

# PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY



Speaker: Hon. Kathleen M. Casey

Published by Order of the Legislature

## Standing Committee on Agriculture, Forestry and Environment

DATE OF HEARING: 5 DECEMBER 2007

MEETING STATUS: PUBLIC

LOCATION: POPE ROOM, COLES BUILDING, CHARLOTTETOWN

SUBJECT: MOTION #13 - COSMETIC LAWN PESTICIDES

### COMMITTEE:

Alan McIsaac, MLA Vernon River-Stratford (Chair)  
Jim Bagnall, MLA Montague-Kilmuir  
Olive Crane, Leader of the Opposition  
Bush Dumville, MLA West Royalty-Springvale, replaces Carolyn Bertram, Minister of Communities, Cultural Affairs and Labour [for afternoon session only]  
Cynthia Dunsford, MLA Stratford-Kinlock  
Sonny Gallant, MLA Evangeline-Miscouche, replaces Robert Vessey, MLA York-Oyster Bed [for afternoon session only]  
Robert Henderson, MLA O'Leary-Inverness  
Charles McGeoghegan, MLA Belfast-Murray River  
Robert Vessey, MLA York-Oyster Bed [present for evening session]  
Buck Watts, MLA Tracadie-Hillsborough Park

### COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Carolyn Bertram, Minister of Communities, Cultural Affairs and Labour [for evening session only]

### GUESTS:

Environmental Health Co-operative (Marian Copleston, Mark MacDougall); Sierra Club of Canada (Tony Reddin); Kevin O'Brien; Dianne Corrigan; Advisory Council on the Status of Women (Jane Ledwell, Lisa Murphy); David Steeves; Council of Canadians (Leo Broderick); Dr. Helen Jones; Katherine Dewar; Allergy and Environmental Illness Group (Sandra Boswell, Jonathan Smith); Philip Brown; Ifo Ikede; CUPE (Leo Cheverie); ECO-PEI (Matthew McCarville); PEI Medical Society (Dr. Kathryn Bigsby)

### STAFF:

Marian Johnston, Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees  
Ryan Conway, Research Officer

The Committee met at 1:36 p.m.

**Chair (McIsaac):** Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to welcome everyone to this afternoon's meeting of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, Forestry and Environment.

A few little rules of order. Anybody have a cell phone that's not turned off at the moment? Or a Blackberry, they count too. If you'd just take a moment, five seconds to turn them off. That would be appreciated.

I guess you know the rules. The presenters are at the table. The ones in the back, if we could refrain from cheering one way or the other or entering into the debate, that would be appreciated. Everybody will have the time to come to the table.

This afternoon and this evening we are dealing with a resolution that was mandated to our committee to deal with by the House. I'm just going to read the be it resolved part of that resolution so it's clear to everyone just for the record:

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that this Legislative Assembly give the Standing Committee on Agriculture, Forestry and Environment a mandate to fully review the implementation and potential impacts of a province-wide ban on the use of cosmetic lawn pesticides;

**THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Committee be authorized to meet after the prorogation of the 63<sup>rd</sup> General Assembly - the time period we're now in - and make report to this House during the spring of the 2008<sup>th</sup> session.

We have this afternoon possibly 10 presenters. Again, this evening we're sitting from 7 to 9 and we hope to have another five presenters this evening on this. We did

receive so far some written presentations as well, and I'm just going to read a couple of examples, one from either side. These are the kind of issues we'll be dealing with and groups we'll be hearing from.

This is one of the comments:

Cosmetic pesticides serve no purpose other than perpetuating the ideal that all lawns and gardens look picture perfect. While this ideal is important to some Islanders, no one can argue that it is unnatural and unhealthy. Please ban cosmetic pesticides, and when you do, please be sure to enforce that ban.

Another example, a touch longer. I'm not trying to make this unbalanced or anything. From a gentleman:

I have a PhD in chemical engineering and I have spent my career both in research and in industry. I've been involved with safety chemical use and environmental issues associated with many projects. Unlike most of the objectors, I have an appreciation for the chemistry involved. Banning the use of cosmetic pesticides is based on politics and mythology. The scientific basis for banning the use of these chemicals in the prescribed manner is not there. Quoted facts from objectors are normally anecdotal statements or misquoted studies selected for convenience. I disagree with banning cosmetic pesticides. They're an insignificant hazard and I will maintain this stand until I'm presented with good scientific evidence proving otherwise. Please don't make a politically motivated decision for a few very vocal activists that are trying to scare the world.

Anyway, that's how much fun this is going to be.

We are going to hear from both sides or we will hear from both sides on this issue and we will make a report to the House in the spring session.

As I said earlier, we have 11 or 10 presenters this afternoon talking about cosmetic pesticides. I just thought I'd clear up a little bit from a study that was done for the Charlottetown Council with regards - just touching on what cosmetic pesticides are and working on the bylaws. They had a report that came out in June of 2007. I'll just touch on this for a second. It says:

Most bylaws are written in such a way that they prohibit the cosmetic use of pesticides in the maintenance of lawn, turf, and ornamental plants, trees, and flowers. Cosmetic use means the use of a pesticide for reasons which are primarily aesthetic. Pesticides may still be used to control noxious weeds such as poison ivy, control indoor pests, control pests which are harmful to the health of humans or animals, control pests on golf courses - some rules may apply there - and control pests which have infested a structure, for example, a house, garage, patio or shed.

Anyway, just a little preamble before we started our session this afternoon.

We are ready for our presenters. We welcome the Environmental Health Cooperative. I would ask you if you would introduce yourselves for the Hansard and for our benefit as well, please.

**Marian Copleston:** My name's Marian Copleston and I'm the president of the PEI Environmental Health Co-operative.

**Mark MacDougall:** My name's Mark MacDougall. I'm also a member of the PEI Environmental Health Co-operative.

**Chair:** These sessions are going to be, since we have so many, we have 15 minutes. I don't want to tell you the clock is running, but the clock is running. Okay? So we want to get everyone through. We want to get everyone through but we want to give everyone a fair time and we'll likely have

some questions as well. So go ahead, please.

**Marian Copleston:** All right.

The PEI Environmental Health Co-op has been working on this issue for a number of years. The co-op was formed in 2002 to support those dealing with environmental health issues. Our group - we have a little pamphlet here that I'll pass out later - provides support to people with environmental illness and we do public education to promote alternative ways to deal with chemicals and contaminants and we do advocate for public policy that would reduce the need for many contaminants in our environment.

It was our group that collected the 4,000 signatures on the petition that was presented to Charlottetown City Council. In addition to that - and, unfortunately, I haven't been able to find them - during a presentation that we organized earlier we also collected about 100 or 200 signatures in Summerside. So that's out there somewhere, just for your information.

We were part of a network that brought Dr. Margaret Sanborn to PEI in March of 2006. She spoke on the pesticide literature review prepared by the Ontario College of Family Physicians, and particularly on the part of that that dealt with the health effects on children.

In the past, we've organized annual dandelion festivals to celebrate the dandelion and to point out that there are many healthful uses for this plant, and in some countries it's very prized. I read a story about a woman who exchanged houses and went to live in France at her friend's house and they came over here. The woman saw all these dandelions on the lawn so she worked really hard over three weeks and dug up all the dandelions and thought she'd done a great job. When the person came back, she was horrified because these were

dandelions that had been handed down through the family and were prized for their medicinal use, etc. So there are cultural differences in the opinions of the value of certain plants.

We have in the past made several presentations to Charlottetown City Council, and we're not alone in this work. In 2002 the PEI Federation of Municipalities did ask the province to enact legislation to ban cosmetic pesticide, and many other provincial and national groups now support a ban, including the Canadian Cancer Society and the PEI and Canadian medical societies.

Mark and I are going to go back and forth here.

**Mark MacDougall:** I guess this is not a new issue for us. Like Marian has mentioned, we've been at it for quite some time. We think we've tackled pretty much every angle that's been asked of us. We've done public education which we've done through the dandelion festival and other initiatives. We've lobbied through government. We've gotten petitions from the public. We've brought in speakers, and, with all respect to your other person who wrote your letter to you, we have scientists on our side as well. It's not science versus anecdotal evidence. It's science and science.

My other point on that is anecdotal evidence is still evidence and people are still people, and so that's not to be dismissed because it's not a scientific study. Some of the information we provide is anecdotal but some is very scientific as well. Our side of the argument - I don't concede science to the other side of the argument. I think science is on our side as well.

I got involved, I guess, for a couple of reasons. I'll tell you, it's not comfortable to come and ask people to do things, to ask people to stop doing stuff. It's not a

comfortable position to try to do that. My involvement in the Environmental Health Co-op - and I will try to scare the world and give you a story in a minute - but I got involved because my mother had environmental illness and I saw the effects that this has on her. I understand what that does to people who are suffering from those conditions. But I also know that whatever was affecting her was affecting me. I'm the new father of a three-year-old son and I know it's going to affect him and so I'm looking at it from the perspective as a parent now where I didn't have to worry about that before. I'm looking at it from the perspective of a son who watched his mother suffer from this, and I'm going to tell you a story about that a little bit later.

We've done our homework on this. We've been at it for a number of years. We feel very comfortable with it. We feel it's a national trend. This is not something that PEI is stepping out on first like we did with the smoking bans. This is something that we're well behind the country on right now. There's bans across the country. Many people living in urban areas and suburban areas are already under bans. This is not new. The counts change daily I guess as to how many communities - I think the last time we did a presentation it was close to 130 communities representing about 36% of the population of the country. It was already either under some ban or in the process of implementing a ban. So this is not something that we're asking people to do that's not being done elsewhere.

I think the boat is leaving the dock on this one and I think it's a matter of when. I don't want to trivialize the arguments against it but I just don't see the cost-benefit analysis swinging in favour of the other side. I just think that when we talk about cosmetic pesticides it's defined very clearly and sometimes the waters will be tried to be muddied. People will try to say, well, agricultural uses - it's very clearly defined

what a cosmetic pesticide use is. I think that it's very important that you understand that. We're not talking agricultural usage here, we're talking cosmetic use of pesticides.

I think there's a lot of environmental issues that your committee, agriculture, fisheries and environment, forestry - sorry - you've got a lot on your plate for the next few years. There's a lot of very big issues that are going to be environmental, and in the other sectors that you're looking at. I know there's a lot of serious problems to deal with there that are going to take a lot of time.

I think when you get a chance to do one - and I'll say this is my opinion - that is an easy one, that you should get it off your plate as quickly as possible. I think you should take due diligence but you can't make easy decisions into - last four or five years contemplating on that. Because I'll tell you, there's a lot of other stuff that you need to work on and I think you will, but you need to have your energies for that as well. I want you to take your time and go through this information, but I really think that we have the information on our side on this one.

**Marian Copleston:** Part of that information has been prepared already for you by the report that came out from the ad hoc committee on pesticides from the City of Charlottetown. They have prepared an excellent report. They've done a lot of research. I think that it would be good for you to seriously consider that report in your deliberations. What they've put forth as being good for the residents of Charlottetown we feel that, you know, are appropriate for all the residents of PEI.

There's one small area in that report that our members would beg to differ, and that would be regarding golf courses. We would like to see, in whatever legislation this committee comes up with, a recommendation that golf courses do plan a phase-out maybe over a number of years.

Because it is a little more difficult. But they really should seriously look at a ban for golf courses as well. Because residents who live near golf courses deserve to be protected as well as the golfers themselves. I'd like to see a survey done maybe of people who like to golf to see whether they would prefer to have pesticide-free golf courses, and if so to implement that, and then that's another tourism draw for PEI.

Obviously, we're aware that there's going to be a differing point of view from the lawn care industry. The two arguments that are always put forth are that those opposing it are scaremongers and that they have bad science, and we've just heard that. As Mark has said, there is very good science on the ban side.

Our concern is with the health of all Islanders, particularly those sensitive to the chemicals, but also all Islanders and, particularly our children. They play on lawns, they can't necessarily read the signs, and we need to take special care.

As Mark has mentioned, we've seen similarities between this and the smoking issue. For years the tobacco industry, you know, they were adamant to say that there was no reason to be concerned about the health of smoking. Few people today would deny that there was a link between smoking and health problems.

We are slowly seeing that growing numbers of people recognize pesticides are not benign substances that can be used without care. These products are in fact toxic and it's actually illegal for anyone to say that those pesticides are safe. The primary justification for using the chemicals seems to be that they are highly regulated and registered by Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency, the PMRA. Unfortunately, a closer examination of the process used in the past by the PMRA only leads us to believe that they are unreliable in

their ability to determine the safety of pesticides and there are several concerns there.

But the main ones are that when they do their evaluations they look at information provided by the pesticide industry. You'd have to question that. There's no significant independent testing done. The testing is done on individual chemicals rather than chemicals in combination, and inert ingredients found in the products aren't included in the testing and they're considered trade secrets. We're also extremely concerned that until recently the standards used to determine acceptable human risk were based on an adult male, and they're now having to re-look at that.

**Chair:** You have about four minutes left. Do you want to do all presentation or do you want to leave some time for questions? The choice is yours.

**Marian Copleston:** You mean the four minutes is left for questions?

**Chair:** Total, yeah.

**Marian Copleston:** Oh, okay, I'm sorry. I thought there was 15 minutes to present and then 15 minutes for questions.

**Chair:** No, 15 minutes total to get through here, sorry.

**Marian Copleston:** I'll just finish off then.

There is the issue of homeowners who think that their property values will diminish if they don't use chemicals. Many jurisdictions have these bylaws in place and the lawns still look fine. There's many options for dealing with weeds and pests, including this excellent book, *How to Get Your Lawn and Garden Off Drugs*. Anything you ever wanted to know, if you want help with the education, it's there. I think you have a copy of the Health Co-op binder. Mark, if you

had anything else you wanted to say?

**Mark MacDougall:** I think it just comes down to, you know, there's a cost benefit to every decision you have to make. What we see is that the benefit of these products in terms of keeping your lawn weed free or whatever doesn't outweigh the health risks that are becoming evident and being supported by organizations like the Ontario College of Family Physicians and cancer society. We see the cost benefit not in their favour. We think the benefit is in favour of the ban.

The other issue is it comes down to risk management. I'm willing to take risks in my life in certain things, and I'm sure everybody is, but what I'm not willing to do is have my neighbour take my risk for me. So you'd like to have choice when you take your risk. So in this issue we feel that that's being shifted a little bit and that other people are taking the risk for you.

I'll just very quickly - like I said, I got involved because my mother had environmental illness. I can remember mornings at 5:30 when she would wake me because she would have the windows open to try to get some fresh air and somebody would be spraying. This was 20 years ago so you didn't have all the notices that were going around. I would have to drive her down to the ocean. She'd have to close the windows first to make sure the house didn't get full and then I'd have to drive her down and she'd stay for two or three hours on the shore to try to get better. I'm sitting here as a young man and I'm saying: Why are we using these products? I'm looking at her and I'm saying: This doesn't make any sense to me. We're spraying things on the lawn to kill a weed or a pest and it's affecting her health like this. I know if it's affecting her like that, there are other people who aren't as sensitive, but it's still having a negative effect. So I feel very strongly that this is something that we need to act on.

**Chair:** Do we have time for a couple of questions? Cynthia.

**Ms. Dunsford:** Thanks, and thanks for the great presentation. I appreciate all the effort your group has put into all these years of work because you care and you have a lot of passion for the topic.

You had talked about looking at the Charlottetown report as a good guideline to adopting recommendations as far as implementing a province-wide ban on cosmetic use of pesticides. With the exception of the recommendation about the golf courses, to your knowledge has your group been able to find any other jurisdictions that had to deal with that and how they did as far as buffer or alternative -

**Marian Copleston:** Yes, we can provide additional information on that if you like.

**Ms. Dunsford:** Sure. That would be great.

**Chair:** Any other questions?

**Leader of the Opposition:** Mark, in terms of some of the researchers that you spoke to relating to concerns around health, did you discover anything around autism and any links? People that are concerned with autism, for example, in the last 20 years the figures have really dramatically increased to the number of people that are diagnosed with autism. I was just curious in your research, have you had - like at one time it was thought to be totally genetic, and now people are saying that there's some triggers in the environment. I'm curious.

**Mark MacDougall:** The literature review that the Ontario College of Family Physicians looked at a number of conditions that were - I guess you'd say they were correlated with usage. I'm not familiar with what the deal was on the autism in that or not.

**Marian Copleston:** It was mentioned but I can't remember.

**Leader of the Opposition:** That's okay. I'm going to ask the college of physicians, but I was just curious because it used to be one in 10,000 and it's gone (Indistinct) -

**Mark MacDougall:** Yes, yeah. Certainly, as a teacher I see a lot more autism today but certainly there's no definitive. I don't know what the answer is, but it does seem to be a combination of things susceptible for some reason and the same sort of environmental thing.

**Chair:** Any other questions?

I want to apologize. Perhaps I didn't clarify at first that it was 15 minutes total. So I'll clarify that better from now on.

**Mark MacDougall:** That's all right, yeah.

**Chair:** I really want to thank you, Mark and Marian, for the presentation and for taking the time to come in to speak to us on this topic.

**Mark MacDougall:** Thanks for looking at it.

**Chair:** Okay, good.

We're now going to hear from the Sierra Club of Canada. Tony, you're going to speak for a few minutes and then show a DVD. Trevor is setting that up, I believe.

**Tony Reddin:** The DVD is the first one on this.

**Chair:** Okay. I want to welcome Tony Reddin. Maybe he should introduce himself to the Hansard and then you can speak and then we'll move into this.

**Tony Reddin:** Okay. My name is Tony Reddin and I'm representing the Atlantic

chapter of the Sierra Club of Canada. I was on the executive committee for that in the past and I've remained active with it. I'm a volunteer with that organization. I bring the congratulations and thanks to your committee and your government for moving forward with this.

As was said previously, you have a lot of issues to look at and this is one that I think you can deal with quickly and move right along and get a lot of congratulations from people elsewhere. A lot of people are watching this and looking forward to a good law on PEI. As of course, Quebec already has the law there that you can use as a guideline.

I have a bit of information on the organization of Sierra Club, which is one of the longest-standing environmental clubs in North America, organizations, and especially involved with working with giving information to governments and working with governments to improve policy on several issues, and especially on issues dealing with natural eco-systems and protecting nature, basically. This is definitely an issue that deals with that.

We have a major problem that's more and more recognized now of toxins in our environment that affect ecosystems and we realize more and more now that we as human beings can't escape those affects that the ecosystem suffers. So this is another example of that, and again I think that it's great that you're working on it and people will recognize that.

We have a tool kit that was designed by a project of the Sierra Club for municipalities and, of course, it applies to this as well on achieving, as it says, a bylaw - in this case, it's a provincial law - and we would certainly welcome any opportunity to help your committee or your government with putting out, clarifying the legislation, and doing the publication education when it

comes to that which, of course, I can't stress enough. A really important part of this is educating the public on why we don't need cosmetic pesticides and other ways and other attitudes to use in looking at our lawns and gardens.

So I want to stress also that the work of the Sierra Club is mostly done by volunteers. Today, as you may realize, is International Volunteer Day. I think it's quite appropriate to recognize that and that most of the people that will be speaking to you on this issue for the public are volunteers and do it from the concern in their hearts. That, I think, you have to balance against the corporate lobby that no doubt you will hear from, and realize and be clear in your minds what vested interests people from corporations bring to this. Of course, they have a valid place to be here, but that's always got to be recognized, that profit cannot come before people and people's health.

I'm going to have you see a video from the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment, which is another very prominent organization that is definitely in favour of banning cosmetic pesticides, and I think it very clearly shows how important to our health this is as an issue. Of course, that is part of the fact that our health is one of those things that we have to remember is so important and it's easy to forget when we're healthy. But as we all know when we get laid up for a while, even in a minor way, it's such an issue. For people whose health is affected through no fault of their own, it's an issue not only of the environment of health but also of justice. It's an issue of fairness. I can't say that enough, and I guess we'll let her roll.

*[A DVD was played; the following remarks come from a variety of unidentified people on the DVD]*

**Unidentified Speakers:** Pesticides for lawn and garden care are a broad range of



chemicals that include weed killers or herbicides, bug killers or insecticides, and fungicides to control plant disease. Over the past decade, scientific studies have shown links between exposure to pesticides and adverse health effects. As well, many of the pesticides used in urban areas are known to be toxic to birds, fish, bees, and other beneficial insects. And recent studies by Environment Canada have revealed the presence of these chemicals in urban rivers and streams. We are conducting a dangerous scientific experiment on ourselves as well as our children and their future environment.

(Indistinct) are increasingly concerned about the use of pesticides because they fear that there are several diseases, many diseases perhaps, that are related to exposure to pesticides such as learning disabilities in children, various types of cancer, worsening of asthma and chronic lung disease.

Particularly when we have acute poisonings, we see children coming into the emergency room with problems like seizures and coma, which are obviously neurological problems, but also the long term we have concerns about neurological adverse effects.

In 2004 the Ontario College of Family Physicians released a systematic review of pesticide research that found consistent evidence of health risks from exposure to pesticides. Some of the most troubling studies showed links between pesticides and reproductive problems including increased rates of infertility, spontaneous abortion, stillbirths, and babies born with birth defects.

One of my other jobs at the hospital is checking all the new babies in the first 24 hours of life, and at that time we check for birth defects, any problems that the babies might have. And one thing I've noticed a lot of are undescended testicles in boys as well as a condition called hypospadias, which is when the hole that the pee comes out of,

called the urethra, doesn't really migrate to the end of the penis. It ends up sort of halfway along which, obviously, leads to problems.

Pesticide exposure can be measured in very, very minute amounts, even parts per million. This, however, is a specific concern for the developing fetus of the young child because the number of cells are continuing to grow and multiply and develop, and this occurs from the time the baby is born until development is actually complete which is in the early teen years. Any stage along this course of development, even a trace amount of a chemical can cause irreparable damage to the organ that's developing.

Licensing of pesticides in Canada is a federal responsibility, but most of the over 500 active ingredients in use in Canada were approved when standards were lower and less research was required.

Many pesticides that are in use today were approved by Health Canada decades ago and have not been re-evaluated since. Where the pesticides have been re-evaluated or when new pesticides are registered, they're still not fully protective of children. They still cannot account for the interactions between pesticides that may make them more harmful.

Even when scientific studies show a pesticide to be a risk to human health, it is often a lengthy and difficult process to take these substances off the market. For example, diazinon has been registered for use since 1956, and chlorpyrifos since 1965, and it is only recently that regulators have (Indistinct) their safety.

Health Canada has followed the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States and has called for a voluntary withdrawal of the insecticides diazinon and chlorpyrifos. Recent studies have led regulators to believe that these pesticides

may be putting people's health at risk. As the research continues, the standards become stricter. More pesticides like these are likely to be taken off the market.

In the meantime, many more potentially harmful chemicals are licensed and could stay in use indefinitely. As a response to this problem, international regulators have developed a precautionary principle. The precautionary principle states that when an activity poses threat to human health or to the environment, precautionary measures should be taken even when the cause-and-effect relationship is not fully established scientifically.

The cause-and-effect relationship between pesticide use and cancer has not been fully established scientifically. However, the evidence is suggestive and is growing. We do know that the international agency for research on cancer has classified a number of substances in pesticides as known probable or possible carcinogens. Because we know there's no countervailing health benefit associated with pesticide use and there is the potential for harm, the Canadian Cancer Society has employed the use of the precautionary principle in developing its position statement.

Due to serious health concerns, many associations that represent health professionals support pesticide by-laws. These include the Ontario College of Family Physicians, the Canadian Cancer Society, the Ontario Public Health Association, the Canadian Public Health Association, the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment, and the Registered Nurses Association of Ontario.

One of the first municipalities to pass a bylaw restricting the use of cosmetic pesticides was Hudson, Quebec. This bylaw has been used as a template for other jurisdictions across Canada.

The town of Hudson issued a bylaw and the bylaw was challenged in the Supreme Court of Canada, and the Supreme Court of Canada really had three important findings: one is that it's legal in the sense that there is municipal authority under legislation to allow them to protect public health in this way; second, that the bylaw that was enacted was enacted upon a basis, municipal authority, which is similar to other jurisdictions - in fact, the Supreme Court basically said that other municipal authorities like that across Canada have the same basis to enact the bylaw; and thirdly, the Supreme Court of Canada invoked the precautionary principle which, in effect, invites jurisdictions to air on the side of caution when there is scientific uncertainty dealing with human health and the environment.

Cosmetic pesticide bylaws do not affect the use of pesticides indoors, in swimming pools or for agriculture. They also do not affect the municipality's use of pesticides for public health emergencies. So these are what I would (Indistinct) balance in bylaws where a clear goal is to phase them out of our use, to create a cultural change in how you view lawns and landscape, to make them more natural, to wean us off pesticide use. On the other hand, recognize that there are exceptions to the rule.

Canadians spend over \$100 million per year on lawn care pesticides. However, people all over Canada are becoming increasingly concerned about the effect of these chemicals on their own health, their children, their neighbours and communities. There is growing demand for alternatives and public education is key. We can take good care of our green spaces without chemicals. Sales of organic lawn care products are booming and lawn care companies that switch to pesticide-free programs are profiting.

These have been very exciting times for the

organic industry. We have quadrupled in service over the last five years. One of the biggest questions that I'm asked in the organics, homeowners will say: What will my lawn look like? We like to demonstrate. This lawn, for example, has been treated with pesticides for the last three years. It is depleted. It needs watering. It has some chinch bug, and it also has some weeds. This lawn has been pesticide-free for over 10 years. In turn, you have a healthy green lawn. It's moist and it's soft to walk on. We use things like aeration. That opens the soil to food, nutrients, and water, allows the soil to breathe. Over-seeding is one of the most important parts. A thicker, healthier lawn will choke out weeds. We also instruct the homeowners on watering practices, for example, one inch a week and letting your grass grow 2.5 to 3 inches high. What happens is you're going to shade out those seeds. In turn, weed seeds will not reproduce, so you'll actually choke out all the weeds and have a thick carpet of grass.

The threats to human health posed by lawn care pesticides do not warrant their continued use in our communities. There are effective alternatives to using chemicals. These include organic lawn treatments, planting native species, and switching to other ground covers that require less maintenance and watering than grass.

Municipalities have an important role to play in educating the public about alternatives and protecting our health by restricting the use of unnecessary pesticides. We all need the peace of mind that our neighbourhoods and parks are healthy places for us to enjoy.

*[The DVD ended]*

**Chair:** Any questions for Tony?

Olive?

**Leader of the Opposition:** They talked

about the bylaw in Hudson. When was that brought in?

**Tony Reddin:** Oh, sorry, you're stumping me there. I would - roughly seven years ago, I guess, more or less and so this would be - I think it went through the courts for about two or three years at least before they actually -

**Leader of the Opposition:** So has there been any research done since that to see if there's been a reduction in the number of abnormal births in Hudson and health improvement in the children?

**Tony Reddin:** No, again, you're stumping me. I don't know the answer to that. It's quite possible there has been.

**Leader of the Opposition:** If there has, I'd like to see it.

**Tony Reddin:** Yeah. It's a good idea. It's possible that the Ontario College of Family Physicians looked at that in their study. Oh, and I wanted to also mention that the Government of Ontario, as I understand it, has recommitted to bringing in a similar law to what you're looking at too, a provincial law to ban cosmetic pesticides.

I guess what I wanted to say about the film is that it again shows that clearly, I mean, doctors always go by scientific evidence and this film is put out by doctors. So there's no question in my mind about where the science is.

**Chair:** Cynthia has one quick question.

**Ms. Dunsford:** (Indistinct), Tony. Earlier on, before the video, you introduced your presentation by mentioning the fact that Quebec is the only province in Canada that has a province-wide ban on cosmetic pesticides right now.

Has the Sierra Club looked at how you

apply a model like Quebec as a province, being a different geographical place than we are, and people are dispersed differently as well, how maybe how some of their ideas about how they did it could be filtered down to PEI style, so to speak? Any ideas on that?

**Tony Reddin:** I don't know, but I can find out what information we have on that in the Sierra Club. Of course, I'll send in to you my comments here, after. But sure, I'd be glad to look for that. Just off the top of my head, I would say Quebec has a lot of farming communities. In some ways their economy is quite similar to us, right, and as far as - I mean most cosmetic pesticide use is of course in towns and cities, right, so, yeah, I can check on that for sure.

**Chair:** Tony, I want to thank you for coming in and representing the Sierra Club and for the presentation. That was super.

**Tony Reddin:** Thank you very much.

**Chair:** Appreciate it.

Our next presenter is Kevin O'Brien. Kevin, I'll get you to introduce yourself for Hansard, if you don't mind. Are you, do you want - I mentioned earlier 15 minutes total so presentation, questions.

**Kevin O'Brien:** I doubt if I'll need the whole 15.

**Chair:** Introduce yourself and then you can -

**Kevin O'Brien:** My name is Kevin O'Brien and I live in Cornwall. I happen to live beside two very large lawns and we have a very large lawn, and my purpose today is actually personalize this.

I wasn't aware that I was going to have so much family here today when I showed up. I haven't seen him in a suit since he was nine. So anyway, when you're surrounded by

Reddins, you're in good company.

There's an old joke that says: When I die, I want to go quietly in my sleep like grampa did, not screaming bloody murder like the two guys in the back seat. I think that when it comes to the planet we can't afford to allow it to go in its sleep, and we're the ones to pay attention.

I really want to thank you for the opportunity to be here today. This is something that's been on my mind for years and years and years, and it's not only been on my mind, it's been in my body. I hope that this is, by the way, just the first step in a long process, because I really do believe that it's not just possible but it would be actually beneficial economically to do this. I think it will create jobs, not lose jobs, and I think if you keep on going and go as far as you can to remove pesticides from all areas - and I wouldn't slam the door on them when it comes to food production and things like that, but we do know that there are new techniques. I would like not only like to see you bring this ban in, but I would like to see you carry it on, the concept of it, gently, in ways that are very respectful of the challenges that people are going to face. But keep on going and, hopefully, one day this Island will be truly known as a green Island and our products and our technology will be sought the world over.

I want to caution about the request from the City of Charlottetown. Sometimes you can tell - the request being that they want to have the authority, ask for the authority to regulate this themselves. Sometimes you can tell a lot by how a question is not answered. I asked a city councillor why they wanted that right. Was it so that they could ban pesticides in the city or was it so that they could prevent banning pesticides in the city? The answer was more or less something like: It's too controversial, and it's too early to say, and this and that and the other thing. It was a very evasive answer, which

suggests to me that there's a better than 50-50 possibility that the chance is that they want it so they can make sure that they're not banned.

It's important to stress that we're dealing with cosmetics. We're not dealing with things that are actually essential to life. I was hoping I could find a black T-shirt with a dandelion on it, because they are flowers. We shouldn't go to war with God's creation just because we can. We should only do things against nature when they are absolutely essential, and that's sort of I think a principle that we can take. It's one thing to use a bug spray or top killer on potatoes, because if we don't we're going to have a hard time getting that crop out. While I'd like to see that change, I really do believe that when it comes to cosmetics we shouldn't do it.

I heard one gentleman, a man I respect tremendously, in the media a few months ago, talking about: If you hold salt in your hands for three days or so it will kill you. What a specious argument. Yes, it's true you can die from salt, but salt is part of the oceans. We evolved in those oceans. We evolved around things like sodium chloride. Those are chemicals that are natural and they're part of nature. Five hundred million years of vertebrate evolution has been in environments with things like salt, for example, and many others. For the last 200 million years, mammals have been living in that same environment, and at least 200,000 to 300,000 years humans have been living in those environments. We did not evolve with the capacity to cope with these kinds of chemicals, most of which have only existed in the last 50 to 100 years, something in that range. That is an instantaneous moment.

If there are folks in this room that believe that the world is 5,000 years old, I just can't help you, because I go by the science. I mean, I don't mean to be insulting about that, but humans have been around an awful

lot longer than that. We have evolved in certain environments and those environments did not include the kinds of substances that we're talking about here.

I want to talk just a bit about the jobs. There will be more jobs. There will be a few jobs lost, perhaps, but when you think about it, the ships that used to carry mail across the Atlantic Ocean, for example, the people who owned those were generally not the people who owned the cables that ran the telecommunications when they first started on the telegraph. When wireless took over and broadcast across the oceans, the people who owned the telegraph cables, the ones that were going on the bottom, they didn't become the captains of the new industry. In every technological revolution it's been extremely rare that the indigenous barons of industry become the new barons of industry.

There is a changing of it, and so in a sense there is some loss and perhaps there will be some loss in the companies too primarily that make their primary living from essentially poisoning our environment to kill dandelions and chinch bugs. But the new companies that will come in - and hopefully, it will be them, and hopefully you folks will find a way to help them do that, so that you can help them move into the new ways of doing things and they can be just as effective, as Tony's wonderful little documentary showed.

I did a search on the Internet today on cancer rates and I found this particular reference in about 30 or 40 different places. It's from 2004 in the United Kingdom: A new analysis of cancer figures for England show that incidence among teenagers and young adults - so we're not talking cancers that are due to longevity increases from other sources, okay? - is rising, with the biggest increase among 20 to 24 year olds, particularly lymphoma, melanoma, germ cell tumours including testicular germ cell tumours - this kind of thing is - I mean, I

encourage you to do it. This kind of thing is trivially easy to find on the Internet. Just search cancer rates or increased cancer rates or something like that.

I want to personalize this a little bit by saying this: The church that is to one side of me and the small business that operates to the other side of me have been in the past frequent users of lawn chemicals and I am very, very severely affected by these chemicals. The first symptom I notice even before I smell them is a crashing depression that is just - you can't imagine what it's like. It lasts a month, and sometimes I'll get another dose before it's over, and I have to function through that. I know no antidote. There is no substance that a doctor has ever given me that would correct that and I am not a person that has this particular problem when I am not exposed to chemicals.

Everybody has their up days and down days, but this is not like an up day or a down day. This is serious. Under those circumstances in the past few years, I have made extraordinarily bad decisions because of the, no doubt, contributing was the state of mind that I was in while I was making those decisions, and I would estimate the cost of that to me at well over \$100,000 in cash. No question about it. That is my personal loss. But the personal impact on my health - and I'm going to show you a picture here - is the part that I'm concerned about. But I've taken steps to work with these people and I have called the companies and I have said: Please, I need a couple of days' notice. I got to get out of Dodge when you're doing this. I even went so far as to buy a gas mask. I use it for other things but the primary reason was - you know, one of those activated charcoal thingyjobbers. That helps me get out of Dodge. You see me driving down the road like a maniac with a mask on, get pulled over. Anyhow -

**Chair:** We have five minutes, okay? I just want to keep you on track there.

**Kevin O'Brien:** I'll be finished in a minute here. By the way, recreational things. I cannot golf. Three or four holes on a golf course, I can't breathe. It doesn't matter what the conditions are. I was never able to get proper notice. They would say they would and then they wouldn't.

A couple of years back, I was getting massage therapy from a local professional and I had had no problems whatsoever, but one day I rose from the massage table and the massage therapist jumped back in shock at looking at my face. It turned out that she uses a fabric softener on her towels. The towel is around that little doughnut thing you put your face in. I was on it for 30 minutes. I had been exposed twice that fall to fairly hideous doses of lawn chemicals with no notice, and for years I was told I would have notice. This is what my face looked like when I rose from that.

**Chair:** Show it around.

**Kevin O'Brien:** Okay, this is what my face looked like, and I took those pictures about three years ago. I took those pictures hoping that this day would come, okay?

I am absolutely convinced that lawn pesticides contributed significantly to this. The cumulative effect of being hit with a toxic dose of something can easily produce a reaction in something that you weren't otherwise allergic to..

So I really urge you - this is no fooling, and this is only a start. I thank you very much for this opportunity.

**Chair:** Any questions?

Okay, Jim.

**Mr. Bagnall:** You had mentioned where you had seen where the cancer rates had gone up where the use of pesticides - also in that information, did they say that pesticides

caused cancer?

**Kevin O'Brien:** No, and I'm no expert in this, but I'm not making a direct relationship between the two, other than to say that they are going up and there has to be a reason.

**Chair:** Cynthia, did you have a question?

**Ms. Dunsford:** Just to kind of follow up on your - I think kind of a big focus here was talking about jobs lost or jobs gained, either way. Have you come across any information that talks about how actually there could be an increase in activity in the lawn care industry because of restrictions or bans?

**Kevin O'Brien:** It would be my impression - and I will claim some expertise simply because I run a business and I try to balance, you know, pros and cons all the time and I'm doing it all the time - that to do these things naturally would be more labour intensive.

But I want to make one more tiny, little point. The church stopped using the chemicals a few years ago and for a few years their lawn was terrible. The dandelions came and the chinch bugs came, but the birds came back. Because I watch out that window all the time. The birds came back. The birds know where to go to feed now. They don't have chinch bugs and they have very few dandelions today and they don't do anything, just mow. So in a sense, if you stop using the chemicals - I suppose I'm arguing against my point about jobs, because if you let nature take care of it, there's no role for us.

But I don't think money is - I think the same people can be employed in the same work, just using different techniques, and I think that perhaps there'll be more employment. Anyhow -

**Chair:** Super.

**Kevin O'Brien:** - thanks very much.

**Chair:** Thank you for coming in as an individual. I mean, you could have written a letter but it's certainly great to see some people face to face like that.

Our next presenter is Dianne Corrigan. Again, I'll ask you to introduce yourself for Hansard. Do you want to leave time for questions or do you have a -

**Dianne Corrigan:** I'm not sure. The snowstorm kind of blew me out of the water yesterday. I was supposed to have been at the library all day doing research and typing in stuff.

**Chair:** You go ahead. I'll give you a five-minute warning.

**Dianne Corrigan:** Just give me a little warning.

My name is Dianne Corrigan. Some of you may or may not know who I am, but I have been an advocate for the ban on pesticide for years. I was pesticide poisoned.

Oh, I should, first of all, say hello and thank you for this opportunity. I am speaking mostly to elected representatives, right, that represent the people of PEI?

**Chair:** We're all elected MLAs sitting around the table.

**Dianne Corrigan:** Okay, yes.

**Chair:** Staff right here. Everyone else is elected MLAs.

**Dianne Corrigan:** So your mandate of office would be to represent the best good for the most people. That would be -

**Chair:** We've been mandated to look at this issue and report back to the House in the spring.

**Dianne Corrigan:** Right yeah, okay, but generally as an elected official, that would be basically you're representing the most people for the best good, okay.

Now I have heard that only about 20% of the people in Charlottetown are using lawn sprays, pesticides, so the other 80% is hopefully where I sit. Because I am asking that there is a ban on the use of lawn spraying.

I will thank you now for this opportunity to plead or beg you to stop the spraying immediately. In 1989 I was pesticide poisoned and ended up losing my job, my house, and all career possibilities. Overnight, I was sick and it was unexplained, and without income and still had three dependents trying to get education.

Now, here I have copies of symptoms of pesticide poisoning. I don't know how aware you are. I'm sorry, again, I didn't get to make enough copies for everybody, but if will you look - the gentleman just ahead of me there, Mr. O'Brien, was it?

**Chair:** Yes.

**Dianne Corrigan:** It starts with very mild symptoms right on through to convulsions and unconsciousness. It's in this book that has been used on the Island from Guelph by the agricultural community to teach people to use pesticide on PEI. Anybody who is using it for lawn spraying over there, they are supposed to be licensed and go through this program. It's called grower pesticide safety course.

Okay, if you just take a look over that, if you get a chance, the symptoms of pesticide poisoning are: blurred vision, laboured breathing, flushed or yellow skin, diarrhea, mental confusion, brain fogging. I was actually driving my car so poisoned that I actually was blacking out, driving on the wrong side of the road, going through stop

signs, sitting at a stop sign, unable to compute whether or not to proceed or stay where I was according to the colour of the light. I could not figure out what to do on a red or green light.

Now I have been to an environmental clinic, and I will be honest with all of you. I was working with Dr. Ken Grant and running a lab. I had to go as a nurse to various doctors, various clinics, trying to find out what was wrong with me and why was I blacking out at the wheel of my car. I mean, a little concerned for the other people on the highway, but now I am meeting other people who are doing just that. I have spoken to farmers who have rolled their vehicles and who have blacked out. Would you have people on PEI, accidents, where it's no alcohol involved but they're on the wrong side of the road, they went through stop signs. You've all heard and you're reading it in your papers.

When I went to doctors for an explanation, they said that because of my exposure to pesticide from the poisoning I was no longer the sharpest knife in the drawer. I would not ever be able to nurse again and I'm no longer the sharpest knife in the drawer. They were gentle with me, but it is because it does affect your brain. I'm one of the primary examples and I'm here today to tell you that.

I could not go back to work because working with Dr. Ken Grant here on PEI and running a lab for him, you had to be a sharp knife. You had to know what you were doing. You had to think and act quickly. I didn't realize that that was a privilege and an honour. I didn't know that was a talent I had. I now can be very easily affected and if I'm overtired, which I try not to be any more, if I go near lawn sprays, if I go out for a walk, I can come back and literally have to go to bed with fatigue.

I'm making this personal because I personally have had my life destroyed by it,



and I have buried family members. Actually, my younger sister died begging people to stop using it. She lived in a community that was spraying every lawn above her. She went walking every evening. She grew her own vegetables. She did all the right things. She was a lot healthier than I was. We buried her over five years ago. My younger sister in the family was diagnosed with cancer at the same time.

The one thing that made the difference in the three people who became dramatically ill at the same time in my family was that they were being provided with vegetables from a farm where the gentleman was actually doing experimental chemical use of pesticide. That was the only difference why they went down and I didn't or someone else did. That was the only thing we could figure out. Because some of them were living a healthier lifestyle than I was.

Excuse me. I'm being affected by my environment here so - I'm allergic to carpets and what they use for cleaning them.

PEI does not recognize environmental disease, and there's no protocol for treatment at our hospital. In this book - or you may be able to refer to it on page 124, the top paragraph - it's often misdiagnosed. You will see on there that in this book it admits that very often symptoms will vary with the pesticide exposure in the individual. Sometimes the symptoms of pesticide poisoning may be confused with the symptoms of food poisoning, asthma, flu, heart exhaustion or other illnesses. If you or anyone else has been exposed to a pesticide and chose any of these poisoning symptoms, call a doctor and go to a hospital. Don't wait is in - but the thing is I have gone to the hospital, and the first thing they do is they diagnose you as being an asthmatic.

I am not an asthmatic, but that is what happens. When you're exposed to a poison, your body tries to shut it out. That is the

natural, normal response. If you get something in your eye, it waters, your eye closes. You know, your lungs try and shut down. If you're breathing in something that the lung identifies as a toxin, the little alveoli will try and shut down to keep that out, and then your ability to breathe becomes limited and there will be fluid. There will be fluid build-up in your lungs as well.

Dr. DeMarsh had an article in the *Guardian* telling people to identify sickness as pesticide poisoning so that they would get different treatment than the prescribed treatment for asthma or whatever, which very often is adding chemicals to chemicals, and you can actually leave the person unconscious, making them much worse.

On CTV last week PEI was mentioned a number of times as a province most likely to have flooding and erosion. Entire Island outlined in red. My question: How much poison do we want floating around? Because we are going to get flooding. We are being told. The scientists have warned us we are the lowest lying or one of the lowest lying pieces of Canada that - Dr. David Suzuki, when he was here, he warned us. PEI is at risk. I think the fish kills we've had should demonstrate just how much of the land we want floating around with no control.

How much exposure can we take? We are exposed to sprays in our coffee shops, nursing homes, hospitals, stores with dispensers in some instances directly over our heads. Now, I have become aware of this because I am sensitive to it. I can walk into a coffee shop and immediately have to leave because they have dispensers in there. Now, I worked in the hospital and I was never told, and didn't know, that in the enclosed air system that we were actually - that they were spraying insecticide at night. I didn't know about it. I didn't know why I was reacting, why I was getting sick when I was in the hospital environment.

We're here to talk about the elephant in the living room, are we not? Children are being affected. I cared for a little boy who was exposed to lawn spray while in utero. He has been to the genetically altered clinic. He is having surgery to try to realign his features so he'll look normal and not be treated differently on the school ground where he is now going. He will spend the rest of his life having difficulties. My question to you is: What is going to happen when these genetically altered children start having children themselves? Are we just hoping that they're all sterile? Because we have genetically altered children on Prince Edward Island. There is over a year wait back then - I don't know, like, he's in school now, I looked after him from the time he was an infant - a year to get into a clinic to find out whether or not your child was genetically altered.

I have a cousin born without a brain, a beautiful first child born to parents who are left to see him through one convulsion after another.

Now I have a document here -

**Chair:** You're at the five minute mark, okay? Just a little heads up.

**Dianne Corrigan:** Research with chemical.com that you can actually go in and it shows us the child and its death at six weeks. There is an article. The research was done to back up.

I have a video, and I'm sorry I don't know the name of the lady who did a study on the children in Mexico. She took her own money and she went ahead and she did a study there, the difference between children exposed to pesticide and children who weren't exposed to pesticide and the effects on those children. I have that video and it's very dramatic. It's pretty hard after watching that video to say that there isn't an effect of pesticide on children.

David Suzuki says, and I quote: Nature is our home. That's from the David Suzuki Foundation:

Nature is our home, and just as we take care of our house, we also must take care of nature, but nature takes care of us too. Nature cleans our air and water, makes the soil that grows our food, and provides the resources to make all our material goods. Sustainability. Nature provides the air we breathe, the food we eat, and the water we drink. Every choice we make affects our environment.

The choices that you're going to make after today are going to not only affect the environment, it's going to affect children for generations. When we spray, it stays with us for a long time. There's no getting rid of it in an instant and those of us who are affected by it - I moved downtown to concrete city here so I wouldn't be exposed to sprays. After three years of not sleeping, I then moved back to Brighton. The first 24 hours I was there I got notice that the man across the street was going to spray. I had been told that there was something in place now that I could ask for protection, that they wouldn't be able to spray close enough for me to be affected. I phoned my municipal representation. I phoned the pesticide police. The gentleman told me there was something in place now. I did everything I could in the few hours I had to get out of there.

I had to spend a night in my car sleeping and I could not go back until I was sure that whatever they had sprayed was what I don't react to. The next time I am sprayed it could kill me, and that's the way I live in the city. There are children who are living exactly like that. They do not know when they go outside to play whether or not their asthma is going to be the last time they will be getting an attack and taken to hospital.

But I would like to think that we could here on PEI start recognizing environmental

illness, have a protocol at the hospital that the people are treated properly, that the children with asthma are really and truly looked at to see whether they are reacting to the pesticide, if they have true asthma. They just may be pesticide poisoned like I was.

I thank you very much for this opportunity, and I'm sorry if I'm a little disjointed and affected.

**Chair:** That's fine. Any questions? No?

Good. Thank you very much, Dianne.

**Dianne Corrigan:** You're welcome.

**Chair:** We're now going to hear from the Advisory Council on the Status of Women. Do you wish me to give you a five-minute warning too or do you want to take more questions from that or is that okay?

**Jane Ledwell:** If we stick to the script, there's going to be lots of time for questions, so I think we'll be okay.

**Chair:** I'll get you to introduce yourself for the Hansard.

**Jane Ledwell:** My name is Jane Ledwell. This is Lisa Murphy. Lisa is the director of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women. I work as a researcher and policy analyst for the council.

We'd like to congratulate government on having hearings on this very important issue, and thank you for the opportunity to speak today. We have a written brief that argues in support of a province-wide ban on cosmetic pesticides, and it kind of outlines what makes this an issue that's important to women. It provides some gender-based analysis and it just focuses on some of the particular risks that women face, negative health effects particularly for: pregnant women, including during the time when they do not know if they're pregnant or not; for

women in general, especially for senior women; and for children. So we've got all of that information there.

Also an argument that we don't see any discernable advantages or benefits that outweigh these health risks in the research that we've been able to do. You can read those details. I'll circulate it after and we can discuss it after. But I wanted to use this conversation time to speak a little bit more personally about the issue.

Because as soon as domestic pesticides are applied, they become a neighbourhood issue. So I wanted to invite you to come with me on a walk around my neighbourhood in Charlottetown. I grew up in the country. I never thought that I would enjoy living in town. I was wrong. I love it now, and I want to walk you through that what happens in a weekday in our neighbourhood. Maybe not today, because they're still plowing out the sidewalks. Let's think of a day in the spring or summer. I'd invite you in this walk to think about as well how pesticides might move from one yard to another or one space to another as they move through the neighbourhood.

What I look forward to most in our neighbourhood in the springtime and summertime is that people and pets get out of their houses to live larger parts of their lives in their yards and on the sidewalks. Early in the morning the paper carrier walks to neighbours' doors to deliver the news. Retired folks get up and walk their dogs who wander back and forth over the edges of lawns sniffing the traces of yesterday's dogs. Back doors open onto backyard gardens where people feed the birds, and cats prowl from yard to yard trying to eat the birds. There are lots of birds in the neighbourhood eating crab apples and insects and keeping out of range of cats. People hang out their laundry before they go to work. Kids walk and cycle and wheelchair to school, to a junior high school

in one direction, an elementary school in the other direction. The junior high school kids drag their flip-flops more and more the closer they get to school. Parents pull up to drop off their younger kids at the licensed child care center around the corner and with the early childhood educator across the street who cares for little ones at her home. Some folks walk to work or to either end of the street to catch a bus nowadays, which is a nice innovation too.

When the workday traffic clears, the baby strollers come out and jogging strollers, infant strollers, toddler strollers, double and even triple occupancy strollers, come out. Some of the strollers get left behind with parents when toddlers like my own one-year-old daughter, who's a cutie, test the world on their own feet and on their own terms. They run ahead on their own with all their senses alert to the world.

Our mail carrier admits that he walks across lawns to cut a few minutes off an over-subscribed mail route. At lunch, when the babies nap, the junior high school kids cut across lawns obliviously on their way to the fast-food joints, because the straightest way to get from point A to point B is a line, and if the line cuts across a lawn, all the better. They swear loudly but they also blush hard. At lunch, working folks also come home to walk their dogs on their lunch breaks.

In the afternoon, the babies come out again, and some of the seniors at the retirement living home sit out on the porch or out in the yard in the sun to move around with walkers and wheelchairs. Women who are making a change in their lives after leaving abusive relationships walk to get groceries for their families where they're staying in second-stage housing. The wind shifts, a light rain begins to fall. From two to four people shuffle to and from the local funeral home for the wakes.

School lets out. There's soccer practice at

the field at the end of our street. Kids play on the streets, throwing softballs and playing street hockey, skateboarding, splashing in kiddie pools, pushing each other off the sidewalk. People break out their barbecues and the smell of other people's suppers makes folks walking home from work arrive home hungry. They eat on their decks hearing the faint sound of their neighbours eating on their decks as well.

At night, after the birds have come home to their roosts and gossiped about their days, people settle down. Sometimes evidence of heartbreak or addiction or conflict spill out into the sidewalks at nighttime, and this is what we mean by all walks of life.

You can see it all in any neighbourhood in Charlottetown, maybe mine in particular, but in all. Personally, I'm a 35-year-old woman. When I walk on my street, sometimes I'm with my curious one-year-old. Sometimes I'm pregnant; sometimes I'm not; and sometimes I might be but I don't know yet. Sometimes I like those maybe times best of all, but those are the times that I'm at the greatest risk for pesticide exposure.

All of this is just to say that all of this vitality and potential vitality in my neighbourhood and in other neighbourhoods is so much more valuable than Mr. X's dandelion-free lawn or Mrs. Y's lawn free of brown spots from chinch bugs.

All of this is to say that cosmetic pesticides can't possibly stay put in a yard where they've been applied, when the wind and birds and pets and children and walkers all trail from yard to yard in a real, lived-in neighbourhood. Property might be labelled private, but it's not, and the air and the water and the animals are all shared.

All of this is to say that you as legislators have an opportunity to take away one health risk for women and children in a risky

world, and there's no reason in the world not to do so when you can. Pesticides are a neighbourhood issue. They're a provincial issue. They're a women's and children's health issues and, finally, they're an equality issue, because if we want equal ability to experience and enjoy the world around us without fearing risks to our health or our children's health, then it becomes important.

So thank you for your time and we would be happy to answer questions. (Indistinct).

**Chair:** You're not publishing that walk by any chance, are you?

**Jane Ledwell:** Well, actually, we did post it to - I have it ready to post for a blog. I can send you a link.

**Chair:** Do you have any questions for Jane?

**Jane Ledwell:** I'm happy to talk about more substantial things as well, as I say. I just wanted to kind of do something a little bit different. Because the scientific evidence can get fairly weighty and it's very hard to make a decision based just on the scientific evidence because it comes at you from all directions.

**Chair:** I just want to ask you something. I know you're with the Status of Women, but you referred to women and children. Is there no concern for the husbands (Indistinct)?

**Jane Ledwell:** Well, professionally speaking, no. There are studies that show negative reproductive health outcomes for men as well as for women. The focus of our review was primarily women because that is primarily what we're asked to do, and also because we looked particularly at the Ontario College of Family Physicians' review of the literature on pesticides. Because they did a really thorough job looking at methodologies, looking at the validity of the research findings. They did not include any studies that they didn't

accept as being really rigorously done. They concluded in the end that there were particular health risks for women and for children.

I think we also have a burden of responsibility in looking at this from the perspective of women and children because in the testing regimens for pesticides, men's bodies are taken as a norm, and that's inevitable. They cannot test on pregnant women. They cannot test on children.

**Unidentified Speaker:** It's unethical.

**Jane Ledwell:** It's unethical, exactly, and so it's really important that we take that into consideration.

If we're going to apply a precautionary principle, it would be for that reason, that you cannot test on some of the most vulnerable people. While the Pest Management Regulatory Agency does say that they take extra precautions because of women and children's health, they also say that pregnant women should not be exposed to pesticides and should not use them. In their own literature, they say that they should not re-enter treated areas within 24 hours.

Now if the health effects are most severe in the very early stages of a pregnancy - the health effects for a fetus are most severe in those earliest stages - a woman who may or may not be intending to become pregnant might not even know. You know, how does she make a choice for her health or the health of children or future generations based on that? I get nervous. I just go.

**Chair:** Cynthia.

**Ms. Dunsford:** Thank you very much for coming in, Jane and Lisa.

I guess when we look at other jurisdictions - and I keep bringing this up depending with

almost every group. Because what we're trying to do is also get information from groups who represent people and ideas to help us with maybe any extra research or work you might have done in consulting with other jurisdictions with regards to the Status of Women, and whether or not there's been any information come through the organization from other provinces or -

**Jane Ledwell:** We didn't get a lot of information from other provinces. But one thing that I'll have Lisa share with you, a statistic that came from Quebec just about children's health, impacts that preceded their ban on pesticides.

**Lisa Murphy:** You mean the (Indistinct) study?

**Jane Ledwell:** Yeah.

**Lisa Murphy:** This is on page 5 of our little paper, and it speaks to a really serious case involving children. As we know, children are close to the earth physically than the rest of us and they're very vulnerable. But in this study they say that children may be affected more by domestic pesticides than any other kind of pesticide. In 1996 the Quebec Poison Control Centre and the Quebec Ministry of Environment and Wildlife released statistics on pesticide poisoning and reported 1,650 poisoning cases in the province.

Now these cases, just under 80% were in private homes, and 46.1% of the victims were children under five. One-third of these children ingested pesticides orally, and just over one-third were exposed following a pesticide application. So it's a very specific review from 1996, very serious, something we can't ignore.

**Ms. Dunsford:** A big part of this - and I've said it before too - is implementing a province-wide ban on cosmetic pesticides as an action piece but I think it's as much about

education as it is about action.

**Lisa Murphy:** Absolutely.

**Ms. Dunsford:** And it's groups like yours who can certainly take part in that when the time comes.

**Lisa Murphy:** You know, yeah, this used to be an emerging issue. That's what we called it, an emerging issue, but now it's an ongoing issue. So more and more jurisdictions including our own are looking at this much more seriously. We do get the very personal stories like the woman who preceded us, and Kevin before that. So we take all those stories, of course, and a lot of those stories are generated under the municipality when this became an issue in the municipality, and then we try to then spin it out wider into a gender-based look so we can apply some research. In fact, some of those individuals would be very willing to share their stories in a more intimate way for sure, but they definitely form the beginning, the basis of our work, and that's with any issue we work on.

**Jane Ledwell:** One other quick comment on why this is a provincial issue in PEI and not every province has taken the opportunity to look at it on a provincial level. That's that we are an island, we are a small island jurisdiction. We have particular opportunities to look at the issue as a province. In most other places, this is being led by municipalities. In PEI the municipalities have asked provincial legislators to take a role in this.

Not only that, but we live in a province where the majority of the landscape still is unrepresented within municipal boundaries, and that leaves a special weight of responsibility on provincial legislators as well. It's also a special opportunity that we have to take a step to eliminate a toxin from the environment.

**Chair:** Okay. Any other questions?

Very well. Thank you. Lisa and Jane, for coming in and making a presentation.

We're going to take a short break and then we'll return. I think Dave Steeves is up next, so if you want to get set, Dave, that would be great. So let's try and be back in 15 minutes, okay? We're doing great keeping on time here so that's good.

*[There was a short recess]*

**Chair:** Okay, folks, I call the meeting back to order.

Our next presenter is Dave Steeves and Dave, I'll get you to introduce yourself for the sake of Hansard. Are you going to have most of your presentation or do you want mostly questions?

**David Steeves:** I won't need 15 minutes to say what I got to say.

**Chair:** Go right ahead.

**David Steeves:** I don't anticipate too many questions.

My name is David Steeves. I live in Charlottetown, and I don't represent anybody but myself.

I'm here today before the Standing Committee on Agriculture, Forestry and Environment because I'm angry and I'm fed up with people who spray toxic chemicals into my environment without my consent or showing concern for anyone except themselves.

I've been here 40 years. Once our potato farms doubled their planting - they went from about 60,000 acres to about 120,000 - we started to experience some problems. This happened in a very short period of time. We experienced increased fish kills.

We experienced pollution of rural wells, rivers, and lakes. We experienced increased soil erosion. We have fertilizer runoff problems for our mussel growers and we have increased cancer rates. I'll come to that later.

Finally, this government has been forced into offering free tests for well water for levels of nitrates because the situation is so out of control. I'm asking the PEI producers to back off, to cut down, to reduce planting before we reach the point of no return, if by chance we haven't reached it already.

A physician, his name is Dr. Ron Matsusaki who did a practice in Alberton, PEI, he noticed a high number of cancer cases on PEI and he was concerned by the volume of pesticides used by farmers. He blamed pesticides for causing cancer. He was so strongly convinced of it he ran as a candidate for the Green Party during the last election. After four years of seeing no change nor improvement in the farm use of toxic chemicals, he left the province.

Dr. Matsusaki's observations about high cancer rates are confirmed by this little booklet here. It's Canadian Cancer Statistics issued by the Canadian Cancer Society and StatsCan. On page 21, the total instances of cancer per 100,000 by province, PEI is the highest with 916 as compared to Newfoundland with 728, and the Canadian average is 812. PEI is 14% above the average while Newfoundland is 10% below the Canadian average. It seems to me a difference of 24% between the two islands is significant and indicates that PEI does have a serious cancer problem.

Some types of bad news don't travel that fast on PEI. One week after the incident happened, the *Guardian* printed the story, so it must be true. Around noon on Friday of November 16<sup>th</sup> a student at Englewood School saw a farmer or someone spraying pesticide-herbicide on land adjacent to the

school. He told the principal who brought all the students inside until the school day ended. For unknown reasons, the school principal waited until Monday to notify the environment department who are investigating the complaint. On November 16<sup>th</sup> the Confederation Bridge was closed due to high winds, and it was a regular school day, but the farmer decided to spray anyway despite knowing it was windy and despite knowing that the rental land was a few hundred feet away from the school filled with children.

The Eastern School Board said the farmer breached the terms of the lease and so they cancelled the contract. I think the horse got away and they bolted the door. The mystery farmer must have forgotten to take his medication on that Friday to make such an insane and foolish decision. The members of the Eastern School board who rented land to a potato farmer adjacent to Englewood School must have known spraying crops is very risky to our most precious resource, our children. The school board members who risked students' lives and health for a few rental dollars in my opinion should be shot at sunrise, and I'm willing to supply the bullets. I wonder how many times other similar incidents happen in other parts of the Island and were not reported. For me, it's depressing to speculate about such a possibility.

In conclusion, I would not only ban cosmetic use of pesticides everywhere on PEI, I demand that this government start protecting its residents. I mean the non-farmers, the 96% of us that aren't farmers that make up the population of PEI, by enforcing the laws and regulations concerning safe and responsible farming practices. They should re-write the environment act - or you people should - so violators can be charged and taken to court. I hope eventually Island politicians understand that there are other groups in society besides potato farmers, and they

have rights too. But these people have to stand up and they have to say their piece like I'm doing today.

**Chair:** Thank you for your presentation.

Any questions for Dave? Cynthia.

**Ms. Dunsford:** You talked mostly about the farming practices and the use of pesticides in farming. We're focusing in this group on the cosmetic group of pesticides, but you do bring up an interesting kind of angle on this. It's been talked about among some of us already. That the cosmetic use of pesticides in the rural areas of Prince Edward Island is virtually a non-issue. When we talk about the cosmetic use of pesticides on PEI, I think we can all agree that the majority of that use takes place in urban areas. But that's not to discount your concerns, obviously, with just pesticides in general and the situation on PEI in general, and I appreciate your perspective indeed.

**David Steeves:** I'm just frustrated with the attitude towards pesticides. I'm really frustrated because 96% of the people don't live on farms and don't depend on farm income. Those 96% of your population are at risk and they don't seem to have much control over who puts what where. I can give you other examples of poor farming practices, if you'd like me to dig some up, but what's the point? We all know what's going on. We all know what's happening.

**Ms. Dunsford:** The non-farmers are the people specifically that the cosmetic pesticide issue deals with mostly, and so there's use - I think the statistic of 20% in the Charlottetown area was bounced around earlier of people who use cosmetic pesticides. You know, that's where this is focused too -

**David Steeves:** I understand that, but to me they're linked. They're linked together because pesticides kill, period, and I'm



afraid that we may have gone too far. I'm just afraid that we're overloaded, this poor little Island, with pesticides and chemicals and you name it, and I think we're going to be faced with a lot of problems, a lot of health problems.

**Chair:** Any other questions?

If not, again, Mr. Steeves, thank you very much. Appreciate you coming forward.

**David Steeves:** Thank you.

**Chair:** We're now going to hear from the Council of Canadians. Leo, I'll get you to introduce yourself and for Hansard. Just a heads up again: Is it a full presentation or do you want a heads-up on the time frame there?

**Leo Broderick:** A heads-up would be good if people want to ask questions. I don't think I'll be 15 minutes anyway, but you never know.

Good afternoon. My name's Leo Broderick and I'm here to present on behalf of the Council of Canadians, and I thank you very much for the opportunity.

The Council of Canadians is a national organization. It's Canada's largest citizens' organization, with members and chapters right across the country, and we have 200 or 300 members here on Prince Edward Island. We do a lot of work on economic and social justice issues. We are particularly concerned with the issues surrounding free trade, water, and clearly the issue of the environment. We promote progressive policies on these issues.

There's no question as we work across the country and here in Prince Edward Island on the issue of pesticides and the polluting of our land and environment and our water and our soil, and as we poison people right across the country and here in Prince

Edward Island, the Council of Canadians has become active at the local level on the issue of having cosmetic pesticides banned.

We're also concerned, of course, with the whole industrial approach to agriculture, which I think your committee will have to deal with at some point, because the two are very much connected. Cosmetic pesticides and lawn pesticides simply are supplied by the very same big corporate interests. We have vertical integration in terms of the production of pesticides, medicine, pharmaceutical, and genetically modified organisms. All of them are connected.

So this afternoon I wanted the opportunity to simply talk to you about why I think it could be and should be a very good idea to have the Province of Prince Edward Island ban cosmetic pesticides. On this issue, the Council of Canadians has been working locally here with many different groups on the issue of banning cosmetic pesticides for at least 10 years. I'm somewhat embarrassed, really, to have to be here this afternoon to once again make a presentation on this issue. To me it's a no-brainer. I can't believe that we are so reluctant as a community and as a government to deal with the issue of cosmetic pesticides, lawn pesticides, when the evidence is very clear. They are damaging to people's health and they are damaging to the environment.

I remember about eight years ago when there was an issue of pesticides in schools. I do know that the school board was dealing with the issue, and so I sent the information off to the superintendent which clearly outlined that there is really a major problem with pesticides being sprayed and used around public buildings, but particularly schools. I sent him the information that, well, a lot of these pesticides or all of them do cause serious health issues and they do cause brain damage. But I did note that maybe the brain damage had already occurred given the reluctance of even school

boards to take the issue seriously.

So I'm hoping that with this group at least, this legislative committee will make a sensible recommendation to the House so that Prince Edward Island can join hundreds of other areas across this country and have cosmetic pesticides banned. Now, there's no question that in Quebec it has been banned, and I'm told in doing the research that it is the most progressive legislation on banning pesticides in North America. There are still probably loopholes, but at least it's a major effort, and I do know that at least 130 other communities across the country have banned cosmetic pesticides with some reservation. So it's time for Prince Edward Island to move into the 21<sup>st</sup> century and deal with the health and environmental issue of cosmetic pesticides.

Now these chemicals - I think most of you know - include herbicides, insecticides, and fungicides, and they are very much connected to health issues. I mean, it's been well documented, and I will say that in the Province of Quebec in one community outside Montreal, when they did a study of the children who lived in that particular community, 97% of the children had pesticide traces in their body.

Now I think it's clear that living here on Prince Edward Island, when pesticides are sprayed in communities - and I would say someone mentioned earlier maybe 20%. But even if it is just 20% of homeowners and commercial establishments that use pesticides, it still really is a very small percentage of the total amount of pesticides that are poured into Prince Edward Island soil. In fact, the agricultural statistic for 2006 suggests that there are approximately 718,410 kilograms of pesticides in Island soils. So if we take approximately, you know, people are saying maybe the cosmetic pesticide accounts to maybe 2%, we're still dealing with a significant amount of pesticides in communities.

They are dangerous to our health. We have huge rates of cancer in the province. I mean, it's clear that cancer, as already mentioned by the previous speaker, continues to increase in Prince Edward Island, and that the overall incidence of both cancer appearing in men and women is increasing, while the rest of the country remains stable. The greatest differences between Prince Edward Island and the rest of the country are evident in lung and colorectal cancers in women, prostate cancer in men, and melanoma in both men and women. All of these cancers can be traced to some aspect of a pesticide. I mean, the research is there.

Now our greatest obstacle to any kind of movement to ban pesticides, whether it be cosmetic pesticides or agricultural use of pesticides, has been the industry that produces pesticides. They're a powerful industry. They usually meet in private with government officials, and in some cases they contribute fairly favourably to political parties which, in a sense, nullifies or inhibits political parties, through legislation, from doing their proper thing. I think there's no exception here in Prince Edward Island, but I think it's time that we moved beyond that and hold the chemical industry accountable.

There's no question that when the chemical industry looks at the whole issue of pesticides, they simply say there is always a safe level of exposure. That's their argument, and the scientific evidence suggests that when the testing is done they do one ingredient at a time. They do not deal with them in combination. Any researcher that has attempted to expose the combination of ingredients in pesticides has been dealt with very harshly by their own research organizations, in terms of these chemical companies, and by government.

I don't think we can rely on Health Canada to significantly deal with this issue, but the Province of Prince Edward Island has the right to ban pesticides. It is in the power of

the province, and I think we need to do that, and I think we can employ the whole issue of precautionary principle.

Now the World Health Organization says that 20% of cancers are genetic in origin. Many chemical companies, pharmaceutical companies, and the medical establishment want us to believe that cancer and other illnesses are genetic and lifestyle. In fact, though, what the World Health Organization is saying is that 80% of cancers and many other illnesses are in fact environmental, and that gives me hope, at least. Because if it's 80% environmental, it means that they're preventable, and that's what we need to do here on Prince Edward Island.

We can prevent more illnesses. That's where we need to focus our attention. If you look at the cancer industry - and it is an industry - they want to look at a cure. Many researchers are saying that as long as we have carcinogens in our land, in our air, in our water, and in the foods that we eat, there's going to be no stopping cancer. The only means to sufficiently curb cancer is to prevent it, and we can prevent it if we take the steps to control what's in our environment.

Now, I think if the Province of Prince Edward Island can limit - it may in some ways be a symbolic gesture, given that we do live on a toxic island. There is no question. Wherever you go you are faced with inhaling pesticides, certainly during the year, during the summer. I would say that when we deal with the issue of banning pesticides, I would not give the golf courses a break on this one. Golf courses must be subjected to the same rules and regulations of any lawn and any commercial establishment. We can rid golf courses on Prince Edward Island of pesticides.

As you look across the province, golf courses are very plentiful and, in fact, they're going to be more plentiful than

churches. We now have approximately 35, and probably will increase, and they use loads of pesticides. I tried to get the statistics on what the provincially-owned golf courses - but they were not available. Neither are the statistics on what lawn pesticides are sold and used, but they are going to start recording, but I think let's not have that. Let's ban it. There are plenty of models. The model of Quebec will show us and lead us in a positive direction if we want to take that risk.

You represent people. You don't represent corporations. You represent the people that elected you. In a democratic institution, if most people want something, that's what most people should get. I'm hoping that we don't have a repeat here - because I did appear before the former legislative committee on the GMOs and, you know, we almost had that won. In fact, one MLA said: You did have a GMO-free province for 24 hours, but the minister of agriculture, having met with the industry representatives, came into the committee in private and the next day the decision was reversed.

So I challenge the legislative committee in your recommendation: let's deal with this up front. There's enough evidence to suggest that a cosmetic ban is absolutely imperative for the province.

Thank you.

**Chair:** Thank you.

Olive has a question here.

**Leader of the Opposition:** (Indistinct) question I have. Both you and Tony Reddin spoke about the example - I believe you were talking about Hudson, Quebec.

**Leo Broderick:** Yes.

**Leader of the Opposition:** I asked him when did that take place, the ban?

**Leo Broderick:** Two thousand and three.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Two thousand and three. So has there been research done since to demonstrate that there are better health outcomes -

**Leo Broderick:** There is.

**Leader of the Opposition:** - less children with defects, less asthma, less cancer rates, and if so, could you produce it to this committee?

**Leo Broderick:** I don't know if I can produce it, but the evidence is suggesting that there is a different approach or at least the people are feeling more healthy, and they may well be, but I will look into that.

**Leader of the Opposition:** That would be really helpful because if there has been increases and we can link them directly to Hudson, it'd be curious to see what those health outcomes are.

The other question I was going to ask you was: Where do you get your food?

**Leo Broderick:** Where do I get my food? We buy our food at the local grocery store.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Like which?

**Leo Broderick:** Co-Op and Farmers' Market.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Okay, because one of the questions - sure - that I've asked some people today so far, and they've talked about Sobeys and Superstore, and I guess I would ask people in terms of - I was just curious with people having a lot of concern around their food, does it follow through that people actually know where we're buying and where our food's coming from? In Canada we tend to have good regulations, and I'm just curious, in terms of food that's coming into Canada, is it under the same

regulations? Are there links then that are related to other things in our health? I was just curious.

**Leo Broderick:** I think that our food regulations need to be certainly improved. I think there's a growing mistrust of food. Even here on Prince Edward Island, if I take the poultry industry, why did we move from free range chickens to having chickens raised in cubicles? It was cheaper, but in doing so we feed them a lot of chemicals, a lot of antibiotics. We do the same in the beef and hog industry. So there are some serious questions about the food we eat.

I think the wonderful thing about the Farmers' Market or having a relationship with someone who grows food, you know exactly what ingredients are going into the production of the food. So there are some fine examples here on Prince Edward Island, but I am skeptical of our regulations. They're not that great.

Health Canada, you know, for these pesticides or even the food, there's no independent research done any more on the pesticide that comes in to be approved. The industry does the research and simply submits, and they go over the research and it usually gets approved. It's an example, you know, like the 2,4-D, it's a perfect example. It's legal in this country but it's been banned in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, and we continue to use. It's one of the ones that's used in the lawn pesticides and it's deadly.

I mean, pesticides kill and we are experiencing that, I think, in terms of - well, we've heard this afternoon the environmental illnesses. But in terms of the other illnesses, we have a high incidence of cancer and I think government has the responsibility to protect its citizens. We have a fundamental right to clean air, to clean food, and to clean water. That's our right.

**Chair:** Cynthia's got one quick one.

**Ms. Dunsford:** Just to go kind of back in, and it's not to purposely constantly try to separate the agricultural and the cosmetic parts of this, but we are dealing with specifically the cosmetic use of pesticides. Appreciate your comments on everything else you've talked about too, Leo.

But the other part to the motion that we're here to address is the potential impact of a province-wide ban, if that were to happen. You mentioned the golf courses, as did a group earlier, in saying, you know, the Charlottetown report had exempted that and then there's been a couple of groups saying they shouldn't be exempt.

I guess if we could get some more guidance on that side of things too because that will impact the golf course industry. It will impact the chemical industry. It's not a matter of whether or not - it's not a should or shouldn't. It's just it will impact. So how do we - are we done?

**Chair:** Well, we're going to be. I'm just glad I didn't give you time for a long one.

Do you want to just touch on that (Indistinct)?

**Leo Broderick:** Yeah. There are plenty of examples of where golf courses can be chemical free. That's what needs to be investigated. It can be done. It seems to be an easy approach to simply spray. We don't have to have spraying. In fact, I will tell you that the more information gets out about Prince Edward Island's toxic playground, the less people will want to come. So it's in the interest of everyone, including the people who come during the season, to have a clean province. Right now we are in serious jeopardy.

So economic reasons in the long run will produce better economics. In fact, in Halifax

when they banned, the lawn care businesses certainly it created more jobs, so there's lots of evidence. We don't have to be addicted to chemicals. Thanks a lot.

**Chair:** Thank you very much, Leo. Kind of gave us a segue into that with the Halifax comment. The next presenter is coming from there.

Our next presenter is Helen Jones and she's come from Halifax today. We had her penciled in as hopefully she'd make it here.

**Helen Jones:** I'm certainly glad I finished that drive.

**Chair:** Anyway, we've been giving people about 15 minutes, and I'll give you a five-minute notice in case you want to close up, and we'll have questions.

**Helen Jones:** Right. Excellent.

**Chair:** Okay? So I'd ask you to introduce yourself for the sake of Hansard and the rest of us here, and you can carry on.

**Helen Jones:** Great. Thanks for the opportunity of meeting with you.

My name is Helen Jones and I am a past member of the Pesticide Bylaw Advisory Committee for the Halifax Regional Municipality. That was an advisory committee that was created to put some options forward to council in terms of how to deal with the pesticide bylaw, and I was one of the signees of the majority report from that committee which recommended a total phase-out of landscape pesticides. Since that time we've had a major reduction in the ambient levels, basically, in our neighbourhoods which, although I don't know of accurate measurements on it, many of the people who are chemically sensitive are much more able now to move about the neighbourhood and live without having accidental exposures. It's not a totally fixed

problem but it's much better than it was.

So I'm also a founding board member of a concerned citizen's group called RATE, Real Alternatives to Toxins in the Environment - a mouthful - and I have graduate degrees in comparative physiology and education; and have been an invited speaker at Dalhousie Medical School on prenatal and post-partum issues, and an invited speaker on pesticide issues in a number of municipalities - Winnipeg, Edmonton, Moncton and others. In 2002 I had my way paid to speak to the House of Commons on the review of the pest control products act, and more recently, I've been a regular with Rick Howe who runs a phone-in talk show on the radio. I don't know if you get here on PEI but I always enjoy him.

I'd like to begin just by reading a few simple words from Dr. Robert Strang, who was a medical officer of health for the Halifax area during our hearings. While he was making a presentation to HRM Council, Dr. Strang stated:

The medical and scientific literature clearly shows that pesticides are a health risk to the entire community, especially to children, as well as to the health of our environment. A total ban on the use of landscape pesticides is the only legislative step that will absolutely decrease the community-wide risk.

That's our medical officer of health at the time. I urge the standing committee here to draft and implement such a ban for the entire Province of Prince Edward Island. I just wanted to make some point forms and try not to take too much time, leave time for questions.

First point would be that I think you need both strong provincial and municipal legislation. Sometimes people say: What do you need municipal bylaws for if you get good provincial legislation and vice versa?

But base this on Quebec's experience. They have used both and they need both to get the level of public health protection that they have achieved. The province-wide ban is an admirable piece of legislation but it's not complete. There are some chemicals that are not covered by the ban. The complementary side of that is that the pesticide bylaws in Quebec prohibit the materials that the province-wide legislation didn't cover.

As you've heard I'm sure many times today, the health risks of pesticides are enormous. They're real, they're sobering, and they're often under-reported. Medical professionals are issuing ever more urgent warnings. A few of the examples that come to my mind are that many fertilizers and weed and feed products contain dioxins in the 2,4-D component that is so commonly present in the fertilizers. So that you may not know, but every batch of 2,4-D that's synthesized has a necessary component - it's always there - of dioxins. You don't have to argue about whether 2, 4-D is carcinogenic. The Swedish researchers and oncologists know it's connected to non-Hodgkins lymphoma. But step back from that. If you have dioxin in every quantity of 2,4-D, you know that's not a good thing to be spreading on your lawns.

Pesticide residues are known to enter our homes unlicensed. They're not licensed to be indoors but they're known to - more than one good study - show that they do come indoors and remain there for up to a year. Without weathering agents they stay there a long time. Some pesticides are estrogen mimics and therefore have the potential to stimulate estrogen sensitive cancers. Some cause neurological and reproductive damage or disrupt the immune system. They either suppress the immune system as dramatically as organ transplant drugs do, or they make it wildly responsive, over-responsive, hyper-reactive, so that you can have both end of the spectrum in terms of immune system disruption.

At least one deadly form of childhood cancer, neuroblastomas, are strongly linked to household home pesticide use. The kids don't usually get over that cancer. That one's a bad one. Genetic damage known to result from pesticide exposure can cause Parkinson's disease and attention deficit hyperactive disorder.

Under-reporting is partially a result of the fact that physicians don't often know what to test for when they know there's been an exposure. They may not know whether to look in the blood, the serum, in the urine, in your fatty tissue. They don't know what metabolites always to look for. I've got documents from people who specialize in this kind of thing, but it's not generally known what metabolites to look for when you're looking for signs of a particular pesticide exposure. Also, some metabolites are really fleeting. Like, they disappear within 24 to 48 hours. So that whole technical side of things make it difficult for doctors to track down and document.

I think another example of under-reporting: there are studies that show that 35.5% of children and, of course, the adults they become, are less able to detoxify pesticides than the average child is already known to be. Children don't detoxify anything as well as adults do, but there's a large sub-group, a large sub-genetic group, that is even less able to handle them. These things get averaged over in most research studies so they get sort of just obscured and you don't really see the impact on this segment of the population.

Another important point is that pesticides are not well regulated in Canada, in my and other's opinion. Pesticide industry people will tell you and claim strongly that the regulatory system in Canada is exemplary, one of the best in the world, but this is untrue and is one of the main reasons why I feel your provincial committee should take some bold action. The federal Auditor

General and successive commissioners of the environment repeatedly pointed out that Canada is not doing a good job of regulating pesticides. There are quotes like: Only Canada and the Slovak Republics do not keep track of pesticide sales. Some strong criticism, and it keeps coming from the Auditor General's department.

Sweden has banned hundreds of pesticides and the OECD countries have banned (Indistinct) about 100 pesticides that you always see these countries have discontinued. Sweden has another - well, in one year they banned 222 pesticides. All starting in 1989 - all through the 1990s they were banning pesticides every year, something like 32 products one year, 50, 60 another, over 100 some other years.

So when you compare what's happening in Canada where we're still releasing these things in our neighbourhoods, this is a very different example. Instead, what we're doing is importing industry-friendly regulatory policy from the US and the chemicals that are made by US companies. I think that it's well known that we don't do any, basically no or almost no, testing of our own so that we're very dependent on the US system, which then requires the US manufacturers to do testing on their own products, which is a fair conflict.

**Chair:** Five minutes.

**Helen Jones:** Five minutes, okay. Let's move right along then. I'm not making fast enough progress.

You need, I think, a better definition of pesticide to have effective legislation, and in the notes that I've given you I'm proposing a definition that's going to work better. The problem with the average definition is that they typically lump together the relatively safe non-toxic products with the synthetic chemical pesticides. They don't identify fertilizer products that contain pesticide as a

pesticide product so it gets a fertilizer product number. It just slips under the boards.

The average definition requires municipal and provincial lawmakers to come up with lists of materials you're allowed to use even though they're included as a pest control product number. Then every time you want to change the list one item at a time, there's a big discussion either at the Legislature or in municipal councils that are contentious and they're time-consuming, whereas there is another way of handling this that works much better.

I've quoted for you a definition that was just used by the Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities in passing one of their resolutions last month. They have said that:

Pesticide means synthetic pesticides including insecticides, fungicides, and herbicides, as well as any product in which they are present whether or not the product has been a Pest Control Product Number in Canada; and then, these are materials prohibited by the organic standard of the Canadian General Standards Board and/or the Organic Materials Review Institute.

There's one of two review institutes in the world. One's in Switzerland, one's in Oregon. So simply put, if either of these bodies prohibit a material, then your legislation would too. In other words, any municipal bylaw or any provincial legislation could be written such that if a material is prohibited by either of these bodies, then so - and that means it would be updated quarterly, it's transparent, it's overseen by a body of experts that is highly qualified. When industry says you're not qualified to make these decisions, you just say: Go talk to their advisory buddies. It's much simpler.

Moving along. A good move would be to ban the sale of mixtures of fertilizers and

pesticides, as Quebec has done. Many people get accidental exposures not even knowing there are pesticides in their fertilizers or weed-and-feeds. If your main goal is to fertilize your lawn, it makes no sense to be putting pesticides all over it at the same time. Some people do that unwittingly.

Another point is to avoid the recommendations that you will be getting from industry to incorporate IPM, Integrated Pest Management, into your legislation. I think this might be the single most important recommendation that will lead to the success of your legislation: to keep IPM or Integrated Pest Management out of your clauses and your statutes.

It's a concept that's been pretty well taken over by the lawn care industry and it relies on the use of pesticides. It frequently relies on a certification program or landscapers issue certification to themselves under IPM, and what - it allows the landscapers to use pesticides anytime they think it's important. It's totally open season for the use of pesticides, if you do incorporate IPM.

Many good recommendations came from the Charlottetown ad hoc committee. I noticed a lot of great things in there, but recommendation number four worried me a bit. Because it has in it a requirement that whoever oversees their permit system, as seen by the committee, would be required to have IPM certification. That means in all probability that's a landscaper. I think you could write statutes that prevent this from happening. You just say that by law, provincial law, the people who oversee any kind of permit system under a pesticide bylaw would need to be at arm's-length from industry. That one seems to be common sense.

Public education is a key thing. This green card will be in the materials that you're getting. This is something that St. Andrews,



New Brunswick, mailed home in their tax bills to every resident in the community. It's a good short education on the subject: organic lawn care on one side, risk on the other.

Strong pesticide regulation is not bad for business or the economy. Statistics Canada figures show that from 2000 to 2005 in HRM there was a 53% increase in the number of landscape businesses and also a big increase in the number of employees. So the thing is this doesn't hurt business.

People can make money selling non-toxic materials. If Health Canada would approve soap for use on chinch bug, that's 99% of the permanent requests in HRMs for chinch bug. Health Canada should approve soap for use on chinch bug. It's a glaring omission. They haven't, because it works. For a lawn care company, they want to make money. They'll say: We'll come and fix your chinch bug for \$200 or \$300. They can use soap if Health Canada would only approve soap for chinch bug. It works.

**Unidentified Speaker:** What kind of soap?

**Helen Jones:** Any kind of soap. Dish soap, potassium hydroxide-based soap works really well, but you can take dish soap, half a teaspoon in a container of water, put it on your lawn, do one or two repeats a week later. It takes care of it. Chinch bug generally makes a dead spot about so big, and then you spray that with soap, including a two foot border around the dead spot where a lot of the current activity is. It'll kill the adults, the eggs, the nymphs, and so will shop vacuums. If you use a shop vacuum, it gets all the eggs, all the nymphs, all the adults. That's a lot of information. People need to know it works, it's cheap, and it won't poison them.

I guess I'm out of time mostly. You need large buffer zones between agriculture spraying and residential properties and schools. This is an important thing. Also, be

sure to include commercial properties if you are writing statutes: commercial, residential, and municipal - all three. Our province just got left out. That means kids in P3 schools are not protected by legislation. That's commercial as well as private daycares, private homes for the elderly, apartment buildings, condominiums, shopping malls. This is where people live, work and play. These are large areas, so be sure to include commercial.

Thanks. That's about it. Any questions?

**Chair:** Appreciate it. We're going to have time for a quick one this time, Cynthia.

**Ms. Dunsford:** God, there's so many. You've provided us with so much information in such a short period of time, and you've traveled far to come here, so we really appreciate this. With regards to how it worked in Halifax, about the golf course, is there an exemption there or how -

**Helen Jones:** The golf courses basically are commercial properties.

**Ms. Dunsford:** So it just fell into that category.

**Helen Jones:** It got left out of the jurisdiction. This is an important thing. I've never seen in Halifax a warning sign. There's a provincial requirement for warning signs to go up on any property that's treated. I've walked my (Indistinct) to golf courses on HRM and I've never seen a single sign warning anybody about pesticide use. I know there are frequent, heavy exposures from golf courses. I wouldn't want to live near one, not within two miles at least.

There are a good number of organic golf courses not only in Nova Scotia but across Canada. If I can get someone's e-mail, I can send you sort of just links to the courses that are already doing this. Some on the Gulf

Islands on the West Coast, but there's a number of them that are already doing it. Bay of Fundy has a good golf course manager there. What he was doing was not spraying any of the runs but just spot spraying the greens. There are golf courses that don't put any at all, and it's still fun to play.

**Ms. Dunsford:** Can I have one more, just a tiny one?

**Chair:** Yes.

**Ms. Dunsford:** The IPM involvement - and you're talking about keeping them definitely at arm's-length -

**Helen Jones:** Yes.

**Ms. Dunsford:** - and that a provincial or municipal body could govern or regulate what an IPM body would normally do. How successful has that been in your district, jurisdiction?

**Helen Jones:** As industry has interpreted this, they have an industry body, Landscape Ontario, that issues IPM certification to other landscapers. This is not anything that independent, standback organizations are doing.

What really works much better are the organic certification programs. In other words, if you want organic methods and knowledgeable, you're not losing anything. In other words, these people know a great deal about organic growing methods of all kinds. What you have with an IPM certification program, you have secret audits, you can't get access to their information. They always have at the bottom that the landscaper can use pesticides whenever they want to. There's no restriction on it. It's the landscape industry's method of derailing municipal and provincial legislation. Usually, the preface is a lot of green, sustainable landscaping

information, but you'll find all of that with the organic growing information.

You don't need the sort of sugar-coated pill approach that they're using. You can get all this information from qualified bodies, really knowledgeable landscapers that are true organic landscapers and will teach you a lot of things.

**Mr. McGeoghegan:** (Indistinct) -

**Chair:** Charlie.

**Mr. McGeoghegan:** - one of those value boards.

**Helen Jones:** Yeah.

**Mr. McGeoghegan:** You said one was in Switzerland and one was in Oregon. Is that what you said?

**Helen Jones:** Yeah. The Organic Materials Review Institute. There are two materials review institutes, one in Switzerland and one in Eugene, Oregon. They provide information for other bodies that certify organic growing methods. Frequently they're agricultural, but they can apply to any growing situation, including landscaping.

So that these bodies - and this is something that I think Health Canada could be doing. I mean, these people operate on a modest budget and they provide quality information on what materials, what is in fact in secret ingredients. They won't recommend any product or material if it has in it unlisted ingredients that are on their prohibited list, and they won't risk any approvals unless the manufacturer fully discloses to them what is in the product, which is much different than what we have as public policy federally. It's what we should have.

But in the meantime, we can use these bodies that with OMRI - they review

materials and US product, but there may be a Canadian product which OMRI doesn't know about, which is why you also need the Canadian General Standards Board. You can access all this information through a Maritime-based group called ACORN. Atlantic Canada Organic Regional Network is their full name. I gave you the website in here on one of these pages. You can go in there and plug in any material you want to know about. It'll tell you the status with OMRI, the status with CGSB, and the status with the PMRA and you don't have to pay a membership with OMRI, which is \$100 a year - I've paid it sometimes - to get the materials from them. Or you don't have to consult two or three web sites because one's for CGSB - the Canadian General Standards Board - one for OMRI, one for let's say what the PMRA is doing. I always get lost in their web sites.

But the thing is that you can get all your information in one spot, one-stop shopping, with ACORN and it's reliable. As soon as something, new research comes on the market, they update it for you. I mean, it's perfect for what you need.

**Chair:** Appreciate that.

**Helen Jones:** Okay. Thank you.

**Chair:** Our next presenter is Katherine Dewar.

**Katherine Dewar:** Feeling a bit like a schoolmarm here. I have handouts for everybody.

**Chair:** Great.

**Katherine Dewar:** Can you just maybe pass them - I know some people like to follow along.

**Chair:** Just wait until we get those circulated around, okay?

I'll just get you to - welcome you to the committee first, and ask you to introduce yourself and then you may begin.

**Katherine Dewar:** My name is Katherine Dewar, I'm a native Islander, a resident of Charlottetown and Darnley. My roots run deeply in my Island back to the early 1770s.

I want to speak to you today not as a part of some other group that I am a part of, but an Islander who is passionate about my Island. Who I am as a person is defined by my relationship to the air, the water, and the soil. Each time I hear of fish kills, anoxic rivers, contaminated wells and sick people from pesticide poisoning, a part of my psyche is wounded and I am diminished as a person.

Once, when I was a very distraught teenager, my father gave me some very sage advice. He said: Little girl, if you never make a beginning, there'll never be an ending.

So today I'm going to talk to you about new beginnings for PEI. While I do not expect you to solve all the environmental problems overnight - I know we took decades to get in the mess we're in - I challenge you that, after careful deliberation, to make bold and courageous decision that can only be to bring in a province-wide ban on cosmetic pesticides, and that is on both the sale and the use. In one fell swoop you could remove a significant amount of toxic contaminants from the air, the soil, and the water. For an island that is under siege environmentally, this would be a very good step forward.

Now why do I suggest this? Cosmetic pesticides are toxic chemicals which pose a health and environmental hazard to the citizens and environment of Prince Edward Island. They are totally unnecessary as non-toxic methods of lawn care are readily available. Over 20 groups on PEI have called for a ban on cosmetic pesticides, and I

cite but a few: you have the literature review by the Ontario College of Family Physicians; you have a binder, a briefing binder that I did for the Environmental Health Cooperative; you have the ad hoc committee report that's already been quoted today from the City of Charlottetown; you have a DFO study that you'll find on the Internet that is talking about the collapse of the fisheries in the Northumberland Strait, and one of the things they cite there is that they found the cosmetic pesticides from the City of Charlottetown out in the strait, and it's one of the factors that implicated possibly in the collapse in the fishery - not the only one, there are five or six other things they mention; there's also an Environment Canada study of air quality on the Internet that you can look at that shows just how bad the air is on PEI.

I think also that PEI's government should be very concerned about this report that shows that we are trending almost 10% above the national average in cancer rates in PEI. Our cancer rates are going like this. Every year they're going up, while the national average is a flat line. They're not going up any more. So that should be a concern to all of us. There's been no studies in the relationship of cosmetic pesticides to cancer rates in PEI, and I think that probably should be done.

Now, one of the main herbicides that's used on the lawns in Charlottetown is called Par III and it's a mixture of three other chemicals: one is dicamba, which is under review by Health Canada, and it will probably be removed from the market - it's one of the old ones, it's banned in Europe; 2, 4-D, another one that is banned in Europe and has been implicated in causing cancer in children in at least one Canadian study; and mecoprop which was withdrawn from the market in 2004 because it didn't meet Health Canada's health and environmental standards or requirements. But PMRA, which is the regulatory agency for Health Canada, has given the chemical companies

to the year 2009 to use up their stock. So there you have three things being put on the lawns in Charlottetown that are very questionable as to their safety.

Now, what would be the advantages to the government of the province of PEI to bring in a province-wide or restriction, whatever term you want to use there? I've looked at four. One is: What are the legislative advantages? Well, you deal with the problem in one fell swoop. You get it off the political agenda and you control the legislative process so that everybody in PEI is treated equally. You avoid dealing with each municipality. I can't imagine that you want to be dealing individually with 75 municipalities, and I think it would be an administrative nightmare. You can utilize the enforcement infrastructure that's already in place. You've got a very good one in place now in PEI. You'd probably need to add one or two more enforcement officers for the five-month period each year. You can capitalize on the availability of the knowledgeable public service that you have that know how to develop legislation and regulations. I doubt that the municipalities have that expertise.

Now, what are the health advantages to doing this on PEI? You'll get major savings to your health care budget. Now I know you're not tracking pesticide poisonings and health care. It might be a good thing to start doing, but anecdotally, we know that the cost of health care budget is probably excessive, and if we had time I could go into my own stories.

Now the other thing you're going to do by bringing in a province-wide ban is you're going to protect a lot of vulnerable populations on PEI. By vulnerable I mean people that are far more sensitive to chemicals than the average person. That's the elderly - because their immune systems don't work all that well as they get older; and the very young, for the same reason,

their immune systems and neurological systems aren't well developed; and there are 30,000 Islanders with pre-existing lung diseases - they are far more vulnerable to pesticide poisoning than the average person; also, those prone to mental illness - we had somebody today say he got severely depressed. Well, that happens.

There are 25% of Islanders who have environmental sensitivities. They're far more sensitive. Five percent of that 25 are extremely sensitive and can die from exposure to pesticides. So we're looking at a total of a third of the population of PEI that can be potentially made sicker by the exposure to cosmetic pesticides.

Now, what are the environmental advantages to PEI for you to bring in this legislation? You're going to remove a major pollutant from the air, the water, and the soil. The largest density of cosmetic pesticide use is in the greater Charlottetown area. Now this is worrisome because these pesticides are possibly getting into the water supply. Environment Canada at the present time is sufficiently worried that they've got a study going on to test the water of Charlottetown, Halifax, and Moncton for cosmetic pesticides. So that's ongoing. I'm not sure when that report will be in. There's a recent DFO study that you can look at on the Internet that looked at the collapse of the fishery in the Northumberland Strait. Again, the cosmetic pesticides are washing off the lawn into the storm sewers out into the harbour, out into the strait, and they've been found out there, so it has implications for the fishery.

The other thing about removing cosmetic pesticides is that you're going to really improve air quality in your municipalities and you're going to prevent drift. Now even if the sprayers are following the directions and the wind speed directions, you're going to get drift. It just happens. I'll quickly tell you my story, not in the detail I'd like to.

In June of 2005, I was lying in bed at 6:00 a.m. I could taste something, smell something, and all of a sudden I got extremely short of breath. My throat got tight and I got dizzy and I bounded out of bed and looked. The people next to me were getting their lawn sprayed. Got my clothes on, got in my car - which absolutely reeked of pesticide spray - and went down to the boardwalk at 6:00 and sat by the water down there so I could maybe feel a bit better. I didn't return to my home that night until 11:00. I wasn't in 10 minutes until I was getting sicker again. I had to leave. I'll shorten the story up. I lost my balance. I had a really bad neurological reaction. I was sick for months and I couldn't go back in my house for five weeks. I had to hire somebody to come in and wash it all out inside, because when pesticides get in your house, they don't biodegrade like they do outside. They can stick around in your house for years. They attach themselves to dust particles and whatever.

Unfortunately, the day that my neighbours were getting their lawn sprayed, I had windows open and I had an air exchange system on and it just got sucked all through my house. So it was certainly an inconvenience to me, but it cost me a lot of sickness. Really, I don't think my head's ever felt right since.

The other thing I want to note about the drift, it not only came into my house, but it had to go from my neighbour's yard across their driveway, my driveway, and across my lawn, and it killed every weed on my grass. Every weed was killed. They weren't spraying on a windy day. They were spraying on a day it was legal for them. Now, they didn't notify me, but anyhow, that's another story.

So I also think there might be some tourism advantages to you to bring in this province-wide ban. You can imagine you can market our cities are beautiful, historic, and have

great air, as opposed to what we're seeing in the *Globe and Mail* in the last year with not very nice environmental stories at all.

So I don't see a problem with this. The only problematic impact that there might be is I understand there are five chemical companies licensed to spray, four in Charlottetown and one in Summerside. Two of them already say they use organic methods, if we trust it. These people are going to have to maybe change the way they do business. They won't go out of business. In fact, it's been shown that their business may improve because it's far more labour intensive.

No doubt you're going to have the powerful chemical lobby trying to dissuade you from the restriction of pesticide use. In weighing your decision you'll have to consider the greater good of society as a whole against the financial bottom line of multi-national corporations.

In terms of implementation, research shows that a ban on cosmetic pesticides needs to be preceded by an educational program and needs to be phased in over a period of time. The public needs to be educated as to the reasons why this is being done and to alternate ways of looking after their lawns.

Presently, there are 134 municipalities in Canada with a ban, six more in the process. And yesterday, if you were reading anything about the Ontario legislature, the speech from the throne, it's saying they're bringing in a province-wide ban on cosmetic pesticides. That would mean that 38.8% of the population of Canada is covered - bang - with that ban. The Province of Quebec has a ban, which is 23.4% of the population of Canada. You add Ontario and Quebec up and you've got over 60%. PEI, unfortunately, is a .4% of the total population, but we tend to think we're important people so I think people would listen.

In summary, I think this is a win-win situation for everyone: the government, the environment and, most of all, Islanders' health and safety which you are mandated to protect.

Thank you very much.

**Chair:** Thank you very much for the presentation.

Any questions for Katherine?

**Mr. McGeoghegan:** The DFO study, is that the one that was done about a year ago?

**Katherine Dewar:** Yes.

**Mr. McGeoghegan:** Do you know the web site for that?

**Katherine Dewar:** It's the DFO website. You have to work through it. I can't give you the links right now, but you can find it if you're patient.

**Mr. McGeoghegan:** That's fine.

**Chair:** Anyone else?

Go ahead, Cynthia.

**Ms. Dunsford:** I'd like to make a comment on Katherine.

I think what's important to note about your presentation especially is your positive approach. This is a very difficult topic, obviously, because we've seen today already how things cross over into the agricultural thing. To try and keep this as doable as we can with regards to the cosmetic use of pesticides I think is the right approach. Offering solutions is, I think, the best thing that this committee can hear, and also identifying where the problems are too, like you have and like so many others have too before you.

This isn't something that is going to just kind of go with the wind. It's going to take some real will from everyone involved. When you're talking about industry - and somebody else has mentioned it before that there is potential for the chemical industry to benefit, or the lawn care industry to benefit, if they choose to go through a transition to better serve Islanders the way they want to be served when it comes to lawn care. So I commend you for your approach and your work. We'll do our best to take everything that you've presented into account, for sure.

**Katherine Dewar:** I certainly would be willing, if you need any information, to be of any assistance in the future.

**Ms. Dunsford:** Great.

**Chair:** Good, appreciate that.

Any other questions? Okay. Thank you very much, Katherine.

Our next presenter is not here quite yet apparently.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Mr. Chair?

**Chair:** Yes.

**Leader of the Opposition:** (Indistinct) if we're waiting.

**Chair:** Sure.

**Leader of the Opposition:** I know yesterday's storm put us off, and I understand that we're tentatively booked to meet this Friday. I was wondering if it's possible with the committee that we actually schedule the people we missed yesterday next week at our regular scheduled time.

I know that would cause problems in terms of moving the lawn pesticide issue to a new date. As people know there's just three of us in opposition. Last week I understand that

Jim Bagnall brought up the same issue because it's difficult when - he, especially, is on all committees. What we've been trying to do is keep our work going here and it's really important to be present at that time. I was just curious if that's a possibility for our committee.

**Chair:** I checked with the clerk yesterday about the problem with rescheduling. We already contacted all the groups to tell them we were going to sit Friday and confirmed with them that we would. I did not realize that Jim had brought this up to my attention (Indistinct).

**Leader of the Opposition:** Jim had brought it up last week and we had brought it up a couple of different times. It's just that, too, we will have to reschedule a lot of things, but if we can't make it happen for this time, in the future if we could stick just with the dates that we talked about, if we have to do them. Because it looks like this winter is going to be tough.

**Chair:** Just at the last break I was just going over with Marian and the schedule. Like you say, I know it's full because -

**Ms. Dunsford:** There's going to be another storm, too.

**Chair:** Two or three other committees - no, there's more than that. You have four

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** There are eight standing committees.

**Leader of the Opposition:** And Jim's on every one of them. Just in terms of the other kinds of duties that we have to do too in opposition, it means that other people are put at the bottom of the line a couple of times. I was just asking.

**Chair:** Actually, the first group coming in on Friday really, really wanted to get in yesterday. I don't want to push them back

any farther. We will try in the future to -

**Mr. Bagnall:** You're talking about the next meeting? Like Friday, I'm not available either.

**Chair:** I realize that. In the future, we'll -

**Mr. Bagnall:** We had made a (Indistinct) to the clerk, I guess, when Social Development was trying to meet that same day, and we advised a week ago that we weren't available this Friday to sit on the committee. So did you advise him on that?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** You were probably thinking it was Melissa who was here that day, that clerk of that committee.

**Chair:** Anyway, we'll try to watch that in the future. We were saying while you were out there, there are eight committees and you get a storm, you have to reschedule, it's tough to plan it because, as I was saying to Marian, speaking with Marian earlier, the schedule is full. It's just unbelievable.

We'll have to try and work around that. Everybody go home and pray for no more storms.

**Mr. Bagnall:** Are you going to be able to be here? I'm not going to be here.

**Leader of the Opposition:** I don't know at this point but, typically, when something's cancelled or whatever, it's postponed to the next date that you're actually scheduling. It puts everything else behind. It's just that when you choose a new date that's when it makes everything complex.

**Chair:** The problem is in this committee we've got kind of two issues going on, and we already have these lined up for cosmetic pesticides. The next meeting is cosmetic pesticides. We were going to go two agriculture, two cosmetic pesticides, so you

got a bunch - (Indistinct) anyway.

**Mr. Bagnall:** We didn't even get a call that this meeting was going to be, even try to schedule on our date either. It was just put on and scheduled for us. I don't know if that happened with everybody else, but normally there's a call to say: Can you do it?

**Chair:** I will apologize. I'm sorry about that, Jim. New at this. I will try and do that in the future, that's for sure.

**Mr. Bagnall:** No, I don't think it's fair to hold a meeting when we can't be there either. We advised last week, especially when the Social Development committee wanted to meet on this particular day and we said: No, we were not available, and the meeting was changed to December 13<sup>th</sup> because of that.

So we had asked that that day be put aside and we're just not going to be here. We don't think it's fair to hold a committee meeting when the opposition is not here and without any consultation with us to that date. I got an e-mail on it and I e-mailed Marian back that we were unable to be there on that particular date.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** I did call your office (Indistinct) -

**Mr. Bagnall:** Yes.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** - and I was told that somebody could be here.

**Mr. Bagnall:** Pardon?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** I did call your office today.

**Mr. Bagnall:** And who told you that? Because we weren't confirmed? Like, we've talked about it and nobody here could be there. We've already talked about it so - and



we talked about it for that Friday before. I don't know who gave you the information. I'm not going to get into that.

**Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Bagnall:** We request that it be changed.

**Chair:** In the future, we're going to work on it. Friday we already booked. We're going to meet anyway, Jim. So in the future we will work on it.

**Mr. Bagnall:** We take objection to that.

**Chair:** So noted.

**Mr. Bagnall:** Because I mean, if you want to go ahead and dictate and call meetings again -

**Chair:** I'm not doing that at all.

**Mr. Bagnall:** Okay, but you did this time without checking with us.

**Chair:** Did you say you had notice from their office that someone could make it? Then let it stand there. We could argue this all night and that won't work.

I apologize, and from now on we will do that in the future.

**Mr. Bagnall:** Why the rush?

**Chair:** Pardon me?

**Mr. Bagnall:** Why are you rushing for this meeting?

**Chair:** Because the group that met, we were supposed to meet yesterday, asked specifically to get in as soon as possible. When we told them yesterday we were cancelled because of the storm, we were going to reschedule on Friday, they wanted to come in ASAP so we set up for Friday.

**Mr. McGeoghegan:** We got the same e-mail you did, Jim. We didn't get called either, so it's not any difference in your case.

**Mr. Bagnall:** You fellows got 26 people or 23 people or 24 people you can rely on to come in here, and we got three people in our schedule, and we had asked specifically that this date not be used.

**Chair:** I don't think that's fair to the group. We've already put them off once.

**Mr. Bagnall:** It wasn't our fault that Tuesday got cancelled.

**Chair:** Nobody's fault because of the storm, Jim.

**Mr. Bagnall:** I think you have to change, you know, as far as we're concerned.

**Chair:** We'll take a couple of minutes' break, I guess. Our next presenter is from the Allergy and Environmental Illness Group.

**An Hon. Member:** (Indistinct).

**Chair:** We're reconvening at seven.

*[There was a short recess]*

**Chair:** Okay, we'll resume.

Our next presenter is here with the Allergy and Environmental Illness Group. We've been giving each of the presenters about 15 minutes, and I'll give you a five-minute warnings if you want to wrap up and you can have some time for questions, or you can fill your 15 minutes in with presentations. It's entirely up to you. I'll give you a little notice, though. If you want to introduce yourself for the sake of Hansard and then you can go right into your presentation, that would be great.

**Sandra Boswell:** I'm Sandra Boswell. This is Jonathan Smith. I've left you each a binder, one for the clerk and one for the Chair, and that should go along with what I'm saying and a copy of the short brief is separate from the researched information, the scientific information that I've given you, so that you can, hopefully, follow along.

First of all, we've done some research in going into stores to check to see what was available on the shelves but we probably would need another six months to give you documents on that, as you well know.

I want to thank you for the opportunity, first of all, for being able to come and present our concerns about cosmetic spraying of pesticides on Prince Edward Island. Unfortunately, Prince Edward Island has become - I don't know if you're all aware - a massive user of these types of products.

As I was preparing for the brief - which you will all find documentation in the binder concerning that - the Ontario Medical Association, the David Suzuki Foundation, the Centre for Canadian Learning Disabilities, and several others are documented in there by e-mails and other information that they sent to me in terms of briefing notes just to support us in our plight to ask the government leaders, and opposition, to do something to resolve this problem.

Since we only have a limited amount of time I've also tried to (Indistinct) the amount of lawn care pesticides used on Prince Edward Island. I've also tried to get it for agriculture as well, as many of you probably know. There are no numbers here on Prince Edward Island other than a list of pesticides that could be used in Canada. We really don't have a list of what lawn care companies are using on the lawns. Therefore, if you do have a strong reaction or even a mild one from them, it's very

difficult to get what they're spraying. So that in itself is very hazardous for Island residents.

Since it is the taxpayers that pay politicians - and we appreciate all the work that you do do - but I think the number one thing is that you should be protecting your citizens which no government has done so far except for Joe Ghiz did try to attempt it several years ago.

I think we need to do a better tracking of what is used here, how much of it is used. If I lived in Saskatchewan I would know every single ounce of everything that was used, but our government is not doing that, or if they're doing it, they're not letting us know.

So in short, as I mentioned, we have Gideon Forman, who is the executive director of the Canadian Association for Physicians, and he has provided information and support in your binder there; Jim McIsaac of the Clean Water, who is the clean water director for the David Suzuki Foundation; Barbara McClune, who is the health advisor for disabilities for the association of Canada; and Marie Girouard from Podium; Kathleen Cooper, a senior researcher with the Canadian Environmental Law Association; Meg Sears, who has a PhD from Saskatchewan; and we also have a group from New Brunswick that has also provided us with support and a small amount of information, and they did ask for cancer statistics from me for Prince Edward Island, which is quite a job to go through.

Some types of pesticides that we found in stores - and Jonathan did go to stores and he did take photos of things on shelves and he looked for active ingredients - and I'm sorry, but since I was called in a little earlier, and I had a problem getting all my binders in the right order, last minute copying, I didn't have time to pick the pictures up, but I'd be happy to drop you off a copy.

Now some of the things were Bug X 7, Biomist, mecoprop, Killex, Weedout, Total Wipeout, Malathion, Carbaryl pesticides - which I don't think I'm saying quite right - carbaryl, Fulltet, Pyrethrins, Pyranin, whatever that is, and Buxoide - I'm not sure what that is, I didn't have time to do them all - and Par III, which is a combination of 2,4-D, dicamba, and mecoprop.

Now according to the Bayer Environmental Science, carbaryl effects are as follows: causing red eyes, irritation, tearing. It's harmful if absorbed through the skin and may cause the same symptoms as if you ate it. It causes irreversible colon estrate - I think is the right way to say it. My mother always said don't say things you can't pronounce, but you have a copy of it in your binder so you can correct me on that. Repeated overexposure to severe colon estrate actually effects the enzyme found in the brain and inhibits this process. It shuts it off so that people's brains are always constantly in activity. It gives you abnormal brain readings, can lead to the onset of nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, abdominal pain, involuntary shaking, excessive salivation, pinpoint pupils, blurred vision, profuse sweating, temporary paralysis, respiration depression, and convulsions. It is harmful if inhaled. People are advised not to inhale vapours, dust or spray mist because it can cause the same symptoms as if you ate it.

The product contains ingredients which are considered to be probable or suspected human carcinogens. Inhalation can aggravate existing respiratory problems such as asthma, emphysema or bronchitis. Many only associate emphysema with cigarette smoking, but that's not true. Chlorthanol and this product can also have a hand in that. Skin contact may aggravate existing skin diseases. Overexposure, as I said before, it can cause salivation, watery eyes, pinpoint eye pupils, difficulty breathing, headaches, weakness. Severe cases can cause convulsion, unconsciousness, and

respiratory failure, which means you stop breathing.

The chronic effects have been proven in carbaryl to cause tumours in laboratory animals. It has also been shown to cause developmental effects in a number of species. It is toxic to humans, is a carcinogen, causes reproductive toxicity, developmental toxicity, neurotoxicity, acute toxicity, is toxic to aquatic organisms, and contaminates waterways. That is just one, and it can affect the unborn fetus as well.

Now Killex 2,4-D, there's a whole list in your binder of these. I maybe won't go through them all, but many times we're looking to medicare to resolve problems for our health. Many times we don't coordinate that learning process with the poisons that we are spraying in our cities and in our communities across the Island. Increased mortality, weight loss, have been observed in offspring of rats, decreased fetal weights, increased fetal mortality, skeletal malformations, incidence of tumour formation, (Indistinct) sarcomas in both sexes, cancer, affects the nervous system at high levels - which is what keeps us all operating - causes stiffness of arms and legs, in coordination, lethargy, anorexia, stupor or coma, affects the gastrointestinal tract, irritates the skin, causes liver and kidney disease in animals, tumours in humans, has been detected in drinking water, causes inflammation of the eyes and skin, hives, nausea, vomiting, throat irritation, headache, dizziness, coughing, difficulty breathing, and it has showed genetic damage in experiments in the laboratory. Affects hormones in people and in animals, and damages sperm and male sex organs so that males have a very low sperm count and can't often reproduce. There is a fact sheet included in your binder on this. In the Netherlands, they have classed it as a carcinogen. There are many other adverse affects like kidney and liver enzyme and blood problems related to this product.

Sevin is another very favourite one for using on lawns here and across the Island in a cosmetic way. It causes birth defects, worsens the condition of people with hypertension, people on anti-depressant drugs, impairs the function of the pituitary gland, impairs the thyroid gland, the reproductive system, causes hyperactivity, causes learning disabilities in mammals, changes the heart rate in people, and can cause cancer in the gut, and causes chromosomal damage to our human DNA.

Dioxins are present in almost every herbicide that is manufactured and they are among the most toxic compounds made by man. Some are targeted for elimination but not all of them. Dioxins bioaccumulate in the fatty tissues and become concentrated in the animals and humans higher up the food chain. Dioxins can be found in mother's milk even before birth. There are 76 chlorinated toxins and some of these are pretty close relatives to Agent Orange, like 2, 4-D.

**Chair:** Sandra, we can get this copied. You don't need to go through all the sprays or whatever, if you don't mind. I mean, there are other parts of your presentation. I told you I'd give you a five-minute warning. We're getting up to that, but I can get this copied and we'll circulate it to the rest of the members.

**Sandra Boswell:** That's okay. You're welcome to keep those copies. I'll keep my copy and you can keep those, but it'd be great if you could photocopy it for others. I only had six days notice. Otherwise, I might have had to get someone to help drag the stuff in.

**Chair:** No problem.

**Sandra Boswell:** Okay.

So for those that are wondering about - many of these pesticides, herbicides,

insecticides, or fungicides that we're using for cosmetic purposes do indeed cause all these things, and I've spent a lot of time researching it. I know the information is valid. It's scientific. It's just not something that people are just saying because I don't use that. But when you affect the endocrine system, which many of these pesticides disrupt, what you're doing is, for instance, if you have runoff of these chemicals into the water, you're actually changing the sex of the fish. Because there's been a huge study done on that, which I have home in my files somewhere, but it does allude to it here. Florida and the Great Lakes did a huge study on it in the 1990s and they found non-sex fish, they found multi-sexed fish, they found abnormal ability to reproduce, and all this was caused from chemicals and the estrogen mimickers that come from plastics that also ran into the Florida Keys and the Great Lakes.

So we often wonder and we look for reasons why we have a declining fish species. This is one reason why we do have a decline in them. But if it can make non-sex fish and if they can make non-sex other things, like birds that don't want to mate - the female doesn't want to mate with a male, they prefer to stay female with female or male with male - if chemicals can do that to the birds and to the fish, I'm quite sure they can do it to human beings as well. Not a lot of people are saying that but there is some information to suggest that.

So I'm saying that we have to find alternatives to the poisons that we're using. I don't want to be the one to badmouth anyone that's sitting around the table or anyone that's within my community, but I do want to say that we've presented briefs here to 20 years. Since our tax dollars go to paying for everything that gets done in government, somebody needs to step up to the plate and save the people from the cancer, the children from the cancer, the bladder cancer, the brain cancer, and a lot of

that, which I haven't got time to read, is all within - you'll find information about that in this binder.

I want you also to look at it very seriously because your children and your grandchildren are the ones that are going to be left with the huge problem. How are they going to fix it, and at what cost? They're going to be the ones left without food because we've lived, many of us, a fairly good life and we've been excessive in our buying and our use of everything on the planet.

So the very least we can do is leave them clean air and clean water to drink, and leave them so that if you're going to have a baby and it happens to be male or female, that's what happens instead of having multi-sex fish and birds and whatever.

I could go on, but maybe I'd just let you ask me some questions if you'd like.

**Chair:** Thank you for your presentation.

Charlie has a question.

**Mr. McGeoghegan:** You made a comment about one of the chemicals that was quite similar to Agent Orange. Which one was that?

**Sandra Boswell:** Some of the formulations of 2, 4-D and 2, 4-D7 or T, I think. There's a document in the book that will explain that better to you.

**Mr. McGeoghegan:** What is that chemical used for, do you know?

**Sandra Boswell:** What's 2, 4-D used for?

**Mr. McGeoghegan:** Like, is it for grass or -

**Sandra Boswell:** They usually use it for weeds, but these lawn care companies can sell anybody anything and tell them they

need their lawn done. You know, what's wrong with a few dandelions on the lawn? Go the heck out and pick them and make some dandelion wine or something you know. There's many things dandelions are useful for, and eczema is one.

**Mr. McGeoghegan:** I guess the reason why I ask that is because back about two years ago I had a guy telling me that a friend of his came to PEI, who was a veteran in both the Vietnam and Korean Wars, and he drove across the bridge and he got probably 10 minutes off the bridge and he stopped the car and left.

**Sandra Boswell:** Yeah.

**Mr. McGeoghegan:** He said that the smell that he smelled was exactly like Agent Orange, and that was the first time I'd heard that until right now.

**Sandra Boswell:** Hence why you have a large group of people on Prince Edward Island who are experiencing allergies, asthma, and multiple-chemical sensitivity.

The multiple chemical sensitivity people were just - I mean, for 20 years they were just non-existent humans in terms of being a citizen. Doctors didn't want to treat you, government didn't want the doctors to treat you because they didn't want people to know about it. Finally, I was the first one that got referred to Halifax to get a consultation, but I'd been consulting with doctors in North America before that that were specialized in that area.

I hear your story many times over. Every time I go to a workshop, whether it's Vancouver or Quebec or Toronto or wherever, I'd say: Why don't you bring your conferences to Prince Edward Island? I love my province, I like to sell it if I can. Many of them will join in and say: We're not going there, they just use too many pesticides.

That's how we've got such a bad name, and I believe that's why tourism numbers have been dropping. Who wants to go to a place where you're going to run into a poison that's going to be forever with you, perhaps? While some of them do go out of your system in a short time span, it's accumulation and the constant exposure that we've had for 50 years that's really creating a problem.

**Chair:** Cynthia has a quick, little question here.

**Ms. Dunsford:** First of all, just to comment, when you started naming all these chemicals that you had found on the shelves, and most of them you couldn't pronounce. I thought that was pretty bad marketing on those companies. I mean, it's either good marketing or bad - maybe it's supposed to - if you can't pronounce it, it's supposed to work or something, I don't know, but I found it interesting that you can't -

**Sandra Boswell:** Maybe I'll let Jonathan comment on that because he went in and took the photos of it and tried to get as much information as he could.

**Ms. Dunsford:** What information did they have, Jonathan, at the different home stores that (Indistinct)?

**Jonathan Smith:** We picked up some MSDS. They didn't have a lot there and I'm not sure but I suspect that they're supposed to have MSDS on every kind of chemical that they sell. They were good enough to at least give us some copies of a couple of them. Killex, I think, is a really popular one. I'm not absolutely positive, but I suspect that it's probably the most popular one that's used.

**Ms. Dunsford:** Roundup and Killex.

**Jonathan Smith:** Yeah, and so -

**Chair:** Is Killex approved by Health Canada?

**Sandra Boswell:** Yes. You can use anything here or sell it. Every chemical is approved by Health Canada.

**Jonathan Smith:** But how is it - I'm not sure if it's the same now as it was. It used to be that Agriculture Canada uses what the companies give them. There's no independent testing. So the company says that this is what it does, and then Agriculture Canada actually uses that as its guideline, rather than doing any independent testing, which to me seems absolutely insane.

**Unidentified Speaker:** But Health Canada approves Killex.

**Sandra Boswell:** They approve it and the thing is that I just barely -

**Unidentified Speaker:** They don't approve - Health Canada approves (Indistinct) - they license it.

**Chair:** Everybody's going to have their turn in the back there, but just we're trying to stick to the table here, if we can. We're trying to get through it.

**Jonathan Smith:** I'll tell you one thing is,

you know, I think they do most of their marketing through nice-looking packaging more than people recognizing the name. They do list in very small lettering some of the different products, like 2, 4-D or dicamba. It is listed on there but they don't give percentages.

**Ms. Dunsford:** Do they show you, then, when you pick up the product or some of it behind cases locked up, and then do they show you or educate you how to use it, or did you have that experience at all or -

**Jonathan Smith:** Yeah, especially like at Canadian Tire, they have to go through quite a rigorous training actually. I was quite surprised. They know quite a bit about it. If you ask them specifics, they're quite honest about what this chemical can do and the fact that you're not supposed to be on the lawn for 24 hours after you put it on. To me that's a -

**Sandra Boswell:** But the problem is, you know, toddlers and young kids, they can't read the signs and people aren't given enough notice. If you have to give notice to spray a poison, then we shouldn't be spraying them. We just shouldn't be spraying them.

**Ms. Dunsford:** Look, I was in - just to end a little sideline story here, if I may. I was in Niagra Falls last year on my bike. I was passing right where the falls - there's the railing and the falls, and there was a piece of lawn and there was family with toddlers, empty strollers, and there was a tree with one of those pesticide sign that says: Warning - pesticides in use. There was a family picnicing right beside the sign with the little children. I took a picture of it and put it on my website because I thought it was just so poignant. I mean, here it is right in plain - do not. There's a warning and yet, you know.

**Sandra Boswell:** What we're doing - cancer

rate is very high now. Lung cancer rate is increasing in Prince Edward Island among people that have never smoked a cigarette in their lives. Liver cancer is increasing, brain cancer, and all sorts of cancer. So that's what we're leaving as a legacy for our children to be proud of us because we've done such a great job in maintaining it.

Well, we get paid for protecting people, and that's a priority with any government. If governments are not protecting people, then if this committee and the government does not listen, I would - although I don't like to do it - go around and I would simply lobby everyone that has allergies that have been chemically induced, chemical sensitivities, or asthma, and I would just say: Hey, you know, maybe you just all need to find a really good lawyer somewhere? Because I've done this for 20 years and I can tell you I'm very tired of talking to people that aren't hearing. I need you all to hear. I need you all to read this information. I know you're busy but you need to read it because it's life-saving information for you and your children and your grandchildren.

**Chair:** Rob's got one quick, little question.

**Mr. Henderson:** Yeah, no. I represent the riding of O'Leary-Inverness and I'm going through the issue with electromagnetic fields right now in Howlan there. We also are kind of going up against Health Canada. They don't see it as an issue. I'm just curious: Do you believe Health Canada is dropping the ball here on this as licensing these products, that they are doing whatever? I mean, I'm just curious why that is happening.

**Sandra Boswell:** It's absolutely right. It's not only pesticides that they're licensing to come in here - and it's hiding behind the privacy, hiding behind the secret ingredient. When it's a toxin, nobody has a right to keep that a secret from the people, absolutely no one. You run into this all the time where it's a trade secret. Well, if you're

going to poison your neighbour or the fellow down the street or the kids up the street, Health Canada has no business licensing that.

But you know, they're a tough group. I've worked on a lot of their workshops, and I tell, you some of them were not very impressed with me, because I won't say, yes, this would be okay to do unless I have a clear picture. I want to see everybody that's sitting at this table - and since I have everyone's names in the binder, I want to see where down the road you all are in recommending to the Premier and to the Cabinet ministers or to whomever what we should do.

But you need to ban the absolute craziness of spraying a lawn most times does not even need to be sprayed. Let them to apply for a special permit if they have something that's destroying their lawn, and if a neighbour has to move out, then whoever's spraying that lawn should pay their expenses. Because I had to leave my home and spend a day and a night or two days in a car because I have nowhere to go because everybody has pets. Everybody has dogs. Everybody has cats. People just don't want you around if you're chemically sensitive because they can't cook the foods they like and they can't do a lot of things.

**Chair:** Thank you very much. I want to thank Sandra, and Jonathan too, for coming and making a presentation and we'll circulate that flyer you had with us.

I think we had a very interesting afternoon. We are going to take a break now and get a bite to eat. We're going to reconvene at 7:00. I think we have five more presenters this evening, so it should make for quite a good evening as well.

**Sandra Boswell:** I have a document here that I printed off for - I think you need to check these sheets because they don't match

in terms of information and safety against what I found. I also found some alternatives here that'll take a little bit of work for someone, but I'll leave that with you as well.

**Chair:** Thank you.

We're adjourned till 7:00 p.m.

**The Committee adjourned until 7:00 p.m.**

**Chair:** We'll call the meeting back together, the evening session of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, Forestry and Environment.

This afternoon we had some pretty good presentations. They were limited to about a 15 minute presentation. This evening we have five more. They're spread out a little more, so you may have a few extra minutes. We have five to get through, though, so we better get started with it.

I'll ask you, Philip, to introduce yourself and then carry on. Do you want to have time for questions afterwards - go through the presentation?

**Mr. Brown:** You can ask questions throughout the presentation, Mr. Chair. That's no problem.

**Chair:** Okay. Do you want to introduce yourself and you can go ahead?

**Mr. Brown:** Mr. Chair, my name is Philip Brown. I live in Charlottetown, and I'm here in front of you representing myself, Philip Brown.

I have to say first, Mr. Chair, this reminds me of an interview that I had down in Montague for a teaching position when Waldo Taylor was the chairman of the school board. I went to an interview and there was a whole tableful of people to



interview one person for one job. So it was a daunting experience. I don't think this is as daunting. For the record, I didn't get the job.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Legislative Assembly, official Leader of the Opposition, ladies and gentlemen.

I would like to begin by stating my appreciation to you for taking on the responsibility as committee members to gather public input in order to prepare and present a comprehensive report to the Legislative Assembly of Prince Edward Island on such an important community health issue. Kudos to all of you, especially MLAs Cynthia Dunsford and Buck Watts for forwarding Motion No. 13, Use of Cosmetic Pesticides, during the last sitting of the Legislative Assembly.

I want to make it very clear that my focus pertains to herbicides, and not insecticides or fungicides. Moreover, my presentation covers residential properties and not commercial non-residential properties.

At a meeting in 2003, the restricted use of cosmetic pesticides in Charlottetown was discussed with a Sierra Club member, Prince Edward Island Environmental Health Coalition representatives, city administration, elected officials, and a representative from the provincial department of environment. At this meeting, the department of environment official stated the Government of Prince Edward Island would be forwarding recommendations to better control the use of cosmetic pesticides on Prince Edward Island.

As you know, a report was presented to the provincial government in 2005 with some 40 recommendations on pesticide control on Prince Edward Island. Overall, the report's aim and focus was more on agricultural pesticide use in rural Prince Edward Island, whereas its target on cosmetic pesticides

related more to the over-the-counter sale of household pesticide products such as Roundup.

The regulations that came into effect on March 1, 2007, require vendors, such as Canadian Tire and other businesses that sell these products, to store them behind the counter. Employees certified to handle these products would be required to retrieve the product and explain to the customer the harm it poses to the environment. As you are aware, these products fall under federal statutory jurisdiction concerning registration, evaluation and approval, whereas the sale is a provincial-territorial responsibility.

Therefore, I would recommend the restriction of the sale of herbicide pesticides for cosmetic purposes. If we are considering an elimination of the use of cosmetic pesticides on Prince Edward Island, it's imperative the law encompasses all applications of cosmetic pesticides.

Mr. Chair, this is not in the presentation I have, but I spoke to some officials in the department of environment related to pesticides control. One of the recommendations was recommendation number 10 - this was the recommendations for the regulation of pesticides in Prince Edward Island - and recommendation 10 states:

All pesticides classified as domestic by Health Canada shall be placed into one of two categories, based on the risk that their active ingredients poses to human health or the natural environment: category 1 domestics are considered to pose a low level of risk to human health and the natural environment; category 2 domestics are considered to impose a higher level of risk to human health and the natural environment.

I spoke to Don Reeves prior to the

presentation I did to the City of Charlottetown ad hoc committee looking into cosmetic pesticides, and I'm going to leave this with Marian as an appendix. He forwarded a list of PEI self-select domestic pesticides. That's where you can go to the counter or go to the shelf in any store, if the product is available, and pick it up. They include Air Guard Konk 406. They include the (Indistinct). There are some herbicide products in this. As for the category 2, they are considered as controlled purchased products and he didn't have a number. The number for this, as I said, is 805. There are 805 listed, self-select domestic pesticides.

Mr. Chair, I phoned today and spoke to someone in the department and she said: As for controlled purchased products, we don't have a number. We don't know how many are listed under that control purchased products. She said: We make reference to the Province of Quebec on what products, either category 1 or category 2, especially category 2, because it's a controlled purchased product, should be listed. The guidelines that the Province of Quebec use are probably the most stringent in the country. It is updated regularly in the most - when I say it's updated regularly, I only know that because of what the departmental official passed on to me. So today there still wasn't a number and at some point in time I think the government should look at gauging that number.

But if we are going to control cosmetic pesticides, I definitely would recommend - and that was my recommendation - that category 2 would be part of the elimination of cosmetic pesticides when it comes to over-the-counter sales.

As I said, Mr. Chair, I will drop this information with Marian so you can all get a copy.

I recall, as chairman of the standing committee for the City of Charlottetown's

parcs, recreation and leisure, a discussion took place in committee regarding the use of cosmetic pesticides in city parks and open spaces. The committee was assured that the practice by staff was to use these products for severe infestations only.

**Leader of the Opposition:** I have a question. How did they identify (Indistinct)?

**Mr. Brown:** The City of Charlottetown?

**Leader of the Opposition:** Yes.

**Mr. Brown:** Nancy McMinn is the superintendent for parks, and she made it very clear at the committee level that infestation was something that was uncontrollable. As for killing weeds or dandelions, weeping willows and so forth, there was no need. But let's say, for example, along the Confederation Trail, it is owned by the province, but the city takes care of 14 kilometres of it that runs through the city. If there was a severe infestation of, let's say, the cinch worm, they would use pesticides.

**Leader of the Opposition:** In a controlled area, just where it was effective or just -

**Mr. Brown:** That's right.

**Leader of the Opposition:** - the whole thing (Indistinct)?

**Mr. Brown:** No, the control area. They would identify the area and then do the spraying, use weed feed, whatever cosmetic pesticide would be required.

It was my understanding, Mr. Chair, that this practice was policy, but I discovered that there is no such policy for these situations. I recommended to the City of Charlottetown cosmetic pesticide ad hoc committee that the City of Charlottetown adopt a policy supported by a resolution of council on a ban of cosmetic pesticides on

city-owned land, and the standing committees - parks, recreation and leisure activities, urban beautification and forestry, public works and water sewer utility - responsible for these green spaces enforce and abide by the spirit of this policy.

Now, Mr. Chair, I make mention of this recommendation because I believe a provincial law eliminating the use of cosmetic pesticides should allow exceptions to permit their use for severe infestations.

This issue of cosmetic pesticides has been a matter of concern for me during my two terms on Charlottetown city council. Prior to the meeting with the Sierra Club member that I mentioned earlier, there was a resolution that was passed at the 2001 annual meeting of the Federation of Prince Edward Island Municipalities - FPEIM - asking the provincial government to prohibit pesticide spraying within 15 metres of schools, residential care facilities and hospitals on Prince Edward Island.

Mr. Chair, I have a copy of that resolution, along with the letter that was sent to the hon. Mitchell Murphy, I believe, who was at that time minister of agriculture and forestry. Again, I will leave that with you. The issue also drawn - I think Pat Murphy, a former mayor of Alberton, this was an article that was in the *Guardian*, Charlottetown, Tuesday, February 26, 2002. This was the incident where a child was exposed to off-spray of pesticides. There was a major - considering the size of Alberton - a major outcry for the town council to do something.

I quote: A concerned resident, Ron Flynn, said that more than 400 names, roughly the number of people who turn out to vote in the municipal election in Alberton, have signed a petition calling on town council to establish a one-kilometre pesticide-free zone from any occupied residences, building, school, church, hospital and manor. That goes back to 2002, Mr. Chair, and I'll leave

that with Marian who can get a copy for the members of the committee.

The buffer zone proposed for these designated areas was not implemented by the previous provincial government. Therefore, for the record, I recommend that the Legislative Assembly of Prince Edward Island, by way of a motion and amendments to the *Pesticides Control Act*, reaffirm the 2001 FPEIM resolution to create these 15-metre buffer zones in and around the aforementioned designated green areas. Those designated green areas are outlined in the resolution that was passed at the 2001 annual meeting.

**Ms. Dunsford:** Excuse me, Philip. Do you still feel - because I know that 15-metre recommendation goes back to 2001 - do you still feel 15 metres - I know this isn't so much a cosmetic pesticide issue - do you still feel that that is enough?

**Mr. Brown:** I believe, MLA Dunsford, that yes, it's required. Fifteen metre, yes, beyond that I don't know. There is one important thing to remember. As a school teacher at Prince Street School, within the City of Charlottetown we have 15 schools. Overall, Mr. Chair, we have 65 schools across the Island. Now if we're just talking about buffer zones around schools, I don't know if the number would be that great of implementing a 15 metre or 30 metre buffer zone around school zones. I don't know if it would be more than 10, maybe 10 to 15 schools.

I know my argument, or the reason I'm here tonight, is to talk about cosmetic pesticides within municipalities from across the Island. I only mention that, Mr. Chair - and as MLA Dunsford has asked, should it be 15 metres, should it be 30 metres. I'm only going with the recommendation that I was part of back in 2001. That resolution, Mr. Chair, was passed unanimously by all the municipalities at that meeting in 2001.

**Ms. Dunsford:** Just since we're on the school topic, on the cosmetic pesticide side of it, are you aware of any school properties that would ever have use for cosmetic pesticide? I don't know.

**Mr. Brown:** If you look at Charlottetown, there are residential properties that border on to almost all 15 schools. Right now, if you're a private property owner and you want to get your lawn sprayed, there is nothing stopping you from doing that. If you go to West Kent, Mr. Chair, as an example, properties border right on to the playground. If you go to St. Jean's it's not the same issue because it's a downtown school. Prince Street School is the same thing. Parkdale, there are properties that border onto Parkdale Elementary School and the list goes on. When you get out into the rural areas, I think the issue is more about agricultural pesticides and the buffer zone around them.

**Chair:** We're going to run out of time here, so perhaps you better hold back on questions till Mr. Brown finishes there, okay?

**Mr. Brown:** During my last term on city council, there were questions posed about an elimination of cosmetic pesticides. Numerous discussions took place at the meetings of the standing committee for environmental issues, and the committee, as well as council, heard a number of presentations from groups supporting a ban and from those involved in the cosmetic pesticides industry.

From all of the input it became clear to me, as a resident and as a councillor, that this was a health issue. This became more obvious with the more than 120 Canadian municipalities and the Province of Quebec supporting similar eliminations or bans; the Canadian Cancer Society's opposition to cosmetic pesticide use; and the resolution passed by the Medical Society of Prince Edward Island at their 2006 annual meeting

supporting an elimination of cosmetic pesticides. The Medical Society of PEI was supported by the Canadian Medical Association General Council on August 22, 2007, where delegates agreed that the CMA oppose the cosmetic use of pesticides.

Let us not forget that the town of Stratford in 2002 conducted their annual survey of residents. A question concerning the use of cosmetic pesticides reported an 86% response of strongly or somewhat in favour of controlling the cosmetic use of pesticides in the town. There were over 4,000 - and I have a copy of this here, Mr. Chair, a copy of the petition - there were over 4,000 citizens who signed a petition which was presented to city council in May 2006 asking council to eliminate cosmetic pesticides. These discussions and actions illustrate a grave concern on the part of local governments, our provincial government, a national organization and professionals in the medical field that we as a community cannot ignore. We need to be decisive and act sooner, rather than later, to protect the health of all citizens.

In 2006 the standing committee for environmental issues sent a letter to the hon. Pat Binns, Premier of Prince Edward Island, asking that the provincial government implement an elimination of cosmetic pesticides in the 75 municipalities, incorporated and unincorporated, on PEI. Mr. Chair, I have a copy of the letter that we sent to the hon. Pat Binns and I'm going to make that as part of my package that I'll give to Marian after the meeting.

His response was reported to us via of the minister of the environment - actually, it was a verbal response - the hon. Jamie Ballem, where he stated the government would change the legislation in the *Charlottetown Area Municipalities Act - CAMA* - to provide the City of Charlottetown with the powers to enact such a bylaw.

I believe the Government of Prince Edward Island at the time took a wait and see approach to this issue. Therefore, for the record, I recommend that your committee seize this opportunity to formulate a recommendation to the Legislative Assembly of Prince Edward Island for a three-year phase-in to eliminate the use of cosmetic pesticides, specifically herbicides, on Prince Edward Island.

Mr. Chair, just to make it clear, if we're looking at implementing a three-year phase in, it should be strongly supported by an educational component that allows for residents that are now using cosmetic pesticides, business operators that are in the business, to adjust to this new law.

Whenever a community decides to make a change for the betterment of all its citizens regarding a health issue such as mandatory seatbelt law or prohibition of smoking in public places, there will be positive and negative consequences. The latter relates to the industry stakeholders and the changes they would have to make in their business practices if an elimination of cosmetic pesticides, specifically herbicides, was implemented on Prince Edward Island. Therefore, for the record, I would recommend that your committee conduct research on what other Canadian municipalities or the Province of Quebec, where facsimile bylaws or laws were passed to address changes in business practices.

Last year the standing committee for environmental issues invited Dr. Helen Jones - and I believe Dr. Helen Jones was here this afternoon. Actually, when she came over to see us in 2006, she drove from Halifax over here to Charlottetown to meet with council. Ended up meeting with two of us, Councillor Bruce Garrity and myself. She had paid all the charges of the bridge toll, gas, and actually she was willing to pay for her own meal. We finally gave in and paid for her meal. This is the commitment

she has and I'm sure that's the kind of message that you received today.

Dr. Helen Jones, a member of the Halifax Regional Municipality Cosmetic Pesticide ad hoc committee, to determine what processes their committee followed in order to present their recommendations to the Halifax council.

According to Dr. Jones, their committee provided alternative methods to maintain and care for green spaces. Furthermore, as a follow-up to the implementation of the ban on cosmetic pesticides in Halifax, she reported there has been an increase in landscape-lawn care business.

When I was on council there was always the cost factor, that was always brought up. How much is it going to cost us? Dr. Helen Jones made very clear that it would be approximately 50 cents per resident. That's what she determined the cost to be. In a study - and I have that study and I'm sure that you've already - yeah. This is a study that was the impact of bylaws and public education programs and reducing the cosmetic non-essential residential use of cosmetic pesticides. It's a best practices review jointly prepared by the Canadian centre for pollution prevention and (Indistinct) Marketing and Communications. Bylaws and education were more expensive than education alone. So if you go with an education initiative only, it's going to be less costly than education and a bylaw, or in this situation, a law.

The cost to implement a bylaw or a law appears to be in the order of 50 cents to a dollar per person per year, while the cost to implement an outreach component alone appears to be in the order of 13 cents to 24 cents per person per year.

The person will not be employed for a full year, because I don't know how you would be looking at someone's lawn during the

winter to determine if they were spraying or not spraying cosmetic pesticides. So it's a permanent part-time position. I know the officials in the department of environment, Don Jardine and others, will tell you that they're overworked now because of all the issues they have to face just with agricultural issues.

Over the last couple of years the province has actually been doing - I'm not going to say surveillance, but enforcement of the recommendations from the committee that presented its findings in 2005. They've actually been doing the work in the city. The city didn't pay them anything for it. The department was called, they addressed the call, either issued a warning or issued a fine. I do have stats but I don't have them here, because I asked Don Jardine, who was I believe the director of pesticide control, to forward an e-mail with those numbers. I have that e-mail and I'll forward that on to Marian Johnston so you have it as background.

**Chair:** You've got about five minutes to go.

**Mr. Brown:** Mr. Chair, in conclusion, my comments only touch the surface of this very important community health issue.

During the last several years, there's been a great deal of discussion and debate regarding this subject and the time has come to take the necessary steps to address and protect the health of the citizens of Prince Edward Island.

Just before I close, again referring back to this report - the impact of bylaws and public education programs, the best practices review - under their findings - this is page 71: Only those communities that passed a bylaw and supported it with education or made a community agreement were successful in reducing the use of cosmetic pesticides by a high degree, 51 to 90%.

I know the margin is pretty wide there. Education outreach programs alone, just alone, just going with - that's what the city always talked (Indistinct), let's just do educational. Here's what the results were:

Education outreach programs alone, while more popular than bylaws, are far less effective. We can find none that have achieved more than a low reduction of 10 to 24% in pesticide use to date. In those communities that use the law as their primary tool, education was still vital to their ability to reduce the use of cosmetic pesticides, along with effective enforcement - which I believe the province could provide - and permitting system that allow people to apply to use banned cosmetic pesticides.

**Chair:** We've two quick questions for you.

**Mr. Brown:** I'm just going to conclude here. During the last several years there has been a great deal of discussion and debate regarding this subject, and the time has come to take the necessary steps to address and protect the health of citizens of Prince Edward Island.

Again, I thank you and the job that you have in front of you for the challenge you as committee members have taken on in finding a reasonable and practical resolution to this issue.

Thank you. Merci beaucoup.

**Chair:** Thank you for your presentation, Philip.

Cynthia, and then Olive.

**Ms. Dunsford:** I have a couple but I will just - if I have time to ask the other one after Olive, I will.

I'll start with the education piece. Because you talked about how education alone doesn't do it. At the same time, in that same

study that you referred to - the impact of bylaws and public education program study - it was also noted that public education and outreach can profit from controversy and public discussion. In fact, in Hudson, Quebec, the sales of herbicides decreased by 90% before the bylaw even came into effect from the education process.

**Mr. Brown:** MLA Dunsford, or Cynthia, I'll tell you what. Dr. Helen Jones, we discussed this with her. Dr. Helen Jones said: If you implement a law or a bylaw, 85 to 90% of the people will respect the law. They will. Because most people on this earth are reasonable people, so they're going to respect. But if you have no law, really, what have you got going for you?

I'll give you a quick example. Go down Gerald Street, which is just off University Avenue. They put a stop sign right in the middle of the street. You know what? Everybody's stopping. But normally you wouldn't drive through. But it's a stop sign so someone's saying: I'm going to stop because it's telling me to stop. It's unbelievable to see how many people are stopping in the middle of the street where there's no need of a stop sign. That just proves my point. You put a law in place, most people will respect it.

**Chair:** Olive.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Sure. How long have you taught?

**Mr. Brown:** I'm going into my 18<sup>th</sup> year.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Eighteenth year. I'm just curious. Eighteen years ago, how many students in your class - were you always teaching in Charlottetown?

**Mr. Brown:** No, taught at Central Queens Elementary in the beautiful community of Hunter River.

**Leader of the Opposition:** How long were you in the city schools?

**Mr. Brown:** Since 1999, 2000.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Oh, 2000, okay. Have you seen a difference or a change in the number of students who may have health issues, attention deficit, cancer, autism, learning disabilities, in the last seven years in your classes?

**Mr. Brown:** Do you know what, Olive? I'm not an educational expert but I'm in the trenches -

**Leader of the Opposition:** (Indistinct) no, no, but (Indistinct) you're here for yourself.

**Mr. Brown:** - and I'll tell you what. If it wasn't for this government that put in place the \$200,000 for the next three years for class composition work to deal with issues related to our school system, how we're not outreaching to a lot of children, you know what? We're having - our classes in Charlottetown - I know from Prince Street - not only have the demographics changed, but the needs have changed dramatically. Now. do I link that to cosmetic pesticides?

**Leader of the Opposition:** No, I'm just curious, though, because we had a couple of presentations today that gave us links and from your experience as a classroom teacher who's been there for seven years, like, if you had 20 students in your class seven years ago, were they really healthy compared to what composition (Indistinct) -

**Mr. Brown:** My honest answer? Yes, I've seen a change.

**Leader of the Opposition:** You've seen a change.

**Mr. Brown:** I have seen a change. You know what, Olive? The other thing I've seen is that you're looking at hyperactivity,

which is now attention deficit disorder, and there are other terms used for it. That's on the increase. If you go to classrooms - look at our school, for example - you will see that you have maybe one, in some classes two, EAs working in the classroom. This year, Olive, this is the first time we're streamlining. We've created a class with 12 students that have high needs. You know what? We're not the only school that have done that.

Now, is there a link? I don't know. I'm not the expert. I'm not a medical expert. But being a practitioner of and being a teacher in the field, I've seen a significant change.

One other thing too. My last couple of years at Hunter River, I would see the spraying going on in around the playground area in Hunter River. I started to close my windows because I had a concern about what kind of effect this would have on me. When you talk about cosmetic pesticides in urban areas it's more concentrated, and I think the effect is more devastating. The higher the concentration of cosmetic pesticides in urban areas, I think have a more dramatic effect compared to what I saw out in Hunter River.

**Chair:** We're going to have to cut it off there. We're over time. Anyway -

**Mr. Brown:** That's not the first time I've been cut off.

**Chair:** No. You're used to it then.

**Mr. Brown:** Thank you very much.

**Chair:** Really appreciate the input. Thank you.

Our next presenter is Mr. Ifo Ikede. I believe that's the pronunciation.

She's supposed to copy all of that (Indistinct). Just take a minute here before

we start.

I'll ask you to introduce yourself, and we have a little bit of time for questions afterwards. Is that what you want or -

**Ifo Ikede:** Yes.

**Chair:** - full-time presentation. Okay. You have a presentation, introduce yourself and carry on then.

**Ifo Ikede:** My name is Ifo Ikede. Quickly, how much time do I have?

**Chair:** We're going to give you almost half an hour.

**Ifo Ikede:** Oh, that's more than I expected.

**Chair:** You can have 15 minutes if you want, whatever. Our next presentation is at 8:00.

**Ifo Ikede:** I have a report or an executive summary of a report from the Pesticide Action Network of North America which I shall forward to everyone to get the chance to look over.

There are just a couple of things. One of them has to do with the future generations that are at risk with the exposure to pesticides. Studies have shown that women in childbearing age have a higher concentration of the toxins in their body, which can be traced directly to the pesticides, the increased use of pesticides and other chemicals in North America. The levels that are found in children are actually quite alarming. You probably already heard reports of the different medical conditions that they're starting to notice. There's attention deficit disorder, there are cases of asthma, there's a whole bunch of other things that are coming up at the rates that we never really experienced before, at least in the last 20 or 30 years.



I believe there needs to be an effort made to ban pesticides, ban the commercial use of pesticides and also the cosmetic use of pesticides. Because what's the use of growing food if our kids are dead or if our kids are hurt? It doesn't make any sense. We claim to be a green province so maybe we should start actually being a green province, instead of just saying it.

Also, when it comes to the ban, I think it's also important that we take a step beyond what Halifax did, where there was a ban on the use of it but there wasn't a ban on the sale of it, which created a very strange situation. A lot of the big stores kept selling the products even though they were not supposed to be selling them and they had no officers to actually enforce the law, the rules. We need to maybe take some examples from some of the things that have gone on in Quebec City and in the Province of Quebec. They've been very effective in their ban. I think it's a combination of both the provincial responsibility and also the local towns or communities.

I'm just going to read a few little highlights of this. There have been studies from the centre for disease control prevention about the - they did some tests for about 160 chemicals, including 34 pesticides for about just under 10,000 people. They compared that to - in the report that I'm going to send to you, they went back to 1993 and came up to - sorry, went back to 1962 and came up to 1993, and compared the levels of toxins that they're now discovering in people. So that would be interesting to look at.

Most of the studies when it comes to the effects of pesticides - not just on the general public, but also the people who are working in the farming industry - it's quite alarming. The level of pesticides that the Mexican workers in the southern States are having in their blood stream is incredible. Those are the same sort of pesticides that we're using here on our green Island in our agriculture

industry. I think that's something that we need to take a look at.

I know there's a lot of talk about the increased spending for health care and the fact that we need to recruit more doctors. I think we need to stop trying to create a situation that creates more patients. It's hard enough as it is.

I'll be happy to take some questions and also read some things.

**Chair:** Okay, Cynthia and then Olive.

**Ms. Dunsford:** Ifo, you just mentioned that there are some interesting studies especially about not just people who are affected by pesticide use, but those who apply it. You mentioned farmers. Do you know of any studies through your own research of companies for cosmetic use, what the effects are on the people who apply the pesticides? There are some available statistics for some farmers, I suspect. I wonder, and I'm asking, if you are aware of any studies that would give us some information with regards to the people who apply the pesticides in the cosmetic pesticide industry?

**Ifo Ikede:** A lot of the studies that I've seen seem to be focused more on the effects on the people who live in the communities that -

**Ms. Dunsford:** With regards to cosmetics.

**Ifo Ikede:** Yes.

**Ms. Dunsford:** Yeah, okay.

**Ifo Ikede:** But considering how bad it is, and they seem to be stating that the concentrations around the homes and the levels of toxins that they're finding with the people who live in those communities are actually higher than they're finding with some of the farm workers, then it would lead me to conclude that the people who are

actually spraying them would be at a significant higher risk since they are doing this on a daily basis.

**Ms. Dunsford:** You would think. I just wondered if you had any kind of data, resource there. Thanks.

**Chair:** Olive.

**Leader of the Opposition:** I have two questions. One, when you were referring earlier to some of your research, do you have any research that actually shows positive health outcomes when the bans have been put in place? I know, for example, today we've heard several people refer to Hudson, Quebec, where they put a ban in, and I found out from one of our researchers that that ban had been put in place in 1991. So because of all the years later you would expect that that particular community is healthier. I'm just curious. With all your research, do you know communities where bans have been in put in place for awhile, and if so, what are the health outcomes? Are people, as a population healthier, the children healthier, do you know?

**Ifo Ikede:** From cosmetics, I haven't actually done much research on that part of it. I know within farming communities there's been actually quite a lot of research, especially among organic farmers and people who are growing things in the global south who have switched to organic and fair trade. There have been significant decreases in any health issues that they or their children were experiencing after they switched from using chemicals.

**Leader of the Opposition:** That led to my second question, which was where you were speaking with relationship to food and you mentioned just now - my question was going to be: Where in the world are countries that actually have bans in place where we know what the research is to show health

outcomes? You mentioned there the south in terms of just a small area of organics. Are there other places? Someone told me, for example, in Cuba, they tend to grow a lot of food organically. Do you know what their health population is - the population of their health is?

**Ifo Ikede:** I don't know, but I think that information should be readily available. Through the Department of Island Studies at UPEI there has been some - there's a project that they have with some islands in Chile which are actually about the same size as PEI. There have been people going back and forth comparing how they're growing things and what they are doing there. There are actually potato growers there too. They've been quite effective without using any of the same sort of chemicals that are being used here.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Sure. One of the questions that I have, I'm always curious about, in terms of a lot of people think our food's safe here, and whether or not it's pesticides or is it other things that's in the food, because the food stays in the distribution system so long. I think it's pretty common knowledge. For example, when people use to die and they had to be embalmed - not a thing to say - but today they use 50% less formaldehyde than they had to 20 years ago. That's a pretty scary thing. Although we're talking about pesticides, I was just curious what research you had done.

Are you presenting here just on your own as a researcher, or representing that North American (Indistinct)?

**Ifo Ikede:** I'm not representing anybody apart from people who care about their kids being poisoned.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Okay.

**Ifo Ikede:** Which is probably everybody.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Absolutely. That's in terms of - because it would be nice if there is research there that can link a lot of the information to -

**Ifo Ikede:** There is a lot of research. There's actually been a lot of research that has been suppressed. People have been fired for actually letting people know how harmful certain chemicals and certain practices are within the food production industry. There are a lot of researchers who have been threatened at universities that they wouldn't get funding if they continue to - if they don't doctor the reports.

The last time I presented here on organic farming I provided information to some of the researchers who have this information, and who the industry tends to be trying to spread some sort of smear campaign against them in order to discredit the amount of evidence that's coming out. But it seems to be something that's relatively difficult to bring out when you have a tied connection between the industry that's funding the research and the researcher is being told: If you provide this, you may not get approved for the next research project you want to do next year. But there are those who are continuing to produce that.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Do you in your organic background have people who would be considered experts in terms of soil health using organic practices that you could recommend to this committee?

**Ifo Ikede:** I wouldn't be considered an organic expert, but -

**Leader of the Opposition:** No, but if you knew someone, because you keep referring to organics, that's an expert in terms of organic practice and soil health. Because in commodity agriculture it's usually the fertilizer, right?

**Ifo Ikede:** Right.

**Leader of the Opposition:** So where in the world is someone that has a lot of knowledge on organic fertilizers? I'm sure they exist. I'm just curious in terms of if you know.

**Ifo Ikede:** There are actually quite a few. I'll be happy to provide.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Would you? Because our committee is looking at agriculture in general as well as this.

**Ifo Ikede:** Okay.

**Ms. Dunsford:** Just to kind of tie it back to the cosmetic purpose of these hearings, there is an organic side to lawn care as well.

**Ifo Ikede:** Yes.

**Ms. Dunsford:** That's another bit that we're wanting to learn more about as well. So by all means, through your own efforts you've got more to share on that area too, Ifo, that would be much appreciated because - organic's a funny word, isn't it? Because there are companies already on PEI who have made efforts to change or make some kind of a switch or transition from using cosmetic pesticides in a traditional way to a more non-traditional way and calling them organic, when in fact we're not sure what that means. We just know that by using that word they might be safer.

So there's a lot of things to learn about all of this. It'd be great if you have any more information.

**Ifo Ikede:** I think along the lines of cosmetic - well, there's whole culture. I mean, we have a culture of trying to make sure that our lawns look like we play golf on them, even though we don't. I think there is lots of things that can be done from a combination of education and awareness to change the culture of what should a lawn look like. A lot of the grass that we have is

not native. Actually, none of the grass we have on PEI is native to PEI. So very important foreign stuff here and then having to spend all this time, money, energy, plus the amount of greenhouse gases that are spent, to try to cut the lawns.

So I think there is a lot of things that can be done as far as changing that ideology behind what our homes should look like. I know in some communities in Canada there are groups that are doing (Indistinct) farming. So instead of having a lawn, there are people that would come and grow different things in your backyard instead. It means you don't have to pay somebody every week or every month, however often it is, to come cut the grass because they come and take care of it, and they share some of the harvest with you. I think there is lots of things that can be done if we start thinking outside the box of the (Indistinct) that we put ourselves into.

**Chair:** Are there any other questions for Ifo on cosmetic pesticides?

If not, thank you for the presentation.

Our next presenter is here, but we'll take a break for about two or three minutes and then we'll change.

Thank you very much for your presentation.

**Ifo Ikede:** Thank you.

*[There was a short recess]*

**Chair:** As soon as everybody is ready, we'll start again.

We're glad to welcome a representative from CUPE. Leo, I'll ask to introduce yourself, and then do you want time for questions as well?

**Leo Cheverie:** Sure. How much time do we have?

**Chair:** Our next presenter is coming up - 8:30 - our next presenter is here, so how about until twenty after?

**Leo Cheverie:** Okay.

**Chair:** So I'll give you a five minute warning -

**Leo Cheverie:** Okay, that's good.

**Chair:** - or we can start questions a few minutes before that.

**Leo Cheverie:** I'm Leo Cheverie. I'm a member of the executive CUPE of Prince Edward Island, and CUPE Prince Edward Island represents over 2,000 Islanders who work in the health care, education, municipalities, university and a few others - nursing homes and a few other sectors. I also give regrets from our president, who is Donald MacDonal, who normally gives briefs, but as some of you may know she's been ill recently. She's still quite active but she is happy to have other people present on her behalf during this time period.

I just basically want to talk about CUPE Prince Edward Island's sort of position regarding this. Certainly our position is basically what we need to do is be very - as we do with the health of workers - we want to be very proactive in protecting people's health and ensuring that people have a healthy and safe environment.

CUPE has an active national environment committee. It actually is moving in this week to one of the greenest buildings in Canada, similar to probably the (Indistinct) building in terms of - so basically it has very strong positions regarding the environment and it does have workers who work in municipal and other areas who deal with these issues.

We are quite aware in terms of when this issue was discussed within the City of

Charlottetown first because our workers are in the City of Charlottetown, and CUPE was one part of a coalition that worked with other groups in terms of the municipal election. One of those issues that came up consistently during that was a cosmetic pesticide ban. We found that there was overwhelming support for it from the groups and other people that were involved with that municipal campaign.

We know that the City of Charlottetown did have an ad hoc committee which had five citizens on it, initially who were given a mandate to go and have presentations and had some public hearings on March 27 and 29. They met with interested groups. They reviewed the federal-provincial legislation, they did some research, and they delivered a report to council within six months. We also know as well that there are 100 communities across the country who have similar pesticide bans, and we also know that there are ways of dealing with lawn maintenance and other things that are organic or non-toxic methods of lawn maintenance that are in place right now that we can use.

I know that the report that this committee gave to the City of Charlottetown in August 2007 and this committee basically was leaked to the press (Indistinct) and that committee which did all this work, it basically said it called for a ban on cosmetic pesticides with some exceptions, but that's what it did. It wasn't made public, I guess, the way it should have been.

Basically then the City of Charlottetown did ask the province to also ban cosmetic pesticides across PEI and part of that was - we're saying: We don't have the resources to do that. We know that 100 of the municipalities across the country have done it. We believe that resources can be made to do it. I agree with Philip Brown earlier, saying that education has a large role to play in terms of making sure that people do follow the rules. When people realize those

are the rules, they do follow them.

But there should not be a cost of saying we can't afford to protect people's health. If we make the links to health, which I think that we can quite clearly, then we need to make sure that we have the resources in place to make sure that can take place, whether that be education or other enforcement. We know for example, the Canadian Cancer Society, the director of the cancer control policy of the Canadian Cancer Society, and they've been researching the effect of pesticides since 2000. They both looked at individual studies which link pesticides to cancer rates and also some pool analysis in terms of large analysis of pools. There are studies to suggest that increased risk of some specific types of cancer result around pesticides including childhood leukemia, childhood brain cancer, adult leukemia, brain tumours, and some lung cancers. That suggested evidence is quite strong.

As well, we also know in terms of - without doing something it's not really worth the risk to human health and there is no real benefit to using these things, other than as a use for cosmetics, then we really should act. We know that many other cities and over 100 municipalities across the country have already acted. We also know as well that the medical society on PEI also called for a ban on cosmetic pesticides. We also know that in terms of the scientific evidence, people are saying these things are safe, or PMRA approved them. When we look at the PMRA record, we know that it's been a very slow process because they may have approved things a very, very long time ago and they haven't been reviewed since then. We know there have been basically four and five old pesticides that they were undertaking to review, and by 2004 only 61 of that 405 products were reviewed. Of that, 53 of the 61 were taken off the market or limited in some ways. Even with DEET, for example, it was started to be reviewed in 1990. By 2002 when the review was finally done its

use was restricted.

We know there are 8,000 pesticides (Indistinct) registered, 500 with active ingredients, 5,000 with ingredients, but we don't believe that these inert ingredients are actually inert. Because they do include things like asbestos, benzene, formaldehyde, vinyl chloride. For example, they do - and PMRA only looks at those with active ingredients. They don't even look at the fact that drug interactions of using more than one chemical or drugs. The same as with drugs in the human body, they can have a negative impact. So you could be taking two or three different drugs even for your own health conditions but they interact with each other. We do know that these drug interactions aren't studied enough.

We also know that the regulatory framework federally is under threat because of the security and prosperity partnership that's happening right now. They've actually lowered the standards in Canada to meet the US standards. That's already happened. So we do know that there is actually a downward regulatory framework to actually reduce the regulatory framework that we really need to have rather than building it up is what we should have.

**Chair:** Leo, I got a question. Just clarify for me. PMRA, who regulates them and how often is that reviewed?

**Leo Cheverie:** In terms of the PMRA?

**Chair:** Yeah.

**Leo Cheverie:** Basically it's the agency of the federal government in terms of (Indistinct) authorize what - and they do the analysis or study of what gets on the market or doesn't. All I know is that they've been quite slow in terms of reviewing even the older ones that have taken place because we know that new evidence happens and there is new research and new studies. When they've done that review - and I (Indistinct)

the facts to you - but they haven't been proactive to the degree that they should be, and they actually haven't had the resources to do what they need to do in terms of all that (Indistinct).

**Chair:** How often is the mandate reviewed, though, I mean?

**Leo Cheverie:** When was their mandate reviewed?

**Chair:** Yeah.

**Leo Cheverie:** My understanding was that they were asked to review all the older pesticides, and there was 405 of them to re-evaluate them. That took a considerable period of time. I'm not sure what exactly year it was. But by 2004 they had only reviewed up to 61 of that 405.

**Chair:** I realize that, but that's an agency of the federal government. Does somebody look at them and say: Hey, you're not doing your job properly?

**Leo Cheverie:** I think the federal government is directly responsible. I'm not sure if it falls within a particular department. I'm not sure if it's a federal - I don't know which federal department it falls under. I assume they may have a relationship with the federal department of agriculture. I'm not sure if that's the department or not. But certainly they are a separate agency. Right?

**Chair:** Okay. Olive.

**Leader of the Opposition:** (Indistinct) because it's close to something you said prior to that I'm going to ask the question now.

When you were talking about municipalities and jurisdictions that have put bans in place, and the bans have been there for awhile, do you have or know of research that's been done after that shows health outcomes? That

shows, for example, that because the ban's in place then (Indistinct) -

**Leo Cheverie:** The only thing I've heard about is Hudson, Quebec is one of the first places I went to and had to go through a whole court case to ensure that they had the legal right to do that. It's been one that's been there - one of the longer ones. Some of the other bans have been in place for a shorter period of time.

I don't know, there probably hasn't been in some cases time enough to have longitudinal in some of these places. But in terms of - I'll give some stats in terms of where Quebec is in terms of (Indistinct). I know the amounts have dropped in Quebec since the time that they were in place.

**Leader of the Opposition:** It would be really helpful, because a number of people have talked about Hudson. If that had a ban since 1991, and we know that there is a dramatic decrease -

**Leo Cheverie:** But I'll tell you, in 1996 within Quebec there was 1,650 pesticide poisonings: 79.4% dealt with private homes; 46.1% of the victims were children under the age of five; and 31% was in with oral ingestion and 34 (Indistinct) dealt with after pesticide applications. Presuming that with this in place, the number of those poisonings would be reduced over a period of time if there was actually less (Indistinct). Also Health Canada is the one who oversees PMRA.

**Chair:** Cynthia had a followup to (Indistinct).

**Ms. Dunsford:** I'm curious to the question because I know, Olive, you've been asking - you want to find out -

**Leader of the Opposition:** (Indistinct).

**Ms. Dunsford:** - I guess until there's an

actual contained research done on a group of people who have the same environment and the same amount of time and that are taken out and put into a different one, I'm not sure anything would be too conclusive anyway.

Because you can't necessarily say their health issues are directly because of this or it could be a combination of two or three things. They could be environmentally sensitive, somebody else might not be. One person might be more affected than the other. So then when you change that environment - I guess my point is that until there's a contained study done on that exact situation, I'm not sure anything is very conclusive as far as comparing ten years ago to now.

**Leader of the Opposition:** I'm just curious if the research is out there, though. Because a lot of universities do a lot of good research.

**Leo Cheverie:** More and more research at the universities is more tied to who funds the research, and certain types of research gets funded more than others. Believe me, there's probably lots more - there is lots of (Indistinct) that shows that the type of research (Indistinct) that do happen are related to commercial applications as opposed to ones that may not be.

But also I know as well, I mean, look at the average North American. When you look at the blood and urine of North Americans, you can test those. On the average they have 13 different pesticides in those, and there's been tests in the north in terms of people at - Inuit in the north - and find out that they have a lot of chemicals in their system in terms of PCVs and breast milk, etc. So we know that the chemicals stay within the system and retain themselves.

But the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety, they look at acute health effects and said that the acute health effects

of pesticides are nausea, (Indistinct) eye, skin, respiratory and throat irritation, muscle spasms and even death. But chronic things are ones that happen over the long term when things build up or things get in your system: neurological problems, brain and lung cancer, immune suppression, leukemia, Parkinson's's, kidney damage, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, reproductive disorders such as endocrine disruptions, sterility, low sperm count (Indistinct).

When we look at children particularly, we know it's a huge problem in terms of cosmetic pesticides. Because when we look at the physiology of kids, they actually take in more food and water or breath more air compared to their body weight compared to other people. Their skin is much more permeable, plus they have more contact there. Plus their behaviour in terms of playing on the floor or on the ground, or they even ingest soil, and actually even breath closer to the soil, and in terms of both their physiology and behaviour, it has a much more negative impact on them.

I know the Ontario College of Family Physicians had a 2004 pesticide report which I'm sure other people have referred to and they talk about having longer adverse health impacts because of the earlier exposure to children and the childhood. They look at non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, there's a higher rate in children exposed to pesticides. There's an elevated rate of kidney cancer. Four times the amount of soft tissue sarcomas, six or seven times the rate of childhood leukemia. Herbicide exposure before one year of age increases asthma rates four and a half times. The use of professional pest control services one year before birth up to three years simply increases the risk of childhood leukemia. Parents who use pesticides in the home one or two times a week, their children are more likely to have two and a half times the likelihood of having non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. That increases to seven times

more likely if they use those things daily. There was a Los Angeles study where parents used pesticides on lawn or garden during pregnancy, and it said there was a 5.6-fold increase in childhood leukemia among those children.

So all these things point to the fact that children are much more vulnerable. (Indistinct) use these pesticides are available and the way that the children in both their physiology and their behaviour, they're more apt to be impacted by them. Certainly, we also know as well that when you look at PEI, there are also people discussing different rates of increases of cancer, asthma, etc., that the rates here are higher than other parts of the country.

In terms of, for example, 2,4-D which is widely used in Canada, it was banned in Sweden since 1989 because of it's health effects. There is also a higher rate of application for homeowners themselves. They use a higher rate of application than farmers do because they have a smaller area. So they are actually applying a greater degree of pesticides on a smaller area than they would if, for example, they used (Indistinct) kilograms per acre, whereas if you were a soybean farmer, you'd use two kilograms per acre. So they use maybe up to about five times as much pesticide in the same space as farmers would use in terms of cosmetic pesticides.

We also know the pros that are available in terms of the environment. The precautionary principle is really important. That in fact, if something is better safe than sorry, (Indistinct) think there are any warning signs out there, which I think all the studies point to, that it's better to be on the side of caution rather than on the other side of it. Basically, when you're looking at cosmetic pesticides, there are other methods of maintaining lawns that don't need to use them in the same degree that are out there that may even create more employment



because they actually have more - rather than being pesticides, they may be actually using more workers in order to do that.

It also protects the public good. A lot of people who (Indistinct) enjoyed their property and even recently on PEI, I mean I know even the province was spraying around seniors' homes and other locations, which was totally unbelievable to me that they would be spraying these chemicals and putting them out on the lawn of places where seniors lived, because they are much more vulnerable.

We often know that there is also protection in terms of groundwater. There is also in terms of a way - in terms of tourists and tourism. We want to attract tourists here, we want to make sure they come to a safe place, and we can actually - and many of those people come from large cities which already have these bans in place. I think they would expect or want to have those same things in place where they come.

There are all terms to the chemicals that are there right now. I agree that there should be public education. There are ways you could actually have transition from where we are now for those companies that may be involved to actually move to much greener methods, and there are ways to do that as well.

I think as well the precautionary principle is really important because when you see children being much more negatively impacted in the studies that are there, then I think they are actually indicating what the impact is, it's more clearly up to them. But the long-term impact to this happens after exposure over a long period of time, and the earlier you're exposed to them the more likely that you are to have suffered those negative impacts later on.

As well, people do talk and say: If they've been approved they must be safe, kind of

thing. I just want to use a couple of examples. There have been lots of drugs or other things on the market that have proven not to be safe after they've been there. Whether it be thalidomide in terms of babies, in terms of tobacco and other things, there are many products out there which have been proven to be unsafe well after they've been approved.

I'll tell you something, I'll actually confess something here, which is a personal thing which I've never talked about publicly: I, myself, was exposed to DS, which is a drug given to mothers who - in my case, my mother had a miscarriage before I was born and she took this drug to prevent miscarriages. But this drug called DS, which was approved and prescribed and went through all the channels, provides a greater risk of cancer among children exposed to it. There's a whole range of illnesses that certainly daughters of DS mothers have. For example, in my case there are discussions around whether it has a greater rate of prostate cancer, testicular cancer, etc. But for daughters, their health effects have been (Indistinct) sarcoma, abnormal paps, that they've had to have pap or pelvic exams after a hysterectomy or menopause, greater risk of breast cancer, twice as likely than unexposed women to get breast cancer, structural changes for reproductive tract, infertility - they've got a greater risk of infertility -, miscarriage, pre term in labour, much higher risk pre-eclampsia, endometriosis, uterine fibroids, ovarian cysts, problems with menopause, cervical cancer, etc. All these things are from a drug that was approved and was prescribed and that was considered to be (Indistinct).

So all I'm saying is the precautionary principle in terms of what you're prescribing, what's there, just the fact that it's right on the market does not necessarily mean that it is safe. I've never talked publicly that I, myself, was exposed to DS in any form before this. But I know that in

my own case, my mother is very concerned that she took this. She came to tell me this was the impact. This was like probably 20 some years ago. Also, I've been very cautious in terms of (Indistinct) since then in saying, we have to be very cautious if we're exposing our kids or children to chemicals or drugs which are going to impact them later on in life. The long-term health costs of not dealing with this are still going to be borne by the province. Because if people are going to get these long-term health effects, who's going to be paying? It's going to be the province that's going to be paying. I think even for that reason alone then we should be very cautious because there is a really hard argument to say that a lawn that looks like this is more important than your kids. I just don't accept that argument.

As well with CUPE is, we have to be very cautious here. Lots of things have been on the market for a long period of time, they haven't been reviewed properly. The PMRA right now has certainly been under a strain because of it being underfunded due to the research necessary. As well, there are also downward trends in terms of pesticide analysis and things. Certainly with this new security and prosperity partnership agreement that's happening, we actually are going towards lower standards rather than going towards higher standards. That worries me. We also know that the Bush administration, who is pushing this, has also been gutting most of the environment regulations we have that help protect us.

I guess that's all I have to say, and I'm open for questions.

**Ms. Dunsford:** (Indistinct) we're talking about the precautionary side of things. The PMRA actually agrees with the recommendations of the OCFP that Canadians should and seek opportunities to minimize their exposure and reduce their reliance on pesticides. So there you have precautionary at its best when you have the

regulatory agency agreeing with the physicians that you need to be careful.

**Chair:** I think since PMRA has come up several times today I'll ask the clerk perhaps to touch base with them to see if we can get them to come in and make a presentation. They're not on our list now, but we might as well hear from them.

Any other questions? Olive.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Leo, I just have one more question for you. We have to ask a lot of questions to get all the information to help (Indistinct).

**Leo Cheverie:** Yes, right.

**Leader of the Opposition:** I'm just curious, because a number of people today mentioned Sweden, the country. They have a ban, for how long?

**Leo Cheverie:** I'm not sure how long it's been in place. I think it's 1988 or 1989, anyway.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Okay. So do you know - and I'm only asking because I don't know, okay? - is Sweden's population healthier for 100,000 people or 130,000 people than ours? Like, I'm just curious.

**Leo Cheverie:** I think the easy answer is to say they are healthier. But maybe not necessarily just for this one reason. I think all the studies show they're actually more active physically and a whole number of other things.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Which we have to do too, but I'm just curious (Indistinct).

**Leo Cheverie:** It's an apple and oranges thing in terms of (Indistinct) - what they're saying is they have a ban on something in here because they have actually said there is a real danger in terms of the health of using

this. I'm just suggesting that there are other countries out there who use the precautionary principle who've studied things and said: There's a problem with using this particular product and we're still using it. So that raises in our mind: What kind of review, what kind of analysis we should have to make sure the whole thing is.

But we're talking about cosmetic pesticides, and I've looked at -

**Chair:** We've got about five minutes.

**Leo Cheverie:** Okay. For example, there are ten steps to non-toxic lawn care. We're talking about lawns here. Then we have all these studies around the impact of this on children. I think the weight of the scale should be balanced towards the health of our children. In terms of people wanting a better lawn care, I mean, 60 or 70 years ago when people took care of their lawns, they didn't need any - they didn't use any chemicals. But things like mowing high, leave grass clippings on lawn, water deeply, use ecological methods of pest control alternatives, rake, fertilize, aerate, are all, like, common sense solutions to doing things basically. I also know with the use of - because time after time, they actually become more and more addictive.

There is something called the green revolution in agriculture which is about if you use more and more of these chemicals, which are produced by the same companies that produce Agent Orange among other things, then you need more and more of them to maintain that same thing. So they're basically there just to sell the product, right? Their interest isn't an interest of health. It's only after a period of time when these things have been ongoing for a longer period of time and using them, then you start realizing there is a real problem in terms of the health of children, because actually they're the early warnings, like the canaries in the coal mine, because they're much more

vulnerable.

But in the long-term we continue to use them. Anyone of us exposed to them are probably more apt to develop long-term health effects. Are we going to wait for that number of years for that to happen? No, I think the wise thing would be to say is there is enough evidence right now to show the problems that are there. All we're dealing with is cosmetic pesticides. There other ways to have a green lawn. So let's just more there.

There is also other questions regarding the use of chemicals (Indistinct) based on (Indistinct), we need to change anyway how we're doing things just because of global warming generally. There must be a much more rational way of transitioning to where we're using fewer fossil fuel based items and things like this in order to sustain ourselves. That's the model I think that we should go towards.

**Chair:** Any other questions?

Super.

**Leo Cheverie:** Thank you.

**Chair:** Thank you very much for your presentation.

**Leo Cheverie:** I let Marian know earlier that I didn't have it written, but I will have a written document to you so you'll have it as part of the record.

**Chair:** Okay, thanks.

Our next presenter is here from ECO-PEI. Matt, you might as well come forward and start.

**Matthew McCarville:** You folks have had a long day.

**Chair:** It's interesting though. As I

suggested to the others, I'll just get you to introduce your name. Do you want time for questions and stuff? We have 20 minutes, I guess.

**Matthew McCarville:** My presentation is going to be relatively brief. If we can open up a discussion afterwards, then that would be great.

**Chair:** Just introduce yourself and we'll start.

**Matthew McCarville:** Hello. My name is Matthew McCarville and I am a board member for the Environmental Coalition of Prince Edward Island, also known as ECO-PEI. I have been asked to make this presentation on behalf of the ECO-PEI board, as well as on behalf of the members of the environmental coalition itself.

The Environmental Coalition of Prince Edward Island is a community-based action group and our goal is to work in partnership to understand and improve the Island's environment. In the case of cosmetic pesticides and other issues, our concerns are for the health of not only the Island environment, but for the human health of Islanders. We have been working on the issue of pesticide reduction for a number of years and are pleased to have this opportunity to speak at this hearing.

Determining the impact of a province-wide ban on the sale and use of cosmetic lawn pesticides requires a very thorough analysis. First, we need to examine the Pesticide Management Regulatory Agency, which is Canada's federal regulatory agency on the issue. We have recently spoken with one of Canada's leading experts in this area, Dr. Scott Finley, the director of the Institute of the Environment at the University of Ottawa. Dr. Finley has provided us with a current assessment of the PMRA and has highlighted three key areas that need improvement to render the PMRA's current

registration decision process more effective.

Dr. Finley states that the PMRA has neither (a) clear statements of what is acceptable and unacceptable risk, nor (b) post-decision monitoring programs to assess the accuracy of their risk prediction, nor © a clear framework for updating the risk assessment based on new information.

So when we speak of the precautionary principle and the need to err on the side of caution when there are serious health consequences at stake, and we find out that our federal regulatory agency is failing on several accounts, several systemic flaws exist, then we have to be concerned.

Recognition that this federal regulatory agency is under increased criticism, coupled with the increasing body of scientific acknowledge that pesticides cause serious health problems from cancers to neurotoxicity in the past, has likely fuelled the public's mounting concern, public awareness and the social movement that is aimed at protecting the health of the public here in Canada. That is more or less how the issue has come to the forefront, and today across Canada we are seeing hundreds of organizations, groups, municipalities, even provinces, are now taking actions and they're all focusing first on cosmetic pesticides.

The reason in our opinion for the focus of a cosmetic pesticide ban is that the desired purpose of cosmetic pesticides is mainly for aesthetic reasons, i.e., for dandelion removal, or for pest removal such as earwigs or grubs. There are very few economic benefits to weight against human health risks in this case, and therefore, ECO-PEI feels banning these cosmetic pesticides is an excellent starting point in the Province of Prince Edward Island.

We feel strongly that the province-wide ban on the sale and the use of these cosmetic

pesticides is the only solution. If you are going to enact legislation it will only be perceived as effective if it has teeth in a real world application. Municipal bans alone have been proven less effective without provincial legislation.

Based on Dr. Finley's suggestion, a provincial ban on the sale and the use should be also combined with a public awareness campaign. The implementation of legislation and a campaign should then be subsequently monitored for effectiveness and revised as necessary, based on monitoring assessments.

So let's expand on our opportunities to improve the health of Islanders, particularly the health of children, and reduce the number of cases of cancer and neurotoxicity. This would reduce the cost of provincial health care and alleviate some of the pressures on a currently strained health care system. A ban may also enable the province to more effectively attract medical professionals, particularly youth, to the region utilizing non-monetary instruments. A recent group of Canadian med students have lobbied for their municipality to enact a cosmetic pesticide ban, stating that they will be more attracted to take up practice in a healthier and safer community. The students submitted a letter on behalf of the medical association of over 2,000 professionals.

As we continue to recruit doctors and develop a strategy, I see it as an important thing to consider opportunities to target niche markets - recruitment opportunities, I'll call them, for a lack of a better term.

Anyway, moving forward. A ban would better align PEI as Canada's green province. It would generate positive publicity for the province which would be reported nationwide. Surveys across the country indicate the majority of the public is supportive of a ban on cosmetic pesticides. Additionally, one group recently collected

over 4,000 signatures on a petition asking for a cosmetic pesticides bylaw in Charlottetown. Therefore, we ask the province to respond to the demonstrated wishes of the public. A ban would position PEI as a leader in implementing effective public policy. We would have an opportunity to learn from the experiences of other jurisdictions, particularly Halifax and Quebec.

Before I conclude, I would like to make the committee aware that I am providing a copy of a resource provided to me by Dr. Finley entitled: Uncertainty, Precaution and Adaptive Management in Canadian Pesticide Regulation. It provides a detailed examination of the PMRA and of the issues at hand.

In conclusion, the Environmental Coalition thanks the committee for this opportunity. We're available for discussion and are willing to provide the committee with other resources which might be of use. We recognize that our assessment does not touch on the many issues that exist. However, it is our hope that with this submission, in addition to other sources of information that have been made available or can be made available to you, the committee will collectively yield an informed decision that is based on the precautionary principle of ensuring the health and safety of Islanders.

So thank you.

**Chair:** Can we get a copy of that? Can you leave that for Marian or get us a copy of that?

**Matthew McCarville:** Of my submission and of the paper (Indistinct) that he's provided me, yeah.

**Chair:** Super, thank you very much for the presentation.

Any questions for Matt?

**Leader of the Opposition:** (Indistinct) from your group's interest in health. You know the main part of our agriculture committee has been going through the crisis as in agriculture, right?

**Matthew McCarville:** Yeah.

**Leader of the Opposition:** The last two weeks there has been all kinds of public debate in the *Guardian*, the blogs and (Indistinct), saying either one can exist or it can't. In terms of conventional agriculture - there's a new model for agriculture. From your group's perspective, who has made the link between cosmetic pesticides and health, how do you feel about agriculture still being produced on PEI? You were talking about recruitment of doctors. Is there an opportunity here to look at a new model for agriculture, and if this government gets a chance to do an investment of money, it's got strings attached to a new model. I'm just curious of agriculture.

**Matthew McCarville:** Explain what you mean by strings attached to a new model in agriculture.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Sure, I'm just curious, because this committee hasn't had a chance to talk about this, but we've been hearing for the last two weeks the crises in agriculture, right?, like the hog farmers, the beef farmers.

**Chair:** A little more than two weeks.

**Leader of the Opposition:** But with this committee, just this committee. The other part too is today, all day, we've been getting great presentations where people have been speaking about their concern for health. I'm just curious, as a province and from your background with ECO-PEI, is agriculture still important to the province? When I'm saying a new model, there was a gentleman

a little while ago talked about organic food and local food supply. I'm just curious if you have any thoughts or recommendations that this committee should consider?

**Matthew McCarville:** Would you like me to go speak at another - on another issue or -

**Leader of the Opposition:** No, I was just curious because I think they're connected.

**Matthew McCarville:** No, no, that's a good question. Yeah, they are, certainly.

**Leader of the Opposition:** I think they're very connected. Just while you're here, if nobody else had any questions.

**Matthew McCarville:** No, this is excellent. I think there are always opportunities to explore new ways of doing things. You can always begin by assessing what else is being done, not only within the province or nationally, but internationally, in order to identify new models that are out there. Growing local and going organic is certainly something that we feel is an important component of transitioning into a healthier, safer community for a number of reasons. From a sustainability standpoint, even in the global economy, it makes so much more sense.

But to try to stay on point, I'm not sure how I'm to tie this to the issue of cosmetic pesticides right now.

**Leader of the Opposition:** No, I was just curious.

**Ms. Dunsford:** (Indistinct) Olive, I think within - it's not that there aren't connections, as we've talked about earlier today, because we're talking about the word pesticide. What we're really trying to focus on with this hearing, as you know - that's why you're here - is to talk about cosmetic pesticides or the cosmetic use of pesticides.

It's hard to keep them separate because they're not, but they are in this sense. We're not reviewing a ban on pesticides. We're reviewing a ban on cosmetic pesticides and how we might implement that, as the motion reads. But I know it's hard to kind of (Indistinct).

**Matthew McCarville:** So I think the reason why we're looking at cosmetic pesticides specifically right now is because it's certainly more feasible, there are less barriers. Like, with the golf industry and with the agriculture industry, those are two huge industries that rely on pesticide use currently. Okay?

We don't have any huge industries that are supported by the use of lawn pesticides. These are people who are living at their homes and their neighbours start having no dandelions, and they say hey, and this is how it happens. We can mitigate risk more effectively in terms of health by eliminating pesticides completely. But we can mitigate risk more effectively, more viably, without impacting the economy in a negative sense by focusing in first on cosmetic pesticides, which is what I said. We see the movement and everyone across the country, they're focusing on cosmetic pesticides for that reason. That's sort of how we see it, I think, yeah.

**Mr. Henderson:** So you don't have a problem with golf (Indistinct) as far as the golf courses?

**Matthew McCarville:** That's not our position. For example, I spoke to a gentleman who worked at a golf course over the past summer. He said: They came, they sprayed, they were wearing full body suits, and they had me standing right there and I had no protection. So an occupational health hazard, I think so.

**Mr. Henderson:** They usually spray at night, too.

**Matthew McCarville:** It was unbelievable to hear that really. I wouldn't have thought that that sort of thing could happen. I think that we're all clear that pesticides are toxic, we wouldn't mix it with our coffee for breakfast, and things like that. I understand the rationale, the economic barriers, the complications that are associated whenever you have industry stakes.

So I think it would be important even more so, in an agriculturally intensive province and a province with such a strong golf industry, to take the advantage of the opportunity to mitigate risk due to pesticide exposure in this area of focus right now.

**Ms. Dunsford:** We've had two different approaches today. Earlier Philip Brown talked about just focusing on pure residential ban. There has been other people talk about residential and definitely commercial. There is a mixed kind of feeling on how to look at this. There has been different approaches in other jurisdictions that have worked. Depends on what's best for PEI.

**Matthew McCarville:** I think if we're looking for a step-by-step approach, what we'd hope to see is, first, a cosmetic ban on pesticides on the sale and the use, province-wide. If the choice is to allow golf courses to continue under an exception, then we would support recommendation that a shift be made. Because right now there actually are a lot of really good alternatives to intensive pesticide use. There really are. There have been some success stories in the golf industry. It's a matter of how much will there is politically to put that pressure on. Then, ultimately you would like to see a lot of solutions for the agricultural industry which is feeling some pressures right now. That is actually pressures themselves has been a barrier to the notion of changing, moving away from that conventional standard.

I mean, that's sort of a three-step approach over the long term of where things will probably go.

**Chair:** I want to thank you for the presentation. It's very interesting. We have one more this evening. As long as you make those papers available to Marian, that would be terrific.

**Matthew McCarville:** Thank you for your time.

**Chair:** Thank you.

Our next presenter is the PEI Medical Society and Dr. Bigsby. You can take a one-minute stretch if you want, folks.

*[There was a short recess]*

**Chair:** I want to welcome Dr. Bigsby to the committee and hearings. She is representing the PEI Medical Association. I'll ask you to introduce yourself for the sake of Hansard. Is it a full presentation or do you want to allow time for questions?

**Dr. Kathy Bigsby:** It's going to be pretty brief.

**Chair:** Okay, good. Just do your introduction then and we'll just roll into it. That's great.

**Dr. Kathy Bigsby:** Sure. I'm Kathy Bigsby, past-president of the Medical Society of PEI. Thank you very much, committee members, ladies and gentlemen for letting me speak.

I'm here as a physician who cares for the children of PEI and I'm also here as a concerned citizen. What I say might sound familiar, might sound a little bit different. But when I thought about what I might say, it occurred to me that if we had an overwhelming body of scientific evidence, that sort of blinded randomized controlled

clinical trials that told us that putting pesticides on our lawn was dangerous to our health, we wouldn't be here talking about this. At least, I would hope that we wouldn't be here talking about this. But we don't have that kind of hard scientific data.

What we have are studies that are challenged by logistical weaknesses. Some suggest that there might be risks and others that have failed to demonstrate any risk. So the question is: What should we as a community do about this? The Ontario College of Family Physicians conducted a systematic review of the evidence on pesticides and human health effects back in 1997. A systematic review is a well recognized technique for pulling together the results of many different types of studies and combining the results in a way that helps to answer a research question.

In his presentation to the federal government standing committee on the environment, Dr. Kelly Martin, who is the author of the report, stated that the combined evidence from animal and human studies was sufficient to create concern regarding the health effects of pesticides at the levels that Canadians were currently being exposed to. He pointed out that we will never have the opportunity, nor should we, to randomly and blindly assign human subjects to pesticides and compare their health to that of those who are unexposed. So as in many areas of medicine, we have to settle for something that is scientifically less rigorous, but still quite sound.

A letter to the editor in the *Guardian* last year on this issue criticized physicians for speaking out on cosmetic pesticides. The writer argued that Health Canada licenses these products, just as they license the pharmaceuticals that we prescribe. He felt that it was hypocritical to oppose the use of one and not the other. What the writer, I felt, failed to address was the risk benefit analysis that we do anytime a drug is



prescribed.

There are licensed medications that have severe life-threatening side effects that are frequently prescribed, but only for those with life-threatening conditions. There are medications that we use all the time such as live vaccines and cancer treatments that can also have effects on those who are exposed to the people that they're given to, and we need to take precautions. Even medications with very good safety records are only prescribed if there's a good reason to do so and the benefits outweigh the risks, however small those risks might be.

So why do I, as a physician, support a provincial ban on cosmetic pesticides? These are drugs. They're being prescribed to ensure that lawns and gardens meet a certain aesthetic standard. They can blow onto adjacent property, they seep into our water supply, they expose those beyond those who do the prescribing and do the using, and they expose our children who are the most vulnerable citizens that we have.

I believe that the risk is not justifiable and we cannot wait for the research to catch up. We need only to reflect on the legacy of delayed action on other toxin exposures such as tobacco and asbestos to appreciate the perils of delaying.

Thank you very much for your attention and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

**Chair:** Thank you very much.

Olive.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Dr. Bigsby, I just have a question. I recognize what you're saying about research, that you can't do research on human subjects and give them pesticides. But I'm curious. Because all day long we heard people referred to either the Quebec model or Ontario model where information was done on communities

where bans were put in place. Do you know if there has been any medical documentation on health outcomes after a ban has been put in place?

I'm just curious. Two weeks ago a doctor presented to opposition on autism and the rates of how autism is just going through the roof. It's just there are so many different things out there. It'd be nice to know, for example, if in Quebec or in a place in Ontario the ban was put in place and people were really healthier after. I know there's a lot of things you can't correlate to it, but I'm just curious in terms of from a health perspective if you know that someone has gone back to health medicare records or whatever and said: Gee, you know, we're really on to something here? There are more kids that are born normal. You know what I'm getting at?

**Dr. Kathy Bigsby:** I do.

**Leader of the Opposition:** Because it's not so much - (Indistinct) are going to be listening. When we're trying to help people Island wide it's to educate everybody.

**Dr. Kathy Bigsby:** I think the short answer to the question is: No, I don't know of any studies. But that is one of the challenges to the research. Look at the health effects of tobacco. If you put a ban on tobacco you don't see results in the very short term, you're talking about very long exposures over time. One of the challenges is that any research that you design is not going to yield you the results that you'd like to have in the period of time that you'd like to have. You do have to kind of boldly go forward and say this is the right thing to do.

**Chair:** Okay, Rob has a question.

**Mr. Henderson:** I guess from my perspective, I'm going through sort of a similar issue in my riding with the Howlan residents with the electromagnetic fields.

The line that we always get thrown at us, Health Canada doesn't recognize this as a health concern. You're in the medical profession. I'm sure there are people medically inclined that are on Health Canada. Why is it that they seem to be either lagging behind or what seems to be the problem there?

**Dr. Kathy Bigsby:** I think it goes back to what I was saying before. These drugs are quite useful in certain situations so Health Canada doesn't want to say you mustn't use these. They have been bold in the past, and there are certain pesticides that are banned in this country. What they've said is: We've looked at the research and we think that you can safely use that.

What we're saying is that, yes, you may safely use it, just the way I may safely prescribe a drug in an indicated situation. But I don't think that that means that we should recklessly spread it over the landscape, and that's the difference.

**Chair:** Are there any other questions?  
Charlie.

**Mr. McGeoghegan:** I read an article probably about six or eight months ago that a doctor wrote. Basically what he was saying was that - and I think he even used these words - that the people on PEI were lab rats for the chemical companies because we're a controlled province or environment. Because we're an island and it's a small area, basically we're being tested. What do you think of that? Is there anything to that?

**Dr. Kathy Bigsby:** I didn't see that article, and I'm not a conspiracy theorist, and I don't think anybody is really studying us. But I do think there is something to be said for the point about being an island, a relatively confined space, our water supply doesn't sort of flow from very far away, the groundwater is the groundwater.

Certainly there was an attempt to look at cancer rates on PEI to see if we could demonstrate a possible effect of pesticide exposure. But really, if you look at the research that's been done on this we're not just talking about cancers. Sometimes you're talking about a small effect and it can be very hard to demonstrate. Also, there are a number of environmental things that conspire. There are demographics that conspire to adjust cancer rates and it can be really difficult to tease out.

But if you go back, as they did in the Ontario study and look at the animal research and put it together with some human studies that are flawed, there is a body of evidence there that suggests that there is an effect. I guess the point is that if people are being exposed to these chemicals for a very good reason and the risk is perceived to be small, you might come to the conclusion that it's justifiable. But when the potential benefit is very small, and some folks would say non-existent, the question is: Why would you take any risk at all?

**Chair:** Cynthia has a question and then Olive.

**Ms. Dunsford:** Question slash comment I guess, more than anything. You mentioned the idea that despite the lack of certain types of conclusive studies that we move forward because we know it's the right thing to do. As a physician, I'm curious, has there ever been a situation with the drug companies - (Indistinct) it's a face-off: drug company and people who are concerned about their health. As a physician who knows the drug companies well, I just wondered if you're ever faced with that situation? As a physician do I - okay, you're telling me this, this and this, but it's too risky, I'm just going to chose to just keep that off my shelf.

**Dr. Kathy Bigsby:** All the time.

**Ms. Dunsford:** All the time.

**Dr. Kathy Bigsby:** They're in the business of selling their product. They spend a lot of money in research and development. You get the product to market, you want to move it along. We've seen lots of examples of pharmaceuticals that have come to market, and there are some folks - and I'm not just talking about doctors, I'm talking about health care consumers - who are very quick to embrace something that's new. Some people do it for a very good reason. They've got a very serious condition, no one's offered them anything. They're anxious to try something new. Other people are just risk takers, and some folks are vulnerable to advertising. There are lots of reasons why people will embrace something new. Sometimes what's new turns out to be really good and sometimes 18 months later it's being pulled from the shelf because there have been excess deaths.

**Ms. Dunsford:** That's when we're talking about somebody's health and not so much how nice their lawn is.

**Dr. Kathy Bigsby:** That's exactly the way I see it.

**Ms. Dunsford:** It's like important, not so important. When I look at it, there is no relation.

**Dr. Kathy Bigsby:** I get that all the time from people when I sort of talk to people about what options are. When I present a new drug, there are some people who say to me: Oh great, we've been waiting for something new, I'll try that. Other people will say to me: How long has this been available? How many people have taken this? What are the side effects like? Some folks are happiest to use what's been on the market for 50 years and is tried and trusted, and maybe have to take it six times a day, but they're good with that.

**Ms. Dunsford:** Risk, yeah.

**Chair:** Olive.

**Leader of the Opposition:** I'm just curious. You've been a physician for quite awhile. Would you describe what our kids are like? Are our kids sicker, or do they have more learning disabilities, like in the PEI context, than in the last 10 years? Or would it be relatively the same?

**Dr. Kathy Bigsby:** Things are different. What I've seen as a pediatrician and a physician over the last 25 years is different. I guess what I'd like to say, it's probably easier to contrast with 150 years ago when I was not practising medicine. But when I was training, we had a 100-year-old textbook that I use to read when I was getting bored with what I was suppose to be studying. It was fascinating. Mostly what it was was descriptions of what children looked like when they were dying from meningitis and pneumonia and whooping cough and diphtheria and diseases that we treat now with medicine. So things have changed in that sense.

I guess what I mean to say is that we are seeing - children are healthier in some ways. We take much better care of their asthma, we take much better care of their digestive disorders. But what happens when you take care of that is that you start to see other problems emerging. As you know, we're having an epidemic of overweight. Who would have guessed that that would be a health problem? That's because we have lots of food. We're seeing epidemics of problems that are related to inactivity. Too much time in front of the screen. I guess I'm kind of dodging your question. I think I know what you're getting at, but we're seeing so much lifestyle related disease that it's really very hard to comment on some of this other stuff. We don't know where that's coming from.

The autism spectrum that you talked about before, what's happened in the US is that

they've seen a huge drop in the diagnosis called nonverbal learning disability, at the same time they they've seen an increase in the diagnosis of autism, and they look a lot alike. So is this diagnostic bias, is there increased recognition? We sort of joke in our clinic that you're not allowed to be a weird person any more, you have to have a diagnosis. I think that's part of it. But there are probably also other things coming into play.

But there's been lots of speculation about in explosions in allergic disease and lots of theories about why that might be happening. Cancer, it terrifies all of us as parents, cancer in kids. But a true thing is that children use to die of infectious diseases. We also see cancer - cancer is a bit more in our face these days too, because children don't die of it. Our cancer survivals are really very good in children. So in the old days a child would get cancer and die and the story would be over. Now we have some very successful treatments, and sadly, it's not always effective. Community will follow along with a family dealing with a child with cancer and through that journey there is a lot of speculation about what could have caused this.

As you probably know, people who study grieving say that there is a stage of grieving that has to do with blaming and anger. Sometimes you latch on to the most convenient thing to blame. A true thing is that that blame is sometimes inappropriate, or maybe not. We just don't know.

**Chair:** Charlie has a quick question to wrap up.

**Mr. McGeoghegan:** Being a doctor, have you guys interacted with the veterinarians at all in any talks with pesticide poisoning or anything? I've had a lot of people tell me that because dogs and cats have paws and their paws are really porous, if they're walking on grass or anything that has been

sprayed anytime, in a short period of time from when they walked on that, that will poison them. There are cats that they have to operate, take their eye out, and things like this, or dogs that have tumours that come all of a sudden. They're being told from the vets that it's because of that.

**Dr. Kathy Bigsby:** The short answer to the question is no. I haven't had a conversation with a veterinarian about that. One of the things that they did in the Ontario study was they looked at animal studies. You can do stuff like that to animals. It's pretty clear that exposure in the fashion that you're describing, they're eating it. As the previous presenter said, we know this stuff is toxic. You don't have it on your breakfast table.

Animals are exposed to it in different ways than humans are. They will lick it off their skin. It gets on their fur, they groom, and they are exposed to much higher levels than we'll typically let people be exposed to. The effects are obvious, it's there. So we extrapolate that to some extent to humans. That's really what the Ontario report was about.

**Chair:** Okay. We really want to thank you for your presentation.

**Dr. Kathy Bigsby:** Thank you very much.

**Chair:** I want to thank all the presenters this evening and this afternoon as well. It was a super day.

Our committee is going to adjourn now and on December 11<sup>th</sup> at 1:30 we're going to resume hearings on cosmetic pesticides for the afternoon and evening. Anyone is welcome to come back and sit in, listen to the presenters at that time. Our committee is sitting on Friday afternoon with regards to agricultural issues.

So, thank you very much for your presentation and your attendance today.

We're adjourned. Thank you.

The Committee adjourned