Thank you for your time this morning.

I wanted to make a few brief comments about the new Pesticide Management Bylaw that is before you today.

As you are aware, last year a subcommittee of the Protection and Community Services Committee, consisting of Councillor Pagtakhan and myself, was formed to look the issue of reducing the amount of "non-essential" pesticides going into our environment.

Much like the practice of exposing people to second hand smoke, the practice of exposing people to pesticides is becoming less and less acceptable.

There is serious and valid public concern about the impact of exposure to pesticides on the health of children and pets in particular.

The products that many provinces and municipalities across Canada are banning have not been shown to be safe.

There has not been enough research by the regulators of these products that has looked at how these products interact with each other and build up the human body

Proving these products are safe, known as the precautionary principle, , makes sense when dealing with serious health concerns.

Two days of public consultation were held in May of last year. With the support of our Environmental Coordinator and the Province's Medical Officer of Health, Dr Margaret Fast we heard a large number of citizens and organizations representing very different sides of the issue.

Following the hearings last year, Council approved in principle the idea of Pesticide bylaw.

Before you today, we have the Pesticide Management Bylaw which will do a few things.

First, there will be a public education Campaign starting in 2008. There is $10,000 already in place for this year's program. Further funding would be needed for 2009 and is requested here.

It is important to make people aware that there are many alternatives ways to take care of a lawn that are not harmful to the environment or to human and animal health.

I also wanted to advise you that I have met with provincial officials and discussed the idea of the province providing matching funds for Public Education. We are awaiting word back on this from the Intergovernmental Affairs Minister.

This would give us the ability to do more public education, but also to draw the province in as a partner.

Another major part of the bylaw is that signage will be required for commercial applicators who apply chemicals to lawns.

For 2008 this will be strictly voluntary. Starting in 2009 the bylaw comes into effect making the signage a requirement.

The Standing Committee has specified that the size of the signage be 8 by 10 inches and on weatherproof material which is consistent with what the city does with it's signage.

The idea of buffer zones has not been included here. It was determined that this measure in this situation could actually lead to encouraging people to apply their own pesticides rather than use commercial applicators essentially increasing the amount of pesticides being used.

The buffer zones for mosquito fogging is different because it the city that is the one applying the fog and not a whole slew of private applicators.

These measures are really taking small first steps by increasing awareness and education about lawn care alternatives.

It is well known that the most effective way to reduce pesticide use is to have it removed from store shelves altogether and to ban the use of certain chemicals.

This is what the province of Quebec has done and they have the lowest rate per capita of pesticide use in Canada. Ontario is now announced that it will be implementing a similar province wide ban.

The report also recommends that the City of Winnipeg work with the Province of Manitoba towards province wide controls on the use of non-essential pesticides.

If there is anything that I can do to be of assistance in working with the province on this issue, I would be happy to help out.

I also would like to say that I am supportive of the amendment that Councillor Steeves is bringing forward today. There are so many new organic products coming on the market that it makes more sense to list the products that require signage than to list the products that don't. I believe the list being suggested is the one that the City of Toronto has implemented and seems to make the most sense.

This also avoids the problem of issues such as treatments for wasps and vermin that was discussed in the media this week.

In closing, I would like to thanks EPC and Council for taking some very minor, but important first steps. I truly hope that when this issue comes up for review again in 2009, we can take stronger and more effective action that will significantly reduce the harm from this serious environmental concern.

Good morning Councillors,

This is the proposed amendment to the pesticide by-law. It is being reviewed by Legal Services right now, and once they have approved (or revised) the wording, I will let you know.

To quickly sum it up, this will address the concerns of the Restaurant Association. The six chemicals listed below are the main ingredients in virtually all lawn and garden pesticides. They are not used to control pests like mice, rats, cockroaches, wasps, etc – and as such, will not affect the operations of restaurants.

The first five are the only chemicals banned for use by the City of Toronto under their cosmetic pesticide by-law. I ran this list past both David Hinton and Ian Greaves yesterday, both of whom felt it was appropriate.

I believe this is a good option, as it will allow new organic products to be used with having to be added to an exemption list.

(d) ***Use of any of the following products either individually or in combination with other products will require the use of signage:***

a) 2,4-D
b) Mecoprop
c) Dicamba
d) Glyphosate
e) Carbaryl