

Adjournment Debate

I had a few more words but I think I have run out my four minutes. I got in what I really wanted to get in and I thank the House and the Speaker for their courtesy.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Let me ask, colleagues, if that same co-operation would allow us to go to the mover of the motion. The hon. member for Davenport under right of reply is entitled to two minutes to close off the debate on this motion. Agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity.

Indeed as in every other debate there is a lot to be learned. I have learned a lot during this hour from the input given by my colleagues whom I would like to thank.

The member for Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia has done a lot of homework. It seems to me however that he is putting forward observations that over the centuries have been made by the scientific community and which are geologically proven, no doubt.

However he is not aware of the fact that in recent times, in 1988 in Toronto at the international conference attended by scientists the scientific community concluded that there is a problem here in terms of climate change. Yes, there were a few dissenting voices but nevertheless a large part of the scientific community was of the opinion that we have to deal with climate change resulting from greenhouse gas emissions. That conclusion was reinforced and fleshed out in more detail in 1991 at the climate conference held in Geneva.

Next year in March a second conference on climate change will take place in Germany at which governments will participate to work out a global plan.

Evidently the scientific community first and then the politicians in the world have come to a conclusion of substance here despite all the understandable and justifiable doubts that have been expressed by the hon. member.

I concur with the member for Comox—Alberni in his warning that it is a difficult path. Change cannot be achieved overnight. We have to look at a mix if I understood him correctly and not rely on a shift from one set of sources, the non-renewable to the renewable, and hope that the problem will dissolve. He is quite right. We cannot do it quickly and it is a very long and difficult path.

• (1920)

It seems to me that the members for Laurentides and Terrebonne missed the point. We, or at least I look at this issue as a form of co-operative federalism. They interpret this issue as one of interference in provincial jurisdiction. Evidently there is a profound ideological difference.

To conclude, I would like to thank and express my gratitude to the member for Cumberland—Colchester for her impassioned and very interesting intervention, for her incisive analysis, for her support and for warning us about the importance of the precautionary principle.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 96 the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

ENDANGERED SPECIES

Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on November 17 the Minister of the Environment released a discussion paper concerning endangered species in Canada. That discussion paper proposes that the laws protecting Canada's endangered species be strengthened. I could not agree more. In fact there is something in this that most Canadians do not know.

Canada is one jurisdiction in the world that does not have federal legislation protecting species at risk. We do however have provincial laws that have been praised for their efforts. In Ontario I might mention Jim Wiseman. The NDP MPP for Durham West has brought forth a private member's bill that has received broad support. Wiseman's bill which passed second reading with unanimous consent of the provincial legislature last week would promote identification and assessment to conserve, protect, manage, restore and reintroduce as well as rehabilitate endangered, threatened and vulnerable species in their habitats.

In spite of this eight out of Canada's ten provinces and two territories have no specific legislation protecting endangered species. Most provinces do have general wildlife laws, but these are directed primarily at regulating hunting of game species. We cannot forget that Canada is a nation with a strong international reputation for environmental awareness. It is a shame that we still do not have federal legislation dealing with endangered species.

Although Canada does a good job at identifying species at risk and preparing lists of species that require attention, Canada does not have any laws requiring that anything be done once a species is listed in any way. I have heard the situation described as operating similar to a hospital which records the names of its patients, assesses their illnesses, but does absolutely nothing to treat them.