

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

Motion 1

Mr. Wetmore, pursuant to notice of Motion 1, moved, seconded by **Mr. Northrup**, as follows:

WHEREAS there is considerable public concern regarding glyphosate spraying in New Brunswick;

WHEREAS there is conflicting public and scientific information as to the use of glyphosate in our forestry sector:

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the Legislative Assembly urge the government to immediately form a working group on glyphosate, comprised of the Departments of Health, Public Safety, Environment, and Energy and Resource Development with stakeholders from outside of government, that would provide a report to the Legislative Assembly with recommendations for government, within nine months;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Legislative Assembly urge the government to suspend the spraying of glyphosate on New Brunswick Crown lands until such time as the working group has tabled their report and recommendations have been submitted to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick.

(**Mr. Speaker**, having read the motion, put the question, and the following debate ensued.)

Debate on Motion

Mr. Wetmore: When I was starting to put my thoughts and words together, what came to mind for me was a song by Bob Dylan, *The Times They Are A-Changin'*. Certainly, everybody knows of the Nobel Prize winner for literature, Bob Dylan. Certainly, “the times they are a-changin’”.

051

14:35

When I think back to my younger days in the fifties, I remember growing up in the town of Oromocto. During the fifties, what would happen is that the army would come along and spray for mosquitos. In those days, it would be in the back of probably a pickup truck or a jeep, and they would go all around the PMQs. Those were the permanent married quarters where the married personnel lived. At that time, when they were going around spraying, every kid on the block would run behind the spray. We called it the fog machine. At that time, everybody did it. We, as children, did not know any different. Our parents did not know any different. That is how things were in the fifties. Again, I say: “the times they are a-changin’”. The fifties . . . They stopped doing that, and we realized that it was not the right thing to do.

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

Then we come to the sixties, and we have the spraying of Agent Orange. Again, I was in Oromocto and can remember Agent Orange being sprayed. I can remember going down Route 7, and we would see a swath where Agent Orange had been spread. Everybody said: You know, there is nothing the matter with that. We found out that there certainly was something the matter with Agent Orange. People in and around the Oromocto area certainly suffered from it. Again, “the times they are a-changin’”. We realized that Agent Orange is not a spray that we should have been doing, but, again, at that time, we knew no better. I go to the seventies. In the seventies, we had spraying for the budworm. For probably 25 years, we sprayed DDT in the forests, and we thought that was great. Then we found out, and we certainly know . . . Again, I say: “the times they are a-changin’”.

As we become more educated, we realize what we are doing to the environment and our health. I grew up in Oromocto, and I can tell you that the cancer rates, I believe, in Oromocto and the surrounding area are probably higher than the provincial average. I can remember my father coming home from the training area, and these guys would be covered in spray and were told that there was nothing wrong with it. My father was very athletic. He was a nonsmoker and a nondrinker and exercised all his life. He was probably one of the fittest soldiers that you would have ever seen, but he passed away of cancer at the age of 67. Certainly, the older I get, the younger 67 sounds. A neighbour of mine, whom I have known all my life and is the very same age as me, is battling cancer. All the people who grew up in and around Oromocto . . . We arrived in Oromocto when the base was started, and a lot of us are living in and around that area now.

Certainly, “the times they are a-changin’”, and we are learning. We are learning so much more, and we have a much heavier responsibility nowadays because we cannot blame it on not being educated. We certainly know what is going on.

What I would like to do is to go over the motion. The first paragraph says:

there is considerable public concern regarding

I am going to try to pronounce it correctly.

glyphosate

Now, if it is as dangerous as it is hard to say, then we certainly know that we have a problem.

052

14:40

We have received an awful lot of calls in regard to glyphosate. The member for Fredericton South has presented probably close to 35 000 names in a petition. In the riding of Gagetown-

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

Petitcodiac, I have received a number of calls and e-mails and have had people come to my office to ask what our position is on glyphosate. They do not know a lot about it.

I will be very truthful with you. I do not pretend to know a lot about it. What I do know is that when constituents of mine bring their concerns forward, it is my job to make sure that their concerns are heard in the House. That is why I am here today. It is to bring the concerns of not only my constituents of Gagetown-Petitcodiac, but also, I believe, the concerns of a lot of constituents from around the province. The member for Fredericton South presented 34 000 names, so it certainly is an issue.

If we go on to the second paragraph, we read:

Whereas there is conflicting public and scientific information as to the use of glyphosate in our forestry sector

Everybody seems to have an opinion, and it is very, very hard to get a general consensus. That is another reason that this motion was brought forward. I wanted to bring this motion forward because if you talk to six different people, there are six different opinions. I feel that it is time that we took the opportunity to sit down and have a discussion to find out the concerns that the people of New Brunswick have about glyphosate and what we can do and what we cannot do to try to fix this problem.

I am a firm believer that if people want to solve a problem, it can be solved. If they do not want to solve the problem, it will never be solved. I am asking the Legislative Assembly to “form a working group on glyphosate, comprised of the Departments of Health, Public Safety and Environment, and Energy and Resource Development”. It should include not only government, because we want to have outside stakeholders. What I am asking for is outside stakeholders. We should have a broad spectrum of outside stakeholders. This group should include industry and conservationists. I believe we should also have people who are involved with the forestry and agriculture sectors. I believe that we truly need a cross-section.

I know that over the years, we have run into some issues. The government decided that it wanted to fire Dr. Cleary. We do know that Dr. Cleary was working on the glyphosate file. We have no idea what it is. When that happens, what does happen is that we start to hear speculation from people. You are hearing that she lost her job because the report was going to come out against the spraying.

I believe that we should get to the bottom of this and find out exactly what is going on. I foresee a broadband group. The people who are going to be on this working group have to be people who have an open mind and are willing to come up with a solution. I do not know what the solution is. That is what I feel this group should do.

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

053

14:45

I have also said that I would like to have the group come back with a report within nine months. Anybody who knows me knows that when I do something, I like to have a date on it. I do not like to leave it open-ended. My concern is that if I do not say a period of time, this would be thrown into never-ever land and not be completed. I truly believe that we can come up with a good, concise report in a very, very short period of time. Nine months is not a short period of time, but when we talk about government, it is probably relatively quick. That is why I am hoping for nine months.

We have asked that there be no spraying on Crown land while the working group is working on this report. We have asked that the report, with the group's recommendations, be tabled with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick.

If we look at that timeline, and if the government supports our motion, the report would probably be coming back around the end of August or so. That will be in the midst of an election, but that report can still be given to the Clerk. The Clerk can keep it until the next government is formed, and he can present that report to the next government.

I can assure you that if it is a Progressive Conservative government, we will read the report and act on it. I am hoping that we would have a free vote on it. That would give every member of the Legislative Assembly an opportunity to get up, debate it, and vote their conscience. That is my hope, and that is why I brought this motion forward.

We have heard on occasion, depending on whom we listen to and what party we listen to, that this is just political grandstanding. I truly do not believe that it is. I say that for a number of reasons. The history of the Progressive Conservative Party of New Brunswick has a strong, rich history in supporting the environment.

I am just going to go back to October 20, 1970. Richard Hatfield was the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of New Brunswick in that day. He wrote to Kenneth Langmaid. Kenneth was a soil scientist at the University of New Brunswick in Fredericton at the time. He was the founding President of the Conservation Council of New Brunswick. Mr. Hatfield wrote a letter to Mr. Langmaid and assured him that if the Progressive Conservatives won that month's provincial election, they would work to preserve New Brunswick's natural environment for the benefit of the people and of the economy and would implement a comprehensive pollution control program. That was back in 1970.

At that time, Mr. Hatfield was acknowledging a letter that Mr. Langmaid had sent out to the leaders of the three major parties in the province. He asked each of them to take a stand on

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

certain environmental issues. The letter to Mr. Hatfield said: so that the voters may choose wisely.

We know that at that time, probably a week later, the Progressive Conservatives, under Mr. Hatfield, defeated the Robichaud government. During Premier Hatfield's first term as Premier, his government passed the most comprehensive environmental legislation ever enacted in New Brunswick up until that time, and the Premier created an environmental division within the Department of Fisheries. In 1975, he set up the first Department of the Environment.

054

14:50

There is no doubt about it. When we look at what our government stands for, we see that we do stand for the environment. There is no doubt about it. Over the time that you go down a path and you go back and forth, back and forth . . . We are responding to the concerns of New Brunswick, and that is what we are doing today. We are responding to the concerns of New Brunswickers. Every legislator here in this House has a responsibility to bring forward any concerns that New Brunswickers may have. That is what we are doing on this side of the House. We are bringing concerns forward. We have heard from industry, and we have heard from conservationists. What we are saying is this, and what we are asking the government is this: Look, let's get a committee together so that we can bring forward some good and proper recommendations to the House where we can debate them properly.

It would be a win-win for all New Brunswickers, and that is what we want. We want people who want to go hunting and fishing and to use the forests for recreational matters. We want them to do that. However, we also know that in New Brunswick, forestry is a big part of our economic driver, so we have to find a way for all groups to work together. I believe that there is a way for all groups to work together. We have managed to do it, probably, for 300 or 400 years. New Brunswick has always been a forestry province. At one time, it was supplying masts for the ships that sailed all over. After that ended, we were doing square timber. We can work, and we can live together side by side—conservationists and industrialists. That is if we want to. On this side of the House, we want to find a way that all groups will work together.

I am urging my colleagues on the other side of the House to have a look at this motion and to support it. Thank you very much.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Members, we have a request to return to Introduction of Guests. Do we have unanimous consent?

Hon. Members: Agreed.

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

Introduction of Guests

Hon. Mr. Horsman: It gives me great pleasure to introduce two young ladies who are visiting from Okotoks, Alberta. I would ask for Bambi Bradley to stand. Bambi Bradley grew up in Oromocto. She was very active in sports, growing up with three older brothers to help her out. She continued her sporting career at Oromocto High School, where she received Athlete of the Year. She continued her education at St. Thomas University, following her older brother. She received her Bachelor of Arts and her Bachelor of Education, as well as many sporting awards at the St. Thomas University, including Athlete of the Year four times. She graduated and went with her teaching degree to Norway House, Manitoba, and then to Driftpile, Alberta, helping First Nations communities and children. I am very proud of her. She then continued on to Okotoks, Alberta, where she now resides with her three children and her husband. She is now retired.

She is joined by her friend Lori Moulton, also a girl from Oromocto. Her married name is Lori Boyle. We all grew up together at the PMQs at Oromocto. The member opposite was talking about the spraying, and many times, we did follow along the mosquito truck, as we called it.

I am very proud that she has taken the time to come visit us, and I am very proud to tell you that she is my sister. Welcome to the House.

055

14:55

Debate on Motion 1

Hon. Mr. Rousselle: I am pleased to rise in the House today to speak on the debate on Motion 1. It is important for our government to understand what matters most to New Brunswickers. We know the importance of creating jobs, growing the economy, and securing and enhancing health care and education. We are working hard on these priorities, and with the support of New Brunswickers, we are seeing positive change, as I have explained before, and we are getting things done.

Notre gouvernement sait aussi que les meilleures décisions s'appuient sur les faits et les renseignements scientifiques. Nous comprenons que l'utilisation d'herbicide à base de glyphosate préoccupe les gens du Nouveau-Brunswick. Nous comprenons aussi l'importance de protéger notre approvisionnement en eau potable, nos ressources naturelles, nos activités forestières et nos industries agricoles. Nous savons aussi que les gens du Nouveau-Brunswick tiennent à la protection de l'environnement pour les générations à venir.

The Department of Environment and Local Government closely monitors what current science is telling us about pesticide products, including glyphosate, and their associated use.

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

C'est ce que font les gouvernements responsables. Nous nous tournons vers la science et nous faisons confiance à l'expertise d'éminents scientifiques. Nous ne nous en remettons pas à une seule étude; nous considérons l'ensemble plus vaste des conclusions scientifiques.

Santé Canada est l'organisme responsable de l'homologation des pesticides au Canada. Les produits sont seulement homologués pour utilisation au Canada après avoir subi une évaluation complète de leur sécurité, mérite et valeur. Santé Canada estime que tout produit homologué est sécuritaire, à la fois pour l'environnement et pour la santé, lorsqu'il est utilisé selon les instructions indiquées.

De plus, tous les produits homologués doivent être réévalués sur une base cyclique par Santé Canada afin de veiller à ce qu'ils continuent de répondre aux normes modernes de sécurité pour l'environnement et pour la santé.

In 2017, after an extensive reexamination of glyphosate, Health Canada determined that products containing glyphosate do not present an unacceptable risk to human health or to the environment when used according to the revised label directions.

Il importe de se rappeler que seuls les produits homologués pour utilisation au Canada peuvent être utilisés au Nouveau-Brunswick. Comme vous pouvez le savoir, un rapport publié en 2015 par le Centre international de recherche sur le cancer a classé le glyphosate comme étant probablement cancérigène pour les humains. Toutefois, ce même Centre international de recherche sur le cancer n'a pas tenu compte du niveau d'exposition humaine qui détermine le risque. Donc, à la suite de ce rapport, une réunion conjointe sur les résidus de pesticides de l'Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture et de l'Organisation mondiale de la Santé, en 2016, a conclu qu'il est peu probable que l'exposition au glyphosate par les aliments cause le cancer chez les humains.

Also in 2016, the New Brunswick Department of Health released its report on glyphosate use and found no increased risk for New Brunswickers who are exposed to glyphosate.

De plus, le ministère de l'Environnement et des Gouvernements locaux prévoit des mesures supplémentaires de sécurité et de protection de l'environnement en exigeant des certificats d'applicateur et de délivrance de permis. Le permis est assorti de conditions visant à protéger l'environnement, y compris des marges de retrait par rapport aux zones écologiquement sensibles, des vitesses maximales du vent pour l'application et la nécessité d'avis publics.

Les marges de retrait sont plus strictes que celles prévues dans le décret de désignation du secteur protégé de bassin hydrographique.

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

I will repeat this in English. The setbacks outlined in the permits are more stringent than those contained in the Watershed Protected Area Designation Order.

056

15:00

De plus, les unités d'épandage aériennes sont pleinement calibrées et munies de matériel d'épandage spécialisé, ainsi que de systèmes de guidage GPS.

Comme vous pouvez le constater, notre gouvernement a non seulement exercé une diligence raisonnable pour veiller à ce que le produit soit utilisé conformément aux lignes directrices mais nous avons aussi mis en place des mesures additionnelles pour une assurance supplémentaire.

Il incombe à notre gouvernement de prendre des décisions avisées au nom de tous les gens du Nouveau-Brunswick. Quand il s'agit de glyphosate, nous devons nous en remettre à ce que nous dit la science. Or, la science nous dit que le produit peut être utilisé de façon sécuritaire lorsque son utilisation se conforme aux lignes directrices de Santé Canada.

Voici des faits. J'ai parlé plus tôt de faits liés au glyphosate et à la science. Parlons maintenant des faits liés au Nouveau-Brunswick.

Forestry makes up about \$1.5 billion of our province's economic output each year.

Tous les utilisateurs industriels des produits chimiques en question au Nouveau-Brunswick doivent respecter les exigences de marge de retrait afin de prévenir des zones tampons sans pesticide entre les superficies traitées et les autres utilisations des terres. Là encore, les utilisateurs industriels peuvent seulement utiliser des pesticides homologués.

Un très faible pourcentage des terres de la Couronne subit en fait un épandage annuel. À peine 1,5 % des forêts de la Couronne font l'objet d'une récolte annuelle au Nouveau-Brunswick.

I am repeating this. Only about 1.5% of Crown forest is harvested each year.

Alors que la plus grande partie des superficies récoltées dans nos forêts ne nécessitent aucune application de pesticide, moins d'un quart des emplacements récoltés compte des arbres qui exigent une gestion de la végétation concurrente tôt dans leur cycle de croissance, de sorte que, en fait, 0,3 % des forêts de la Couronne font l'objet chaque année d'une application de pesticide.

I will repeat this. On fact, only 0.3% of Crown forest lands receive herbicide applications each year.

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

Donc, je le répète : Ce sont seulement 0,3 % des terres de la Couronne, et ce, conformément aux marges de retrait et aux lignes directrices de Santé Canada. Le pourcentage vaut pour tous les pesticides et non pas seulement pour le glyphosate.

Cependant, nous comprenons que des gens du Nouveau-Brunswick sont préoccupés par le glyphosate.

However, we do understand that New Brunswickers are concerned, even fearful of glyphosate.

Cela étant dit, je ne peux pas appuyer la motion 1, telle que présentée. J'aimerais suggérer que la motion soit amendée comme suit :

Amendement proposé

L'hon. M. Rousselle, appuyé par **l'hon. M. Doucet**, propose que la motion 1 soit amendée comme suit :

dans le premier paragraphe de la résolution, par la suppression de tout le passage après le mot « exhorte » et son remplacement par ce qui suit :

« le Bureau du médecin-hygiéniste en chef à déposer auprès du greffier de l'Assemblée législative le rapport intitulé Résultats du plan d'action du BMHC en matière de glyphosate et à faire le point sur le rapport dans l'année qui suit son dépôt auprès du greffier de l'Assemblée législative » ;

par la suppression du deuxième paragraphe de la résolution, et son remplacement par ce qui suit :

« que l'Assemblée législative exhorte le gouvernement à continuer de surveiller l'ajout de toute information fournie par Santé Canada et le Bureau du médecin-hygiéniste en chef du Nouveau-Brunswick relativement à l'utilisation du glyphosate, dès que l'information devient disponible,

et que, si le médecin-hygiéniste en chef ou Santé Canada avise ultérieurement que l'épandage du glyphosate représente un risque accru pour la santé humaine, la province suspende immédiatement l'épandage de glyphosate sur les terres de la Couronne. »

057

15:05

(Le vice-président donne lecture de l'amendement proposé et propose la question; il s'élève un débat.)

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

Debate on Proposed Amendment

Mr. Northrup: I must say that I am tremendously, tremendously disappointed in this Minister of Environment. He is usually a man who, if he is given 40 minutes to talk, will talk for 40 minutes. If he is given 15 minutes to talk, he will usually talk for 15 minutes. However, he is just trying to slough this through this Legislature. That is why we on this side are not going to allow that. We are not going to allow it. We are very disappointed in the amendment that the minister put in place. It has no concrete information at all. I applaud my colleague, the MLA for Gagetown-Petitcodiac, and the hours and hours that he put into the motion to bring it to the floor.

Obviously, this is very, very, very important to this side of the House because it is the first motion that we put in on opposition day, on Thursday afternoon at 2:30 p.m. It is very, very important, not only to us but also to the people of New Brunswick.

I noticed that the Minister of Environment stated in two previous statements that he is a man of facts. That is exactly the point of the member for Gagetown-Petitcodiac bringing this motion up. That is exactly why the member for Fredericton-Grand Lake has participated in this debate with us. She has brought her concerns. She is one of the best MLAs that we have in this province, compared to what the member for Fredericton North said yesterday. I am very, very disappointed in the member for Fredericton North and what he said against our hardworking MLA that we have in Fredericton-Grand Lake.

058

15:10

There is a difference between rural MLAs and urban MLAs. Urban MLAs are not out in the rural areas as much as we are. We are very dedicated to our ridings and very dedicated to listening to the people. That is what we do on this side. I think the member for Fredericton North should apologize to our MLA on this side. He had better watch what he is saying. He had better watch in his own backyard because we have blue sneakers lined up to run against him. I was very disappointed in his remarks yesterday because we have a very hardworking MLA in Fredericton-Grand Lake. The member should be ashamed of himself.

Getting back to the motion, I really want to emphasize what our member for Gagetown-Petitcodiac has brought to the floor. As I emphasized, it is the first motion we have brought here, so we realize how important it is. I think this is the big line in this motion, and I am going to read it twice:

WHEREAS there is conflicting public and scientific information as to the use of glyphosate in our forestry sector;

I want to read that again so that everybody understands it, on both sides of the House.

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

WHEREAS there is conflicting public and scientific information as to the use of glyphosate in our forestry sector;

That is exactly what we are doing here. We have two sides to the story. We have one side of the story on the left and one side of the story on the right. What we want to do as an opposition, and what we should be doing as MLAs, is to bring that together and form a common theme at the end of the day. That is what we are doing here. We are not here to fearmonger. We want the facts at the end of the day. That is why I am so disappointed in the Minister of Environment bringing this up. It is going to be really interesting to hear what the member for Fundy-The Isles, who is Minister of Natural Resources—what I call Natural Resources, what used to be Natural Resources—is going to say about this. Hopefully, he will agree with this, because we can put this motion to bed right now. The government that is in power right now could say: This is a good idea. Let's work together on both sides of the House. Let's sit down.

I am not an expert in this; I will be the first to admit it, and I am sure a lot of the MLAs in this room would say: I am not an expert in this. However, we do have experts out there, whether it is in the Department of Health, whether it is the private woodlot operators who are in the field day in and day out, or whether it is industry people. Let's get them all together. That is the main thing about this motion—to get everybody together.

I can say that I applaud the MLA for Gagetown-Petitcodiac because he has put a lot of work into this. I have information here—tons and tons of information that I have read—and it has taken me hours and hours to go through this, but I do not have the answers to this. I will be the first to admit it. I do not have the answer to this situation. I was really hoping that we would not even have to go through the two hours here today. I was really hoping that the government would say: Yes, this is a good idea. Let's work together for the betterment of the people of New Brunswick—all 750 000 of them. It is a situation where we have received e-mails, we have received calls, and it has really come to be an issue. Like I say, I applaud my colleague for bringing it to the floor of the House to debate.

If we look at the Chief Medical Officer of Health, she was basically fired by the other side, by the present government. If I could read some of the things that she had said, she knew—and probably still knows, as of today—that there is more to know on glyphosate than anybody in this room knows. That is right from the words and mouth of the Chief . . . I should say former Chief Medical Officer of Health.

Cleary said there's not a good enough understanding of chemicals, such as glyphosate, in public health.

"Glyphosate is one of the pesticides that is used extensively, and I think the more we know about it the better," said Cleary.

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

I agree with her one hundred percent. The more we can find out about this, the better. The Minister of Environment gets up and says that he knows everything about it. Well, I disagree with him. I disagree with him wholeheartedly.

059

15:15

The report goes on to say:

She added that all the studies she worked on during her time with the province were collaborative within the department.

.....

“When a person who is looking long term and the health of people in the long term . . . it may be perceived as going against the grain,” said Cleary.

Those are her exact words, before she was put out to pasture.

There are facts here . . . I could stand here until midnight going through the facts that are for the spraying and the facts that are against the spraying. That is why we are here today. It is to form a committee of the experts in this. You do not hire a baseball coach to coach a hockey team. You just do not do that.

There are different studies and different panels. There is information about an outfit that I have read through. Part of its company name is Monsanto. Part of Monsanto’s defense of glyphosate hinges on the United States Environmental Protection Agency’s decision that the chemical is not likely to be carcinogenic to humans. That was issued in 2016. That is kind of the left side of the story.

Then we have other studies that say, yes, it is harmful to humans. We cannot go on hearsay. We have to go on facts. If you want to drive a car, you have to drive the car, and it takes a while to become a good driver. It is going to take a while before we can come to this. The government could start the study today or tomorrow, form the committee, and the report could be ready in nine months. It is as plain and simple as that. KISS—keep it simple, stupid. That is what we should do here.

If the members on other side could do that, I would personally work with them. I have worked with the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure on a couple of issues. I have worked with the Minister of Environment and Local Government on different issues. When we were on the other side, I made time for the opposition. I sat down with them. Unfortunately, that has not worked here in the past couple of years.

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

I want to bring up the situation involving Erin Brockovich who, today, is with Moms Across America. The organization released glyphosate test results revealing that all five popular orange juice brands tested positive for glyphosate weed killer. The Moms Across America founder, Zen Honeycutt, stated:

The discovery of glyphosate residue in orange juice is unacceptable, especially since a branch of the World Health Organization designated glyphosate a probable carcinogen, two years ago, back in the spring of 2015. The EPA has had ample time to revoke the license of this chemical and restrict its use in our food and beverage crops.

That is saying that the orange juice that all of us here have probably had to drink . . . In fact, I am drinking orange juice right now. Is that harmful to my health? Well, I am drinking it, and I do not feel that it is harmful to my health, but it is glyphosate that is used by farmers on a day in, day out basis. The farmers do not seem to be part of this conversation. It is all about the forestry.

I am sure that all of us here have eaten an ear of corn or eaten pumpkins or potatoes. They are all sprayed. If I were a betting man, I would say that all of us have eaten potatoes and all of us have eaten corn. If I were a betting man, I would say that 99.99% of those were sprayed by glyphosate. There is no doubt in my mind that this has taken place.

That is the right wing part of it. I have explained both sides—the left wing part of it and the right wing part of it. I think I have explained it well, but at the end of the day, we need to know the facts. There are no experts in here. There are no experts around here at all.

060

15:20

We need to form a committee. As the presenter, the member for Gagetown-Petitcodiac, said, New Brunswick should “immediately form a working group . . . comprised of the Departments of Health, Public Safety and Environment, and Energy and Resource Development with stakeholders from outside of government”. That is exactly what we want to do, and this government can do it tomorrow. It can do it this afternoon. The government members could end this motion here today, and we could start on Motion 2. However, I cannot emphasize how important this Motion 1 is to us.

There are always two sides to every story. We want to bring everybody together. We want to have an intelligent conversation under one roof and then to bring it back to the Clerk to deliver it to the government of the day. That is all we are asking. We are trying to keep this simple. I do not think that it is something that we can do. I would be more than willing to work with the other side. I would be more than willing to work with the member for Fundy-The Isles-Saint John West. We have worked together on a couple of other things. We have been here a long time. I would be really willing to work on this and to bring it where we want to bring it. We would get

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

all the facts together and form a committee. Even the private woodlot operators and industry—I think that both of them should be part of this because they are in it day in, day out. My understanding—and I could be wrong in this—is that there are seven boards in New Brunswick. Some of them use this, and some of them do not use it. That would be a clear example of going to these boards and saying: How come this board is using it, and how come this board is not?

Just to wrap up, we need to work together. We need to work with the third party—and I have no problem working with the third party—to bring this to an end. Let's form a committee and have a look to see where we are going to go from Step 1 to Step 2. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Members, we have another request to revert to Introduction of Guests. Can we have unanimous consent?

Hon. Members: Agreed.

Introduction of Guests

Mr. B. Macdonald: It is a pleasure to welcome two gentlemen to the gallery today. I would like them to stand as I give their names. First of all, we have Jake Stackhouse. Jake is a resident of the riding of Portland-Simonds. He is the President of the New Brunswick Young Progressive Conservatives association. He is studying political science and economics at UNBSJ.

Joining Jake today is Andrew Bradley. Andrew is the New Brunswick Young Progressive Conservatives Treasurer. He is from Quispamsis, and he graduated from the Atlantic college with a diploma in recording arts. I would like to ask all members of the Legislature to help me welcome these two young gentlemen to the floor of the Legislature.

Debate on Motion 1

Hon. Mr. Doucet: It is certainly a pleasure to stand up today and participate in this Motion 1 that has been brought forward by the official opposition. A lot of these things are about timing—the timing about when to do something, the timing of when to think something out, and the timing of when it is right to make a motion on the floor. I have to tell you something. The news that we received out of Washington today is very disappointing. We just received this news today, and we are analyzing it. It has to do with our softwood lumber case, and this is right across Canada. It has quite an impact. I think that the opposition's timing on this is very poor, especially when we are talking about a huge pillar industry in the province.

Do we ever talk about the men and women who have boots on the ground in this industry? There are some 22 000 people who work in the industry, and we have 25 softwood mills, 4 pulp mills, and 2 paper mills. They are doing a heck of a job in our sector. We have men and women who

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

are in the industry. They are a part of our economic development. I heard the mention about being on the ground in rural communities, but this is particularly for rural communities. It is good business for rural communities.

061

15:25

Day in, day out, they put food on the tables of New Brunswickers. They put food on the table for their children. They pack lunches for their children. They pack lunches for their families. They also pay good taxes, and they are good contributors to our economy. They help pay for our priorities, which are education and health care.

We have some strife in the industry right now, but we do not want to talk about that. We do not want to get into that discussion whatsoever. It is not only the people in the industry, but we also have a tremendous supply chain. There are mills in general that use primary products coming directly from the forest, and there are more mills that depend on those primary users and that use secondary products coming from these mills. We have tissue plants, pellet plants . . .

(Interjections.)

Hon. Mr. Doucet: Diapers. That is so appropriate coming from the opposition.

What we have going on here is a tremendous economy, yet we are not talking about that. We have some very serious strife going on in the industry today, as we are trying to grapple with the impacts of what is taking place with the news out of Washington.

I heard the member opposite today. I have some great respect for him. He is not a great hockey player, but that is okay. He was talking about concrete facts, and I think that we need to have concrete facts. What I do not understand is why this was not really overly important as a subject. It is a subject that has been around with government after government for many years. Why was this not important when they were in government? Why was this not important when the member who talked a few moments ago was a minister? Why did he not take hold of it at that time? Here is a case when, as government, you did absolutely nothing at the time. I really am keen to know what he has to say about bringing people together. Let's bring people together. The opportunity is now. The opportunity is new, and we have to grab hold of something. This is what it is. You cannot have your cake and eat it too. You cannot be saying one thing back then and then say something different today.

We have also heard from people who have expressed concerns about the safety of the product that we are talking about. This is a product that is found in most hardware stores, and, as with many other products in the world today, when it is used properly, it poses no risk to your health. As you know, the government of New Brunswick continues to rely on the evaluation of experts

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

when it comes to using products like glyphosate. Those experts are not using Google. They are not doing a Google search. I think it is really important that the public gets the facts about the use of glyphosate in New Brunswick. We, as an authority, think it is important to review those facts. It is important for the Chief Medical Officer of Health, who we trust, to get those facts. The Office of the Chief Medical Officer of Health is an organization that has the ability, experience, and knowledge to look at this issue thoroughly.

We know there are a lot of misconceptions out there. There are people who think that one quarter of New Brunswick's forests are being cut every single year, and that is wrong. There are even people who think that the amount of forest being cut is bigger than that. There are people who think that more than 1 million hectares per year are being cut. That is wrong, and it is wrong to put that out there. There are people who think that the same huge area is treated each year, every single year, and that is wrong. There are people who think that spraying is done over water sources on a windy day, and that is wrong. For whatever reason, they are not aware of the facts about our forest sector, and they do not know about the processes that are being followed. They do not know about the setbacks that prevent aerial spraying near water sources or about the high-tech machinery that turns the applicators off when an aircraft leaves the designated spray area.

We are giving people the real facts. That is important. We have to get the real facts out there. I can tell you right now, unequivocally, that 1.5% of our forest is harvested in a given year. Does anybody realize that? Some 1.5% of our forest is harvested every year. I can tell you that more than three quarters of the area harvested each year does actually grow back on its own and does not receive any treatment of herbicides.

062

15:20

I can also tell you that of the area of harvest each year, a small portion—less than one quarter of that harvested area, in fact—is planted with trees that originate from a variety of seed sources throughout New Brunswick and trees that are well suited to the areas where they are planted. I can tell you that only these planted areas in less than a quarter of the harvested areas . . . Now, we are talking about less than one half of 1% of the forest is treated responsibly and according to label and permit requirements each year. These treatments ensure the seedlings that we put into the ground, the seedlings that occupy a small portion of the land base and also the seedlings that play a very important and key role in our forest of the future, indeed, survive. I can tell you that the government of New Brunswick relies on the expert evaluation and the decisions from Health Canada to make decisions based on facts and scientific data. They seek out credible authorities and real evidence.

We know there are people out there with very strong views. We know there are people with views that are not supported by credible scientists, by the experts in the field. I can tell you that the federal and provincial governments work in partnership to ensure a safe and responsible

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

herbicide application. I can tell you why I think more people are so disengaged. I could point fingers. I could blame the past government, or I could look to see how we can work to address the concerns that people are expressing.

We know that forestry is an important industry, along with fishing and farming. It is a keystone of our traditional economy, part of the backbone of our province. We are always looking at ways of creating jobs and growing the economy. Just as essential is working to ensure that we do not make knee-jerk decisions that affect the jobs that we already have and the economic activity that is taking place that supports services that we have in health care and education.

I want to repeat this. I know that our fellow members in this Chamber know the statistics. About 22 000 people are employed in the forestry industry and connected sectors. It is estimated that there is about \$1.4 billion or \$1.5 billion in contributions to our New Brunswick economy. Those are tens of thousands of New Brunswickers making a living, paying a mortgage, keeping the heat on, and putting food in the kids' lunch boxes. What we really need here is someone whom we all trust to review the facts, the evidence, and to talk to the experts. That is what we are looking for. I think we share that. We are doing that today with the amendments that we offered.

We know that the Office of the Chief Medical Officer of Health offers an important approach to all these matters, and we hope that if the office needs to, it will approach outside experts who have the necessary experience to provide more insight into the products and practices that are being employed here. I hope that all members of the Legislature can come together to support the amended motion. We know that the best decisions are made, based on scientific facts. Let's make sure that it is grounded in good, solid science. Here we have glyphosate, one of the herbicides most used in the world. Because of that, it is one of the most studied. When it comes to our use of glyphosate, we rely on our partners to provide us with the best information that they have, whether they be experts from Health Canada or the experts from the Department of Environment and Local Government. We are monitoring the science around pesticide products and their associated uses.

I have to echo something that my colleague the Minister of Environment and Local Government said earlier. What he said really gets to the crux of it. He said: This is what responsible governments do. We look to the science and we trust leading scientists for their expertise. We do not rely on just one study. We look at the fuller picture of scientific conclusions.

Remember this: We look at science. Let's make sure that it is grounded in good science. We have to trust the leading experts and the scientists. We do not rely on just one study alone. We look at the full picture, and that full picture is not a Google search. Is that what we are all trying to do every day? Is that not what we are telling our children to do? We tell them not to react to a single piece of information or a single event. We encourage them to look at the broader view to understand how that one piece of information will fit into the bigger picture. Is it true that in

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

2015, a report issued by the Internal Agency for Research on Cancer, IARC, classified glyphosate as probably carcinogenic to human? There are a lot of everyday things on that list. We treat those appropriately, or in moderation, or according to the recommendations.

063

15:35

Now, let's look at the whole picture. The IRAC classification does not take into account the level of human exposure which determines risk. Then, in 2016, the year after the release of the IRAC report, there was a joint meeting on pesticide residues between the food and agriculture organizations of the United Nations and the World Health Organization. At that meeting, it was concluded that "glyphosate is unlikely to possess a carcinogenic risk to humans from exposure through the diet".

Remember, we are talking about glyphosate. It is among the most studied herbicides in the world. It is among the most commonly used herbicides in the world. Also in 2016, the Office of the Chief Medical Officer of Health of New Brunswick completed its report stating that the application of glyphosate at recommended levels presents "no discernible increased risk to human health". Glyphosate is not just used in the forest. It is also used on the farm. I was amazed that the motion that was brought forward did not mention one thing about the agriculture sector.

Scientific evaluations have been conducted to determine whether glyphosate causes any negative effects to people, animals, birds, insects, or plants, as well as soil and water, when used according to label directions. To this end, Health Canada has concluded that, when used according to the label's instructions, products containing glyphosates are not expected to pose risks or to be of concern to human health or the environment.

Glyphosate also undergoes routine reevaluation by Health Canada. We are looking at that right now. How do we reevaluate it? The reevaluation decision was announced on April 28, 2017. The reevaluation concluded that "products containing glyphosate do not present unacceptable risks to human health or the environment when used according to the . . . label directions."

In fact, among highlights of this study, Health Canada noted that:

- *Glyphosate is . . . unlikely to pose a human cancer risk.*
- *Dietary (food and drinking water) exposure associated with the use of glyphosate is not expected to pose a risk of concern to human health.*
- *Occupational and residential risks associated with the use of glyphosate are not of concern, provided that updated label instructions are followed.*

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

As a requirement for the continued registration of glyphosate, Health Canada requires that new risk reduction measures for the end-use products have to be included on the product label. These label changes must be made before April 2019. That is to ensure proper use.

As you know, the application of herbicides, like those mixed using glyphosates, that are applied on Crown forests is highly regulated to ensure proper use. We ensure their proper use in the Crown forests only, and only qualified individuals who have met training and certification requirements are permitted to handle any herbicide products. Additionally, New Brunswick regulates herbicide storage, use, and disposal to further ensure that herbicides are used very responsibly. Herbicides are applied to a very small portion of the cutover forest land each year. Again, about 1.5% of the Crown forest is harvested each year. Less than one quarter of that amount is treated with herbicides. In fact, the trees are planted, and they require some management . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. Coon: Let's talk about the science. Why not start there? That is a good place to start. There is extensive research, and a growing body of scientific publications have reported damage to DNA, malformation of embryos, damage to cells, endocrine disruption, and other effects on enzymes associated with glyphosate and its additives in a wide range of species, including humans.

A consensus statement published last year in the journal *Environmental Health* by a dozen leading scientists and epidemiologists concluded a number of things, including that "Regulatory estimates of tolerable daily intake for glyphosate in the United States . . . are based on outdated science." Let's just take a look at what these dozen scientists and epidemiologists wrote in their consensus statement in the journal *Environmental Health* in 2016, volume 15:19. They said:

With respect to glyphosate-based herbicides, we are certain of the following:

.....

2. *GBHs contaminate drinking water via rainwater, surface runoff and leaching into groundwater . . .*
3. *The half-life of glyphosate in water and soil is longer than previously recognized. . . . The risk of long-term, incremental buildup of glyphosate contamination in soil, surface water, and groundwater is therefore driven by highly site-specific factors, and as a result, is difficult to predict and . . . monitor.*
4. *Residues of glyphosate and its principal metabolite AMPA are present in nearly all soybeans harvested from fields planted with Roundup Ready soybeans*

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

064

15:40

In their consensus statement published in *Environmental Health*, 12 scientists and epidemiologists, under Section II, said:

We estimate with confidence that:

1. *Glyphosate provokes oxidative damage in rat liver and kidneys by disrupting mitochondrial metabolism . . . at exposure levels currently considered safe and acceptable by regulatory agencies*

Let me read that one more time, slowly:

1. *Glyphosate provokes oxidative damage in rat liver and kidneys by disrupting mitochondrial metabolism . . . at exposure levels currently considered safe and acceptable by regulatory agencies . . .*
2. *Residues from GBHs may pose higher risk to the kidneys and liver. Metabolic studies in a variety of laboratory and farm animal species show that the levels of glyphosate and AMPA in kidney and liver tissues are 10- to 100-fold . . . higher than the levels found in fat, muscle . . . and most other tissues. Increases in the frequency of serious, chronic kidney disease have been observed among male agricultural workers in some regions in which there is a combination of heavy GBH use and ‘hard’ water . . .*
3. *. . . Glyphosate and AMPA are not monitored in the human population in the United States, despite the 100-fold increase in use of GBHs over recent decades.*

I would say those things are cause for concern. Section III states:

Current models and data from the biological sciences predict that:

1. *Glyphosate and GBHs disrupt endocrine-signaling systems in vitro . . . Rat maternal exposure to a sublethal dose of a GBH resulted in male offspring reproductive development impairment . . . As an endocrine-disrupting chemical . . . glyphosate can alter the functioning of hormonal systems and gene expression patterns at various dosage levels.*

Current models and data from the biological sciences predict that:

.....

4. *The incidence of non-Hodgkin’s Lymphoma (NHL) has nearly doubled in the U.S. between 1975 and 2006 . . . GBHs are implicated in a heightened risk of developing NHL among*

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

human populations exposed to glyphosate occupationally, or by virtue of their residence in an area routinely treated with herbicides

An interesting side point is that the Canadian health agency suggests that there are significantly elevated levels of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma in men in New Brunswick compared to the rest of Canada. Regionally, the rate of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma in northern New Brunswick is double that in the south.

6. *Glyphosate is a chelating agent with potential to sequester essential micronutrient metals such as zinc, cobalt and manganese . . . This property of GBHs can alter the availability of these micronutrients for crops, people, wildlife, pets, and livestock. These micronutrient metals are enzymatic cofactors, so their loss has the potential to contribute to a number of deleterious effects, especially on kidney and liver function*

Now, in the next section, we read:

Existing data suggest, but do not empirically confirm

They “suggest, but do not empirically confirm”.

a wide range of adverse outcomes:

1. *Multiple studies on GBHs have reported effects indicative of endocrine disruption . . .*
2. *The action of glyphosate as an antibiotic may alter the gastrointestinal microbiome in vertebrates . . . which could favor the proliferation of pathogenic microbes in humans, farm animals, pets and other exposed vertebrates.*
3. *Increased incidence of severe birth defects in Argentina and Paraguay in areas*

—where glyphosate has been sprayed. Glyphosate has been shown

to increase retinoic . . . activity during fetal development

—in those areas.

065

15:45

Glyphosate-contaminated soybean feeds used in the pork industry have also been associated with elevated rates of gastrointestinal-health problems and birth defects in young pigs.

4. *Some developmental studies in rats undertaken at relatively high levels of exposure suggest possible GBH-induced neurotoxicity through multiple mechanisms.*

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

5. *GBHs may interfere with normal sexual development and reproduction in vertebrates.*
6. *A recent report demonstrates that environmentally relevant concentrations of commercially available GBHs alter the susceptibility of bacteria to six classes of antibiotics. . . . Furthermore, GBHs can also induce multiple antibiotic-resistance phenotypes in potential human pathogens*

—such as E. coli and salmonella—

Such phenotypes could both undermine antibiotic therapy and significantly increase the possibility of mutations conferring more permanent resistance traits.

Experiments with zebrafish with dosing of GBH in the upper range of environmentally-relevant contamination levels, show morphological damage to ovaries.

Section V

Uncertainties in current assessments persist because:

For example:

. . . The first and only in-depth USDA testing of glyphosate and AMPA residues in food targeted soybeans, and occurred once in 2011. Of the three hundred samples tested, 90.3% contained glyphosate at a mean level of 1.9 ppm.

8. *Glyphosate residues are generally uncontrolled for in the standard rations fed to animals in laboratory studies.*

Let me say that, in fact, people should recognize that most of the studies that are done on pesticides, and all of them to be registered to receive approval to be used, are done for the manufacturer of the pesticide, so it is submitted by the manufacturer of the pesticide. Only later, as problems and concerns start to arise, do independent studies start to get done, as this has been indicated.

Implications of this consensus statement:

1. *The margin of safety between typical glyphosate and AMPA exposure levels and the maximum allowed human exposures has narrowed substantially in the last decade. The margin may well have disappeared for heavily exposed segments of the population in some countries . . . We conclude that existing toxicological data and risk assessments are not sufficient to infer that glyphosate-based herbicides, as currently used, are safe.*

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

I am going to repeat that because the Minister of Environment and, I think also, the Minister of Energy and Resource Development said that this is safe if the instructions on the label are followed. What these prestigious scientists and epidemiologists conclude is that “existing toxological data and risk assessments are not sufficient to infer that GBHs, as currently used, are safe”. This is important. This suggests to me . . . I do not know what happens when you get on the other side of the House, but you start hearing industry talk coming out of the ministers responsible, rather than their using their own intelligence when it comes to addressing such important issues as the use of hazardous chemicals in our environment and the impacts those might have ecologically and on people.

I think that it is also important to reference the fact that . . . The member for Gagetown-Petitcodiac referenced a series of pesticides that we had used and that were later banned because of problems that had occurred with them. Well, this occurs because in every case, as you look back through history, there has been a concerted industry-led campaign to sow doubt that magnifies and exaggerates the inherent uncertainties in the science of toxicology and epidemiological studies as a way of delaying regulatory action on their pesticide. That is why it has taken so long in the past to ban DDT or Agent Orange, or to get rid of fenitrothion. This is an important thing to remember. We were told by manufacturers that all these things were safe, and then campaigns are mounted to delay any action when doubt arises—to delay any action to tighten the regulation or to ban them.

066

15:50

Recently, in New York State, there was a court case that was brought by people who had contracted non-Hodgkins lymphoma and were concerned. They believed that it was related to their exposure to glyphosate. The files, which were unsealed by Judge Vince Chhabria, who was presiding over that litigation, provided some pretty startling information, and this was reported in the business section of the *New York Times* on March 14, 2017.

The court documents included Monsanto’s internal emails and email traffic between the company and federal regulators. The records suggested that Monsanto had ghostwritten research that was later attributed to academics and indicated that a senior official at the Environmental Protection Agency had worked to quash a review of Roundup’s main ingredient, glyphosate,

Roundup is manufactured by Monsanto.

that was to have been conducted by the United States Department of Health and Human Services.

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

The documents also revealed that there was some disagreement within the E.P.A. over its own safety assessment.

That is its very own safety assessment of glyphosate.

“Court records show that Monsanto was tipped off to the determination” by the World Health Organization that it was a probable human carcinogen.

That led the company to prepare a public relations assault on the finding well in advance of its publication. Monsanto executives, in their internal email traffic, also said that [they] had promised to beat back an effort by the Department of Health and Human Services to conduct its own review.

Dan Jenkins, a Monsanto executive, said in an email in 2015 that Mr. Rowland, referring to the other agency’s potential review, had told him, “If I can kill this, I should get a medal.” The review never took place. In another email, Mr. Jenkins

—a Monsanto executive, according to the story in the *New York Times*,—

noted to a colleague that Mr. Rowland was planning to retire and said he “could be useful as we move forward with ongoing glyphosate defense.”

.....

In one email unsealed . . .

as a result of these court proceedings,

William F. Heydens, a Monsanto executive, told other company officials

—according to this newspaper story—

that they could ghostwrite research on glyphosate by hiring academics to put their names on papers that were actually written by Monsanto.

What kind of faith can we have in what it says on the label when these kinds of hijinks are going on? The quote is:

“We would be keeping the cost down by us doing the writing and they would just edit & sign their names so to speak,”

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

This is responding to the scientists who had signed this ghostwritten research,

These disclosures were certainly the latest to raise concerns about the integrity of the scientific research funded by agrochemical companies—much of the initial financed research about the safety of glyphosate. This, in fact, is in the public record. This was available to the Minister of Energy and Resource Development to review or for his staff to provide to him, and they chose not to address any of this information that I have brought forward today in the Legislative Assembly.

I thank my colleague from the riding of Gagetown-Petitcodiac for bringing forward this motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stewart: Isn't it a fine occasion to be back in this heralded House, to be surrounded by so many friends—not just on this side of the floor but some on the other side too. It pleases me to no end—some days to the bitter end. The greatest occurrence of all, at least for the moment, is that I have the microphone for 15 minutes. As long as I am good, I can keep it, right? The greatest thing, though, is that I get to say things—all sorts of things—not only to the best of my ability or for the entertainment of the few in here or for those watching at home, but for those who have missed my points of view. I have missed offering them, especially to you, Mr. Speaker.

Today's topic is glyphosate. Before I go any further, I am against the amendment and for the motion that was put down by the member for Fredericton-Gagetown-Grand Lake . . . whatever it is called. It is a long one.

067

15:55

On the amendment, this is interesting. The Chief Medical Officer of Health was named here. Although I have respect for these offices, I will tell you that my office in Southwest Miramichi-Bay du Vin recently had to contact the Chief Medical Officer. She was very gracious to get back to me, and I had a nice chat with her. However, the interesting thing was that her staff members were actually chasing after an elderly lady in Blissfield because they did not like the place where she prepared her pickles and jam. Pickles are full are vinegar. Jelly and jam are full of sugar. Nobody has ever died from that, that I have heard of.

In any event, the Office of the Chief Medical Officer of Health was making this elderly lady's life very difficult. The Chief Medical Officer seemed unaware of it. She helped correct the situation. You live in a world where pickles and jelly is under severe scrutiny and poor people who have a bed and breakfast are asked to build another piece, another kitchen, on just to make jam for the people they were already making it for and serving it to for 25 years. When you see

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

the Chief Medical Officer supporting glyphosate, yet chasing after pickles and jellies, I question that. I will continue to question it as long as I am in this House and, I am sure, long afterward.

Another example of how facts are never known in the Legislature and how the facts never truly get out is on the issue of the Department of Natural Resources, which comes into play on this file. Some years back, the rural community of Upper Miramichi wanted to have a community forest. This is what occurred. Industry prepared its own documents stating how complex it was, and the rural community of Upper Miramichi was denied. I left thinking that the people of Boiestown had lived there over 250 years. They had lived off that land for that long. It is interesting how industry could prepare its own document and say that people who have lived off it for 250 years would not be prepared to understand the complexities of the forest. From this time and place, I shall use examples and situations of both the workings of the members of this House and in our forests to describe angles not yet considered in this argument. I do not pretend to be a scientist or be overtly technically knowledgeable on the chemicals used.

First and foremost, let it be known that I have never personally, politically, morally, or in any way supported the endeavour of spraying glyphosate upon the animals, their habitats and food sources, into the air we breath, and upon the very spirit of what, to me, are New Brunswick crown jewels, the trees themselves. I am against glyphosate, and it would not matter which tie I wore. I am against it, and I will be against it. Also, I do not speak from a scientific point of view. I firmly support placing a suspension on this practice to allow some investigative research and oncoming recommendations from a task force. I appreciate this motion. Thank you to my colleague from Gagetown. Thank you so much for this.

Let's do a little history lesson. What does history tell us when chemicals are used on people or animals, either for killing bugs, experiments, or otherwise? Think about for a second. Take a good long few seconds, and think about that. What is really at risk? What is at risk for us? They are air quality, food safety for animals and human beings, and wildlife and livestock.

Lastly, the side of the debate that is so commonly avoided is what it is doing to our hardwood and why that is being done at all. What is the value to New Brunswickers of preventing the slow but certain long-term and prosperous growth of hardwood? Even if it is only a couple of percentages each year, it is still a lot. We still have to ask what that will mean 30 years down the road. We do not know what hardwood will be worth in 40 years, who wants it, or who needs it. We, all of us in here, need to think about that.

Do the people in urban parts of our province understand the emotion and fear of those living in and near the wooded areas that are being sprayed? They do not live in heavily wooded regions like mine, for instance. How can we fully appreciate the views of those not breathing it in at the rate some of us are, such of those, like myself, who live near Cains River and how it would

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

affect them to raise their children nearby knowing that it is being taken in by every breath that you take. Is it poisonous? Do we know? Who can we possibly trust?

For example, you walk into the forest today and you read a sign: Do not eat the berries. You cannot eat the raspberries. You cannot eat the blueberries. The deer are not there anymore. Everybody has their own answers. I do not know the real reason, but I can tell you that glyphosate is sprayed nearby.

068

16:00

There are not many species in the brook in terms of trout, although that has declined rapidly anyhow. There is a lot of evidence in there. A lot of hunters will say that, although the liver has been a problem for deer for the past 40 years, kidneys are now a problem and livers are even a bigger problem. Something is doing it. We have to examine, at least, what possibilities might be out there. If something is doing it to our animals, then we have to think about what it is doing to us too. It is an observation. Any MLA worth his or her salt would be standing here, taking a position that would actually benefit the people of New Brunswick.

The unknown is the fearful, the debate, and the questions themselves. One organization says that it is full of carcinogens, yet the scientists hand-selected by industry and the department say they could drink glyphosate out of a glass. I would love to be a witness to that. I would love to see that, actually. I would give anything to see them drink glyphosate out of a glass with their bacon and eggs or something.

Look at the public interest. Let's look at the public interest. I was told that a poll exists that states that 90% of the people of this province are against glyphosate. Whether it is not bad or really bad, some 90% of our people are against it—90%. That is a lot. I am guessing . . . I believe firmly that they identify with not wanting this to be sprayed, regardless of whom they vote for, thus making it easy to remove party politics from the issue. The subject of banning or suspension of glyphosate is for the public as a whole to witness, for once, an electorate actually listening as a whole. Anyone in this Legislature who votes against this has overlooked in its entirety the will of 90% of our population. Forget the colour of your tie. Forget all of that. Some 90% of the people who put you in these chairs are against it, whether you can drink it or whether it is killing us all—90% are against it. That is the number that I have heard.

Suspension of the practice of glyphosate is a proper undertaking for New Brunswickers. The forest is yours and mine, not the property of those licensee holders who wish to continue having the public front the bill for the spraying and the potential devastation caused by it. That can be no more. Big business needs to hear the word “no”—a very simple word—and it needs to hear it more often. This is an opportunity, whether this is harmful or not, for big business to start hearing that little word, “no”. It is a very powerful word.

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

Glyphosate reeks of corporate greed and control, despite the damages that it potentially causes. Here is an example of corporate greed sponsored by government—this current Liberal government—and brought to you by none other than the Liberal minister from the riding of Miramichi.

This is from the 29 subsidies by the U.S. government. Essentially, IPP received a grant. I believe that is Irving Pulp & Paper. It says: “stated that IPP received certain grants from the RDC and identified three separate programs . . . (1) the Innovation Program, (2) the Northern New Brunswick and Miramichi Regional Economic Development and Innovation Funds, and (3) the Total Development Fund”. Here is the kicker: The Total Development Fund is available only to provincial government departments, Crown corporations, and not-for-profit corporations. It is a perfect example of corporate greed supported by my colleague from Miramichi. It is sinful. I am going to talk about it here because it goes right to the very essence of this issue that we speak of today. It is alive and well in this province. The members opposite know it. They need to do something . . . The people of this province know that they are incapable of governance—incapable. They are playing games with elections, getting second jobs, and lobbying. It is endless.

Because IPP received these funds outside of eligibility requirements that limit the funding to provincial departments, limit the funding to not-for-profit organizations. It was determined “that the grant provided . . . under this program constitutes a financial contribution in the form of a direct transfer of funds”. That brings me to another point. This government and whoever else paid for glyphosate to be sprayed, not fully knowing what it was doing, other than it was killing hardwood so that they could plant more trees . . . We know who wants that. That is within the 10 percentile of the public of this province, and it is a very small number in that 10.

069

16:05

I will tell you today that DNR needs a forensic audit. Glyphosate needs to be suspended, or you are against the will of 90% of your population. It does not matter if it is suspended, if it is banned, or if there is a moratorium. There are a million plays on words. However, if nine months go by and a task force proves that this is not healthy, then guess what? It is going to stop. It started right here with the member for Gagetown-Petitcodiac.

In closing, whether you are personally, theoretically, morally, or politically against it, since we are politicians, and since nobody but the greedy few want it, the question is: Why vote against 90% of your people? Why vote against 90% of the people in Moncton, Fredericton, all the rural communities, and the Acadian Peninsula? Why vote against them? Why do it? There it is.

I support the motion. I do not support the cowardly amendment. That is what it is. I thank my colleagues from Gagetown and Sussex and all other MLAs of many political stripes who have

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

helped thus far. This is one for all New Brunswick, and the time is right for making a well-rounded decision, supported collectively by each of us here, and for the public. Imagine that—for the public.

I encourage all MLAs in this House to be courageous and to be bold. Be bold enough to vote in favour of the motion. Remove your amendment and help suspend the practice of using glyphosate in this province. All of you should do it. Do it now. Thank you.

Hon. Ms. Rogers: I am rising in the House today to take part in the debate on Motion 1, as introduced by the member for Gagetown-Petitcodiac. Just to make a couple of comments on what I have heard in the last few minutes, I do not have a particular colour tie that I am wearing, but I am going to speak anyway from the stand that I will take on this. I like to make decisions, and I think that our government does too. It likes to make decisions based on scientific facts. Maybe that is where we might differ. We want science-based, evidence-based decisions.

Lots of times, I agree with things that the leader of the third party says. He is commonly calling for more investment in social programs, which I would agree with as well. I heard him today asking for more animal fencing. However, we also have to have a balanced approach. We have to find a way to pay for this. We have to ensure that we have economic growth, and we have to ensure that we are protecting businesses. We have to pay for this fencing. Nonetheless . . .

Nous sommes conscients que certaines personnes du Nouveau-Brunswick sont préoccupées par l'utilisation d'herbicides à base de glyphosate dans notre province. Je le suis moi aussi.

I have also been thinking a lot about glyphosate recently. I have had many meetings with people in my riding, which does not really have a lot of forestry. Nonetheless, I am also very interested in following where the science is on this. I have also been reading what I can on the subject. We want to make our decisions based on evidence.

Our government certainly understands the importance of protecting our environment, which also means protecting our drinking water and our natural resources as well as our natural resource industries. We all rely on a healthy environment, of course. That means that whether we are individuals, businesses, or industries, we need a healthy environment. In fact, to have healthy bodies, we also need healthy environments. We need clean water to drink and good, healthy food to eat, and the food and water that animals access also has to be good.

070

16:10

In fact, a good healthy ecology means that there is a consideration of the interconnection of all of this. We are very interested in ensuring that we have scientific bases for decisions that impact our ecology. We do not want to make our decisions based on just rhetoric that is dominant for

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

the day in terms of headlines or based on fearmongering comments. We need to base our decisions on facts.

We also know that New Brunswickers would like decisions based on facts. We know that New Brunswickers care about their environment, and we care not just for today but also for generations to come. We have said many, many times that our government wants nothing more than New Brunswick to be the best place to live, to work, and to raise a family, and we recognize that protecting our environment will help us do that.

When it comes to our forestry, there are lots of things that we want to think about. We want to think about what this offers for economic growth. We want to think about what this brings for wood products, but we also want to think way beyond this. We want to think about tourism, eco-tourism, and all kinds of uses for our natural resources. We want to think about recreation and healthy living, and even the connection of our products in tourism with the Food and Beverages Strategy. Therefore, we want to make sure that we protect our New Brunswick products.

This is especially important to me. As a sociologist, I always think about the interconnection. I want to make sure that New Brunswick is a good place to live today and going down the road. I gave up two careers to have this career and to be working here so that I can bring something to a balance that considers the social, the economic, the fiscal, and also the environmental. We will keep doing this.

I really do believe that when we work together . . . When we hear the dialogue and the perspectives of all stakeholders, we can continue to move our province forward both fiscally and economically, as we have been doing. I recognize the importance of industries such as forestry. They play important roles in the lives of New Brunswickers. We know that it is an important industry, along with fishing and farming. It is the keystone of, in fact, traditional economies. Forests are way more than just crops. Our forests serve many purposes. They are wetlands. They are air filters. Again, they are for recreation, for tourism, and for enjoying active living with our families.

Our government is always looking at how to create jobs and grow our economy. We have to think ecologically about this. As Finance Minister, I would be remiss not to mention that we are obviously doing something right with our balanced approach and our consideration of multiperspectives. Since 2015, our economy has been growing. In fact, through 2017, the GDP growth is forecasted to be 4.5% over the three-year period. This compares to a -1.4% growth over the previous three years, from 2012 to 2014. Part of the . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: State your point of order.

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

M. Savoie : J'invoque le Règlement. Le sujet du débat est le glyphosate et non pas l'état des finances de la province. Je vous demande, Monsieur le vice-président, de recommander à la ministre de rester sur le sujet de la motion.

Le vice-président : Aujourd'hui, j'ai entendu plusieurs discours provenant des deux côtés de la Chambre. Selon moi, la ministre n'est pas hors du sujet. Merci.

L'hon. M^{me} Rogers : Merci, Monsieur le vice-président.

The forestry industry is, indeed, helping our economy to grow. The latest numbers from the Department of Finance estimate that the direct and indirect impact of the forestry sector in the province is more than \$1.4 billion. This is \$1.4 billion added to the New Brunswick economy each year, which is important to consider with the topic of today. This is an important sector for New Brunswick's economic growth.

071

16:15

En plus de l'incidence positive qu'elle a sur notre économie, l'industrie contribue de façon importante à la création d'emplois dans notre province.

We collected some numbers here. There are about 22 000 people employed through forestry and connected sectors, and it is estimated that there is \$1.45 billion in contributions to the New Brunswick economy through our forests. That is tens of thousands of New Brunswickers making a living and, of course, paying their mortgages, keeping their heat on, and putting food in their children's lunch boxes.

We know that New Brunswickers are very interested in having all the facts and information so that we can make informed decisions. Our government has processes in place for the use of this product to ensure that it is used within the proper guidelines, and our government works in partnership with the federal government. Of course, our government wants to ensure safe and responsible applications in our province, and it will continue to ensure that this is done. It relies on a variety of systems that require, for example, that only products registered for use in Canada are permitted to be used in New Brunswick.

The Department of Environment and Local Government also puts additional measures in place, on top of Health Canada's comprehensive evaluation. For example, it has added additional safety and environmental protection measures that include requiring applicator certification and the issuance of permits. The permits outline terms and conditions aimed at protecting the environment, including such requirements as setbacks to sensitive environmental features, restrictions on applications during windy conditions, and notification of the public. These are conditions that we want to take very seriously.

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

The government members of New Brunswick continue to rely on the evaluation of experts when it comes to using products such as glyphosate. We think it is important that the facts are out there. The Office of the Chief Medical Officer of Health is an organization that has the ability, experience, and knowledge to look at this.

We also know that there are some misconceptions out there. There are some people, for example, who think that one quarter of New Brunswick forests are being cut every single year. This is a misconception. There are even people who think that the amount of forest being cut is bigger—there are people who think that more than one million hectares a year are being cut—and this is also a misperception. There are people who think that this same huge area is treated every year, which is also wrong. There are people who think spraying is done over water sources or on windy days, and I am told that this is wrong as well. For whatever reason, we need to make people aware of the facts instead of the myths that are being perpetuated about our forest sector. Many people do not know about the setbacks that prevent aerial spraying near water sources or about the high-tech machinery that turns the applicators off when aircraft leave designated spray areas, so we are very interested in giving some real facts.

072

16:20

Less than 1.5% of our forests are harvested in any given year. More than three quarters of the area harvested each year does actually grow back on its own and does not receive any treatment of herbicides. Of the area harvested each year, a small portion—in fact, it is less than one quarter of the harvested area—is planted with trees that originate from a variety of seed sources throughout New Brunswick, and they are trees that are well-suited to the areas where they are planted. Only these planted areas, which are less than one quarter of the harvested areas that we are talking about, or less than one half of 1% of the forest, are treated responsibly and according to label and permit requirements each year.

The government of New Brunswick relies on facts and not on myths. It is in all of our best interest to ensure in fact that our humans are healthy and that our environments are healthy and to protect both of these while also growing our economy. This is truly the balance that is necessary for us to strike. Our government will support this motion but only with the proposed amendments that my colleague introduced earlier.

Our government knows, again, that the Office of the Chief Medical Officer of Health offers an impartial approach to all matters it works on. In fact, many times people ask for things to go through this to make the impartial decision. This is one of the times that we are doing this, and this is why we are proposing the amendment that the Office of the Chief Medical Officer of Health table its report entitled *Results of the OCMOH Action Plan on Glyphosate* with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly. In addition, we are proposing that the Office of the Chief Medical

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

Officer of Health provide an update to that report within one year of the date of the report and that it be tabled with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.

Through a second amendment, if the Chief Medical Officer of Health advises that spraying represents an increased risk, the province immediately . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You are done.

Mr. Wetmore: To say that I am disappointed in the government would certainly be an understatement. However, it has been three years, and I have been disappointed with these guys since 2014. I would like to say that it is unfortunate that it is this government that has thrown the reputation of the Chief Medical Officer of Health out to the wind. There was a report coming from Dr. Cleary with regard to glyphosate, and the government fired her. I hate to say it, but I do not believe that there is a great deal of independence or trust with the current department at the time being. Then you gutted that department anyway, so I am not quite sure what is left.

I am also disappointed in what we heard today from the Minister of Energy and Resource Development and the Minister of Finance. However, there are all kinds of members from northern New Brunswick who have a robust forestry industry in their ridings, and we did not hear one word from them at all. Probably the only minister who I respect on the other side did not speak on this today, and that is the Minister of Justice and Public Safety. When I do not hear from the Minister of Justice and Public Safety, it makes me wonder. The gentleman is honest and honourable, and I was quite surprised that he did not speak with regard to this motion. That sort of makes me wonder a bit, too, about why the esteemed member did not comment on this.

This motion was with regard to just Crown land, and I hear from the members opposite that we are cutting 1.5% and that, of that 1.5%, we are spraying only 2.5%.

073

16:25

(Interjections.)

Mr. Wetmore: That is right. It is a quarter—a quarter—of the 1.5%. They are telling me that it is not a very big amount. However, if it is not a big amount, then why would you not listen to the 35 000 New Brunswickers who have concerns? I am listening to my colleague from Southwest Miramichi-Bay du Vin who feels that, in his area, there are certainly a lot more people who would like to see a halt on this and who would like to sit down together and have a committee struck.

I listened to the member of the third party. That is one of the problems with regard to New Brunswick and the people of New Brunswick. You end up being glassy-eyed listening to all the

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

scientific talk. New Brunswickers want the straight talk. That is all that we were asking. It was a simple ask but requested by a lot of people. Basically, all we asked was to put together a committee to bring forward recommendations to the Legislature with a nine-month suspension of spraying on Crown land.

As the Minister of Energy and Resource Development said, we are cutting only 1.5% of the land. I am going to take it as Crown land. I believe that it is Crown land. Of that, we are only spraying a quarter. I would not think that this is going to put an industry out of business. I do not think that it would affect any of the 22 000 workers that we have. This is a government across the way that lambasted the forestry strategy. Now, it is the only thing that is driving its economy.

The provinces of Quebec and Nova Scotia are not spraying and their forestry industries are certainly doing well. Can we not? Is it too much to ask this government to put a committee together and, for nine months, suspend any spraying, get this report, and bring it before the Legislature? Unfortunately, this government does not want to do it.

As I mentioned before, it took years for the government to stop spraying DDT. It took years to stop the spraying of Agent Orange. It took them years to stop spraying for mosquitos in and around the Oromocto area. I have an ad in front of me that is from 1946. This ad in front of me has dogs dancing around. It has carrots, cows, and happy potatoes. It says “DDT is good for me-e!”. That was back in 1946. In 1946, we did not know.

New Brunswickers are asking questions for which they do not know the answer. They do not trust what they are being told. If they trusted what they were being told, we would not have a petition presented with 35 000 names and we, as elected officials, would not be having people coming into our offices and asking questions on the glyphosate. People would not be sending us e-mails. I know that the members opposite are also getting e-mails in regard to the spraying. I cannot understand why they are not standing up for their constituents. That is what I am doing. I am standing up for my constituents because my constituents have a concern. I really feel that the motion brought forward would help alleviate a lot of the concerns that are being brought forward to me, to you, and to the rest of my colleagues.

074

16:30

But again, this government is interested in one thing. Whatever the opposition has to bring forward, it just wants to ignore. It is politics as usual with this group. But, fortunately for me, every day that it is in the House, it is probably driving more and more votes to me in the riding of Gagetown-Petitcodiac. With the new ferry coming, the people are going to be happy for that, because we are going to be in government and we are going to have a place to assign the new ferry. With the government pretty much gutting the motion brought forward in regard to glyphosate, it is going to bring more voters our way.

EXCERPT / EXTRAIT
Daily Sitting 7 / Jour de séance 7
Not finalized / Non finalisé

November 2, 2017

le 2 novembre 2017

We are certainly looking forward to 2018, when we will be able to have a good discussion in regard to spraying. Members will be able to have the opportunity to say what they want to say. It will be a free, open Legislature, and members will be able to bring their concerns forward. Maybe, just maybe, we will be able to hear from the honourable Minister of Public Safety, and he will certainly be able to fill us in on what his thoughts are in regard to spraying Crown land. You have heard the old saying that silence is golden. The quieter you are, the louder we hear you. Mr. Minister, I have not heard anything from you, and I certainly, certainly appreciate your silence in regard to this.

I will not be supporting the motion as amended. Thank you.

Adoption de l'amendement proposé

(Le vice-président donne lecture de l'amendement proposé et met la question aux voix ; l'amendement de la motion 1 est adopté.)

Adoption de la motion 1 amendée

Le vice-président donne lecture de la motion amendée, dont voici le texte :

attendu que l'épandage de glyphosate au Nouveau-Brunswick suscite de vives préoccupations dans la population ;

attendu que les renseignements publics et scientifiques concernant l'utilisation du glyphosate dans notre secteur forestier sont contradictoires ;

qu'il soit à ces causes résolu que l'Assemblée législative exhorte le Bureau du médecin-hygiéniste en chef à déposer auprès du greffier de l'Assemblée législative le rapport intitulé Résultats du plan d'action du BMHC en matière de glyphosate et à faire le point sur le rapport dans l'année qui suit son dépôt auprès du greffier de l'Assemblée législative,

que l'Assemblée législative exhorte le gouvernement à continuer de surveiller l'ajout de toute information fournie par Santé Canada et le Bureau du médecin-hygiéniste en chef du Nouveau-Brunswick relativement à l'utilisation du glyphosate, dès que l'information devient disponible,

et que, si le médecin-hygiéniste en chef ou Santé Canada avise ultérieurement que l'épandage du glyphosate représente un risque accru pour la santé humaine, la province suspende immédiatement l'épandage de glyphosate sur les terres de la Couronne.

(Le vice-président met la question aux voix ; la motion 1 amendée est adoptée.)