

*Supply*

been wanting this park for some time. The Province of Saskatchewan had been holding back, so in exchange for the licence, Saskatchewan agreed to go along with the Grasslands park.

As well, many of us suspected another reason. Around that time the Federal Court made a decision regarding French-language rights in the Province of Saskatchewan. Remember, as well, that was around the time when a by-election was being held in the riding of Saint-Jean in the Province of Quebec.

We suspect as well that there was some agreement of compliance with the federal order regarding French-language rights in Saskatchewan in exchange for this licence.

Right from the beginning political deals were being made, political deals about the environment. Well, that was not good enough for people concerned with the environment. It was not good enough for the Canadian Wildlife Federation and with an organization called SCRAP which is Stop Construction of the Rafferty-Alameda Projects. They went to court and on April 10, 1989 the Federal Court squashed the licence because, as the court stated, the minister did not comply with the EARP guidelines.

The Saskatchewan government appealed this and on June 22, 1989 the court upheld its first decision saying that the EARP guidelines were binding on the minister and must be applied to the Rafferty-Alameda dam project.

Already we have had two court decisions insisting that the federal government has a responsibility and that it had not lived up to that responsibility before issuing the licence.

A second licence was issued on August 31, 1989 after the minister had ordered an initial environmental evaluation, an IEE. This is the way the EARP process works. First, the minister has what is called an initial environmental evaluation. There are no public hearings on this. A rough evaluation is made and a report presented to the minister. Then the minister decides whether there is reason to hold a full public inquiry. The minister at that time decided that there was not enough reason to hold a

full environmental inquiry and so he issued the second licence.

Again people opposed to this project took the government to court and a historic decision was made in December of last year. The decision reiterated the two previous court findings, that there was federal responsibility and a full public inquiry should be held.

What the court said was that the government should either revoke the licence in the 30-day period or else put in a full environmental review process.

The Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada reached some agreement. It was the understanding under that agreement that no construction was to take place other than for safety reasons, an environmental review process was to be put in place, an independent panel was to be named, public hearings were to be held, and we thought things rested with that. People were generally happy with that process.

Earlier this spring, upon hearing rumours that construction was continuing on the Rafferty part of the project, I visited the site and indeed I saw the bulldozers working back and forth. I raised the matter in the House at that time. The former Minister of the Environment assured me that the federal government was aware of this ongoing construction, that he was going to send a group of engineers to the site to see what type of work they were going to be doing, and that he would report back to the House. He never did report back to the House. It appears as though construction continued and continued until the panel itself felt that its own integrity and the integrity of the process was just being blown away. It became public last week that the panel had decided not to proceed further with its hearings. Then the premier of Saskatchewan repudiated the whole agreement officially and the next day the panel resigned, so here we are in this present situation.

I maintain that the federal government is not in compliance, as things stand now, with the Federal Court order. The Federal Court order of December of last year insisted that the licence be revoked unless there was an environmental review process. To do an environmental review process, and I quote from the court's decision, "the minister is lawfully obliged to require and permit a panel to conduct a public review of all the significant adverse environmental effects".