

Supply

and other parts of Saskatchewan—and, more importantly, what it does for the entire process of environmental review, what specific steps he intends to initiate to stop the construction of the project so that a review panel can do its work? As he is fully aware, his original review panel quit because they said there was no point in doing a review while the work was going ahead. Why appoint another panel when the work is proceeding? How is he going to stop the work?

Mr. de Cotret: Mr. Speaker, I think I have been very straightforward and very clear on this issue. First, I will live with the court order that we got in December 1989. We will appoint a new panel because that court order was very specific. We are in discussion right now with Saskatchewan on an agreement that would lead them to stop construction. There are other steps available. What I explained a few minutes ago was very simple.

The question of simply revoking the licence is a non-starter for the very simple reason that the licence has not been breached in any way. What has been breached is the agreement that was signed between Canada and Saskatchewan in January of 1990. That was the document that was breached. There is recourse to that document if we want to pursue it. That is exactly what I am doing at the moment.

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina—Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I share the sentiments of my colleagues from Manitoba in my bitter disappointment at the minister's lack of action.

The minister is going to implement or put up a new panel. We have had a panel resign because they could not do their work and maintain the integrity of the environmental review process due to the actions of the Government of Saskatchewan and the inaction of the federal government in stopping the action of the Saskatchewan government. Now the government is talking about a new agreement. It thought it had an agreement with the province of Saskatchewan. That agreement grew out of a court order. The court order said lift the licence. The only reason it could maintain the licence was if it set up a proper environmental review process.

The government reached an agreement with the province of Saskatchewan. The spirit was there and the spirit of a court order was there to have the environmen-

tal review, for the construction to stop, other than for safety few reasons, and to have the review panel report?

Saskatchewan totally ignored the process. There is no other alternative but to revoke the licence. The court order demands that the licence is revoked. The one condition the court allowed to maintain the licence has now been breached and is no longer in existence. Therefore, the court order says to revoke the licence. The minister is not in compliance with a court order. For days and weeks now, the minister and the government have not been in compliance with the court order. If I was the minister, I would be very worried about that.

My second point is regarding the minister talking about Bill C-78. I drew attention to this in my speech and I hope he heard it. If not, he should refer to *Hansard*. They are remarks by Mr. George Hill. He said: "The head of FEARO reports to Dr. Good. Dr. Good has flung his whip to include all the—"

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Order, please!

Very briefly. Since several Hon. Members have asked the Chair for an opportunity to ask questions or make comments, I would appreciate it if the Hon. Member for Regina—Qu'Appelle could be very brief, please.

[*English*]

Mr. de Jong: I will, Mr. Speaker. Let me just conclude with this quote.

This is what Mr. George Hill stated about his relationship with Dr. Good of the environmental department. Speaking of Dr. Good, Mr. Hill claims that "he had assured me that he was in control and he would see they acted"—meaning the environmental review process—"expeditiously and reported in short order because, after all, this project had already been reviewed twice". In other words, Mr. George Hill was claiming that Dr. Good was in control of the review panel. If that is the case, surely it is time that the minister's Bill C-78 be amended so that the environmental review reports to Parliament and not to the department.

I would appreciate comments on both points I have made.

Mr. de Cotret: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the point that in reading Bill C-78 carefully, one will see that under the new recommended process the group that would be designed to carry out environmental reviews