

*Supply*

environment, but had his credibility damaged by his reluctance to do the right thing with respect to Rafferty-Alameda.

We now have a third Minister of the Environment. If he ever wanted to do anything to shore up, build up or create some credibility for himself, having originally got the job in an extemporaneous sort of way because of the resignation of the former minister leaving the government caucus to join the Bloc Quebecois, he should do the right thing and take a very tough line with the Government of Saskatchewan. We feel that tough line should be the revoking of the licence, not taking the Government of Saskatchewan to court because that takes time.

The Government of Saskatchewan has shown that it has no respect for litigation. This has been through the courts and the construction continues. The only possible thing that might work is to revoke the licence. That is what the minister must do. If that is not the announcement he makes today then we will continue to be on his case until he does that.

We are talking about the rule of law. We listened, and all Canadians listened, with some sympathy to the Prime Minister the few times he emerged from under whatever rock he was hiding this summer to say something about what was happening at Oka. He would talk about the rule of law, about how all Canadian laws must be respected and that sort of thing. That is what we are talking about here. We are talking about a situation which has been ruled on by the courts, and the Government of Saskatchewan has flagrantly ignored the judgments reached by the courts, and what we assume was the spirit of the agreement between the federal government and the Government of Saskatchewan pursuant to those court judgments.

If this sort of thing happened anywhere else, if there was this kind of unauthorized property damage going on anywhere else, we would call the police. What is happening here is that the common property of everyone, in this case the environment and the land being subjected to the construction activities at Rafferty-Alameda, is being illegally altered and illegally damaged. If someone did this in your backyard or if someone went into the backyard of the hon. member for Brandon—Souris and said: "Well, I know there's a law against this and I know

there is a court order against this, but I have decided I want to do this anyway," then proceeded to dig up his backyard. What would happen? That person would be brought to heel and might even end up in jail.

• (1230 )

There has been a lot of talk over the last 10 years or so with respect to the environment. Some of it has come from the other side, but mostly it has come from environmental groups. They express the need to see negative or illegal actions against the environment, not in the namby-pamby way that we now regard them as civil matters which can be litigated and negotiated, but as crimes and the kind of thing we put an end to when they are happening. That is the kind of situation that we have here with respect to the Government of Saskatchewan and the Rafferty-Alameda project.

What kind of possible credibility can the government, or for that matter, the whole environmental review process, ever hope to have in the future if the Government of Saskatchewan can get away with simply saying: "We don't like that ruling and we have a different view of the agreement that we had with the federal government. We are just going to go ahead." It is no wonder this panel resigned.

Any group of people with a smidgen of self-respect would not have anything to do with this process. Perhaps these people felt, at the time at which they were appointed, that there was a serious intent on the part of both levels of government to initiate a full and meaningful review. Fair enough. But they have obviously come to the judgment that the kind of review they had in mind is not in the cards, and that the Government of Saskatchewan was proceeding apace with the project. Who would want to be part of a farce where you come up with a final review or judgment of a project just at the time it is being completed?

The only people who seem to be able to tolerate that scenario in its own mind is this government, but it is not just the credibility of the government that is at stake. If it was just that, I would not worry about it. It is like worrying about nothing, because it does not have any credibility. That is not the point. Who cares about the credibility of this government, *per se*, by itself?

What we care about is the way in which this government, by adding fuel to the fires of cynicism which are