

face-saving, Mr. Speaker, and this bill was brought in as a political move, a form of tokenism to the people of Canada who want action now in the area of foreign ownership.

The government knows that the majority of Canadians want action soon in repatriating their economy and their culture. The government did not intend to do anything about it until they saw that public opinion was catching up with them and they had to save face. So here we have the midwife assisting in the birth of the economic eunuch that will produce hardly anything at all in terms of meaningful action to repatriate the economy. It is a sell-out, I suggest, to the multinational corporations. It is a sell-out to the continentalists in the Conservative party, led of course by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce who himself is a mouthpiece for many of these people.

I am sure that this minister, along with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) will go down in history as being members of one of the most conservative governments this country has ever known. They are very oriented toward the status quo. Sometimes they put up a good fight, but they do not change the system. They do not change the system when it comes down to the real dollars and cents issues which affect the working people and the farmers of this land. Then we see all the sheep in the backbenches of the Liberal party getting up and bleating in agreement as they vote for this bill. Some of them, out of one side of their mouth, may say that the bill does not go far enough. One of them said this evening he would support the bill because it would then make the minister realize how ridiculous it is and that maybe he would then do something. That is the kind of logic the Liberals pursue.

The minister may know that his own backbenchers are sheep, but I assure him that the Canadian people will not be fooled by this type of legislation. The people of Canada want action now. I am sure all of us received a copy of the telegram from Mr. Edwin Goodman of the Committee for an Independent Canada. I shall read the telegram to the House:

The Committee for an independent Canada urges you in the strongest terms to participate in debate on foreign investment bill. Essential to Canada's future that private members of all parties show inadequacy and weakness of government's bill. Respectfully suggest that pertinent recommendations of parliamentary committee and the Gray report be embodied in the bill and review process widened.

May I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Goodman is no flaming revolutionary who is practising doctrinaire Marxist philosophy. I assure you that Mr. Goodman is not that type of Canadian. I assure you hon. members, too, that other Canadians such as Mr. Walter Gordon, who the minister might be afraid of, are not that type of Canadian either. The bill falls far short of what it should do. It is doing nothing about direct foreign investment in our economy. It will do nothing at all about the expansion of United States firms or other foreign firms which are already operating in Canada. In fact, it touches very little upon foreign investment in this country.

In my constituency people are concerned about foreign investment. They want us to take action now. The government of Saskatchewan has introduced in the legislature a bill on foreign ownership which will prohibit the purchas-

ing of farmland in that province by foreigners who live outside of Canada. It is a small step, Mr. Speaker. This principle should be applied to other industries if we want to build a Canada for Canadians.

The question of foreign ownership is one which causes many heated arguments. It is one which will polarize opinions as it obviously does in the House of Commons. I think it shows us whose side the people will take—the side of those who are interested in promoting the well-being of the multinational corporation or of those who are concerned about promoting the interests of the farmers and the small businessmen of Canada. I want to see much more done than is offered in the bill before us because our economy, much more than any other in the western world, is owned and controlled by foreign corporations. We lose more out of our country than comes in in terms of wealth. We are losing jobs, we are losing political autonomy, we are losing the right to make many of the decisions we should be making in this country.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock?

\* \* \*

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. MacLean:** Perhaps the minister can confirm whether we shall be continuing this debate tomorrow.

**Mr. Pepin:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think so.

---

#### PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

• (2200)

#### HEALTH—SUGGESTED INCREASE IN HEALTH RESOURCES FUND TO ENABLE TRAINING OF MORE GENERAL MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS

**Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North):** Mr. Speaker, during the question period the other day I raised the problem of the acute shortage of general practitioners. This is becoming a very serious and grave situation, so grave that in another 20 years at the present rate we will be approximately 25,000 short. The minister inferred that the provinces were not taking up the health resources funds that were available. It was my understanding from the province of Ontario that they could not get sufficient money to provide the teacher scientists, the space or equipment necessary—in other words, the teaching complex.

I have talked to the deans of various universities about fully qualified students who year after year are refused entrance. Some of these boys worked as male nurses in hospitals, which proves their dedication. They hoped that by doing this they would be accepted. The deans of the universities for which I have high regard told me that without exception they felt very badly about the students whom they could not accept even though they were qualified. One university reported to me that they had 25