

Economic Relations with United States

Mr. Sharp: If I may continue, if it would satisfy the hon. member, may I make two statements.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The Chair has been asked to make a ruling. Although I feel that the hon. member is a little aggressive toward the Chair, I will try to make a ruling. I think that it has been the practice—perhaps not the best practice but an accepted practice in the House—to refer to opposition members in other ways than as members of the Official Opposition.

I have heard many times from both sides of the House identification of members as members of their parties. This is not the proper procedure which is to identify members by the name of their riding. I think that the point of order was taken too far. At this time, I can only take the opportunity to invite hon. members who take the floor to follow the basic rule of the House to identify hon. members by their constituency and not by name or by any other means.

Mr. MacInnis: I have one further point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I will make it simple for the Chair. The minister, in his last few remarks, referred to the China situation and to members of the Official Opposition who spoke on this matter. I draw your attention to the motion before us and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to bring the minister back to the motion before the House. We are not discussing the China policy at this time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hon. member is asking me to rule on the procedural acceptability of some of the remarks of the minister. I do not feel that the point of order is valid. If he so desires, he may raise another point of order regarding relevancy, but the point of order which he put forward in my view relates mainly to the language used by the minister and the Chair cannot comment further on the remarks of the minister. This is a question of debate and, although the minister's remarks might not have been relevant to the motion before the House, the Chair will follow what the minister has to say from now on.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the reason I was referring to China was that I had been invited to do so by the hon. member for Hillsborough who, I was assuming, spoke both for the Official Opposition and as a member of the Progressive Conservative party.

Mr. MacInnis: Would the minister permit a question?

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. MacInnis: The minister surrendered the floor to me to permit a question. Now that he is dealing with China, would he also deal with the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) when he spoke in Russia about the American military threat?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. Perhaps the Chair should take the opportunity to intervene and to bring the attention of hon. members to the motion before the House. Questions as well as speeches should be relevant to the motion.

Mr. Sharp: The hon. member for Hillsborough had been outlining in his speech the attitude that he took toward the question of the membership of China in the United

Nations as a point at issue between Canada and the United States. I do not agree with his point of view, and I suggest that some members of the official opposition and of his party do not agree with him, either. So, I suggest that this is a question upon which the official opposition should make up its mind before it brings a motion such as this before the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sharp: The attitude of the Official Opposition even toward Amchitka seems to me to be ambivalent. It is remarkable that there was only one member of this House present at that time who voted against the resolution of the House of Commons upon the Amchitka test, and it was a member of the Official Opposition who spoke about it and indicated that that was the position he would take. I suggest that this kind of issue should be resolved within the opposition before they accuse the government of not having a firm policy toward the United States.

I will bring forward another of these issues at stake between Canada and the United States, namely, the auto pact. What has been the position of the Official Opposition on the auto pact? They condemned it. That was their initial position. But now, after the benefits of the automobile agreement have become manifest, they are very anxious that the government should protect the interests of Canada. I suggest once again that the Official Opposition should make up their minds how they want to deal with the United States, and with the issues which are under discussion between our two countries. Indeed, I suggest in general that the attitude of the Official Opposition towards the United States is ambivalent. The attitude of this government towards the United States is not ambivalent. We have taken clear positions and we intend to continue to do so. We think that is the way to maintain good relationships with our friend to the south.

• (5:10 p.m.)

When I think back to the rapid deterioration that took place in relationships between Canada and the United States between the years 1957 and 1963, when a government led by the official opposition was in office, my view and I think it is one that history will confirm, is that the problem arose out of the lack of a firm policy on the part of the government of that day. It was the confusion in the minds of the Americans about Canadian government policy that led to that very serious deterioration in relationships that the hon. member for Hillsborough, in his selective reading of history, omitted to mention. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the main problem we have here, to quote the words of the resolution put forward by the hon. member for Hillsborough, is that the official opposition fails to see that there is no reason why a distinct Canadian policy should be detrimental to the "common interest" we share with the United States, or detract from the "mutual respect" that the two countries share.

We have our own interests, but we are aware of and are taking into account the interests of others. Our interests compete. Competition produces some friction and it generates heat. But the degree of friction is a function of the complexity of our contacts. We do not have many problems in our relationships with Mongolia. That is because we have very few contacts with Mongolia. The problems