Mr Mayor, Committee Members.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

My name is Ralf Klenke and I own several businesses in Winnipeg and outside.
One of these Businesses is Nutri-Lawn
As an environmentalist and business owner I support 100 % every effort to reduce pesticide usage. Period.

I do not however support any legislation that in fact increases use of pesticides behind a mask of ill conceived and poorly copied bylaws.

In detail:
RECOMMENDATION A
All commercial companies already use signage after an application. Why are we wasting time and resources to define details, while any homeowner can apply too much product at the wrong time without notifying anybody. Why the double standard? By passing this recommendation, What changes and to whose benefit? The recommendation A of the proposed bylaw will not contribute to a safer neighbourhood nor to a reduction in pesticide use.
This recommendation is as usefull as a dull knife to cut tomatoes.

RECOMMENDATION B
This recommendation can only be acceptable if a doctor's note is required as Brandon's bylaw does.
The majority of homeowners do not want a bylaw on pesticide usage. This has been proven by many surveys. Usually it is close to 3/4 against a bylaw and 1/4 for some kind of restriction. Accepting this recommendation without a doctor's note is equal to a large scale ban for professional applicators. Strategically placed homeowners will deny a large numbers of homeowners the right to care for and maintain the value of their home and landscape professionally and drive them to buy products in stores and apply pesticides themselves.
Why do we constantly allow a small , but very vocal minority to dictate what we can and cannot do? I expect my city councilors to make smart decisions based on facts rather that emotions and convictions as presented in this report.

I would like to point out several items I noticed while reading the report.

1. The committee members who have called for this ad-hoc committee were in favour of a ban even before the hearings started. The discussion on cosmetic pesticides is like a discussion about abortion. You are pro life, or pro choice and you do not flip flop when you hear the arguments of the other side. Not a single person who attended the meetings changed their opinion on the topic during or after the hearing. This is a polarized issue.
2. Based on this, I would like to point out that the report is not a fair representation of the presentations at all but is very subjective and based on the convictions of the members.
3. The section in support of regulation presents unsubstantiated research as facts which it is clearly not. When science fails to prove a point statements like this one are made: "*The Cancer Society notes that there is very little, well-documented data on cancer risk and exposure to pesticides ... and while evidence ..is not scientifically definitive it is strongly suggestive of a link...*".
4. The section in Opposition to Regulation is not presented objectively to the reader. As an argument in opposition is presented it is instantly followed by its counter argument. I consider this an extremely biased representation, which is clearly meant to sway the opinion of the reader towards the need of a pesticide bylaw.
5. I guarantee that if I were to write this report it would include statements like " *while many presenters in favor of a bylaw spoke of research that proves a direct connection between pesticides and cancer it has to be noted that much of the data presented came form activist funded and motivated groups with the clear purpose to show a causal connection and was neither peer reviewed nor repeatable. The reports often referred to products like Agent Orange to prove a connection between pesticides and cancer, while there was no or inconclusive data to prove a cancer connection between today's pesticides approved for use on residential lawns.*"

   This report does not give an accurate representation of the presentations but pushes the preexisting conviction of the committee members that there is a need to follow other municipalities.

Without going into further details of this report I believe we all agree that the purpose of any bylaw is the reduction of usage and with it a minimized risk.

This approach is wrong and we don't have to copy any ill-conceived by-laws that other municipalities have passed, we have the duty to do it right. The only way to change the behavior of homeowners is through their pocketbook.

Here is what works:
A bylaw that increases the price of pesticides on retail shelves by a factor of 3 over time and the requirement of a pesticide applicators license to purchase pesticides.
Additional revenues are allocated 20% to the stores for the administration and collection of the levy and 80 % to the city. The money will be used to educate and to promote organic alternatives on city property.
This solution will

- Actually reduce usage substantially,
- create funds for education
- create funds for alternatives on city land
- allow the homeowner a choice
- allow professionals to do their job

The proposed bylaw and its general direction that will <u>not see a restriction</u> in retail sales will:

- Restrict or prohibit trained professionals from applying products
- Drive homeowners to the stores where they can buy all products without restrictions
- Increase usage and exposure by and from untrained homeowners
- Will see more applications of more product without posted signs

If that does not sound like a good law, it probably isn't.

Why is it then that we spend all this time on this? This is neither common sense nor does it make business sense.

I dare the city to show leadership by creating bylaws that actually reduce usage rather than bylaws that are conceived after pressure form vocal minorities to copy bylaws from other municipalities, which in fact are

counter productive to the goal. These bylaws cannot be enforced and will lead to increased pesticide usage.

130 or so misguided communities of lemmings have gone to the cliff and we watch them go down as pesticide sales in retail stores keep rising. Is Winnipeg the next Lemming to follow or are we going to step out of that line and become a real leader.

Do not pas this bylaw, use your time and resources wisely and create one that makes sense and works.

Thank you.