

S.O. 29

with everything he says. In fact, I am not going to agree with what he is about to say in this Chamber. I have listened to him for 13 years and he will put forward a very serious argument that because the Governments of Canada have so restricted the use of insecticides, it has caused a destruction of our forests. Basically that is what the hon. gentleman is about to say. His contribution will perhaps be one of the more important contributions to the debate this evening.

I want to point out to the Member that there is one thing wrong with the argument that he is about to present. What if the Government of Canada had followed through and allowed the amount of insecticide required to kill the spruce budworm, the balsam woolly aphid or the hemlock looper and the one here in Ontario, the gypsy moth? I have no argument against the Ontario Government using *Bacillus thuringiensis*, or BT for short. However, I have a serious argument with the Government of New Brunswick and the Government of Newfoundland using the types of chemicals they have been using. The argument is this, and the Hon. Member will say, that because the Government has been so restrictive, forest insects have eaten the forests, causing the trees to dry, causing a natural phenomena to be present whereby forest fires are very easy to start.

● (2320)

If you want to start a small camp-fire, you break off a piece of dry wood, that is certainly not alive. That is what causes, or certainly encourages, forest fires. I will agree with the hon. gentleman if he says that we have been so lax in forest management that we have dead trees lying around throughout the forests in Canada. In the forests in Newfoundland, you do not have to chop down trees to get enough wood for your stove. You can just pick it up along the side of the road or anywhere in the forest.

Over the years the hon. gentleman has put forward a very solid argument with which I disagree. He says that even with our present technology, forest fires will continue to be a threat which will, indeed, continue to get worse. In New Brunswick, in 1957 and 1958 they used DDT without much control. They then used fenitrothion and Matricil. We progressed up the line until the Canadian Forestry Service discovered BT in the Quebec region. Until that was used, I cannot see where there was any great effect in getting rid of the spruce budworm or any other forest insects. They are still there.

The Government of Canada and the provincial governments say they were only trying to control the population. Still, the forests were dying, the trees were drying up, and forest fires were starting very, very quickly. I am not talking about a shell from Armed Forces Base Gagetown. I am talking about a potential shell right around the forests in New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Quebec, and the northern part of Ontario where the infestation of forest insects is a very serious problem.

I have told you approximately what the hon. gentleman is about to say, Mr. Speaker. I believe that he will put forward a very strong argument on a very sensible subject which is well

founded in fact, but I strongly disagree with his logic, and I believe that there are other solutions.

The Government of Canada has been lax throughout the years in that it did not pay enough attention to finding a solution to chemical insecticides. The Member for Carleton—Charlotte will have to agree that we do not permit anyone to spray large forest lands with an amount of chemical insecticide sufficient to kill the forest insects. They were never killed and they will not be killed in Newfoundland this year through the use of fenitrothion. They will not be killed in New Brunswick by using whatever they are about to use. I look forward to hearing the Hon. Member for Carleton—Charlotte put forward his argument, which will perhaps be one of the better arguments put forward here this evening.

**Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton—Charlotte):** Mr. Speaker, I suppose that is the price you pay for associating with people whom you might otherwise call friends. I do consider the Member for Gander—Twillingae (Mr. Baker) to be a constructive Member of this House most of the time. I have enjoyed his remarks and his predictions are, in part, correct. I will address them from the beginning.

At no time has the Government of Canada ever devoted the necessary research to the preservation of the forest structures of Canada. That is because we assumed that we had enough wood that we could waste it, burn it, and pillage it in our silviculture practices. Our supply problem was never recognized in New Brunswick until some time in the last 15 years. We have known that our cut has exceeded the growth in the forests of New Brunswick. Even though we have established a level of allowable cuts, we have still exceeded the growth of our forests in the province. We must put that against a background in which we never even approached the production of the forests of New Brunswick as long as the budworm did not exist in a serious way, although it has always existed. As long as that forest was effectively sprayed, we still had growth exceeding the cut. It was effectively sprayed in the 1950s.

I am not saying that we should go back to DDT. I am saying that when all the scientists in Canada get together and give a convincing argument that BT will never mutate and never attack anything except spruce budworm, I will be much more prone to the use of BT than I am now.

I happen to have a sick grandson in the hospital at the moment. He has an infection which has developed an immunity to the drug which was being used. He has been seriously ill. The only way that that could happen is because of a mutation of the virus present in his little system today. There must have been an element of mutation, an adjustment to the environment in which it has thrived, namely the human body, so that it resists whatever drug was used to fight it. There is ample proof that those little critters which infect the health of birds, animals or insects do indeed have a mutative capability to develop an opportunity to survive in the presence of pesticides. It has happened in agriculture so many times that one could make an endless list. When the scientists of Canada promise