the middle of a great depression. We had drought, a tremendously bad financial rating, a lot of poverty, farmers riding the rails, dust storms, hunger and famine of the 1930s. Our people decided they had to control their own economy and they built the wheat pools and the co-operative movement and fought hard for things like the Wheat Board. They wanted more public direction, control and self-determination, which is probably the best word, over the way the Saskatchewan and Canadian economy worked. They went out and fought for some of those ideas and we now have a Canadian Wheat Board which gives farmers collective clout, and a Minister who has a lot of clout in grain marketing in this country. I am not asking, nor is the Liberal Party, for anything more than some clout, some public input and direction. I know the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson), who just came into the House, is one of the best known red Tories in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Gauthier: He was a Liberal at one time.

Mr. Nystrom: One of the best known red Tories in Saskatchewan gets up and fights for things like the Wheat Board, parity pricing and the CBC. He does that because he believes that the Canadian people need to have more say over the future economic direction of their lives. If he were the Minister in charge we would not have a Bill that was as wishy-washy as this one; we would have a Bill that would give the Minister some real clout. So I feel sorry for the Hon. Member who must feel very frustrated that this Government across the way is so conservative. No wonder he is silent, because if he got up he would give a thundering dissertation in this House just like John Diefenbaker would do. John Diefenbaker used to have a national vision; he stood up for Canada and criticized—

[Translation]

—and you agree with me on that, he often criticized the Liberal Government and the Liberal Party for being overly pro-American, too strong a supporter of the United States.

[English]

He was very, very critical of that and I am sure that if he were in this House he would be extremely upset to see this kind of legislation before the House. We are timid and meek like little kittens. I am sure he would agree with that. We are really afraid to assert our own independence, and that is not what the Conservative Party used to be. Historically it was a nationalist Party and the Liberal Party was a continentalist Party. I think the Hon. Member for Assiniboia agrees with me and I am sure that is why many years ago he left the Liberal Party and joined the Conservatives, because he thought John