

*Economic Relations with United States*

independence and fully employ our growing and highly-skilled human resources.

I agree. The intention of the mover of the motion may not be the same as my own, but I know that to apply that motion, one only has to tell Canadians to produce what they need. Then, the labour problem would automatically be solved. Then our problems with the U.S. are settled for, if China and Russia buy millions of bushels of wheat from us, it is probably not to help us get rid of our surplus production but because they need it.

It is very difficult to create artificial needs in foreign countries to get rid of our production. This is what allows us to see, how disastrous and stupid it is to base an economy on trade relations with countries other than those with which we normally trade. That is the problem. Last summer the U.S. simply decided to protect their producers by imposing an import surtax. In an economic system such as the one advocated by the Social Credit, this would not have damaged our economy at all. In addition to the evidence of certain facts like the strained relations now existing under the present system between the United States and Canada—no matter what the prime minister may say—we have to admit that we are closely related to the American policy. We are bound by their rulings and the only way we can free ourselves from their economic influence—since all other pressures from that country are due to their economic stronghold over Canada is to apply the formula under which we produce ourselves all we need and to ask ourselves but one question: Is it physically possible? If so, we only have to make it financially workable.

[*English*]

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome this debate for two reasons. First, it brings to light an effort being mounted by the Official Opposition to convince the Canadian people that the Canadian government is anti-American. Second, it gives the Official Opposition an opportunity to state what it would do in response to the economic measures of the Nixon administration. After listening to the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) I suggest to him that he did not make a very strong case of anti-Americanism against this government nor did he make a very strong case on even the narrow issue of communications. I like listening to the hon. member for Hillsborough. I find his speeches charming, and I admire his wit. There is not always as much substance as wit, but I suppose that is true of most speeches. But there were many occasions when I listened to him today when I applauded.

• (5:00 p.m.)

**An hon. Member:** Let us have a little substance.

**Mr. Sharp:** The sentiments that he expressed were sentiments with which we could all agree, namely the importance of good relations with the United States and that no government should embark upon anti-Americanism, and so on. These were sentiments that we could applaud heartily. Indeed, I think the applause from this side of the House sometimes exceeded the applause from those behind him.

However that may be, in my opinion the trouble is that the hon. gentleman is not quite convinced about his own

[*Mr. Matte.*]

case. Indeed, he is not quite sure what this motion means, and of course we are very puzzled, too. Perhaps I may attempt to paraphrase the motion which I tried to read a number of times. Perhaps with the amendment it will not be necessary to read all of it, but in any event, taking the motion as presented, it condemns the government for failing to be closer to the United States, and at the same time it condemns it for not being more independent. Perhaps that is possible for the opposition but for the government it just does not make any sense, and I think the hon. gentleman should have clarified his intention which is not at all clear in the motion.

Indeed, I thought the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) dealt very effectively with the hypocrisy of the motion of the Official Opposition.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sharp:** The real problem I suspect is that the Official Opposition has not resolved its own internal problems. I think of its attitude toward China, and I listened to the spokesmen on the other side and, if I may say so, I do not really know who speaks for the Official Opposition on this question. I listened to the hon. member for Hillsborough, and I have listened to the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather). I am not quite sure whom I should believe. Sometimes I would like to know who does speak for the Progressive Conservative party with regard to its policy toward China.

**Mr. Chrétien:** They have no policy on anything.

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wish to draw your attention to the fact that the minister does not know the rules of the House when referring to the Official Opposition, and he should learn how to do it.

**Mr. Perrault:** That is not an official point of order, either.

**Mr. MacInnis:** I would very much appreciate a ruling as to whether the minister may continue to refer to the Official Opposition in the manner in which he did.

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. MacInnis:** Mr. Speaker, I asked for a ruling from the Chair.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** It would be difficult for the Chair to make a ruling on something that he did not hear. The Chair was speaking to the Deputy Speaker. If the hon. member wishes to make a specific charge and tell the House what cannot be accepted under the rules, I will try to make a ruling.

**Mr. MacInnis:** The minister should know that under the rules he must not refer to any political party in this House. He referred to members on this side of the House in their capacity as members of the Official Opposition or of the opposition parties, but he may not put name tags on members on this side and he may not express opinions in this House; that has been ruled upon several times. I think it is time that the minister was told some of the rules which he should observe. If the Chair has not been listening, it might be better to send for Mr. Speaker.