

sions. We can buy power cheaper, for example, from other sources such as North Dakota and Manitoba.

There are some legitimate questions to be asked here. Certainly local benefits are legitimate, but so are some of these other questions. When challenged, the courts have found that some of these questions had not been properly addressed. That was the opinion of the court.

As a result of that, we had a process put in place whereby a review or process had to take place, or the licence should not be proceeded with. Clearly the action of the review panel in resigning makes it obvious to all of us. I do not think the hon. member is even arguing that what is happening is in contravention of what the court order said. Something has to happen.

I guess that is where I would like to turn briefly to the remarks of the minister, which had to be one of the most disappointing performances that I have heard. Certainly, he stood up and tried to address the issue. In the end, what did he really say? He said basically that, while the easiest way may be to lift the licence, he does not have the authority to do that because there is no breach of the 22 terms and conditions. That flies in the face of everything I have seen in those 22 terms and conditions. He said it would give Saskatchewan time to comply, but that it would take too long.

• (1630)

But then he said that since he has a court order, he is going to reappoint a panel. At one point he said that he would take the appropriate steps, and then the necessary steps to make sure that construction does not proceed. He said that very clearly. He was challenged numerous times. When we wanted to challenge him some more, some of the hon. members opposite, including three from Saskatchewan, spoke up. I believe it was the Minister of National Defence who said, no, questioning should not proceed. What are these necessary and appropriate steps? We do not know.

The minister says he is not going to lift the construction order and that he is not going to stop the project by that means, but he says that the government is going to take necessary or appropriate steps. Surely the hon.

### *Supply*

member's constituents must be wondering what is going to happen next. The minister's own government has put him in as bad a position as any opposition member could have possibly done.

**Mr. Gardiner:** With help like that from your friends.

**Mr. Funk:** Yes, with help like that from your friends, you really do not need any enemies.

I guess what really sticks in people's craw here—and I think the member knows it—is the whole political taint to this thing.

This is in the Premier of Saskatchewan's home constituency, after all. The gentleman is in deep political trouble, as everybody knows. The Alameda Dam is in the constituency of a new senator and that whole Senate appointment phenomenon is not only a legal cloud, but certainly a political cloud as well.

The president of SaskPower Corporation, who is also from that area, a former president of the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan, was quoted earlier in the House as having made a speech in which he said that the senior level bureaucrat in the Department of the Environment had assured him that everything was looked after essentially in terms of the environmental review process. It does not look very good I would like to say to the member for Souris—Moose Mountain.

It looks like we have had whole series of secret deals. First came the one that Elizabeth May unmasked. We have never really seen what is in that January, 1990 agreement. There was also the September 5 oral agreement.

I would like to read briefly from an article in *The Globe and Mail* which states:

On Sept. 5, 1990, Mr. Devine and the current federal Environment Minister, Robert de Cotret, met in Ottawa. Mr. Devine said the pair orally agreed to alter the terms of the Jan. 26 deal: the project could go ahead and \$10-million was to be set aside to alleviate any adverse environmental impact afterward. On Sept. 10, Saskatchewan sent the terms of the new agreement to Mr. de Cotret by facsimile machine, but it says it received no response.

I think that is a very crucial point here, because after that the environmental review panel quit and really threw light on this whole situation. It drew attention of the public, the media, and the House.