

statements by the board will have to be made public and that in respect of some of the larger projects public hearings may be held is, I think, credit insofar as the minister is concerned on this point.

In closing I again want to point out that if the environmental impact studies are really to do the job which I think should be done we must get into the field where we can insist on these impact studies being made in those areas where we have only partial jurisdiction. One is in the field of the Navigable Waters Protection Act. Does this House know that a Crown corporation in the name of a province cannot be touched under that act? It can build any dam it wishes and does not have to come to the federal authorities for any license. It does not have to let the minister know what damage might be done behind the dam that is to be built.

● (1420)

I agree with the hon. member who has just spoken. We have to expand impact studies to cover the whole of Canada in order to really do a job for the people of Canada in the future.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gilles Caouette (Charlevoix):** As usual, Mr. Speaker, this statement is a necessary one, but it comes belatedly, which has been the characteristic of the government administration for many years.

When all our rivers are polluted and when only perfunctory legislation has been created and nearly nothing is being done to rectify a persisting situation, the minister tells us that in the future all projects that may interfere with the environment must be approved by his department. The planning must incorporate any corrections or recommendations made by his department and, lastly, all the findings must be published.

In no way does the minister indicate what penalties will be imposed on those who do not obey these regulations and, even less, how they will be forced to do so. Money will once again be spent, not to rectify an existing situation but only to study and recommend a type of action which nearly never was applied in the past.

The House certainly recalls the nice briefs on pollution in the Great Lakes and in the rivers and water resources of Canada, but they are still polluted. Consider the Ottawa river, for instance, which is certainly not too far away from Parliament to go unnoticed. Pulpwood driving had been forbidden, but last summer tugboats still ran on the river with their shipments of wood. Nothing is being done. Then why make such a statement today when we are powerless to implement previous decisions?

Does the minister simply seek to toss good wishes in the air, or is he really prepared to get down seriously to the job of correcting present problems first?

This statement for the future is appreciated, but I have yet to be convinced of its effectiveness for, as I have said earlier, the minister puts nobody under the obligation of believing his statement, and moreover he sets no time limit for effective implementation.

I must therefore conclude that the minister simply perpetuate a deplorable situation and is absolutely not inter-

*House of Commons Hockey*  
 ested in correcting the problems we are now facing regarding the environment.

\* \* \*

[English]

## PUBLIC SERVICE

### TABLING OF REPORT BY JACOB FINKELMAN ON EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE RELATIONS

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to table Part I of the report on employer-employee relations in the Public Service of Canada prepared at the request of the government by Mr. Jacob Finkelman, chairman of the Public Service Staff Relations Board. Mr. Finkelman's terms of reference were outlined in the House of Commons on April 17, 1973.

The report is comprised of three parts. Part I of the report, which I am tabling today, is the substantive or main part of the report. Parts II and III will be tabled as soon as they are prepared in final form. Part II is to be a compilation of the recommendations that are set out in Part I and will be, in essence, what might be termed a ready reference document. Part III will be in the form of a draft bill which will simply embody in legislative language those recommendations contained in Part I that deal with the revision of the Public Service Staff Relations Act. The draft bill, of course, like the rest of the report, will be the work of Mr. Finkelman and it should not be regarded as being a government proposal or government bill.

As indicated earlier, it is the government's position that no major amendments will be made to the Public Service Staff Relations Act without a full opportunity being given to the employee representatives to express their views. The employee representatives, of course, will probably appear before the standing committee charged with the consideration of Mr. Finkelman's report. In addition, there shall be full consultation between the government and the employee representatives before the government brings forward any bill making major amendments to the act.

On behalf of the government, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure on behalf of members of the House, I should like to thank Mr. Finkelman for his thorough study of employer-employee relations in the Public Service of Canada. Mr. Finkelman's experience and reputation in this field are evident in the quality of the report he has prepared.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

### HOCKEY GAME BETWEEN MEMBERS AND PRESS GALLERY— REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 43, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to introduce a motion.

Considering that it was vital for the honour of this House to avoid defeat in last night's hockey game between