

*Private Members' Business*

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the House would consent to calling it 5.40 p.m. so we could proceed to private members' hour.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to call it 5.40 p.m.?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Translation]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Since, as we decided, it is now 5.40 p.m., the House will now proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business as indicated on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

### ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES ACT

The House resumed from June 20 consideration of the motion that Bill C-275, an act respecting the protection and rehabilitation of endangered and threatened species, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to speak on Bill C-275.

The fundamental goal of any endangered species legislation must be to ensure—

**Mrs. Ringuette—Maltais:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As a member of the government I should have the privilege of speaking first on this motion.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member will appreciate that there is no automatic order to the government side's speaking on a private member's bill. I understand that a government member spoke last and therefore it is now the Reform Party's turn.

**Mr. Hermanson:** Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the fundamental goal of any endangered species legislation must be to ensure that no further native species go extinct and that already endangered species recover to healthy and self-sustaining levels. To do this we need to use the most effective, efficient and fair methods possible.

The federal government has jurisdiction over the management and preservation of wildlife on federal lands. Likewise, the provincial governments have jurisdiction over the management and preservation on all non-federal lands.

I understand that currently only four provinces have endangered species legislation: Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick.

Farmers and ranchers in Saskatchewan are concerned this type of legislation will prevent them from doing what they want with their own land. They are afraid governments will annex

part of their land if an endangered species makes its habitat on their property. Farmers and ranchers are not against the protection of endangered species and populations. Farm owners, landowners and land leasers are respectful of our duty to protect all species with which we share this planet.

Any legislation must first consider the rights of the private landowner. By considering their rights we will then be able to find a co-operative solution to the preservation of endangered species.

My constituents who are farmers and ranchers certainly do not want to have any legislation thrown at them telling them how they ought to regulate their land. They must not be ignored. Farmers and ranchers are the closest to the land and are familiar with the animals that are endangered species and what needs to be done to ensure their survival. It is the duty of responsible government to sit down with those most affected by such legislation and find a common solution.

Recently United States officials under the U.S. Endangered Species Act shut down a portion of a west coast logging operation in order to save the spotted owl. This was economically disastrous for several communities. We are aware of the extreme measures taken by the U.S. Not only were they irrational but they do not in any way take the private citizen's concerns and rights into account.

The U.S. Endangered Species Act compliance process for single family residential lots states that only a recent issuance of a proclamation by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services has changed this regulation. The United States has spent approximately \$825 million and has not recovered one species.

Some member from across the floor might say the U.S. measures are draconian and that this government would never follow such a lead. Let me remind Liberal members that the Minister of the Environment is a follower of U.S. practices. The U.S. banned the additive MMT in unleaded gasoline and the Minister of the Environment followed suit. The U.S. is considering a ban on sulphur and so watch for the minister to be trapped and only a step behind on this one as well.

Bill C-275 is not similar to legislation currently practised in the United States. The bill's scope is to protect only species on federal lands. Like most legislation that comes from the government side, it flirts with that slippery slope concept.

We are concerned, as I know landowners in my part of the country are, that the Minister of the Environment may be using this as a test case to bring forward some severe legislation not balanced and not fair to landowners but protecting endangered species, which we all share a concern about.

Clause 9(1)(a) states in part that the minister "may make regulations forbidding or restricting any use of, access to, activity on, or the release of any substance on, federal lands that are public lands". Clause 9(1)(b) states in part "federal lands that are private lands".