

Water Resources Programs

water, the federal government and the government of the United States would work together to see that the objective we all agree must be accomplished if anti-pollution measures are to be a success becomes a reality. This is not in any way being accomplished today. This must be done. We must stop merely talking about the need for co-operation. We must appoint an agency and a minister in charge so that the job can proceed. The minister who I would suggest to handle this agency would be the minister without portfolio from Windsor, because he is not only a hard-working, conscientious young minister but also possesses considerable tact. This job as co-ordinator requires tact. The minister whom I would nominate to not receive such an appointment would be the present Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources because if there is one quality this minister does not possess it is tact.

Mr. Sharp: He has charm.

Mr. Hees: He has proven this in the past few days and weeks by the speeches he has given in the United States. These speeches should have died before they were born because, unfortunately, this minister does not know the difference between being firm and being insulting when dealing with a foreign government.

I have had some experience in dealing with the government of the United States as has the Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Sharp) who is sitting opposite me at this moment. He and I, and anybody else in this House, who have dealt with the people of the United States, particularly government people, know there is only one thing they respect; that is firmness, a knowledge of what you are talking about and an indication that you will not allow yourself to be pushed around. There is also one other thing for which they will not stand, and neither do we,—in fact they tried to use it on us—and that is being insulted to one's face. When you read over that masterpiece that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources delivered in Denver, you find that it is the most insulting, bullheaded, antagonistic, and bull-in-the-china-shop speech I have ever been privileged to read. How a minister in his right mind could say that to the United States and at the same time try to get the co-operation which we need in so many fields, is quite beyond me.

• (4:20 p.m.)

As we know, the United States buys 70 per cent of our exports. We are their greatest
[Mr. Hees.]

customer, and they are by far our greatest customer. We are allies who must rely on each other's co-operation for the mutual defence of the North American continent. We and they simply must get along. It is like living with one's wife. One may fight with her but one has to live with her. So it is with the United States. We may disagree with them but we have to live with them and get along with them. They understand and respect firmness but they do not understand insults, and that is what this minister has dealt out to them in large degree. I think that he has set back Canada-U.S. relations a long way in this extraordinary effort that he made. My nomination, therefore, for the man least likely to succeed as minister in charge of "Environment Canada" would be the present Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources who does not even show enough interest in the bill he is piloting to come to the House to listen to what members have to say. All ministers in other departments from time immemorial, even though they may have been bored with what was being said, have at least had the decency and the good manners to sit in the House while their bill was being debated. But not this minister, oh, no.

Since I think the insult that the minister handed out to the United States has to be straightened out for the good of our mutual relationship in the future, because not only in pollution matters but in trade and defence as well as in practically everything that we do we need to work with the U.S., I would suggest to the Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Sharp)—

Mr. Stanfield: He said it was a good speech.

Mr. Hees: If the Acting Prime Minister thinks that was a good speech, he goes down greatly in my estimation. I have always considered him a reasonable and a sensible man, but I do not think he made that comment seriously. I would ask him to give consideration to a suggestion of mine. The only way one can explain away that unfortunate speech is to go to the U.S. government and simply say: "Look, you have your Spiro Agnew, we have our Joe Greene. We know what you go through and you can understand what we go through with this stupid ass making speeches of that kind to you. Please forget it; we are sure, having suffered with Spiro for the past few months, you will understand".

Finally, the last thing that I feel we must do to make our anti-pollution program a success is to make it possible for municipalities