

**Third Session - Fortieth Legislature**  
**of the**  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**  
**Standing Committee**  
**on**  
**Intergovernmental Affairs**

*Chairperson*  
*Mr. Dave Gaudreau*  
*Constituency of St. Norbert*

**Vol. LXVI No. 1 - 6 p.m., Monday, May 26, 2014**

ISSN 1708-6663

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Fortieth Legislature**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Constituency</b>	<b>Political Affiliation</b>
ALLAN, Nancy	St. Vital	NDP
ALLUM, James, Hon.	Fort Garry-Riverview	NDP
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	NDP
ASHTON, Steve, Hon.	Thompson	NDP
BJORNSON, Peter, Hon.	Gimli	NDP
BLADY, Sharon, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	NDP
BRAUN, Erna, Hon.	Rossmere	NDP
BRIESE, Stuart	Agassiz	PC
CALDWELL, Drew	Brandon East	NDP
CHIEF, Kevin, Hon.	Point Douglas	NDP
CHOMIAK, Dave, Hon.	Kildonan	NDP
CROTHERS, Deanne	St. James	NDP
CULLEN, Cliff	Spruce Woods	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	PC
EICHLER, Ralph	Lakeside	PC
EWASKO, Wayne	Lac du Bonnet	PC
FRIESEN, Cameron	Morden-Winkler	PC
GAUDREAU, Dave	St. Norbert	NDP
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Liberal
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	PC
GRAYDON, Cliff	Emerson	PC
HELWER, Reg	Brandon West	PC
HOWARD, Jennifer, Hon.	Fort Rouge	NDP
IRVIN-ROSS, Kerri, Hon.	Fort Richmond	NDP
JHA, Bidhu	Radisson	NDP
KOSTYSHYN, Ron, Hon.	Swan River	NDP
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	Dawson Trail	NDP
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Flor, Hon.	Logan	NDP
MARCELINO, Ted	Tyndall Park	NDP
MARTIN, Shannon	Morris	PC
MELNICK, Christine	Riel	Ind.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	PC
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	NDP
OSWALD, Theresa, Hon.	Seine River	NDP
PALLISTER, Brian	Fort Whyte	PC
PEDERSEN, Blaine	Midland	PC
PETTERSEN, Clarence	Flin Flon	NDP
PIWNIUK, Doyle	Arthur-Virden	PC
REID, Daryl, Hon.	Transcona	NDP
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Kewatinook	NDP
RONDEAU, Jim	Assiniboia	NDP
ROWAT, Leanne	Riding Mountain	PC
SARAN, Mohinder	The Maples	NDP
SCHULER, Ron	St. Paul	PC
SELBY, Erin, Hon.	Southdale	NDP
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	NDP
SMOOK, Dennis	La Verendrye	PC
STEFANSON, Heather	Tuxedo	PC
STRUTHERS, Stan, Hon.	Dauphin	NDP
SWAN, Andrew, Hon.	Minto	NDP
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	NDP
WIGHT, Melanie	Burrows	NDP
WISHART, Ian	Portage la Prairie	PC
<i>Vacant</i>	The Pas	

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS**

**Monday, May 26, 2014**

**TIME – 6 p.m.**

**LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba**

**CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Dave Gaudreau**  
*(St. Norbert)*

**VICE-CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Ted Marcelino**  
*(Tyndall Park)*

**ATTENDANCE – 11 QUORUM – 6**

*Members of the Committee present:*

*Hon. Ms. Howard, Hon. Mr. Mackintosh*

*Messrs. Eichler, Friesen, Gaudreau, Marcelino, Martin, Nevakshonoff, Pedersen, Saran, Ms. Wight*

**APPEARING:**

*Hon. Jon Gerrard, MLA for River Heights*

**PUBLIC PRESENTERS:**

*Mr. Gideon Forman, Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment*

*Mr. Justin Duncan, Ecojustice*

*Ms. Mariah Mailman, Concerned Mothers Coalition of Manitoba*

*Ms. Melissa Atkins, private citizen*

*Ms. Adrienne Percy, private citizen*

*Mr. Brian Chorney, Manitoba Canola Growers Association*

*Ms. Jane Seniw, private citizen*

*Mr. Grant Shewfelt, Manitoba Weed Supervisors Association*

*Mr. Josh Brandon, private citizen*

*Mr. Steve Rauh, private citizen*

*Ms. Amanda Kinden, Green Action Centre*

*Ms. Michelle McNeill, private citizen*

*Ms. Samantha Braun, private citizen*

*Mr. Sig Laser, private citizen*

*Ms. Melinda German, Manitoba Beef Producers*

*Mr. James Battershill, Keystone Agricultural Producers*

*Mr. Ken Guilford, private citizen*

*Ms. Delaney Ross-Burnack, Canadian Association of AGRI Retailers*

*Mr. David Hinton, Landscape Manitoba*

*Ms. Melanie Sourisseau, private citizen*

*Ms. Erin Crawford, Canadian Cancer Society, Manitoba Office*

*Mr. Ken Wiebe, private citizen*

*Ms. Natalie Reimer Anderson, private citizen*

*Ms. Danielle Sanderson, private citizen*

**WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:**

*Doug Dobrowolski, Association of Manitoba Municipalities*

*Lise Smith, private citizen*

*Frank B. Reddick, Turf Logic Inc.*

*Kathleen Cooper, Canadian Environmental Law Association*

*Elizabeth Chrumka, Canadian Organic Growers*  
*Mary Robinson, Council of Canadians, Winnipeg Chapter*

*Tim Gray, Environmental Defence*

*Doris Grinspun, Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario*

*Jodie Harpe-Lesperance, private citizen*

*Kristina N. Hunter, Manitoba Round Table for Sustainable Development*

*Anne Lindsey, private citizen*

**MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:**

*Bill 55–The Environment Amendment Act (Reducing Pesticide Exposure)*

\* \* \*

**Clerk Assistant (Mr. Andrea Signorelli):** Good evening. Will the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs please come to order.

Before the committee can proceed with the business before it, it must elect a new Chairperson. Are there any nominations for this position?

**Ms. Melanie Wight (Burrows):** I would like to nominate Mr. Gaudreau–Gaudreau. I can't say it. Mr. Gaudreau.

**Clerk Assistant:** Mr. Gaudreau has been nominated. Are there any other nominations?

Hearing no other nomination, Mr. Gaudreau, will you please take the Chair.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, our next order of business is to elect a Vice-Chair. Are there any nominations?

**Ms. Wight:** I would like to nominate Mr. Marcelino.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you. Mr. Marcelino has been nominated. Are there any other nominations?

Hearing no other nominations, Mr. Marcelino is elected Vice-Chair.

This meeting has been called to consider Bill 55, The Environment Amendment Act (Reducing Pesticide Exposure).

Before we get to the presentations, we have a few housekeeping items to discuss, so I will ask for your patience as I take you through them.

Two of the presenters on our list, No. 12, Gideon Forman, and No. 15, Justin Duncan, have asked to make their presentations by telephone, and we have arrangements in place to accomplish this.

I would ask if it is the will of the committee to entertain these presentations first and then move on with other presentations. Is that agreed? *[Agreed]*

On the topic of determining the order of public presentations, I will note that we have out-of-town presenters in attendance, marked with an asterisk on the list. With this consideration in mind, in what order does the committee wish to hear the presentations?

**Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside):** Typically, in the past, we've got out-of-town presenters first but, in this case, once we finish our phone calls, then we should proceed with out-of-town presenters after that.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Very well.

I would like to all-inform all in attendance of the provisions in our rules regarding the hour of adjournment. Except by unanimous consent, a standing committee will-to consider a bill in the evening, must not sit past midnight to hear presentations, unless fewer than presenters are registered to speak, and all bills being considered when the committee meets at 6 p.m.

As of 6 p.m., this meeting, there were 29 persons registered to speak, as noted on the list of presenters before you. Therefore, according to the rules, this committee may not sit past midnight to hear presentations.

Therefore, how late does the committee wish to sit this evening?

**Mr. Eichler:** Why don't we re-evaluate it at 11?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Very well.

So we have agreement to sit until all business is completed and to re-evaluate at 11? Agreed? *[Agreed]*

A number of written submissions on Bill 55 have been received and distributed for the committee's consideration. A list of individuals providing these submissions has also been distributed to committee members. To save the Chair having to read out these names, does the committee agree that the list of individuals providing submissions appear in Hansard? Agreed? *[Agreed]*

*Doug Dobrowolski, Association of Manitoba Municipalities; Lise Smith, Private Citizen; Frank B. Reddick, Turf Logic Inc.; Kathleen Cooper, Canadian Environmental Law Association; Elizabeth Chrumka, Canadian Organic Growers; Mary Robinson, Council of Canadians-Winnipeg Chapter; Tim Gray, Environmental Defence; Doris Grinspun, Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario; Jodie Harpe-Lesperance, Private Citizen; Kristina N. Hunter, The Cosmetics Pesticides Working Group of the Manitoba Round Table on Sustainable Development*

And does the committee further agree to have these submissions appear in the Hansard transcript of this meeting? Agreed? *[Agreed]*

Before we proceed with the presentations, we do have a number of other items and points of information to consider. First of all, if there is anyone else in the audience who would like to make a presentation this evening, please register with the staff at the entrance of the room.

Also, for your information of all presenters, while written versions of presentations are not required, if you're going to accompany your presentation with written materials, we ask you provide 20 copies. If you need help with photocopying, please speak with our staff.

As well, I would like to inform the presenters that, in accordance with our rules, a time limit of 10 minutes has been allotted for presentations, with another five minutes allowed for questions from the committee members.

Also, in accordance with our rules, if a presenter is not in attendance when their name is called, they will be dropped to the bottom of the list. If the

presenter is not in attendance when their name is called a second time, they will remove—be removed from the presenters' list.

Prior to proceeding with public presentations, I would like to advise the members of the public regarding the process for speaking in committee. The proceedings of our meetings are recorded in order to provide a verbatim transcript. Each time someone wishes to speak, whether it be an MLA or a presenter, I first have to say the person's name. This is a signal for the Hansard recorder to turn the mics on and off.

Thank you for your patience, and we will now proceed with public presentations.

### **Bill 55—The Environment Amendment Act (Reducing Pesticide Exposure)**

**Mr. Chairperson:** As per the agreement, we are now going to call Gideon Forman, who is No. 12. He is—the organization is Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment, and we are going to call him now.

**Mr. Gideon Forman (Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment):** Yes, I'm here.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Hi, it's Dave Gaudreau, I'm the Chair for the committee. I—you can—do you have—did you send any written information with the committee?

**Mr. Forman:** I did. I sent my remarks to Mr. Signorelli. I'm going to present them now, but you should have them, or he certainly does have them.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, they're just going to circulate them. Just give us one moment.

**Mr. Forman:** Thanks.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, we all have the—your information, and now—you weren't here before, but we have—you have 10 minutes for your presentation and then we'll have five minutes for questions and answers from the people on the committee. So the floor is yours.

\* (18:10)

**Mr. Forman:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, and members of the committee. I much appreciate you giving me this time today. I won't take up your full 10 minutes, just to move things along, but I very much appreciate the opportunity and especially letting me speak by phone in this slightly unusual

manner. It's very helpful to us in terms of reducing our carbon footprint, actually.

So I'm the executive director of the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment, and I speak on behalf of over 6,000 doctors and concerned citizens from across the country, and we're here today to strongly support bill C-55, but also to request that it be strengthened a little to make it even more protective of human health and the environment.

Before I make a couple of suggested amendments, I'd like to say why our doctors' organization is so pleased that the government has introduced western Canada's first province-wide ban on lawn pesticides.

As you know, the science shows that people exposed to pesticides are at increased risk for cancers and neurological illness, such as Parkinson's, and are more likely to have a child with birth defects. Research done by the Ontario College of Family Physicians, which represents thousands of family doctors, some 9,000, found that people exposed to pesticides are more likely to get brain cancer, prostate cancer and kidney cancer. Perhaps the most tragically, children exposed to these poisons are at increased risk for leukemia, a sometimes deadly blood cancer.

Research published in the journal of the Canadian Paediatric Society—which represents pediatricians, of course, across Canada—looked at the common weed killer 2,4-D which is the most common herbicide used to kill weeds on lawns, and again found that it's linked to neurological impairment, reproductive problems and cancer.

I don't think there's a person on this committee and, indeed, in this province who hasn't been touched by cancer. I think of my mother's breast cancer, but each of us has had to wrestle with this terrible disease in some way and we all know that stopping cancer before it develops is an absolute top priority. But that's exactly what this pesticide ban will do; it will tackle cancer by prohibiting carcinogenic products. So this legislation, in the view of our doctors, is to be applauded and celebrated as a major contribution to cancer prevention.

The ban will also protect Manitoba's drinking water, your lakes and streams, because it will mean a major reduction in the volume of toxic chemicals leaching into them, and I'm confident of this because we've seen it already in Ontario where there's been a

pesticide ban, as you know, since 2009. Ontario scientists compared pesticide concentrations in urban streams before and after that province's ban came into effect and they found that pesticide concentrations following the legislation were down as much as 97 per cent in some of these streams. In other words, we expect your pesticide ban will produce a real and very dramatic improvement in water quality.

The only requests we make is that you extend the legislation a little bit so that it, in addition to banning lawn pesticides, it also prohibits pesticide use on gardens and golf courses. I'm sure you'll agree that use of pesticides in these locations is not necessary for human health. Ontario's ban includes gardens, as you know, and I can tell you from first-hand experience that gardens across the province are in beautiful shape; they're well maintained, they're safe for kids and pets to play on and they're a wonderful habitat for songbirds, butterflies and bees. And I think that we can all agree on the importance of protecting our bees these days, in particular, in a province so committed to agriculture such as Manitoba. So I think, for those reasons, it makes a lot of sense to extend the legislation to include gardens.

Likewise, we believe that golf course pesticides are not needed. Runoff from these chemicals ultimately ends up in our water, threatening aquatic wildlife, including fish. And more worrisome still, actually, is that scientific studies on golf course superintendents, the people who are on these courses day after day who spend a lot of time around pesticides, the science shows that these workers have elevated levels of mortality from cancer.

While we recognize that golf courses do face some special challenges in eliminating pesticide use, we feel that a permanent exemption from the ban is not warranted. Rather, we would urge that golf courses be included in the ban, but allowed some additional time to make the transition to pesticide-free maintenance. As you know, there are pesticide-free golf courses already operating in other parts of North America—I think, for example, the Blackburn Meadows course on Salt Spring Island in BC, the Applewood Golf Course in Colorado—and we see no reason why Manitoba operators could not follow in the footsteps of these industry leaders.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Chair, and members of the committee, the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment is very supportive of

the proposed pesticide ban. We only ask that you strengthen it by including, as we mentioned, a prohibition on pesticides used on golf courses and on gardens.

Now, that concludes my remarks, and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Forman.

Questions from the committee members for the presenter?

**Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship):** Yes, Gideon, it's Minister Mackintosh here. Thank you very much for your advocacy. It's greatly appreciated and we certainly respect the views of Canada's physicians on this topic.

Perhaps just a non-science question, though. We may hear from people tonight who say that dandelions in Ontario have gotten way worse since the pesticide ban in that province in 2009. As someone from Ontario, perhaps we should just pick your brain before you leave us here tonight, but is there any objective evidence, because I don't—you talk about gardens continuing on, but do you have any comment on that? [*interjection*]

**Mr. Chairperson:** The honourable Mr. Forman—Mr. Forman.

**Mr. Forman:** Yes. May I go ahead, Mr. Chair?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Yes, go ahead, sir.

**Mr. Forman:** Thank you, Minister, for that question. That comes up often when we make these presentations across Canada, how will the properties look. I can tell you, Minister, from my own first-hand experience, the properties look beautiful.

And it's not just my own anecdotal evidence, but if you ask lawn care professionals—I'm thinking of Frank Reddick, for example, been in the industry, lawn care industry, for 40 years, operates a business in Ontario. He says the lawns—I'm quoting from a letter he sent in—the lawns look just fine, and I can attest that where both homeowners and municipalities have been following pesticide-free maintenance, the lawns have become easier to maintain.

So we know that it's practical to move to the pesticide-free maintenance and the properties look

beautiful, and properties right across the province, from Trent University in Peterborough in the eastern part of the province to properties in Ontario—central Ontario and southwestern Ontario, right across the province. It hasn't been a problem because consumers and the industry have been embracing these effective non-toxic methods which are widely available and price competitive. So, in terms of the properties, they're just as beautiful as ever.

The other thing that we're seeing, Minister, that's really positive is that we're seeing a growth in the non-toxic, the pesticide-free lawn care companies. The pesticide-free applications are a little more labour-intensive, Minister, so we're also seeing some growth in employment. We're seeing some job growth in the sector because it's more labour-intensive.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Any further questions from the committee?

**Mr. Shannon Martin (Morris):** Gideon, thank you very much for your comments. I just had a question. I've been on your website and it was very informative. A lot of the—or at least some of the information I saw had some serious concerns about the ingestion of pesticides when it came to food products, and I'm just curious why the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment encourages the Province to extend the ban to gardens and golf courses but not to agriculture, if the ingestion of pesticides is a concern as outlined online.

**Floor Comment:** Yes, that's a reasonable question—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Forman? Hold on, Mr. Forman, I just got to recognize you first and then you can go ahead. So, Mr. Forman, go ahead.

**Mr. Forman:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. My apologies.

I think our view is that in terms of agriculture it's a much more complicated issue. There are issues around protecting the food supply, and we don't think that that's something that the Province should be dealing with right now. We respect that farmers should be able to use any legal product to protect food supplies, so we leave that to the farmers to do what they do best.

Our view is that we need to focus on lawns and gardens and golf courses because these are non-essential uses of pesticides, Mr. Martin. These are places where the pesticide doesn't have any health benefit, it just changes the appearance of a

property, and in those cases we say, why take the risk? And that's our view, it's the Canadian Cancer Society's view and it's the view of nurses as well. We shouldn't be taking those risks when we don't need to, and that's our view about cosmetic use, so-called cosmetic use of pesticides, and that's why we focus on lawns, gardens and golf courses.

Does that speak to your question, Mr. Martin?

**Mr. Martin:** Yes, it did. I thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Any other questions from the committee?

All right. I thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Forman. It was—thank you for calling in on this, it's great.

\* (18:20)

We're now going to phone Justin Duncan from Ecojustice.

Hello, Mr. Duncan.

**Mr. Justin Duncan (Ecojustice):** Hello, good evening.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, I'm just—I'll explain a little bit of the rules to you; then we'll proceed. You have 10 minutes to present and then there's five minutes for questions and answers. So I will now—and you have to be recognized before you start speaking, so it's a little bit of a weird process, but we'll get used to it.

So I'll let you now speak, and the floor is yours.

**Mr. Duncan:** Okay, thank you very much.

So thank you to the committee for allowing me this chance to speak today, and thank you especially for allowing me to speak by phone. I admit it's not as ideal as appearing in person, but I think it seems consistent with the theme of the day to reduce pollution by me not travelling to be with you there, and travelling from Toronto, so thank you for that.

In terms of who I am, I'm a staff lawyer with Ecojustice, and for those of you not familiar with Ecojustice, we are a national charitable organization dedicated to defending Canadians' right to a healthy environment. Our lawyers and scientists work to set precedents and strengthen environmental laws right across our country, and our aim is to protect and restore the environment. And we're a staff of about 50 lawyers, scientists and others, and we have about 14,000 supporters across Canada, including now many people in Manitoba.

Ecojustice has worked on pesticide reduction initiatives throughout our 24-year history. We've had—we've supported municipal cosmetic pesticide bans both in courts and through helping municipalities draft bylaws. And we've also helped with the introduction and implementation of cosmetic pesticide bans provincially here in Ontario and a little bit of work in Quebec. Most recently, we successfully sued the federal government to ensure that 24 pesticides are subject to regulatory review, so that process is ongoing now.

I'm here today to voice Ecojustice's strong support for Bill 55, but also to suggest some—a couple items to strengthen the bill slightly. I understand that Gideon Forman from the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment appeared before the committee today, and his comments, I understand, were about why it's so important to have Manitoba enact western Canada's first province-wide ban on lawn pesticides. And I won't repeat what he had to say, but I—some of his comments—and say that it's all about health protection. Really, the old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure is really pertinent in this context.

And, in that regard, I have—I've heard a lot of public debate, both over the years involved in—when I've been involved in pesticide issues but also in Manitoba. I've heard people say that Health Canada's approval process reveals that pesticide use is safe, but I guess I'll just quickly address that issue. I think it's useful to—for me to speak to that. Although Health Canada registers pesticides for use nationally, Health Canada suggests limiting their use and reducing any unnecessary exposures to pesticides. Furthermore, Health Canada does not recommend calling pesticides safe, basing its registration status instead on the determination of acceptable risk.

So Health Canada does recognize that there are risks associated with pesticides. And, certainly, certain serious concerns have been raised regarding Health Canada's approach to pesticide registration, including that it assesses chemicals one at a time, regardless of the fact that many pesticides act in similar ways and pose similar health risks, raising questions about the both cumulative risks of real-life exposures to hundreds of these chemicals on a daily basis.

And another criticism that's been aired is that when Health Canada conducts its risk assessments, it doesn't adequately incorporate scientific evidence in

relation to human exposures in the real world and its reliance is heavily on industry-supplied animal data, which is more limited in nature.

And then, a final point I'll make in relation to Health Canada is that, you know, it has to be recognized that accidents happen. Again, they do happen. In 2007, the David Suzuki Foundation compiled data on pesticide poisonings in Canada, including cosmetic use of pesticides and found that 6,000 cases of pesticide poisonings are reported in Canada annually. And, most importantly, half of these cases involve children under the age of six, so it's important that we—I stress that as an important point in terms of taking a preventative approach as Manitoba's now doing or proposing to do.

In relation to our recommendations, specifically, I provided a two-page letter to the committee clerk today that outlines eight recommendations. I don't intend to go through all eight today. I don't think I've got time to do that. Instead I think what I'll do is I'll just highlight the three most important ones in our view. The first one is that we believe that extending the prohibition to clearly include gardens and non-agricultural landscaping would strengthen the bill. I note that the bill currently is silent in relation to those two items. So neither the prohibition section or the exemption section speaks to gardens or landscaping. So we recommend that these be included with lawns in section 40.4 to ensure that the prohibition protects human health but also to address any potential for ambiguity that can arise in reading the bill.

The second point is that we recommend that the ban be extended to golf courses. In Ontario, when the ban was being introduced, the thought was that that would get revisited and we're probably around that time now where we should revisit that part of the exemption. But certainly the—in bringing in the ban in relation to golf courses, Ontario required that golf courses meet certain requirements so they can continue to use pesticides and that included preparing an annual report that sets out how they would minimize pesticide use and then also hold an annual public meeting so the public could be involved. And we would recommend that these interim measures be used but that a ban on pesticide use on golf courses be phased-in over time.

The final point that we recommend is that the exemption section in 40.6 subsection (e) be restricted in some manner so that it can't be used down the road to undermine the intent of this bill. So, for instance,



perhaps there could be a prescription that qualifies how that particular section can be used so it can only be used under certain circumstances that uphold the intent. So, for instance, in applying that section that health protection be prioritized or the reduction of pesticide use.

Just a couple of final points here and that is that recognizing that Bill 55 is largely in the nature of enabling, an enabling enactment, and that the details will need to be fleshed out in regulation, and we look forward to providing input for anything you have future public processes in relation to regulations. And I'll just conclude by saying that Ecojustice is very supportive of Bill 55 and we hope you'll consider our recommendations as you deliberate how the bill could be strengthened and also become even more effective.

\* (18:30)

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Duncan, for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Yes, Mr. Duncan, thank you very much for your insights and for your legal analysis. We'll certainly consider that.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Any further questions from the committee? Seeing none, we will now move on—thank you so much for your presentation, Mr. Duncan. I appreciate you taking the time to phone in.

**Mr. Duncan:** Oh, more than happy to. Thanks so much.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Have a great night.

Before we move on to the next presenter, we have two new mothers that are here tonight and I was wondering if there was leave from the committee to authorize No. 6, Mariah Mailman, and No. 26, Melissa Atkins, to come forward and speak in—as the next two presenters because they have their children here with them. Does—do we have leave from the committee? *[Agreed]*

Okay, so—and one more order of business, No. 18 is Bill Ross. We're just—it's Brian Chorney is going to present. He's the VP of Manitoba Canola Growers Association and he's going to present on their behalf.

So now we move to the next presenter, and I will now call Mariah Mailman. Hi, Ms. Mailman, do you

have any written materials for distribution for the committee?

**Ms. Mariah Mailman (Concerned Mothers Coalition of Manitoba):** I do.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Can you—we'll just distribute them and you can proceed with your presentation.

**Ms. Mailman:** I'm Mariah Mailman, and this is my daughter, Liv *[phonetic]*, and I'm here to support the ban. I'd like to first say congratulations for implementing the ban, and we strongly support the bill and we'd encourage the Province to take further responsibility and leadership to expand upon the bill to include the golf courses and the gardens, as the previous speakers have said.

We understand that people want their lawns to look nice and that people in the industry want to keep getting paid and a lot of people are upset about the proposed changes, but the approval process for the pesticides—what I want to say in this presentation is that I feel that the process is flawed, that there's lots of health implications and that the health implications are costing a lot of taxpayer dollars.

Can everyone hear me okay? Okay? Yes, all right.

Therefore, the new legislation is really important to protect our children, our health and the environment, and we would like to see whole-cost accounting and that people need to come before purpose.

So the flaws that I'd like to outline within—for regulating the pesticides, the industry provides the funds or the research to have the products approved and they only have to provide a minimum number of studies while they can perform as many as they need to to find the circumstances under which their products show no harm and those other studies go undisclosed. So some of these exact things that I'm talking about are—they can use the least sensitive organisms. They can use only the single ingredients of the product or alter its form. They can shorten the duration of the study, alter the exposure route and the concentration tested.

So many changes are needed. We need independent funding and independent organizations conducting the studies. The studies should use realistic concentrations and realistic routes of exposure, sensitive organisms, multiple organisms, acute and chronic exposures, cumulative assessment with additive effects and epidemiological studies to

assess effects on humans. All ingredients should be tested and these ingredients should be disclosed on the labels. Currently, only the active ingredient is—has to be disclosed on the label.

Consideration should be given to alternatives that are safe, if they exist. If they exist, synthetics should be rejected. We would like, therefore, to be—to have zero tolerance for the production and release of the toxic substances in our environment.

I found one study that said—a government study saying that the pesticide management regulatory agency is wholly inadequate when they conducted their own audit. Therefore, the acceptable level of risk approved by Health Canada is unreliable and Health Canada has failed to provide protection. And that protection I'm talking about is some of these health effects include the synthetic substances pose a health risk to pregnant women and children—that's going to be my focus—and it's a good thing I have this written down.

Children are most susceptible to the substances because children play on the ground and they have more of the hand-to-mouth contact, meaning that their exposure is greater and because of their small bodies they concentrate to a greater degree. Even when children are not present when the substances are applied, the substances stick to dust particles and the soil, and children come along, play in that area, a lot of their play stirs up the dust, it's very windy here and they are often eating in these areas as well and picnicking. So they're able to pick up these contaminants through inhalation, ingestion and absorption. The dust is easily suspended.

So—here we go—small children also explore the world by putting everything in their mouth, so whether they're eating or not—and if the pregnant women are out at the playground, say she has a toddler and she's taking her toddler out, she has the greatest risk of exposure with the developing fetus in her tummy.

So—here I'm just going to skip through—essentially the contaminants are present throughout the environment, they have no boundaries, they're permeable with our breath, our blood, our skin, our tissues. There's no buffer zone, no safe zone, and for me there's no acceptable risk. The risk of exposing our children to these substances is unreasonable and unacceptable and chronic exposure to a contaminant is killing our children softly. Our children must be protected from unnecessary risks.

So it was once believed that the solution to pollution was dilution, and that's been disproven. And a lot of people say a little bit won't hurt and everything in moderation, but unfortunately that's not true either. Effects of chronic exposure to the low doses of pesticides is measurable and causes meaningful damage. There's thousands of synthetics in circulation in our everyday environment and in our bodies. Mothers everywhere have measurable pesticides in breast milk, blood, urine and amniotic fluid. These substances transfer from mothers to the babies through the placenta, they cross the blood-brain barrier during development and they're measurable in babies' first poop. Our babies are exposed to these in the womb where their little organs are developing and these synthetic substances have effects at all toxic end points: neurological, cancer, reproductive and DNA.

Coming from a 'toxilogical' background, I took a test to see if my levels of—in this case, heavy metals—before getting pregnant so that I could use any techniques of—any natural techniques to lower the exposure that my children would get. I have been eating organically for 10 years and, with this great effort, my kids are still being exposed to breast feeding. So I don't find that acceptable, and if it was your children, I don't think you would find that acceptable.

And it's a little bit of questioning here, just to put it in perspective, would it be acceptable if I put a drop in your coffee? How about just a drop in the cream that goes into the coffee? That would be very dilute, but it wouldn't be acceptable.

So current research is accessing the most critical timing of exposure with regard to stages of brain development. The function of many pesticides is to impair the neurological system of the insects and, by that very function, it also impairs our babies and our children. One in 68 Canadian children now have autism. It's up 120 per cent since 2000. It's really alarming and something's clearly going wrong, and that has been linked to pesticide exposure.

\* (18:40)

Scientists postulate that even more neuro-toxicants remain undiscovered. In a lot of cases, the methods to analyze the toxicants aren't developed yet, so the scientists are working to create the methods to analyze the substances that are released into the environment before we know what kind of effects they have on human health.

This is a quote from the scientists, though: We propose a global prevention strategy. Untested chemicals should not be presumed to be safe to brain development, and chemicals in existing use and all new chemicals must therefore be tested for developmental neurotoxicity.

Childhood cancer can be caused by exposure to the cumulative contaminants in our environment and it's a leading cause of mortality in youth in Canada. In Manitoba, about 31 children per—on a per capita basis get cancer, and I've watched two of my friends' children, under the age of two, be diagnosed with cancer and go through chemo, and one of them survived with a hysterectomy and a partial vaginectomy.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Just so you know, there's one minute left.

**Ms. Mailman:** Thank you.

The responsibility is on the Province, regardless of Health Canada regulations and label instructions, and we would like the Province to be accountable for providing pristine, clean, safe and healthy environment for children and grandchildren. And we feel it—that it shouldn't take legal action for benign methods to control insects and weeds. We'd like an inclusive ban, including the gardens and the golf courses and we'd like to see enforced compliance.

Thank you very much, and I'll be happy to answer any questions.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have any questions for the presenter?

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Well, thank you, Ms. Mailman. I think that you've introduced the youngest co-presenter that I'm familiar with in this room, and I'm pleased the committee was able to accommodate your family needs.

I take it that the main theme that you have brought to us is the importance of exercising the precautionary principle when it comes to protecting children. Is that—would you conclude that's—wraps it up?

**Ms. Mailman:** Yes. Thank you.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** I appreciate your presentation, and you clearly have a toxicology background. Can you tell us a little bit more about your—you've got a Ph.D.—and your expertise in this

area and also about what you know about the link between autism and pesticides.

**Ms. Mailman:** Yes, my background is studying mercury in aquatic environments, specifically trying to find ways to lower mercury in fish in hydroelectric reservoirs. I did that research, the master's and Ph.D. at the Experimental Lakes Area.

The link between autism and pesticides that I've seen is from the papers that have come out in this calendar year by Grandjean and Landrigan, both published in *The Lancet*.

Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Any further questions from the committee?

Thank you very much, Mr.—Dr. Mailman, for your presentation, and we will now call up the next presenter. Melissa Atkins, please.

Ms. Atkins, do you have any written material for distribution for the committee?

**Ms. Melissa Atkins (Private Citizen):** No, I don't.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, please proceed with your presentation.

**Ms. Atkins:** Okay. Thank you for allowing me to go first. I have a two-month-old at home that I'm eager to get back to.

I'm here as a supporter for the bill. I'm here to support those who support the bill and I just wanted to speak from the heart.

I just have one comment to make. I think that it's wonderful that everyone here is in a position to make a change and I just ask that you consider the future for our children and for our grandchildren when you make your decisions. And that's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

Do any members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

**Mr. Martin:** I'd like to thank you for that nice, succinct presentation and I appreciate, obviously, your passion for future generations.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you.

Any further questions?

Thank you very much for your presentation.

We will now proceed with the out-of-town people, starting with Adrienne Percy.

Do you have any written materials for distribution?

**Ms. Adrienne Percy (Private Citizen):** I do, actually. I see you all skip ahead, though, and you shouldn't do that. Okay.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Please proceed.

**Ms. Percy:** All right. Well, thank you.

As you just heard, I'm Adrienne Percy, and I'm a business owner, a rural resident, a former journalist and an agricultural PR strategist with one of the largest grain exporters in the world. That's my background. I'm also a mother of two young children, and I'm the founder of the Concerned Mothers' Coalition of Manitoba. Thank you so much for this opportunity to speak today. And, you know what? You've already heard a lot about the science that is backing up the move to this bill, so I'm going to start by relating a story to you today.

I want you to imagine that you are out enjoying the summer day—I hope that's not too hard to imagine—with your children. I'm sure many of you would rather be there—or grandchildren or nieces and nephews. If they're grown, go back to the time when they are—they were small.

So imagine yourself for a moment out at their soccer game or some other summer sport that kids enjoy. There's a funny smell in the air, but you're not quite sure what it is. Then you set your nine-month-old baby on the grass to play, to eat their snack, and someone comes to tell you that the field has actually just been sprayed with a herbicide, just that day. But no signage was erected. You look across the field at your child and many others playing soccer, and then you look down at your baby, who is, as babies do, tugging grass from the field and putting it in their mouth, of course. At this point, you feel more than just a little sick when you realize what's happened.

That was the scene in Gimli, Manitoba, last summer with dozens of children playing soccer. I was actually the parent who warned the others. How did I know that field had been sprayed if there was no signage? Well, I'd just been there the night before and now the dandelions were withered corkscrews. I knew that unmistakable smell, being raised in the country. And when I brought it up, a farmer who was there confirmed it. He said, absolutely, they'd just sprayed this field. The next day the municipality confirmed it too.

You know, it was sickening to see this happen. And I knew that this was not an isolated incident by any stretch of the imagination. I have seen and experienced this in rural and urban settings. So I started a petition, and you know what? I was pretty nervous about that. Having grown up on a farm, having covered agriculture and worked for a grain exporter, I knew that many of the parents there would also be farmers and that they might feel uncomfortable or maybe even angry about the petition. After all, these were the same chemicals that many of them use on their crops. But you know what? Instead, something quite different happened. Almost every single parent that I approached signed that petition that night, whether they lived in town or out of town, whether they were what some people might call crunchy or a farmer. They were young and old. Some of them were reluctant because, you know, that's how it is in a small town, but they did it because the one thing that they could all agree on was this: No one, not one single person there wanted their children unnecessarily exposed to cosmetic pesticides, not one.

So that was interesting. But it was some of the other things that I heard as I was out gathering names on that petition that surprised me. I heard from farmers who said that there's no need to spray where kids play and that they don't want to put their kids in that position either. I heard from business owners with lakefront businesses who said they see municipal crews regularly spraying along the lake and despite their best efforts to have municipal officials take action, they were repeatedly ignored.

\* (18:50)

I also heard from a man who approached me who was too scared to sign the petition. He was a little shy, but he wanted to share a story. Maybe that comes from my background as a journalist; I don't know. He told me that he used to do the spraying for the municipality, but after working with these chemicals he got sick, really, really sick, and he had to stop. And I knew from my own research and from a family member who almost died from cancer, a cancer that is strongly associated with the chemicals he uses on his farm, that there is, indeed, mounting evidence that these chemicals are causing real harm to our children and to our environment and that they are especially dangerous to young children and pregnant women. Their tiny developing bodies, brains and immune systems are especially vulnerable, and that vulnerability comes not from a massive, one-time exposure—they're not being dusted

in a field somewhere—but from repeated low-dose exposure that people experience in their everyday life.

Since this incident last year, I have heard from mothers across the province. This groundswell of support has turned into a movement. I'm going to go so far as to call it that. And the Concerned Mothers Coalition of Manitoba was born. The CMCM is a grassroots movement, one that represents mothers, rural and urban, in constituencies clear across this province. This is not a rural or an urban issue. They come from different backgrounds. They are business owners, scientists, as you just heard, doctors, farmers, landscapers and mothers. And they're speaking up. And they asked me to carry a message to you tonight, that they want you to know they want this bill to pass, that we support it wholeheartedly. Yes, we would like to see it expanded, like you've heard from some of the other presenters tonight, but this is a really, really important first step.

We know that many of you are likely also grandparents or parents as well and that no one wants to see children harmed or made sick from something that's not even necessary. As one of our members said, a complete and swift ban on cosmetic pesticides means peace of mind, that the simple act of playing outdoors won't increase our children's risk of reproductive and respiratory problems and cancer.

So, you know what, I'm quite sure that you will hear from many people tonight who will tell you that these chemicals are approved by Health Canada, so they are safe. But we know the system is flawed and can take time to catch up to the evidence, as we saw with BPA, asbestos, DDT, and thalidomide, just to name a few—just a few. We know that although there can be resistance to change, you guys all probably remember when everybody first had to start wearing seatbelts, and the kids couldn't roll around in the back of the car any more. And smoking in public places; remember, the sky was going to fall with that. People adjust, the sky doesn't fall, and lives are saved.

We know there are plenty of acceptable alternatives when it comes to our homes and lawns, to the parks where our kids play, to the hospitals and daycare centres, to the soccer fields. And we know that spraying your lawn with cosmetic pesticides is not a fundamental human requirement like clean water and clean air or healthy children. So we're asking you to move forward swiftly and confidently, to think of the children of this province, the ones

who are all counting on you, looking to you to do the right thing for them and future generations.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Well, wow, that was a very powerful presentation, Adrienne, thank you very much. Thank you for your advocacy on this, and I think that you're speaking very, I can assure you, loudly and clearly on behalf of families across Manitoba tonight. Thank you.

**Mr. Martin:** Ms. Percy, thank you for your comments. I'm just curious: Would you like to see the ban on residential properties moved up? As the current plan stands, residential properties won't see the ban take effect, essentially, until the summer of 2016. *[interjection]*

**Mr. Chairperson:** Ms. Percy. Sorry, I know it's weird. It's very—it's really odd, so. Go ahead.

**Ms. Percy:** Yes. Of course, the sooner the better that we prevent incidents like what happened last year with all of those kids and the people who unsuspectingly put their children in that position. So, of course, the sooner and swifter we can act on this, the better it's going to be for the health of—you know, it's not just our children; it's ourselves, too, so. Yes.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much for coming out and presenting tonight.

We'll now call Eva Pip. Okay, Eva Pip? Seeing that she's not here, she'll be dropped to the bottom of the list and be called again at the end of the night.

We now move on to Brian Chorney, No. 18, who is an out-of-town presenter. Brian Chorney, do you have any written materials for distribution?

**Mr. Brian Chorney (Manitoba Canola Growers Association):** Yes, I do. Yes.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Mr. Chorney:** Good evening. Thank you for providing me the opportunity to address the standing committee on Bill 55, the environmental amendment act. My name is Brian Chorney. I farm outside of the city in—near East Selkirk, and I'm currently serving as the vice-president of the Manitoba Canola Growers Association.

I would like to take the moment to provide some background information on the MCGA and the role

canola plays in the province of Manitoba. MCGA represents over 9,000 canola farmers province-wide and is committed to maximizing growers' net income through sustainable farming practices. Access to new tools and technologies has driven the growth of canola in Manitoba. Thanks to improvements in seed, pesticides and agronomic practices, canola acres and yield have increased by 25 per cent in the last decade. Today, canola is one of the top cash crops grown in the province and a major economic driver, contributing \$3.4 billion to the Manitoba economy in 2012-2013.

In partnership with the provincial and federal governments, canola farmers and industry have invested annually in research projects in Manitoba to improve the health benefits of canola oil, meal, and improve crop production practices. MCGA education extension services ensure growers have the best available tools to attack agronomic and pest challenges and to maximize their canola production.

Our industry has recently adopted an ambitious plan: 52 by 2025, Keep it Coming, to further grow our sector. The plan aims to increase the current yield from 35 to 52 bushels per acre of sustainable production by 2025 by focus on sustainable, reliable supply, differentiated value and stable, open trade. Agriculture relies on strong, science-based regulatory frameworks to be successful, and this is a critical component of the continued growth of the Manitoba canola sector. Farmers need access to new crop input products, and investors need an investment environment that favours innovation and consumers need the confidence in the food they consume. Government policy needs to be driven by sound science, and the science shows that pesticides provide many benefits and can be safely used.

Science-based regulatory system: MCGA is very concerned that the science surrounding the proposed pesticide ban is not being fully recognized and that misinformation regarding the products used by their producers will jeopardize future innovations and customer acceptance. The proposed ban undermines the existing science-based regulatory framework in Canada, contradicts the federal findings and breeds mistrust in the—in a federal institution.

The Pest Management Review Agency, PMRA for short, rigorously reviews all pesticides, synthetic or biological, before they are sold to ensure that they do not pose an acceptable risk to humans, animals and the environment. Their decision is based upon substantial review of the best available scientific data

and is made only after they receive the necessary evidence to make an assessment. The assessment takes into account sensitive groups of the population such as pregnant and nursing mothers and children, as well as worst-case exposure scenarios when determining application rates.

\* (19:00)

The science continually evolves and new information becomes available—as new information becomes available, all must—products must be re-evaluated by the PMRA every 15 years to ensure they meet the latest environmental and health-risk assessment standards. Notwithstanding, PMRI—PMRA will review any pesticide on the market should valid concerns with a safety risk arise.

Nowhere in this process is MCGA aware of this government producing its own scientific studies of a negative impact of the pesticides used on lawns and public spaces or communicating their health and concern—and safety concerns to the PMRA. It is also unclear whether regulators or pesticide specialists were consulted in the development of the proposed legislation. This is—there is little in the way of conclusive, factual evidence justifying the ban.

Impact on agriculture's competitiveness: While we appreciate the bill excludes agricultural activities from the ban, it is still—it will still have negative direct consequences to the agricultural sector.

First, we will—we are also very concerned that this stigmatation of cosmetic bans being 'pertutlated' by the government will lead to the stigmatation of all pesticides, including the ones used in the agricultural sector. If pesticides are safe for the use in a garden and in food production, it begs the question, why are they not safe for use on lawns and green space?

Farmers would not jeopardize the health and safety of their families and their customers by applying a product that is not deemed safe by the Canadian regulatory bodies. We are responsible users of the technology and we are not idle in our practices. Our sector continually evolves, and farmers adapt the best management practices for their farms, whether they are ensuring—whether they are for ensuring environmental sustainability, more targeted pesticide use or reducing soil erosion.

Second, the pesticide ban is not only restricted to urban centres like the city of Winnipeg. A lawn is defined as a plot of grass that is maintained at a regular and approximate uniform height through

periodic and regular mowing. This very general and raw definition will encompass farmyards, many—any building adjacent to a farm, a plot of land in town, such as a school, recreation complex or health facility, or a rural or provincial road or rail line.

Weeds spread quickly, taking over a field and robbing a crop from the necessary nutrients and sunlight to reach its potential. I am reminded of an old saying: One year's seeding, seven years weeding. Once they establish, they will be extremely difficult to control and eradicate. Effective weed control is critical to—for growing canola, as young canola plants are uncompetitive and other plants—with other plants and needs effective management to ensure the plant survives and the health of the field.

It is unfair to expect farmers to risk weeds spreading to their fields, ultimately threatening their financial returns, or to make it illegal to control, by either the farmer, the town or the rural municipality, their spread in a targeted and effective manner. Ironically, farmers will be forced to apply a pesticide to control their spread, cancelling out the intended benefits of the proposed ban.

This being said, it is imperative that The Noxious Weeds Act be exempt from Bill 55. As it stands, the proposed clause references the exemption for uses related to the activities or for the purpose that are prescribed by regulation. The government has previously indicated that the act will be exempt in its discussions with industry and its communication messages around the bill. This is critical to ensure the agricultural activities are truly exempt—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Just one minute left.

**Mr. Chorney:** —from the ban, and policies continue to have access—and growers continue to have the access to the tools and services required to the harmful weeds and the—and diseases and insects.

As such, MCGA recommends that the committee amend and strengthen the bill by specifically denoting the exemption of The Noxious Weeds Act under paragraph 40.6.

With that, I'll leave the ineffective policy section for you to read. I would just like to again thank the opportunity for the members of the committee for me to present today and share with you the concerns of canola farmers on the—pending your legislation.

Thank you, and I'm open for questions.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

The members of committee have questions for the presenter?

**Mr. Martin:** Mr. Chorney, thank you for taking the time to join us this evening. I'm just curious, the 53 bushels goal by the Canola Growers Association, how would you see that being affected if the ban was extended to agriculture production, because I know in conversation with ministerial staff they've indicated to me that this legislation was just the beginning?

**Mr. Chorney:** Yes, I guess in order for us to grow a very high-yielding crop of canola, we need to do a effective job of controlling weeds and have access to the latest technologies. If this was extended to agriculture, we would be nowhere near—we'd be decreasing our effective yields instead of increasing it, so it would significantly decrease the economic impact that the canola industry has in Manitoba.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Yes, well, just to cut off some mischievous words from the critic, the legislation is what's on the agenda. There's no—the statements that the member's talking about from staff—I understand from staff was talking about legislation as the first step towards developing the regulations. This bill, as you are well aware, doesn't apply to agriculture, and there's no intention that it would.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation.

We have one order of business to take care of tonight—one presenter Anne Lindsey could not be present tonight, but left her written submission and staff is going to be distributing it. Does the committee agree to have this submission appear in Hansard transcript of this meeting? *[Agreed]*

**Some Honourable Members:** Who?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Anne Lindsey.

I will now call on Jane Seniw.

Do you have any written materials for distribution?

**Ms. Jane Seniw (Private Citizen):** Yes, I do.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Is it—sorry, is it Seniw?

**Ms. Seniw:** Seniw.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Seniw?

**Ms. Seniw:** Yes.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. You may proceed with your presentation.

**Ms. Seniw:** First of all, good evening to the standing committee and ministers present. Regarding this bill we—I'd like to thank you for giving everybody in the province an opportunity to be here and to do this.

So, after a very long winter, Manitobans are very eager to enjoy a spring and summer that provides them with fresh air and the opportunity to enjoy the outdoors and this province that has so much to offer. However, many of us would be conscious and wary of pesticide exposure in many locales and by varied means. Not only do those of us living in the rural areas need to be aware of the local weed control district spraying the small towns we live, work and play in, but all the utility companies, school districts and golf courses that are gearing up for the same activity.

For those of us who are sensitive to chemicals or are dealing with lung diseases, this is not a great time to be outside. In reducing the exposure to cosmetic chemicals, we are heading in the right direction to having an age-friendly, healthy province.

I would like to share some of the incidents that cosmetic chemicals have been linked to and—just in my life. In 1995, our household had the occasion to have a cat who started convulsing and having breathing stress. We could find no outward issue to warrant this and took him to a veterinarian who was also stymied but thought the animal had been poisoned. The cat had to be euthanized and, after an autopsy was performed, found that the entire chest and abdomen cavity was full of cancer tumours. The family was heartbroken and sad to realize how this animal must have suffered.

\* (19:10)

The vet proceeded to share with us that he had seen an increase in this type of disease in small animals and that his retired veterinarian father of 35 years had seen a progressive rate of cancer in not only small animals, but also in dairy and beef cattle.

The interesting fact is our household does not use chemicals of any kind in our property or in our daily lives. So the question is, where did this owl come in contact with the dangerous chemicals that prompted the growth?

In the fall and winter 1996 into 1997, I attended a number of women's health seminars hosted by the Health Sciences Centre. One of the sessions dealt solely on breast cancer, and the lecture hall was filled to capacity by both genders and various ages. Dr. Boroditsky spoke to the topic of breast cancer

and how tissue samples that were taken 24 years previously were being researched to find high traces of DDT. Now, remember that was 1996. A chill went through many of the younger women in the audience, and they asked why any man-made chemical was still being allowed to be used at such a risk.

This year of 2014 marks an anniversary of sorts for me in that I am a cancer survivor after being diagnosed in April of 2004 with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. I lost three years of my life for not being able to work, treatment time and recuperating time. My work background is in arboriculture—that's the study and science of trees—horticulture and market gardening. At no time did I knowingly use any cosmetic chemical. I was told by my well-respected oncologist that I must not expose myself to any chemicals at any time for any reason.

I did not return to the garden centre or any greenhouse to work, and have worked using homeopathic and alternative applications in my work with trees and gardens, which have proved to be very effective.

In addition, I have provided a yearly petition to Conservation Manitoba regarding a pesticide-free zone in our neighbourhood and local parks. In regards to this yearly petition, this entire procedure needs a complete overhaul in its advertising and the yearly need to repeat the same petition.

The local Roman Catholic cemetery, which I happen to be the chair of, has also gone to a pesticide-free zone by using alternative methods such as corn gluten and rejuvenating the prairie meadow grasses, all without any chemicals. Our visitors and families are very happy with this plan, as we are not exposing them to any harm.

In addition, it is alarming and interesting the rate that lung cancer and disease has been on the increase for the non-smoker, and that the studies in the United Kingdom and the University of Waterloo have linked lung cancer with lawn and garden-use chemicals.

In closing, I hope that the members we have voted for to take care of us will see the way to vote with their conscience, for I am also a pesticide-free zone and plan to be one for as long as I live.

I thank you for your time and consideration. Open to any questions, if there are.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

**Mr. Martin:** I just want to thank you for your presentation and, obviously, congratulations on



marking, I mean, 10-year anniversary. I mean, that's a significant milestone, and hopefully there'll be many more milestones ahead.

**Ms. Seniw:** Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Any further questions from the committee?

Thank you very much for your presentation. I will now call Grant Shewfelt.

Do you have any written materials for distribution?

**Mr. Grant Shewfelt (Manitoba Weed Supervisors Association):** Yes, Sir.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Please proceed.

**Mr. Shewfelt:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, committee members. As I'm listening to this anecdotal testimony, I feel like I'm a bit of an anomaly. I grew up on a farm. I've worked for a weed control district for 25 years, and I feel relatively healthy. Other than a bout of West Nile virus caused by a mosquito bite back in 2003, which was quite serious, I have no serious health concerns.

I'm here today on behalf of the Manitoba Weed Supervisors Association, also on behalf of my family. I have two university-aged daughters, and I hope to be a grandfather someday, so I'm speaking for my future generation as well.

We represent municipalities and weed control boards. We're responsible for implementing weed control programs within our weed districts, as well as controlling weeds in and on public areas. We may extend services under contract to control weeds on provincial highways, railways, et cetera.

We work with landowners to develop control strategies on private lands for particularly invasive weeds such as leafy spurge. If necessary, we are authorized to regulate weed control under the authority of the Province's Noxious Weeds Act. Now this act dates back to the very beginning of Manitoba. In fact, it—in the first session of the first Legislature of Manitoba in 1871, there was legislation passed on this act.

This act remains a vital provincial statute to this day. It helps us to control weeds in the province. And I've included an excerpt from the act just outlining that it's each individual's responsibility on their own land. It's a landowner's responsibility to take care of the weeds and to make sure that those weeds are not spreading off that property.

So, as you can see, the group that I represent, the Weed Supervisors Association, and our respective rural municipalities and villages, we exist to protect our environment and our agricultural lands from encroaching weeds and invasive species.

Although The Noxious Weeds Act and municipal weed inspectors have been around for over 100 years, our organization has existed for the past 50 years, using the principles of IPM, Integrated Pest Management, and Early Detection, Rapid Response. Though we have no vested financial interest in pesticides, we consider a herbicide as one tool in our tool box of weed control methods. Sometimes a herbicide application is the most appropriate means of weed control, especially on a new invasive plant or perhaps where cultural controls are not sufficient.

The MWSA has always promoted the safe use in application of all pesticides. This includes IPM techniques and proper timing to minimize the need for repeated applications. Any pesticide application deemed necessary is carried out using a federally approved product and applied under our provincially issued pesticide-use permit.

These products are developed to deal with threats to our economy and our environment and, in case of herbicides, are largely used to control species that have become biological polluters in this province. One of the greatest threats to the provincial environment and local ecosystems is a long-term infiltration of weeds and invasive species. Please note, the overwhelming majority of existing noxious weeds of concern to agriculture and to the rural landscape are non-native species, introduced by humans, either transported accidentally or as ornamentals that have escaped from a flower bed. These weeds are not supposed to be here; they are a threat to our native habitat. It is our responsibility to use reasonable means to limit the impact of these invasive species. Noxious invasive weeds left uncontrolled become permanent biological polluters. They damage our ecosystems while the herbicides that we use are regulated to minimize their impact on the environment.

Any changes to the regulations would compromise our ability to enforce noxious weed control, which is mandated by the Province under The Noxious Weeds Act. If it is, indeed, the position of this committee to have no negative impact on agriculture and our rural landscape, it is important that The Noxious Weeds Act be exempt from or take precedence over Bill 55.

Now many of our public sports grounds lie next to surrounding agricultural areas. As example, let's consider a ball diamond where a weed infestation has become severe enough to warrant a pesticide application. Perhaps there's a risk of injury due to too much weed growth. If we look at a comparison between using existing federally approved herbicide versus a prescribed bioherbicide—and I'm talking at label recommendations—our weed control costs will go up by a factor of 60, six-zero.

\* (19:20)

The cost per hectare would be approximately \$2,640 per hectare for the bioherbicide as opposed to the current \$44 per hectare for the existing product. The bioherbicide may have some place in the small homeowner—small-lot homeowner market. But, as you can see, it is completely cost prohibitive for public works use.

Now that homeowner may very well choose to illegally apply the banned product. We do not have that option. Remember, we're applying products under a provincial pesticide use permit, and we are accountable to our taxpayers to provide fiscally responsible programs. By implementing Bill 55, you are, effectively, removing a valuable tool from our toolbox without replacing it with a viable alternative to (a) control the spread of noxious weeds, as is our mandate, or (b) provide an environment safe for sports.

I would like to conclude with a few specific questions for this committee to consider. As mentioned, our pesticide applications are done under a provincial pesticide use permit. We apply for next year's permit at the end of the calendar year. When can we expect the prescribed list of viable herbicides to be available so that we may effectively complete our use permit applications in a timely manner?

Secondly, a few years ago, the British Columbia special committee on cosmetic pesticide use determined that there was not enough scientific evidence to warrant a ban on the sale and use of urban pesticides in the province, affirming its confidence in the federal regulatory process. This decision came after the committee heard from a variety of witnesses, including those from Health Canada, specifically PMRA, the federal body that regulates the sale and use of pesticides. PMRA has made it clear that they are willing to contribute to these proceedings. Will the standing committee choose to invite PMRA and consider their input?

And, finally, as weed control managers, we hear that residents of rural Manitoba have valid concerns and questions regarding this bill. This bill may have serious and permanent implications reaching far into our rural landscape. Will the standing committee travel outside of the city of Winnipeg and into the rural communities to get a feel for what those implications and opinions are?

Now I've included a few pictures for you to look at, and if there's any questions about my presentation or what's in those pictures, I'd address that.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Thank you for your presentation. Just to reinforce the—the regulations will address high-risk noxious weeds, poisonous or invasive species. That was clearly the intention. But, as well, just to confirm on the record, the Weed Supervisors will certainly be consulted in the construction of the regulation. We think that kind of partnership would be very important. Thank you.

**Mr. Martin:** Grant, thank you for your presentation. I'd just like a little bit of clarification in terms of what you suggest will be the cost and I guess the effectiveness of the bio-herbicides. I mean, the government has made clear on the public record there is no cost difference in terms of the application of—and use of bio-pesticides, nor is there any difference in their effectiveness. So your comments here just strike me as a bit different than what the government has stated. So, I mean, is this anecdotal or is this, I guess, directly observable? *[interjection]*

**Mr. Chairperson:** Sorry. I just have to identify you.

Mr. Shewfelt, go ahead.

**Mr. Shewfelt:** Not anecdotal. I have not used this pesticide. I have seen it in a—on a trial basis, the bio-herbicide. I think there's a bit of a misconception that these products can be applied as a broadcast treatment and comparative in costs to existing. That's not the case. I think these products are being set up as a spot-spray application, and my point was that that does not apply itself to public works.

When you're looking at a sports ground, you're not looking at a piece of property that lends itself to cultural control methods. You've got a lot of compaction from kids running around out there, you know, packing the grass down and packing the soil. It's—it leads itself into weed infestations, and quite often, once you reach a certain threshold, a pesticide is the best way to deal with those problems.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

I will now proceed—this was the last of the out-of-town presenters. I will now proceed down the list, starting with Josh Braydon, please. *[interjection]* Brandon, sorry.

Do you have any written materials, please?

**Mr. Josh Brandon (Private Citizen):** I do have them here.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Mr. Brandon:** Thank you. I'd like to thank the minister and this committee for providing me the opportunity of speaking today about this important bill. As the committee knows, and I'm sure everyone in this room will agree, that there's no value more important to Manitobans than the health of our children. This proposed bill, the environment act, reducing pesticide—The Environment Amendment Act (Reducing Pesticide Exposure), will reduce Manitobans' exposure to pesticides and provide a significant positive benefit for Manitoba families. This bill will bring Manitoba into step with the majority of other provinces in Canada by limiting our exposure to pesticides used for lawn care. This will be welcomed across Manitoba as a significant step for the health of Manitoba families, their pets and the environment.

I support the sensible decision of the minister in this bill to focus on lawn care chemicals. Eliminating the use of toxic chemicals for lawn care is one of the most practical and effective steps we can take for our environment. The use of toxic chemicals for controlling weeds and insects on lawns puts a needless strain on the environment and poses an unnecessary risk to human health.

Despite what pesticide companies say, there is widespread evidence of the risk of cosmetic pesticides. A study by the Ontario College of Family Physicians, published in 2012, examined 142 studies on the effects of pesticides in—on human health. They found that exposure to pesticides can lead to child neurodevelopment issues, including autism and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and respiratory problems, such as lung disease and asthma.

The chemical industry claims that Health Canada registration of their products assures their safety. However, registration is not equivalent to an absence of risk. In fact, all registered pesticides come

with advice about how to minimize risks, such as wearing protective clothing, keeping pesticides away from pregnant women and reducing exposure to children. According to Health Canada, it is good practice to reduce or eliminate any unnecessary exposure to pesticides. Canadians can and should seek opportunities to minimize their exposure to and reduce their reliance on pesticides.

Children are at the most risk from pesticides. Young children may be unaware of the dangers of pesticides or may not recognize signs warning them to stay off treated grass. Their organs are still developing, they eat and drink more relative to their body weights than adults and they spend more time playing close to the ground where pesticides may have been applied. And we heard stories about cases like that today.

This same principle also applies to our pets, who are likely to be exposed to dangerous pesticides. Even more disturbingly, a recent study by Environmental Defence found 137 toxic chemicals, including pesticides—including several pesticides, in the bloodstreams of newborn children, indicating how pervasive these chemicals are in our environment. It is all of our responsibility to ensure an environment where children can be safe.

Scientists have also found pesticides are a danger to our environment. Aquatic ecosystems are especially affected, and with all the problems facing Manitoba's waterways, and Lake Winnipeg in particular, reducing unneeded pesticides should be a priority.

There are many non-synthetic alternatives and less toxic, reduced-risk pesticide products. Moreover, the best form of lawn care involves maintaining a healthy—maintaining its health by aerating, overseeding and the application of compost. Weeds are often a symptom of an unhealthy lawn, not the cause. With proper care of your lawn, you may not need pesticides.

\*(19:30)

Canadian jurisdictions have over 20 years' experience in implementing bans on cosmetic pesticides. In 2001, the Supreme Court upheld a ban on cosmetic pesticides in the town of Hudson, Quebec. Justice Claire L'Heureux-Dubé wrote: Today, we are more conscious of what type of environment we wish to live in, and what quality of life we wish expose our children to. This court has recognized that everyone is aware, individually and

collectively, we are responsible for preserving the natural environment. Environmental protection has emerged as a fundamental value in Canadian society. This decision enshrined in Canadian law, the precautionary principle, when human life and the environment are at risk governments should exercise caution even in the absence of scientific uncertainty. Since this ruling, most Canadian provinces have developed legislation protecting their citizens from needless risks posed by cosmetic pesticides. Manitoba is poised to offer protections enjoyed by most other Canadians. Manitoba is playing catch-up, actually, compared with most other provinces, and we can learn what has worked elsewhere to become a leader in strong and effective pesticide regulation.

When the Manitoba provincial government conducted consultations in 2012 on options for regulating pesticides, 70 per cent of Manitobans responded that they want the same protections for their children and for the environment that residents of several other provinces already receive. These consultation results mirror poll results that show a large majority of Manitobans, 71 per cent, support phasing-out the use of cosmetic pesticides for lawn care. All members of the committee should be aware that this support crosses party lines, with the majority of Manitobans in every region of the province supporting a cosmetic pesticide ban regardless of party preference.

I hope this public support for action is reflected in the unanimous support of this committee and in the Legislature when it comes to that for this act to reduce pesticide exposure. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

Questions from the committee?

**Mr. Martin:** Josh, I want to—just want to indicate our appreciation for your comments and obviously your passion for the issue.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Any further questions?

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Well, thank you, Josh, for your leadership on this issue, and I think you've studied this very deeply and we appreciate your insights here tonight. Thank you very much, again.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Brandon.

I will now call Steve Rauh.

Do you have any written materials for distribution for the committee?

**Mr. Steve Rauh (Private Citizen):** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Mr. Rauh:** Well, thank you for considering this important bill and I just wanted to make a few comments about not the science, but what the meaning of reasonable doubt is in my case.

I'm, let's see, 65 now. When I was 23 I was the executive director of a youth conservation program in California, in the mountains of California, and I would take kids on two-week backpack trips. And we would climb mountains and run around and do all sorts of great things for two weeks, and the kids would go up in a yellow school bus, all clean and wonderful. And after two weeks we'd come back hardy and dirty and—but strong, and so it was interesting. I was young, I was 23 and I thought, what does this mean to the parents?

After about three years I had a staff that I thought could do a good job concluding the trip, and I thought I'd sit down on the steps of the Quaker meeting house where we brought the kids back to and watch them meet their parents.

The kids were a variety of kids. Some of them were from the ghetto of Oakland, some of them were from upper class in vicinity. So they were a big socio-economic range, and I thought this is going to be interesting, I'm going to watch them meet their parents. Well, some of them didn't want to see their parents. Some of them looked down at the ground and some of them were timid and some of them were just, like, oh boy, there's my parents—two weeks, I can't wait to tell them what happened and they ran up and they hugged their parents. And I was sitting watching them, and then I watched the parents and there wasn't one parent, not one, who didn't walk up with a twinkle in their eye. There wasn't one parent there who wasn't just overjoyed to see these kids.

And here I was, 23 years old, and I thought, boy, am I arrogant and brash. What am I doing taking these kids off to the mountains for—far away from anything. We had to fly them out with helicopters when there were problems. I would rather be responsible for the destruction of the Mona Lisa than losing one of these kids. At that time, I thought I was brash and arrogant. Now I think, gee, that was a lesson in values, a lesson in meaning, a lesson in reasonable doubt.

Fast forward to the year 2002, when I held—when I helped co-ordinate a conference as a board member for the Social Planning Council called Exposed

for Life, and, at that conference, a fellow came to speak who was 19 years old. His name was Jean-Dominique Levesque-René, and Jean, who was 19—and talked about the time when he was 10 and reached up to the back of his neck and felt a bump while he was watching *The Simpsons*. That bump turned out to be non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, and he talked about how he was in the cancer ward for non-Hodgkin's with other kids his age. And he talked at one point about holding the hand of a girl, 16 years old, and she said she was dying, and she said: Jean, please tell the world what happened to us. Tell them what pesticides did.

So, you know, that girl—I didn't have a Mona Lisa to give her and save her life. Jean lived and he's telling people about it. And I'm just wanting to say that reasonable doubt, and there is reasonable doubt, that this stuff is good for us is something that, you know—I would trade the Mona Lisa for any child who is harmed by these chemicals and for their parents and for their parents' twinkle in their eye. That's my comment.

**Mr. Martin:** Steve, I mean—your story is quite profound. I just want to say it's—I appreciate your sharing it with us.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Well, there's some powerful presentations here tonight, and I'm going to remember yours for a long time, Steve. Thank you very much. I think it reminds us, too, the importance sometimes of just a personal story rather than statistics and a lot of lengthy science, which is all very important, but I think your presentation was most important. Thank you.

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

**Mr. Chairperson:** I will now call Anne Lindsey. *[interjection]* No, sorry. Danielle Sanderson. Danielle Sanderson? Her name will be dropped to the bottom of the list and called again later.

Amanda Kinden.

Do you have written materials?

**Ms. Amanda Kinden (Green Action Centre):** Yes.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Ms. Kinden:** Hello. Good evening. Thank you for having me here this evening. Thank you for your time and consideration. We all really appreciate it, both sides I'm sure.

So I'm Amanda Kinden. I'm from Green Action Centre. I am the Living Green, Living Well coordinator and, you know, Green Action Centre's position is that we are very happy that you are taking this important step and reducing Manitobans' unnecessary exposure to chemicals wherever possible. Lawn pesticides used merely to maintain an appearance is a good example of unnecessary exposure. Unfortunately, we are often not in control of the harmful chemicals that we are exposed to on a daily basis, so this legislation is an important part in minimizing that unnecessary exposure.

There are many scientific studies that link pesticide exposure to negative health effects, like autism, ADHD, respiratory problems, cancer, Alzheimer's, just to name a few. The pesticide industry claims that these products are safe, as they are regulated by Health Canada, and Health Canada states these products pose minimal risk when used properly. There are two problems with that statement. First, Canadians should be able to determine their own level of acceptable risk, because everyone has a different reaction to chemicals they're exposed to, and these products are often not used properly. So two pretty big holes in Health Canada's stance. And the reality is that we live in a society that believes more is better and that doesn't have time for instructions, so, again, they're not often used properly.

\* (19:40)

And there are many examples of what was once perceived safe but has since been taken off the market, and they have been named—DDT is a great example. And just a comment on why pesticides on our lawns are being banned, and we're not advocating for agricultural uses of pesticides. Obviously, like Gideon said, it's a more complex issue to deal with, but also pesticides absorbed by skin directly enters your bloodstream, they don't go through your digestive system and they're not, to some or any extent, excreted at all. So it's sort of a direct line these, like, pesticides you'd be exposed to from drift used on one. So it's an important step for sure.

And so Green Action Centre again applauds the provincial government in being the first western province to take this important first step to protect our children's health. We are seeing increased rates of almost every kind of childhood developmental and health issue in recent years, and it is easy to see our

increased use of chemicals and pesticides is not having a positive effect on their developing bodies. They breathe more air than adults and have very close contact with lawns; they have a lot of hand-to-mouth contact, so they could potentially digest—or ingest the chemicals directly; and they have systems and brains that are still developing, making them very vulnerable.

Also important is that they have longer latency periods, so when they're exposed at a young age, the chemical has a lot longer—a longer time to wreak havoc as they become adults because often the chemicals stay in their bodies, rather than if we're exposed as adults it's a lot less time, obviously, right?

And from Health Canada's own website, to quote, companies that want to market a pest control product in Canada must submit detailed information and data to Health Canada. Health Canada uses this information to determine if the human health and environmental risks of a new product are acceptable and the product has value. So obviously they rely on this data to determine safety, and these are industry-funded studies, and without thorough testing of pesticide products by Health Canada, including so-called inert ingredients which, as was stated before, aren't listed on product formulations, it's just the active ingredient, and they're now being found to significantly increase the toxicity of the active ingredient of a product. So Health Canada is not really in a position to determine acceptable levels of risk.

Also, the PRMA is behind on their re-evaluations, so to say that they re-evaluate products every 15 years is what is supposed to happen, but because they have limited funding it often does not happen.

Also, weeds are subjective, it's a—they're a man-made sort of idea or a concept and we did bring them over for the most part on purpose. Dandelions, for example, have great medicinal uses and are actually beneficial to your lawn as they aerate the soil and make calcium and other nutrients available to your lawn. So it's kind of ironic that they do have a good use. So it all depends on your perspective.

I am a former organic lawn care educator with Manitoba Eco-Network, so I've given many organic lawn care presentations to the public, and there are lots of people who are interested in maintaining healthy spaces in Manitoba and who are hungry for the information as to how to do that.

The irony of lawn pesticides is that they don't provide a healthy green space as often the industry claims and are actually counterproductive to maintaining your lawn in a beautiful, green, lush way. Pesticides are designed to kill and are not discriminate in that goal, so killing—they will kill beneficial micro-organisms, insects and earthworms that are sort of the workhorses of a healthy lawn.

Lawn pesticides were actually just a way for chemical companies to expand their market for the pesticides they sold for agriculture. And despite what the industry claims, it is possible to have a usable green space comprised of grass that will not be overrun by weeds. I have one in my yard.

And Manitobans will also seek—will always seek out help when it comes to their lawns, and the number of the lawn care companies offering organic services are already growing without a ban already in place. This trend is similar to what happened in Nova Scotia which actually saw an increase in lawn care companies after a ban was introduced. The economy will not suffer after this legislation is in effect, and, with the elimination of unnecessary pesticide exposure, our health costs—health-care costs will decline as well.

In that effect, as weeds aren't sort of native to our landscape, neither are lawns. Obviously prairie plants are what should be growing here and that's part of the reason it's so difficult to maintain a lawn. Just maintaining a uniform, one type of vegetation is very difficult so you need a lot of inputs.

Last year I moved into a house and started caring for a lawn organically, and our lawn is noticeably greener and contains significantly less weeds than my neighbours. The previous owner did not spray pesticides but once a lawn care company did do so accidentally, which is why it is very important to stop the use of lawn pesticides by everyone, lawn care applicators included, because mistakes do happen.

By hand weeding and overseeding the lawn, it is better able to out compete most weed seeds that blow over onto a lawn. Pesticides don't provide that protection. They require repeated applications to attempt to maintain that weed-free appearance but it's not attainable. This is called the pesticide treadmill, which I like to compare to a hamster running in a wheel. You get nowhere really for nothing.

So Green Action Centre would like to—I would also like the provincial government to consider three things: that the regulations adequately support this

legislation. We are very happy the sale of lawn pesticides will be restricted and for that to be effective, we would like these products behind a counter or a cabinet, and store employees to receive proper training on how to sell the restricted products for the approved uses.

Secondly, the expansion of this legislation to include golf courses, of course, and small personal use gardens, vegetables and ornamental. Clear Lake golf course in Riding Mountain National Park is a good local example of a golf course that uses very little pesticides. I believe they use a small amount of fungicides. So it is possible. And when we exclude something that sort of, a golf course is similar to a lawn, and when we exclude that use and not another use, it does send mixed messages to Manitobans, which makes them question the validity of this legislation.

And finally, we would also like the date of this legislation to be moved up. It would be ideal if Manitobans did not have to endure two more seasons of exposure to these harmful chemicals. We've been talking about this for quite a few years now so lawn care companies have had ample notice to sort of get their policies and practices changed.

Also, I'd like to say there is a ton of weeds already, right? Like, not using these chemicals isn't going to really significantly increase the amount of weeds we have. You drive down Corydon. There are a great number of weeds blooming right now. So the fact that these pesticides are available currently, and we already have a lot of weeds, is probably a pretty significant point.

Yes, so although there are many studies linking pesticide exposure to health problems, unfortunately, but probably fortunately, we can't test directly on humans to have the conclusive proof that the industry wants us to provide.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Sorry, your time for presentation is up. I didn't give you a one-minute warning because—

**Floor Comment:** You didn't give me a one-minute warning.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Well, I know you were saying you were winding it down, so I thought we'd go with it.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** I think some in this room, Amanda, might be surprised that there are lawn care

educators in Manitoba, so I think you're going to be recognized for that.

Just to clarify the record, the legislation will come into force this winter. It'll take a few months to get the regulations in place working with the stakeholders, but the—it's certainly anticipated that there's not going to be two more seasons of lawn pesticide exposure. There will be a grace period for homeowners. In other words, fines won't be assessed for homeowners, but we will hold, of course, professionals, whether at the retail level or the applicator level, to the new law in the first season. *[interjection]*

**Mr. Chairperson:** Ms. Kinden, sorry. Go ahead.

**Ms. Kinden:** I've been watching all night. There is confusion around that then. So homeowners will get a grace period starting 2015, but lawn care applicators will be held to it in 2015?

\* (19:50)

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Yes. We think that the professionals, the retailers, the applicators will be expected to comply fully with the legislation, but homeowners, we want to work with them to make sure that they understand what the legislation is intending to do. But we think by focusing on the retailers and the applicators in the first year, we will have a more significant—or a better phase-in and workability of the legislation.

So it's getting the regulations developed now over the next few months that will be the challenge, assuming this legislation passes the Legislature in June.

**Mr. Martin:** Amanda, I appreciate your presentation.

Just a point of clarification. You indicated your recommendation that you'd like to see this expanded to small personal gardens. Is that due to that later comment—and, obviously, your presentation got cut short a little bit—but about that mixed message that it's not safe for us to walk through a lawn that might be spot treated with pesticides, but it's okay to consume food that's been sprayed with pesticides?

**Ms. Kinden:** Yes. Also, we're talking cosmetic pesticide use on lawns, so if you have an ornamental flower bed, a use of pesticides on that is also cosmetic. So it sort of—it should go hand in hand. It sort of makes sense to expand it to there.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call Michelle McNeill.

You have written materials for distribution?

**Ms. Michelle McNeill (Private Citizen):** Yes, I do.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Ms. McNeill:** Hi. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak.

Again, my name is Michelle McNeill. I'm a mother of two young children. And just to give you a little bit more background, I grew up in a very scientific family, where science was really religion. And my husband is a professor. I have a bachelor of science. I also studied pre-med organic chem and biochem. Since then I spent 10 years meditating and I'm now a yoga teacher. So my presentation will be unusual in the sense that it isn't very scientific, but I passed out the scientific papers because I recognize the importance of them.

So I'm a person who is very involved in community. I have, you know, a book club that I'm have a lot of friends a part of, I home-school, I have a home-schooling community, I have a large family, and I can very much say that I represent a diverse number of people in my presentation.

So I believe that we've been sold lies for far too long. We've all grown up, at some point in our lives, in the age of media and commercialism. As human beings, we are drawn to stories. Ancestrally, through word of mouth and stories, we learn values and principles of our culture. In the past, those ancestors would tell us stories that would empower us and how to live within a culture. At some point down the line, those stories were hijacked by the media and large corporations and were no longer being told to us for our own good but for the good of someone's bottom line and the economy.

We have all been brainwashed by the stories, including those who have written the stories. I don't believe there's any one or many culprits that we need to wage war against. And I think it's actually the opposite; we need to stop waging war. The war we are waging is ultimately on ourselves, humanity and nature.

Somewhere along the way, with our motivation to earn more and more and create more profit, we have begun to value the superficial and lost sight of

what is truly important. In order for a human being to survive, we need clean air, clean water, sunlight and earth. We need food to survive, clean food.

The use of herbicides and pesticides is ultimately a war against plants and insects for the sake of keeping up appearances. What we have forgotten is how intrinsically we are all connected to each other and to nature and that when we use chemicals that destroy a part of nature, we are also destroying a part of ourselves.

I'm a 35-year-old mother of two who has also begun looking after my elders, so I'm part of that sandwich generation. There comes a point in your life where you need to stop looking at the previous generation to create the changes you want to see in the world and stop blaming others for what has happened. It is now my time to speak up for the sake of the children because they deserve a future, and so do my children's children.

I am happy this ban has moved forward as far as it has, and I thank you for that. Ultimately, I would encourage you to strengthen the ban, including golf courses and gardens, as others have said.

And just this past week, I've started considering a rural property. So, all of sudden, at the agricultural runoff is becoming a huge consideration for me, and it's not far from Lake Winnipeg and we all know that Lake Winnipeg is one of the most-lost the word. It's in trouble right now and a lot of it is due to the agricultural runoff. So I think we actually do need to start looking at the agriculture, but I realize that it's something that takes time and it has to unroll at a time that we are able to try to appease everybody, and yet at the same time sometimes we need to make big changes in order to protect ourselves and future generations.

I truly believe that in our heart of hearts, everyone here knows the risks we are taking by continuing to allow these chemicals to be applied in our neighbourhoods. Let us start listening to the authentic and genuine stories of our brothers, sisters, friends and neighbours and independent scientists who speak truthfully and stop allowing ourselves to be influenced by large multi-billion-dollar industries that are destroying our planet and shaming us by having dandelions in our yard. And this shaming happens when you watch commercials with beautiful yards, and we all believe, oh, that's what we want, that's what we want.



But I, actually, in this past year, have studied a lot of wild edibles and nature survival courses. And the really interesting thing on the back page of what I handed out to you is the nutritional breakdown of all these weeds that are actually wild edibles and, ironically, they are—their nutritional profile is far superior to anything that we buy in the grocery store, and these species are rugged. They don't need all the care. They don't need to be protected. Dandelions—we can eat them. I have a lot of friends right now who are making dandelion fritters, and they're really high in vitamin A and they're really high in protein. And in our house, the kids now know, wood sorrel is another one that grows in our yard.

I've actually start—stopped gardening because the amount of wild edibles which are actually weeds that we've started eating that actually have a much higher nutritional composition. And I realize this is a little extreme, but I'm hoping this is a place we can start to reawaken to what is already present in nature. And when people talk about the destruction of the earth, and, oh, human beings might not last that long. But the earth will actually survive, it will. The earth will survive, and these invasive species, like, we don't have to worry about that if there's no human beings. It will regulate itself, and Mother Nature and the earth is intelligent and sometimes we just have to step out of the way. So I'll conclude with that.

There is that list there that I printed out for you. There's, I'm sure, more that you can find online. There's also a woman—might be worth writing down her name, it's Laura Reeves, and in the province she's the No. 1 wild food expert. She knows everything. She eats all a wild food diet where she just harvests straight from her yard, from the forest, anywhere, and that's the diet that she consumes, and the nutritional composition is highly superior.

So maybe this will give you some ideas about where we possibly could head, because I feel like we're taking these forward steps but we don't know in what direction we could head. We don't have solutions. We want to be able to feed the population and we don't quite know how to do it. So that's just maybe some ideas of possibly where we could head in the future. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Thank you very much for coming down tonight and sharing your ideas, and I'll certainly look at the materials that you've presented. So thank you again.

**Mr. Martin:** Michelle, thank you for those comments. I just want to clarify something you said. The legislation currently outlines a number of exceptions to the pesticide ban, including agriculture, sod farms, forestry. So it'd be your recommendation to cover—government to phase out those exceptions under the legislation? *[interjection]*

**Mr. Chairperson:** Sorry, Ms. McNeill, go ahead.

**Ms. McNeill:** Oh, sorry. Yes. Yes. Definitely.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call on Samantha Braun.

Do you have any written materials to distribute?

**Ms. Samantha Braun (Private Citizen):** No, I don't. I'm winging it.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, for sure. Please proceed with your presentation.

\* (20:00)

**Ms. Braun:** So my name is Sam Braun. I'm a mom as well. I've got two kids, seven and nine, who spend an awful lot of time outside. I am surprised here with how many presentations that—there's a lot of us moms who are sort of closet scientists, so I'm another one of those as well. I like to call myself a plant nerd, but, yes, so I have that hat as well. And I also own a local business, Ecotones, which is—I deal with ecological landscape design. So this is a very interesting topic for me because I sort of stand with one foot in one industry and one foot in what I would consider at this point, common sense. I've also had a—had some very life-changing things happen to me in the last couple of years.

So I stand in front of you as somebody who's worked with the chemicals we're talking about for decades, and then, now, after what I've gone and had to look into with my science hat because I got very sick, I can't unsee what I've seen in the literature, and as Michelle's handed you, there's—I haven't seen what she's got on there, but I know she's spent as much time in biochem as I did, so, I mean, it's one of those things that if you've looked at it long enough, you can see the information's there, and it almost becomes common sense at some point to us that are in it all the time.

A little bit of the background too. We've—we're discussing the pesticide ban in terms of lawns. I would also encourage you add the caveat for gardens and golf courses because I'm not actually somebody

who's gone and sprayed 2,4-D all over the place. I've worked with a lot of invasive species. I work on a lot of habitat work, so if I've—I can go into an area that—a park, for example that's overrun with thistle or some of the woody plants, European buckthorn. I've helped out with the Province on—and Nature Conservancy—with cleaning out areas with leafy spurge, and I can say, as an ecologist, sometimes when you walk into a site, it just doesn't work to use the pesticides either, and you have to essentially suck it up and use manpower to pull it out and deal with it.

So I'm really impressed to hear how much ecology has come out tonight because that's sort of my baby. At the same time, I can understand that there are implications that if these chemicals are taken in terms of public perception as being unsafe, which, like I said, I cannot unsee what I've learned. I cannot undo the information I've looked at in terms of liver toxicity and then, in my case, my toxic liver—as a very healthy 15 per cent body fat and I could move rocks bigger than me, I had a fatty liver from working for years next to these chemicals in a garden centre where every time it rained, the dust went on to the ground and I soaked it up my pant legs for hours and hours and hours at a time. And when you get busy in a garden centre, you grab a sandwich and you eat it; you don't go wash your hands.

I worked in box stores where these are, you know, your Killex and your Roundup is skidded and stuck up on top of a beam somewhere. Now, granted, over time they decided putting Roundup over your head was not a good idea, but at the same time, you're bringing in people. Real people are unwrapping this stuff, touching it, breathing it. When somebody knocks a bottle of Killex off, there is a spill, and, according to the people who had given me the education on the chemicals themselves, 2,4-D's safe, Roundup's safe. I've even talked to agriculture reps where the girls were drinking Roundup as part of their presentation.

I can't unsee that very recent research has come out that one part per trillion is active in a petri dish on cellular—on tumour growth, of Roundup. To give you a reference, that's like one drip in an Olympic-sized swimming pool. That's scary. I'm sure that's why I had a fatty liver, even though I looked, you know, broad-side-of-a-barn fit. When that fatty liver had nowhere to go, the toxins went into my intestine, and two years ago, I had an absolute random—nobody knows what happens out of—you know, you could imagine being a science nerd; I spent as much time in the school as the fellow in front of me who is

supposedly the top 'endoc'—or the top gastro guy in the province, and he stares at me blankly with that nerd face, saying, I don't know what happened.

That's why I started looking into what happened. I had to put my science hat on. I wasn't doing anything else. I was too sick to do anything. I'd lost five feet of my small intestine with no apparent cause. So you can imagine that would send somebody like myself into the literature, and then if you—if we talk about this getting heated and passions and anecdotal evidence and all those other things that is—it—that makes my science brain kind of cringe in, like, ooh, anecdotal; nobody does that. Like, no, we need numbers. I can assure you the numbers are there.

But at the same time, common sense and what we see around us—when I see puppy dogs—anyone that I have that is a client, that has 2,4-D on their lawn repeatedly through the summer has mysterious endocrine problems with their puppies. This is something I didn't see five years ago even. But five years ago, the Killex was going out to Grandpa. He'd squirt a couple of dandelions and it would go back in the shed.

Now, when I go to a client's house, they've probably got 2,4-D sprayed over the lawn, and that ticks me off as an ecologist as well, that I'm seeing it sprayed before it's even warm enough for the dandelions to take it in. It's being sprayed on lawns that don't have any dandelions anymore. It's being sprayed non-target species. The kids, when I walk up to the Killex truck and, you know, when the big machine's there—and we can all smell it—and I'm seeing a university student paying his way through school like I did, with Killex dripping down his elbow, runners and socks soaked, or the bottom of the jean pants soaked up to here again.

So, when we're talking golf courses, there are human beings who have to spray the chemicals over the golf course. I've worked with the guys in the city who have come and helped me deal with noxious weeds and sprayed Roundup and sprayed 2,4-D, they look like something out of a haz-mat movie. They're covered, right?

That's not what we're seeing when we walk around and see the Green Drop guy, and I'm not using any specific, but any of the lawn care guys, they are not walking around with goggles and a white suit and duct tape sealing the gaps. That has a tough perception if someone comes home at 3:30 seeing their lawn being sprayed and the guy's

looking like he came out of a zombie movie. That doesn't work.

But those kids are taking this in too. The little puppies running around because nobody knew their lawn got sprayed, or they—the residue is supposed to be gone once it's dry. I can assure you, going into a client's garden the next day, when the dew is on the grass, it's active again. And I'm at the point with my system, my biological system, that if I'm working around this stuff for more than about an hour, I can be sick—I will be sick for 48 hours.

I can choose to eliminate most of this out of my world. Unfortunately, thankfully—and I'm praying this goes through, because right now I'm dealing with clients that I have to say I'm sorry, I can't work for you because I cannot be in your lawn without being sick for 48 hours. I'm watching their dogs getting medicines and me having to explain to them that it hits liver, it hits adrenals, it hits immune systems because our gut is our immune system. So, when Roundup causes toxicity to bugs who live in your tummy—and that's an ecology thing, too—and your immune system can't handle that, it's just a huge domino effect.

So I would urge you to think about the people like myself who have no fault to their—well, not through no fault, they've chosen their work, but the information out there seems to be this stuff's okay, and Mr. Chorney has probably some very valid concerns about the implications in the agriculture sector. I'm just going to say flat out, as a mom, science hat as well, that sometimes we have to do the right thing even though it's not the easy thing, just like I can guarantee I'm going to lose clients by standing here.

I'm going to have—I already have a hard time finding a guy with a Bobcat that can put dirt in the right spot. This is going to be really hard for me now. But I—like I said, I cannot unsee what I've seen, and I cannot not protect my kids, my pets. My mom's dog just died of liver failure; my dad—you know, this is something I've been handing to people under the impression it was okay, and it's not okay. And I greatly appreciate—

**Mr. Chairperson:** One minute.

**Ms. Braun:** Okay. I was going to say, and I greatly appreciate that this is now on the table and we can take steps to at least minimize what people are exposed to, knowingly or unknowingly.

Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Well, I can assure you there are other lawn care applicators and providers that share your views. You bring to the table tonight a very unique synergy of life experiences, and I think that's invaluable, as is a very interesting evening, and you certainly made it increasingly so. Thank you very much for coming down.

I might just add, too, for you and other mothers, it's my understanding that it was parents, and mothers in particular, that really led the movement in the eastern United States for pesticide exposure reduction laws. So you are an important voice.

**Mr. Martin:** Samantha, can you give me an idea—sorry, I'm just curious. You mentioned your business, Ecotones. And, sorry, I just wanted some clarification—

**Floor Comment:** What is it?

**Mr. Martin:** Yes.

\* (20:10)

**Ms. Braun:** I special—I—my background's ecology, and I paid my way all the way through undergrad and grad school. Once you start with plants, you kind of keep going. So I was working through—with garden centres and that, doing landscape designs. I was finding that people were going in and buying things and just taking onesies home, so I added the design element in so that—and putting things where they want to grow, so I always have this bias of ecological functioning in the system and it started out many moons ago with sneaking in native plants when nothing else was going to work as a hybrid with other plants.

And, I mean, it's neat to see public opinions shift because now I mostly get the calls along the riverbanks where, you know, regular garden stuff's not going to work. I get the calls from people that my lawn is horrible, it's not working, it's just oh, so, if they're not even growing dandelions you know they've got a problem, so some of it is education. But I can assure you there's definitely a shift in terms of public acceptability of this.

I mean, now I can do primarily native plants and landscapes and even our own garden was on two garden tours last year so I had 500 people traipsing through my yard and, again, I did a bit of a deep breath because my garden is not a—it's not petunias, it's actually sort of a woodland in the front, I have a kid's play area built into it because if mom's got to

weed, there's got to be somewhere good for a kid to play on that's just, you know, and my—obviously my definition of weed is different than someone else. But having hundreds upon hundreds of traditional gardeners walk in and take a deep breath and not go oh, what's going on here, that was a huge shift even for myself.

So we talked about medicinal plants; we've talked about edible plants. I'm finding even people that, you know, you say that, you know, old dogs don't learn new tricks, it's surprising what people do when they have good information and when they know people are acting from the right place. So I think with what the Province is doing, it's coming from the right place and I'm hoping that even though it might be a little trickier to find a bobcat, that I can be at least of assistance, you know, I can put my nerd hat on and help out with, you know, this is, you know, we just got to shift it over here a little bit and it'll work really well.

You know, once you get the system set up and running, it's completely doable, even in the terms of some of the noxious weeds. I'm going to say just a little bit that sometimes if we think in terms of say cancer treatment when there's—when something's really bad sometimes you need to hit hard, sometimes. I see a lot of plants that are already outstripping the pesticides used on them, so it's sort of like antibiotics and things; you save it to until the—when you really need it. So there may be some caveats built into the legislation, I would imagine, in terms of the noxious weeds. So I'm glad you're working with those guys to figure it out.

But I can tell you, too, sometimes you just have to pull them and it's not a—once you lose the crutch you have to get real good at another alternative, so I think that's what we're going to see happen.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Great. Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call on Mr. Sig Laser.

Do you have any written materials for distribution here tonight?

**Mr. Sig Laser (Private Citizen):** Yes I do, I'll hand them over.

**Mr. Chairperson:** All right, thank you and please proceed with your presentation.

**Mr. Laser:** Good evening, committee members, Mr. Chair, Mr. Gaudreau. My name is Sig Laser and I live in Winnipeg. I thank you for the opportunity

of providing comment on Manitoba's proposed pesticide legislation.

I'm sure others will address specific issues in greater detail or will have already done so and, therefore, I'm going to allow myself to be a little more personal and impressionistic in my remarks, but briefly so.

And having listened to the presentations that went ahead of me and how impassioned they were and how rigorous they were, you know, and even how their anecdotes were similar to what I'm going to present, I almost wonder if I need to. But, yes, it's important to me to put this on the record and so I'll proceed.

I'm a recently retired policy analyst, that was in November 2012, from Manitoba Conservation, now Conservation and Water Stewardship. Unlike some comfortably retired commentators, however, who seem to delight in second guessing previous employers when they could have or should have spoken up, when they had some power of decision making, I'm actually here to congratulate and to encourage.

The legislation has been a long time coming and I believe it strikes a reasonable balance on this issue. I'm here in support of moving quickly to regulations and implementation.

I remember the weekly policy unit meeting and this would be at some point in 2010, when someone mentioned that, you know, six other provinces already have legislation around cosmetic pesticides—Quebec since 2003—is this something we should be looking at?

So the file was opened and the work of inter-jurisdictional comparison began along with an analysis of Manitoba's existing but quite dated pesticide legislation. Some pesticide regulation falls under the Manitoba agriculture. The Conservation minister of the day was Bill Blaikie. In early 2011, the Manitoba Round Table for Sustainable Development weighed in with a report urging the minister to move on the issue and, at about the same time, the David Suzuki Foundation issued a report that looked at cosmetic pesticide legislation across Canada. It deemed that Ontario and Nova Scotia had the most rigorous legislation, but it was silent on Manitoba, which had no such legislation and appeared to be out of step with most other provinces. It was at this point that lobbyists for the retail manufacturing and lawn care industries took notice.

You will no doubt hear, or will have heard, industry representatives say that their products have been approved by Health Canada and PMRA and that this is all validated by sound science. What you won't likely hear is that the data used was largely furnished to Health Canada by the industry itself and, as for the science, am I the only one in this room aware of the less than friendly attitude to science shown by the current federal government, of the cutbacks to departmental resource, and the muzzling of scientists who might otherwise wish to communicate with the public on issues of concern?

Now, that said, Health Canada has now moved to ban fertilizer-pesticide mix products because they don't meet the best practices of integrated pest management. These are the very same products that were once vigorously defended by the same industry representatives. When it comes to decision making, I think I'm going to side with the many physicians and health-care organizations that for years now have been warning and urging caution with regard to pesticides, not so much with the industry and its lobbyists, as they are the very definition of a special interest, always viewing their financial interest as paramount. And this is actually a little puzzling, because the very elements of the pesticide industry—because various elements of the pesticide industry have, in fact, already learned to adapt and live with the pesticide legislation in other provinces.

They now have had upwards of a decade to adapt, and I don't think the sky has fallen yet, but they are sufficiently financed that they will mount opposition whenever and wherever they think the industry's financial interests might be made subject to the general interest of public health and safety. You needn't expect otherwise from them; it's what they do.

Allow me a further comment on science and public health and safety. You may hear that it is not possible to absolutely link particular diseases as they manifest in individuals to pesticide exposures in a previous point in time, as in children. Yes, it may be difficult to declare with 100 per cent certainty that somebody developing, say, cancer, in their 40s and 50s does so as a direct result of childhood exposure to pesticides their parents used on the lawn many, many years before, but, even though an absolute causal link may not be demonstrable on this point, I would recommend to you the precautionary principle and advise an abundance of care, of due diligence and caution on the balance of probability. Once

again, on this point, I'll side with the physicians and scientists who have no vested interests.

Bill 55, as drafted, excludes agriculture, golf courses, forestry and issues related to public health and safety. This strikes me as a balanced and even modest effort. For my part, I might not have excluded golf courses. I believe a few courses are ahead of the curve on this, but others still seem to need regulatory encouragement. The example of the Seine River comes to mind in terms of the danger of potential runoff. In the city of Winnipeg, three golf courses run adjacent to the Seine: the Niakwa course, the municipal St. Vital course and the St. Boniface course on leased city land. If pesticide use and chemical runoff continue, not only are adult golfers at some risk on the course itself, but the resulting runoff into the river would be injurious to wildlife here and in adjacent—and adjacent to the Seine, and, ultimately, then, also in Lake Winnipeg. We have an opportunity here of acting on behalf of fish, amphibians, birds and our pollinators. Let us not miss this chance.

\* (20:20)

In closing, then, let me say that I am surprised that the opposition in the Legislature has taken the position of opposing this modest and overdue legislation, even to the point of calling it a radical agenda.

Really? You think dandelions are a greater danger to athletes and other playground users than chemical pesticides? I confess, I don't follow the political logic here. Do you really believe that exposing mothers and children to potential harm will lead to some sort of political advantage?

Here, it can be noted that the City of Brandon enacted a bylaw already in 2006—Brandon, in rural Manitoba—to restrict pesticide application near schools, daycares and other public spaces. I don't think the sky has fallen yet in Brandon. So, radical? No, I don't think so. But then, perhaps, for some, this is like the seat-belt issue. It may not be possible in the fractious atmosphere of the current Legislature, but if there's any issue that deserves enthusiastic bipartisan support, I think this would be it.

So to conclude, congratulations to Minister Mackintosh for your perseverance. Legislation is always the art of the possible, and Godspeed with your bill.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Well, thank you very much, Mr. Laser, for the well-thought-out presentation. And we have to recognize your modest political push, as well, at the table here. Thank you very much. *[interjection]*

**Mr. Gerrard:** Thank you. You provide insightful comments, having worked on this in the very beginnings in the department. Maybe you can help us by giving us a little bit of a comparison across other jurisdictions. And do most other places include gardens and golf courses? Does it vary? *[interjection]*

**Mr. Chairperson:** Sorry—Mr. Laser, just one—I'll recognize you, Mr. Laser. Go ahead.

**Mr. Laser:** Thanks, Mr. Chair.

No, I won't presume to go into that. I've been away from it for a year and a half, and perhaps, you know, half a year to a year on the file before that. Though your first two presenters by telephone did mention that Ontario has, you know, put in place a pesticide regulation regime and it seems to be working well. So my own issue on the golf course is that I would certainly add—it's a very personal one, but I'm glad you're back. When I saw you, I thought you actually might have some interesting comment on how pesticides affected our—one of our favourite birds, the eagle, in the days when you were doing your research. I thought you might have some particular insight into that, that could help the committee here tonight.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

I will now call Marg Friesen. Marg Friesen. Her name will now drop to the bottom of the list.

And we'll now move on with Melinda German.

Do you have written material?

**Ms. Melinda German (Manitoba Beef Producers):** Yes.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. Please proceed with your presentation.

**Ms. German:** Thank you and good evening. My name's Melinda German. I'm the general manager of Manitoba Beef Producers. Manitoba Beef Producers is pleased to make a submission tonight on Bill 55, The Environment Amendment Act (Reducing Pesticide Exposure).

We're a non-profit organization of producer elect board consisting of 14 directors, representing cattle

producers around the province. We represent approximately 8,000 individual producers involved in various aspects of beef production in Manitoba, including cow-calf, backgrounding and the finishing sector.

Agriculture provides a significant portion of Manitoba's GDP and is one of the largest wealth-generating activities in the province. Beef production represents Manitoba's single largest livestock sector in terms of the number of individual farm operations. Our industry plays a vital role in the maintenance of Manitoba's economic environmental sustainability. On an annual basis, Manitoba cattle producers—the industry purchases more than \$300 million worth of feed a year; on top of that, another \$225 million in operating inputs. The value of goods and services demanded by value—beef producer operations is approximately \$635 million annually.

Manitoba Beef Producers believe three key principles should be followed when public policy related to the environment is being developed.

First, Manitoba Beef Producers support strong, science-based initiatives designed to ensure the preservation of our land and our water.

Second, Manitoba Beef Producers strongly supports the beef industry and governments working together to develop environmental initiatives that can be embraced by all sectors of our industry without harming the producers' ability to earn a living.

Thirdly, Manitoba Beef Producers strongly believes the co-operation between producers and government, as opposed to excessive regulation, will always lead to more effective programs and to results that are flexible enough to meet the challenges and changes over time.

Manitoba Beef Producers participated in the government's early consultations on the potential restrictions on cosmetic use of pesticides, but our organization has not seen any drafts of Bill 55 prior to the induction—introduction into the Legislature. We acknowledge that Bill 55 does not apply to the use of prescribed pesticides related to agricultural activities or for the use related to the protection of public health and safety. We appreciate that those important exceptions have been included; however, we do have a number of concerns about Bill 55.

Our first concern rests with the creation of an artificial distinction between the use of federally approved pesticides in an urban, personal situation

versus the use of the same product in an agricultural setting, in forestry or to protect the public health and safety. MBP believes that its approved pesticide has been deemed safe for the use in agriculture and forestry or other circumstances. It's safe for personal use by individuals who follow the product guidelines for usage.

We have concern that the debate of Bill 55 can contribute to the undermining of public trust in the long-established scientific process around pesticide approvals in Canada, or, for that matter, around other science-based approval processes used by the provincial and federal governments alike. The provincial government, for example, recently used extensive scientific analysis and advice to inform its approach in tackling the zebra mussels problem in Lake Winnipeg.

This debate over cosmetic pesticides also has a potential to create a negative perception of the use in pesticides in modern agriculture that is simply not borne out by scientific review. The lack of public understanding of rigorous scientific review undertaken before pesticides are registered and released, for some, are worrisome.

Further, Manitoba Beef Producers is concerned that stricter regulations, restrictions on pesticide use will increase the spread of weeds from urban areas and municipal properties to nearby crops and pastures. We cannot understate—or we cannot state strongly enough the economic and production management threats posed to this province's beef industry by the spread of noxious diseases and invasive species.

A case in point is the spread of leafy spurge through Manitoba. Areas most affected by spurge include pasture and forage land, natural areas, roadsides, rail lines, and utility corridors. This invasive noxious species is particularly destructive to the beef industry as it results in a loss of grazing capacity. Leafy spurge competes with very successful—very successfully with other plants as it pushes out other plants that cattle normally eat. Cattle tend to avoid these sites. They will not eat it, and, in fact, this plant can be detrimental to their health.

Moreover, losses in grazing lands also impacts biodiversity. Maintaining healthy landscapes such as pastures is important when it comes to preserving habitat for species at risk.

Both Manitoba Agriculture, Food and Rural Development, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship are members of a leafy spurge stakeholder group. In 1999, a study by the group found that at least three thousand–340,000 acres of leafy spurge in Manitoba were in the province with a total economic impact of \$20 million. This negative impact included decreased land values, lost productivity and lost income. Ten years later, the study was followed up and found the acres were 1.2 million, three and a half times that 10 years previous. The total economic impact: \$40.2 million, more than double than the 1999 assessment. Further, the 2010 leafy spurge study found that these economic losses—\$10.2 million in direct costs alone—were incurred by the livestock sector based on the value of lost grazing capacity of pastures. Agriculture, government, utility firms and other companies spend hundreds of thousands of dollars a year annually trying to manage this weed.

\*(20:30)

Leafy spurge is but one example of a weed whose spread can have devastating effects on agriculture production and the larger provincial economy.

Canadian thistles and burdocks are all too prevalent in urban settings and may not be properly managed and can readily spread into areas of agricultural production. Again, they exact a heavy economic and production toll on agriculture.

The management of 'invasis'—invasive and noxious species is also an important component of on-farm biosecurity practices. As the Canadian beef cattle on-farm security standard and other industry guides point out, certain noxious weeds, foreign or invasive plant species, may present a health risk to cattle.

Beef producers are doing their best to ensure biosecurity is not compromised in their livestock operations. However, Manitoba Beef Producers believes it takes a collective societal effort to ensure noxious and invasive species do not spread. We strongly encourage government to take this into account when they're developing weed control policies that may have unintended consequences.

Manitoba Beef Producers notes that the provincial government has held a series of consultations in 2012 on their proposed changes of The Noxious Weeds Act. We believe it would be appropriate if the discussion over potential

restrictions on the use of certain pesticides also be taking place in tandem with any changes that may be forthcoming to this legislation. It's been decades since there was substantive overhaul of The Noxious Weeds Act, and we would like an update on the process—on when this process will be proceeding. We too seek clarification of the impact of Bill 55 on The Noxious Weeds Act.

As stated earlier, Manitoba Beef Producers provided input to the provincial government in the first proposed changes around the cosmetic use of pesticides. The following is a summary of that input.

First, we believe the provincial government should not place additional limits on the use of pesticides that have not already been approved through Health Canada's regulatory process. This recommendation applies to all pesticides no matter the setting in which they may be used.

Manitoba Beef Producers does not accept the artificial distinction between commercial and cosmetic pesticide usage. We submit that the safety of a product does not depend on where it is used. Rather, if a product is federally approved as safe for use in rural Manitoba, it is safe in urban Manitoba, provided all product guidelines for usage are followed.

Manitoba Beef Producers is concerned that new restrictions on the use of pesticides can undermine the science-based regulatory system upon which agriculture is based.

If this legislation is to proceed, Manitoba Beef Producers believes there must be a strong public education component. This should apply to either federally approved pesticides or the variety of alternative products available for purchase.

Similarly, on the Internet, we see there's access to many guides in making your own pesticides. These recipes—have these recipes been tested and with any scientific rigour are we sure they do not present a threat to public health or the environment?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Just so you know, you have one minute.

**Ms. German:** Thank you.

Manitoba Beef Producers again cautions that new restrictions on the sale and use of pesticides in urban home settings will create reservoirs of noxious weeds and invasive species that could migrate into agricultural operations.

In closing, we believe that thorough stakeholder consultation is essential to the creation of effective legislation. Manitoba Beef Producers would welcome the opportunity to provide feedback into any proposed amendments of this legislation, as well as any regulatory changes that will accompany its implementation.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on Bill 55, and I thank you for your attention this evening.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Thank you for the input from the Beef Producers. It's been an ongoing process. I just want to assure the Beef Producers that the fight against these high-risk noxious weeds and invasive species must continue as strong as ever, if not stronger, and that the intent, of course, of this legislation is to complement the work to fight those species.

**Mr. Martin:** I appreciate the comments being shared by the—on behalf of the Manitoba Beef Producers, especially when you made the comment about that artificial distinction that the government may be creating. I know the current legislation specifically excludes agricultural activities.

But, I mean, from your organization's perspective, is there concern that this may lead to prohibitions within the agricultural sector?

**Ms. German:** Obviously, that could be a concern when such amendments such as this are put forward. Once again, we just ask that the group consider the science behind it and the long-term impacts that we could see elsewhere outside of urban settings.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

We will now call James Battershill.

Do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. James Battershill (Keystone Agricultural Producers):** I do.

I have to apologize twice, first, that there's been a printing error in our material. We'll provide the clerk of the committee with a clean copy.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation, sir.

**Mr. Battershill:** Good evening, honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, ladies and gentlemen. My name is James Battershill, and I'm



general manager of Keystone Agricultural Producers, Manitoba's general farm policy organization, commonly known as KAP. We work in the interests of all farmers in the province of Manitoba. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak today and share with you the agriculture industry's perspective on Bill 55, which will prohibit the use of some types of pesticides in Manitoba in certain circumstances.

Let me start by saying that our organization has concerns about the messaging currently being used by government around pesticide use. As more Manitobans lose connections with farming and agriculture, we increasingly see less understanding about the modern agricultural practices and their role in ensuring that Canadian agriculture is able to continue to sustainably feed the world and drive our provincial economy.

While we understand and appreciate that all agricultural pesticide has been excluded from this act, our concern remains that Bill 55 further confuses the public about the safe, necessary and selective use of pesticides in agricultural production.

Pesticides, which we often refer to as crop protection products, consist of herbicides for weeds, insecticides for insects and fungicides for plant diseases. On the farm, they are used only when a particular pest reaches a level where it will result in significant crop loss. It is in a farmer's best interest not to overuse these products, as there is a high cost associated with the purchase and application.

I do appreciate the minister's comments on May 15th about the responsible use of pesticides in agriculture, but I would suggest that farmers are not the only ones capable of safely using these products. Prior to being registered for use, these crop protection products undergo evaluation by PMRA and meet strict health and safety standards.

We do strongly suggest that this committee seek out Health Canada to provide insight on their regulatory approval process, and if there are concerns about potential gaps, we urge the government of Manitoba to work with PMRA to find ways to mitigate risks rather than imposing its own restrictions.

I am familiar with Health Canada's position that exposure to pesticides should be limited, as the minister referred to during the second reading of this bill. It is our position, however, that education is the most effective means to reduce risk.

Farmers are educating themselves, and KAP is very pleased to partner with the governments of Manitoba on the delivery of Manitoba's Environmental Farm Plan program, which does include a section on safe pesticide storage and handling. We believe that all Manitobans would benefit from learning about safe pesticide use so that we have an informed population that is capable of keeping itself safe.

Now, despite being exempt from pesticide restrictions, a cosmetic pesticide ban will inevitably impact agriculture. Unchecked weeds in urban and rural yards and green spaces, along with municipal property, will inevitably result in weed spread. Weed seeds are capable of spreading very quickly with the wind from yard to yard and field to field when not controlled. KAP has been opposed to the cosmetic pesticide ban because we're very concerned about weed spread onto agricultural lands and the potential need for additional herbicide use to control increased weed populations.

If this ban is to go ahead, we do ask that it be phased in so the general public, especially those in rural areas, along with urban and rural municipalities, have an opportunity to learn about the importance of maintaining healthy lawns and green spaces. We urge the governments of Manitoba to educate all stakeholders fully on what their options are in this respect. If this legislation is passed as presented, we want to see a phase-in schedule included in the associated regulations, along with a plan of action on an education component. We simply feel that implementing a ban with no education will be detrimental to the agriculture industry.

Another note on education I would like to point out related to healthy lawns, and particularly in the Lake Winnipeg watershed, is their value as they perform an important environmental function. I am concerned that people will reduce the amount of lawn space on their property or eliminate their lawns entirely as a result of this legislation. Lawns provide an important function in filtering rain water and eliminating the stress of our municipal sewage infrastructure during heavy rainfall events.

\* (20:40)

Areas of the city of Winnipeg, as an example, built before the 1960s have a combined sewer system where one set of pipe collects both waste water from our homes and businesses and surface runoff from rainstorms and snow melt.

During wet weather conditions, when rainwater overwhelms the combined system, untreated waste water overflows into our waterways out of any of 79 outlet points. A 5,000-square-foot lawn can absorb upwards of 12,000 litres of rainwater, which really does help to mitigate this risk, and the risk to our—the health of our lakes and rivers.

Again, I think that the focus of my request here today and my presentation is that education is absolutely critical and the delayed implementation of this bill will be important, so that those in the watershed are able to ensure that their lawns remain healthy and risks are limited.

I do think it's safe to say that we all have a vested interest in ensuring that these restrictions are implemented slowly and wisely.

Further, to highlight some of the other points that other rural Manitobans have presented here today, we do all have a vested interest in controlling noxious weeds such as poison ivy on our properties. These weeds, designated under The Noxious Weeds Act, are tenacious, hard to control and capable of spreading very quickly, and can be detrimental to the health of humans, animals and the environment. KAP wants the regulations to address this issue, so the property owners can access the appropriate pesticides for control.

I urge the governments of Manitoba to consider these issues I have discussed before enacting this bill. We need a well-thought-out approach to this legislation that focuses on education as the first means of reducing risk. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Thank you very much, Mr. Battershill, for your comments. And we'll certainly keep Keystone informed, and we will consult, as the regulations take form, over the next few months.

When Ontario brought in their legislation, the development of replacement products was really in its infancy. A lot has changed over the last number of years, and what we're seeing across Canada where regulation is in place is that lawn lovers continue to control their weeds on their lawn. And I think we should look forward to that continuing here in Manitoba. Replacement products and practices are well known here now, and, indeed, I think it—the big box stores, and even at my own hardware store, the replacement products that are identified by PMRA's lower risk are, in fact, the only products that are available. So we certainly will be encouraging

Manitobans to continue their practice of weed control.

**Mr. Martin:** Mr. Battershill, I'm wondering if you'd agree with the Manitoba cattle producers' comment about the creation of that artificial distinction between federally approved products available and acceptable in some situations but not acceptable in other situations, and what that kind of creates in terms of confusion of consumers and the public.

**Mr. Battershill:** Generally, I would agree. I believe that there are a lot of, as I mention at the beginning of my presentation, misconceptions about modern agricultural practices and their use. And I believe that implementing the bill as it reads today would add to that confusion along the same lines as has been mentioned in by a series of other presenters: if it's not safe for application on my lawn, why is it safe for use in an agricultural setting? And I think that that's sort of concern is very serious for our sector because we know that, in terms of investment and research, public buy-in is absolutely critical to succeed in long-term markets.

**Mr. Gerrard:** I'm just curious, because you've, I'm sure, been following what's happened in other provinces, in other provinces where they've brought in similar pesticide bans for lawns or even for gardens in some areas. What is the observed impact on agriculture? And, you know, what, based on that experience, is the suggestions from mitigating any effects?

**Mr. Battershill:** In our conversations with our colleagues to the east, we do understand that—and I think that this is based primarily on the cost difference right now between the conventional synthetic pesticides, which we're used to using, and some of the alternatives that the minister has referenced—that there are instances where, in rural areas, there is less care being taken of lawns, an increased weed pressure, which is resulting in the rural landowners and farmers in the area having to actually increase their own pesticide application rates, simply because the weeds do have an opportunity to travel so quickly.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you.

I will now call Ron Thiessen. Ron Thiessen? You will now drop to the bottom of the list.

And we will now call Ken Guilford.

Do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. Ken Guilford (Private Citizen):** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. Feel free to go ahead with your presentation. Go ahead.

**Mr. Guilford:** I haven't got time to write. I don't have time, and you know why? Because I'm an activist.

My name is Ken Guilford. I'm a community activist, advocate and facilitator. I work with Bell Tower; I work for many different organizations, as some of you may know. And I would like to say that my email—I'm proud to say I—that I—my email, anybody wants it, it's ken.guilford@yahoo.com or it could be g-o-gmail.com. Whatever.

What I'm saying is if the farmers can do it, so can the people of Winnipeg. I am mad because the damn border, Perimeter, I say get the damn Perimeter out of here. Move back and forth. We should move with the farmers. That's crazy. That's stupid. I better not say anymore, but I am pissed off because this lady, VP in Manitoba Beef Producers, you'd better listen to what she says and the speakers after, right. Sorry, I didn't make it in here because I was in there making four more presentations, five more presentations.

I had vowed when I could find this session that I would be listening, and to the gallery, and I'd be saying what's going on. I vowed also that I would come into the void in this big room, and the 255. But I didn't know it was going to be sitting on hard chairs. I didn't know that. I didn't know I couldn't take water up to the front when—where we were sitting. I didn't know we couldn't do that. So I'm dying of thirst. I had to go to the bathroom because [inaudible] but I'm dying. I can't even go to the bathroom. It'd be too hard. You know why? Because I can't get any water. They're frozen. Those chairs in that other room are hard as rocks. You got to be fixed in here. These rooms are great, and the flooring in here—I want a better that too. I—and the other day, Friday, you know what happened? I fell down. You know what? No signage at all. Then I see the signage. But, before, you have no signage at all. And that's crazy.

Jon Gerrard made a statement here the last—in the other room. He made several good ones. The best one I heard was, you would say, they're bad and good ministers. You know what it is, Jon? It's not bad and good; it's training, absolute training. Ted and Gord, everybody else around here, I don't know some of you, but I know Ted and Gord, you guys are

trained right. You're damned good ministers. And, Jon, I hope to hell you [inaudible] men in when he said good because they are. Jon, that's [inaudible] There are some people that are no good, but give them training. Take them into education. We need more education; we don't need to worry about pesticides. Leave the damn thing alone. The farmers already said to the lady here, leave us alone.

Well, I wrote a letter to—an email to some people here, and I'll tell you that right now. I am mad because I did not get one—response. That's bullshit. I'm the same [inaudible] here. I pay them money. Who the hell are you guys? Who the hell are you put your fucking nose up in the air? Sorry for the expression, but who are you to put your nose up in the air? You don't know what you're doing—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Guilford, just one second. I just want to caution you on some of the language, please. Okay, thank you.

No, go ahead. The floor's yours again, just watch the—some of the language, thank you.

**Mr. Guilford:** There's only one piece of language I said, okay? Anyway, it will be in hazard—Hansard is not hazard. Hansard. What about Hansard? Who gets a copy of that? How do I get a copy of this Hansard to know what I said in it in that Hansard. My mishap in knowledge. I [inaudible] and I'm sorry, I've got EP, that EP, I've got CP too.

I have mood disorders and I got a lot of things wrong with me. Most of you guys, most of, if not say you all, I'd say most of you guys are okay. I'm okay. Do you know why I'm okay? Because with my disorders I enjoy it and I can do things that help me keep up to where I'm going because I keep on going. I keep on going like, you know that Energizer Bunny? That's me.

\* (20:50)

What I would like to say, I'm very disappointed. Why in the hell would you send an email—I pay my taxes. I rent, I pay taxes. I don't care. I know I pay taxes because I'm smart. If you want to not ignore me—you want to ignore me, that's fine because I don't give a shit, but you'd better not. I warn you, everybody here. I know all the people sitting here. You know why? Tell me why. Because I'm smart. I know what's going on and you guys, too. I also know you. But would I do anything about it? Probably not, but ignore me. Ignore me and you know, Gord, you know, Ted, what I do when people ignore me, eh. I don't really excuse them for being good. As Jon says,

they're bad, but they need training. They don't know—a lot of them don't know.

There's mood disorders in the corner *[inaudible]* and the Assiniboine. It is Independent Living Resource Centre right here on 393 Portage, did you guys even know that? How many people know that? How many people know that? *[inaudible]* she knows; she has a disability. She knows. See, I know a lot of people do.

But I would say that you people cut the Perimeter. If you don't want to cut the Perimeter, at least try and squeeze your car past it. Is that a big deal, man? We got to stop at the red light, that's it, but at the green light you go, same as a Winnipegger. Get out there. I come from Clearwater, Manitoba, and, man—and I ain't somebody—an MLA out there—a Conservative MLA. Why? Because we don't give a shit; because past the Perimeter, who gives a shit? We're wrong; we're going to lose this next election because you know why? We don't care. And I'll tell you right now, you sit on your ass and do nothing; that's the way it is. Is that bad? A-s-s bad? Is a-s-s a bad word? *[interjection]* Yes, okay. *[inaudible]* Sorry.

And I would tell you this right now, my brothers, three brothers all live in this town, Clearwater, Manitoba, about 10 miles past Pilot Mound, five from Crystal City. And I would like to say I am proud of my brothers. But you know they complain, that they say them and their friends control, take the bloody control off because the NDP's trying to control the people. And also the Conservatives—where are you going, ma'am? Okay, sit down. I'll tell you right now, you do not get any votes at all if you try and vote people.

You know what, one night I was out in the country—and I was really hard-core NDP and I still am—and I was at a party, after I had had three beer, I guess, I don't know. But you know what? I had to fall asleep. Why? Because my cousin wanted to beat me up. I never fought in life, you know, why I *[inaudible]* cousin. And so I had fought. I fought him, I didn't *[inaudible]* No, I didn't, I just went—I wasn't sleeping because the guy didn't know enough to know if I were sleeping or not. He was crazy. *[inaudible]* But you got to try and live with people and work with people. Gord, you should know that. How long you been MLA? A long time, right? So do you not know how to control and work with people? Damn it. You're not controlling, I tell you right now.

My brother's—my older brother's son and his wife go to Russia—Russia—and they were working for two firms in Russia, what they do with my son—my brother's son, he's always over to the—Russia to pick up his orders, or else they're sent by email to him. *[inaudible]* computer. And he gets his—he goes around in North America, bringing any cattle back to Clearwater, his farm, 130 miles from here, and what he does, he looks after his farm—he looks after his farm. And then all these people in Russia—do you want these people in Russia to get all of the pesticides over there? No. Then leave the damn pesticides alone.

You don't need—you know you guys have a hell of a lot more things to worry about than damn pesticides. I tell you right now; there's nothing to it, you know.

And I fell last Friday; that's why I couldn't come in to session. I'm sorry. I fell in the Rotunda, and if I—and my blood was already hurting—Rob Altemeyer, he came to my aid, and he knelt down beside me, he was excellent. And I really 'commendate' Rob Altemeyer for doing that. He was—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Guilford, one minute, just to let you know.

**Mr. Guilford:** Okay. So what I say is get these things together, get off your bloody ass. Drive to the farm, talk to farmers, see what they want—see what they want. The last thing they want is to talk, right, Jon? You're not listening—you're not listening.

Thanks. Thanks very much for hearing my story. Okay? You don't have the guts to say a little into the—sorry. I thought you were my friend. I'm disappointed.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, that concludes our time for the—for your—any questions from the committee?

**Mr. Martin:** Not so much a question, Ken, but I heard anecdotally about somebody having an accident in the Rotunda, so I just want you a speedy recovery. *[interjection]*

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Guilford, sorry. Mr. Guilford, you—please, it's okay. Yes. He just asked—said—wished you well, and now we're going to move on with the next presenter. *[interjection]* Okay. We're going to move on with the next presenter now. Okay. Thank you.

Bill McDonald, please. Bill McDonald? No, Mr. McDonald's not here. We will put him to

the bottom of the list, and I'll call Delaney Ross-Burntack, please.

Do you have any material to—oh, sure. They'll just hand it out for you and then please proceed with your presentation.

**Ms. Delaney Ross-Burntack (Canadian Association of AGRI Retailers):** Good evening, and thank you for the opportunity to speak regarding our opposition to Bill 55 as it has been proposed by the NDP government.

My name is Delaney Ross-Burntack. I'm a mother, a weed scientist and the president and CEO of CARE, the Canadian Association of AGRI Retailers. I'm here on behalf of the agricultural industry to make three points this evening.

Every pesticide product available for homeowner use in Canada is approved by the most stringent, world-renowned federal regulator, Health Canada—you've heard that a lot this evening—and these products are proven as safe, effective and low-risk products when used according to label directions. The ability of homeowners, municipalities, businesses and other caretakers to maintain their lawns, sidewalks, patios and driveways, and to afford such maintenance will be seriously and quickly compromised without access to a suite of safe, effective and economical options for control of weeds, insects and disease.

Finally, banning the use of federally approved, economical and effective weed control and other pest control products will unfairly and unnecessarily force homeowners, municipalities and businesses to spend more money on less effective products.

As trusted advisors to Canadian farmers, the Canadian Association of AGRI Retailers, or CARE, as we go by, is acutely aware of the value inherent in plant protection tools such as pesticides as well as the rigorous standards that those tools must meet in order to be available for use. Bans that ignore the scientific evidence required by existing federal regulations for approval of such products, such as the ban proposed in Bill 55, jeopardize the health and safety of the very communities they are intended to protect.

Over 200 separate tests meeting consistent and rigorous standards as mandated by Health Canada are analyzed by more than 350 experts at Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency, PMRA, and assessment of products for home use is particularly stringent due to the presence of

vulnerable groups like children, pregnant women, the elderly and pets. The fact that the pesticide products available for home use are stringently tested and repeatedly proven safe by the experts at Health Canada when used according to label directions is true.

Every product available for home use, and as you'll see in the chart that I provided in the handout, is a low-toxicity product and have a much higher—much lower toxicity rating than many familiar household products, as you'll see in that chart. Commonly consumed products like caffeine, aspirin, iron tablets, are more than 25 times as toxic as the active ingredients in common household weed killers like Killlex and Roundup—25 times. Bleach is six times more toxic, and even the table salt that many of us add to our meals is 1.5 times more toxic than these specific weed killers, and I speak specifically of these products because when speaking about the characteristics of pesticides it is critical to speak of the specific product. It is just as inaccurate to say that pesticides cause cancer as it is to say medicine treats cancer. Not all medicine treats cancer. The acetaminophen in Tylenol does not treat cancer just as the active ingredients in Killlex and Roundup have been shown not to be carcinogenic. It's very important to be specific.

\* (21:00)

As you'll see in your handouts, from its label, bleach is poisonous and damaging to the respiratory 'tract' if misused, yet most households keep it available. Even products we trust to protect our children's health, like the acetaminophen found in Children's Tylenol which you have a label in front of you, have labels that must be followed correctly in order to be safely used. Prenatal vitamins, like the label provided in your handout, like the vitamins I was taking two years ago when I was pregnant, even state that the amount of iron in the product is dangerous to children. It states right on the label that accidental overdose of iron-containing products is the leading cause of fatal poisoning in children under six, yet this product is highly beneficial to pregnant women and their unborn children when taken in the prescribed dose on the label.

It's also important to understand what Health Canada knows well, that natural does not equal safe. For example, acetic acid is a natural product, it's found in vinegar, we consume it as a food, and in higher concentrations it's also approved for use as a pesticide. Where glyphosate, which is the active

ingredient in Roundup, is a synthetic product also approved for pesticide use. However, acetic acid has twice the toxicity of glyphosate, yet it's welcomed as a safer alternative because it can occur naturally.

Health Canada tests both these products with the same level of stringency to truly ensure that safe use of either product is possible. As I mentioned, they use over 200 separate tests and a team of experts to prove and reprove, when necessary, that the products that they have approved can be used safely.

A ban on pesticides also seriously and quickly compromises the ability of homeowners, municipalities, businesses and other caretakers to maintain their lawns, sidewalks, patios and driveways, and to afford such maintenance without access to a suite of safe, effective and economical options for control of weeds, insects and disease.

Unfortunately this is already proven in other provinces where a ban similar to that proposed in Bill 55 has been implemented. In regions like Ottawa and Toronto, weeds are out of control in large areas where more costly, less effective products or control methods are simply not able to be used. And we heard that earlier. Costs of \$2,600 more per acre compared to \$44 per acre—or per hectare, sorry. That's a significant increase.

Hand weeding, more frequent mowing and increased fertilizer is not a viable option where tight budgets are concerned, nor are costly alternative products. So many green spaces in the larger acreages are left without control, leaving sports fields compromised with unsafe tripping hazards and weed clumps as well as public spaces and businesses looking unsightly and unkempt.

There are a growing number of reports of regions and municipalities working around the bans out of desperation to salvage their parks and sports fields.

Of significant concern to CAAR and the agricultural community is how this ban will impact the ability of farmers to maintain the quality and productiveness of their crops and animal feed. You already heard some of that this evening. Dandelions are on the noxious weeds list because they are such a challenge to control in food and feed crops. And uncontrolled weeds on lawns and larger green spaces will allow weed seeds to drift into agricultural spaces.

We would ask the NDP government to clarify how Bill 55 and the ensuing regulations will protect

agriculture in Manitoba, ensuring noxious weeds like dandelions are controlled near agricultural centres. We would also expect this committee to gather input from areas outside of Winnipeg where the impact of this ban on the agricultural community will be most significant, and would request conformation from the committee that this consultation will occur before the bill is passed and the regulations developed.

The facts demonstrate that thanks to the extraordinary due diligence of Health Canada, this ban is unnecessary and wasteful. It unfairly forces home and business owners, municipalities and other caretakers to spend more on less effective means of upkeeping their green spaces.

The products that will be on the list of alternatives are of acute interest to Manitobans and our members, and it has been disappointing to advise them that no list of alternatives has been brought forward to date. We would ask the NDP government when this list will be made available so Manitoba businesses, municipalities and homeowners will be able to understand the full financial impact they face.

Will Health Canada's PMRA be consulted in the development of this list? And how many options will homeowners have for the control of the weeds in their grass, as we're aware of only one product at this point?

We would strongly encourage the NDP government to look to other provinces and the reaction of homeowners when considering Bill 55, as there is growing evidence at the displeasure and declining support of this type of ban. Ontario residents went from a majority of support for a ban to less than 50 per cent support in only two years. And I've provided some data for you from an independent study on that. In fact, this independent study found that homeowners admitted to illegally using pesticides that were left over from before the ban or acquired outside the province or mixing their own potentially dangerous home remedies to try and get their green spaces under control and beautiful again. A shocking 61 per cent of homeowners lost their grass entirely, either having to resod or convert green spaces to patios, rock gardens or decks.

Last spring Landscape Manitoba did an outstanding campaign to gather input from Manitobans and they received more than 15,000 responses to date, stating that Manitobans want a choice, not a ban. We support that request—

**Mr. Chairperson:** One minute left.

**Ms. Ross-Burntack:** Thank you. Almost done.

We support that request, as it is what the evidence supports.

We would request that if the NDP government chooses to continue with Bill 55, in spite of a lack of evidence to support such a ban, that all Health Canada-approved lawn care products should be included on the list of allowable pesticides, as outlined in the regulations. We would further request that Health Canada's PMRA be included in every step of the process as expert consultants and that the pleas of more than 15,000 Manitobans not go unheard by this government.

Thank you, and I would welcome any questions you may have.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Thank you for your presentation. The reason the list isn't available is because we will now enter the regulation-making phase, which will consult with stakeholders and ensure that the list is put together in a collegial way, but I can assure you that we will be looking as well to the Nova Scotia and Ontario experiences. We think, and we've heard this from industry, that there is some value to having some consistency across the country as much as we can.

But that's why the list isn't here. It's because we're going to create that list in concert with key stakeholders.

**Mr. Martin:** Ms. Ross-Burntack, I appreciate your presentation, obviously, the work put into it and, obviously, the observation that a significant number of products in our own lives and our own medicine cabinets and such have warning labels and that.

One of the comments—and I asked KAP the same question—that was put forward by the Manitoba Beef Producers was that of the creation of an artificial distinction between federally approved products in certain situations and yet the same products are—will essentially be illegal in other situations. And I'm wondering if you'd like to or if you're able to comment on—or if you'd agree that the government's creating this artificial distinction.

**Ms. Ross-Burntack:** Yes, I would agree. I actually commented to the Manitoba Beef Producers' representative that that term is representative of our thoughts as well, that the science that Health Canada brings forward supports these products, no matter the use. Either they're safe for use or they're not,

according to the label. And I'd, you know—I'd be curious to know how the distinction is made, because it does appear artificial. I don't understand the criteria in terms of deciding how a product is safe for use in any situation outside of the federal regulation.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

I will now call David Hinton, please.

Mr. Hinton, do you have any written materials to distribute to the committee?

**Mr. David Hinton (Landscape Manitoba):** No, I don't. I've killed enough trees on this issue already, so—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**Mr. Hinton:** Thank you and good evening. My name is David Hinton. I'm representing the Manitoba Nursery Landscape Association, which is also known as Landscape Manitoba. Our association has represented the green industry in the province for over 50 years. Our members grow, install, maintain the green infrastructure in Manitoba. I've been on the board for over a decade, served as president for four years and I currently sit as the provincial rep on the board of the Canadian Nursery Landscape Association.

My family and I have owned and operated the Weed Man lawn care business in Winnipeg since 1987. Weed Man has franchise locations throughout Canada and the United States, and we have seen first-hand how legislation like Bill 55 has negatively affected not only businesses but consumers across the country.

Landscape Manitoba is in favour of allowing Manitobans the ability to choose which legal, Health Canada-approved products they wish to use to control weeds and other pests on their properties. We feel Bill 55 is not necessary, as Health Canada already provides very strict regulation of all pesticides sold and used in Canada. Ninety-six per cent of all pesticide use in Canada is for water treatment and wood preservatives. Less than 1.6 per cent is used on turf grass.

\* (21:10)

Bill 55 is not going to have any kind of significant impact on the amount of pesticide exposure that Manitobans have. Manitobans take great pride in their properties. You just have to visit any local home improvement store on a Saturday

morning, you can see homeowners buying paint, lumber, building supplies to make their corner of the world a little better. Their outdoor space is an extension of their home, and most people want to keep their property looking good. They should have the choice to use Health Canada-approved products to maintain their landscapes when required.

On the lawn care side, we are not in the pesticide business. We have always preached good lawn maintenance to reduce weed problems, we educate our customers constantly, trying to get them to do everything right. We teach them on the importance of proper mowing, top dressing, overseeding and fertility to promote a healthy lawn that requires very little use of these control products.

When imbalances do occur, or to help a customer that has inherited a poorly maintained lawn, pesticides are sometimes required. And because they are expensive, the products are used as sparingly as possible and only when necessary. They are not an—or they're not a revenue source but they are an expense for all lawn care companies.

We make our living helping Manitobans maintain their properties. If we can do it effectively for less cost, we can help more people enjoy their beautiful landscapes.

The green industry's largest concern with this legislation is the lack of effective alternatives. If we already had cost-effective alternatives, everybody would already be using them. In the press release, the justification for banning these traditional products is that there are, quote-unquote, many lower-risk alternatives available. Well, this is just not true.

The proposed legislation is specifically about lawns and the only alternative product that is available right now to control an existing weed in your lawn is a product called Fiesta. The cost of this product is very high, it must be applied at a high rate and also needs to be applied more often to be effective. These three attributes make it much more expensive to use. The product also requires different equipment to apply it as it corrodes existing application equipment quickly and is more difficult to store and handle. These factors dramatically increase the cost of its use.

Another product that's mentioned is corn gluten, but it really has no effect on existing weeds and only a very limited control of new weeds that are germinating. Since many weeds found in our lawns are perennials, like a dandelion, corn gluten will

have no effect on them whatsoever. Homeowners who have tried it become very frustrated; they've spent hard-earned money on a product that does not work at all.

The rest of the recommended alternatives cannot be used on lawns because they are not selective, i.e., they will kill the grass. So this legislation is about your lawn and there's a big list of alternatives, but if you use them on your lawn, it will actually kill the grass. So the added cost of these alternative products will prevent many Manitobans from maintaining their property, and this is additional tax that no one wants.

Landscape Manitoba is concerned that many homeowners who used to purchase products from a local retailer or hire professional licensed applicators will now look for lower-cost traditional products across the border and apply it themselves. We have seen it in other provinces who have passed similar legislation. It will be impossible to police these kind of activities, and Manitobans know it. This puts the law-abiding garden centre or lawn care company at a huge disadvantage. We are already hearing of stockpiling that is occurring. How is the government going to ensure that there will be a level playing field and prevent law-abiding companies from being at a disadvantage?

Landscape Manitoba would like to make the following changes to the legislation: So, No. 1, we've heard it before tonight, education needs to be a top priority. Manitobans will need to be educated on the importance of maintaining their landscapes to reduce weed populations. There will be need—there will need to be more than a website to explain the new rules and what can be done to prevent a weed on a lawn. Reduction in pesticide use can be achieved if practices such as integrated pest management are employed to reduce the need for control products. Landscape Manitoba will be willing, and is willing, to work with the Province to develop a strategy to help educate Manitobans on how to maintain their landscapes with minimum amount of pesticide use.

And the second request we have is we want to see a longer phase-in period so businesses can properly make the changes necessarily to educate their customers and change their operations to apply these new products. We don't know any of the details yet. Bill 55 has some definitions in it, and we really aren't sure of, obviously, many of the details. They're all going to come with these regulations, but until we see the regulations, it's going to be impossible to plan



and educate our customers on the changes that are coming. And we feel that to bring this into effect by January 1st, 2015, when the regulations haven't even been developed yet is not fair, especially to be able to give the homeowners another year's grace when businesses that have to plan farther ahead than a homeowner will be forced to walk the line next year.

Retail businesses also require some time to make changes to their stores to comply with the new rules governing the sale of these products. Locked cabinets and secure points of sale may be necessary, but, again, we're not sure.

And as I said before, you know, educating our customers and the public out there is a huge concern that everybody in our industry has. There's so much confusion out there right now about what can be done, what's allowed, what isn't allowed. It's a real mess out there.

I think, you know, if homeowners are allowed a one-year grace period to get ready, then Manitoba businesses should at least have the same transition period.

We do look forward to working with the government on developing these new regulations, and hopefully we can come up with some good policy for everybody. So that's all I have.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Well, thank you, Mr. Hinton, for your ongoing advocacy, and while we haven't agreed on everything, I think one common area that we have in agreement is that we do want to reduce exposure to pesticides, and now it's time for us to work on the regulations and roll up our sleeves and get in the room and figure out how we do that while allowing Manitobans to continue to control their weeds.

So thank you for your perseverance here tonight as well, staying late in the evening. Thank you.

**Mr. Martin:** Mr. Hinton, I echo the minister's comments in terms of appreciating your involvement in the democratic process.

You made reference to one of the alternatives that the minister is advocating, that being Fiesta. Now, I know the minister's made public statements that the cost differential between Fiesta and synthetic pesticides is negligible and that the impact or the effectiveness is, again, is virtually identical. As an individual who may have used both products, I wonder if you could speak to that.

**Mr. Hinton:** We're seeing a lot higher product cost use in our operations in Ontario, from, you know, 5 and 6 per cent costs on weed control products up to 35, 40 per cent now for just the weed control aspect of it. So the costs are enormous with it.

As I said, with Fiesta, it is killing the weeds, but you need to apply a lot of it and you need to apply it more often. So that's the way it works and means more frequent trips to the customer's property, more applications. The rate it goes down with is a lot higher in concentration than what the traditional products are. So those three things cause the cost to go up, and then, as I mentioned, the cost of actually handling it and applying it. It's extremely corrosive on any kind of equipment, so we've been really trying to learn that. It's cost a lot of money to make those changes, and it's not easy, that's for sure.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

I will now call Melanie Sourisseau.

Do you have any written material to be distributed?

**Ms. Melanie Sourisseau (Private Citizen):** I do.

**Mr. Chairperson:** All right. Please proceed with your presentation when you're ready.

**Ms. Sourisseau:** All right. Good evening, and thank you for this opportunity to speak.

As a mother of two toddlers, I commend the Province for taking the necessary steps in order to introduce legislation for reducing cosmetic pesticide exposure. It is unfortunate that Manitoba has not been a precursor in this movement, but the time has finally come for us to join six other provinces that have already implemented similar legislation.

What I believe Bill 55 signifies is our Province's cognizance of its accountability to Manitobans' health and safety, particularly for our most vulnerable populations: children, pregnant mothers and even our pets. I believe that it also represents acknowledgement of its ownership of how we as a province treat our land, water and air.

Since discussions around this amendment to The Environment Act began, there has been a misapprehension that not having recourse to the use of synthetic pesticides will result in the ability-inability to control weeds and pests on one's property. In actuality, should one choose, options will continue to be available, and as the honourable Minister Gord Mackintosh has clearly explained

more than once, they already are and can be found at Pollock's Hardware.

\* (21:20)

With the proposed changes, there will be no revocation of one's right to choose whether or not to use a lawn treatment. What is currently not available, however, is the inverse. Manitobans who have not wanted these chemicals used near their homes have not been permitted to request buffer zones or advance notification of their use. The City of Winnipeg, for instance, allows citizens to register for both when it comes to any pesticides that may be applied in residential areas. Their website also details the products that they will be using. In the case of lawn care, none of this exists. Awareness of pesticide treatments come either via its distinctive owner or, when done professionally, signage, providing that the homeowner, groundskeeper or property manager does not remove it.

With the exception of being informed by a neighbour whose lawn is treated or, on the rare occasion, by the lawn company itself when one inquires, no system has been in place, and there is definitely no system when this has been done by an individual.

Manitobans should always feel safe and confident that neighbourhoods, schools, child-care centres, parks and recreational green spaces are free from harmful chemicals. And, although synthetic pesticides have been federally approved, there has been a gross misrepresentation and overstatement of Health Canada's position. In the section of their website entitled Healthy lawns, they advocate primarily minimizing the use of pesticides, adopting environmentally safe lawn care practices, and even provide comprehensive information on how to care for a lawn.

In addition to setting realistic expectations for one's lawn, their recommendations are mowing high, watering deeply, overseeding, aerating, replacing grass in high-traffic areas, as well as growing more than one kind of grass and a variety of plants for birds, butterflies, wildlife and beneficial insects and organisms. Before resorting to pesticides, they suggest weeding by hand or applying boiling water. Should chemicals be used, they advise applying the products only where needed and using a spot-treatment method instead of broadcast application.

Further to that, under the heading, Choosing a lawn care service, they caution that one should avoid lawn care programs that regularly apply pesticides whether or not pests are present. I would not consider that a ringing endorsement for the indiscriminate use of cosmetic pesticides, as is done today under today's practices.

And as Health Canada also states, and I quote: Remember that pesticides give short-term control of lawn pests, but rarely long-lasting solutions. I would be curious to know how often lawn care companies remind their repeat customers of this fact given how staunchly they uphold Health Canada's position.

As previously articulated, I fully support this proposed legislation. That being said, I do feel that Bill 55 is not without weaknesses. For one, golf courses within city limits should not be exempt from the restriction, especially where synthetic chemicals are solely for cosmetic use. In Winnipeg, these grounds are woven into residential neighbourhoods. They abut upon private residences, community centres, parks and their paths, and even a school. In other words, places where children can be found.

I also believe that the garden exemption within city limits is neither reasonable nor realistic. Gardens are not usually disjoined from lawns, paths, patios, et cetera, and I cannot comprehend how chemicals restricted for any other use could possibly be permitted and sold on good faith. I would like to know what measures will be used to enforce their limited use. To my mind, these exemptions undermine the entire platform of the proposed restrictions.

The plain truth is that there are mothers, fathers, grandparents, aunts, uncles, who do not want the children in their lives to be exposed to these poisons, certainly when their purpose is to control perceived pests. It would be highly irresponsible and reckless to await the results of the kinds of multi-year analyses required to adequately convince all parties that synthetic pesticides are irrefutably harmful to children's health.

One does not to look far to find parallel solutions—or situations. By the time asbestos was deemed dangerous, pleural mesothelioma had already claimed many lives. And, following a four-year study, Health Canada reversed its stance from one week to the next on Bisphenol A, which is linked to endocrine disruption, thereby resulting in a ban for use in baby products.

As for synthetic pesticides, risks such as brain tumours, lymphoma and leukemia are not ones that should be taken or even associated with children. Anyone who's experienced cancer personally or alongside a loved one should see that the amount of accumulating data is convincing enough to say that the precautionary principle should be applied to the use of cosmetic pesticides and that we cannot wait for a smoking gun.

Thank you for your attention.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Well, thank you very much for staying, Melanie, so late and providing your insights. It's greatly appreciated. Particularly appreciate your overview of what Health Canada does say to Canadians about the use of pesticides.

**Mr. Martin:** Melanie, you made a comment about measures to enforce the limited use of pesticides, and from your perspective, what measures would you like the government to undertake in terms of enforcement?

**Ms. Sourisseau:** Ideally, these chemicals would not be available for sale for any use. I mean, it doesn't make any sense and the whole idea of even this, you know, phase-in, I mean, to say that you—one doesn't know that this ban was coming is kind of like saying that we don't get snow in Manitoba in the winter. Like, this has been a long time in the coming and I don't see the need for having these exemptions at all, especially for garden use around home. You can't tell a child not to run through a garden. It happens, you know.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call Erin Crawford.

Do you have any written material for the committee?

**Ms. Erin Crawford (Canadian Cancer Society, Manitoba Office):** No, I don't.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, please proceed with your presentation.

**Ms. Crawford:** Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to the committee tonight.

The mission of the Canadian Cancer Society is to eradicate cancer and improve the lives of those living with cancer. To date, research on cosmetic pesticides is not conclusive, but it is suggestive of a

connection between pesticides and certain types of cancer.

Given the suggestion of a possible link to cancer, particularly to childhood brain cancer and leukemia, to non-Hodgkin lymphoma, multiple myeloma and prostate, kidney and lung cancer—when these pesticides are being used for purely cosmetic purposes, a precautionary stance is warranted.

It should be noted that the society does not believe this prohibition should be extended to non-cosmetic use from the agricultural forestry sectors to control noxious weeds, invasive species or mosquito control, because the test of what constitutes acceptable risk is different when there are countervailing health benefits.

In the absence of any countervailing health benefit, rather than taking a wait-and-see approach, we support adopting the precautionary principle, which states, when an activity raises threats of harm to human health or the environment, precautionary measures should be taken, even if some cause-and-effects relationships are not fully scientifically established. In other words, if something may cause harm, we should be cautious even if the link is not definite yet.

Guided by our mission and this principle, the Canadian Cancer Society supports this legislation. In taking our position, we've considered the whole body of evidence and determined that the growing and suggestive link calls for a cautious approach.

Prohibiting the sale and use of cosmetic pesticides is a sensible and appropriate response, given pesticides applied for cosmetic purposes offer no agricultural or health benefit. They simply pose an unnecessary risk to public health.

Whenever a cancer can be prevented, when a family can be spared the experience of a cancer diagnosis and all that follows, we advocate taking measures to prevent it. Thank you.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Well, thank you very much, Erin. I understand that position is the—indeed, has been advanced across the country by the Canadian Cancer Society, and I welcome your voice here tonight. And, indeed, I think that analysis is consistent with the views of the Chief Provincial Public Health Officer for Manitoba. So thank you very much.

**Mr. Martin:** I appreciate your presentation and just a question. Your comments about the growing suggestive link and purely cosmetic as being, you

know, the Canadian cancer—that's sort of, I guess, the foundation of Canadian cancer's support for the bill. Correct me if I am wrong, but the position of the Canadian Cancer Society also supports a ban on indoor tanning of juveniles in the province of Manitoba.

**Ms. Crawford:** Yes, that's correct.

**Mr. Martin:** I'm wondering what the government's position to the Canadian Cancer Society has been on that particular ban.

**Ms. Crawford:** I don't know if you want to speak to that legislation here tonight, but we have advocated a ban for minors for indoor tanning, absolutely.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call Ken Wiebe. Do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. Ken Wiebe (Private Citizen):** Yes.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you. Please proceed with your presentation when you're ready.

**Mr. Wiebe:** Well, a couple of quick observations. I'm not sure if you're as grateful as I am that I'm the second-last presenter here tonight but, wow, this is a long meeting.

\* (21:30)

Boy, just another observation is that it seems that nearly everyone here tonight has made some reference to Health Canada, whether they're for or against the particular bill, and it just seems both stunning and remarkable to me that this committee has not formally invited Health Canada to speak to this issue; I just can't believe that. People are putting all kinds of words in their mouth, and why they're not here to represent themselves is just amazing. But I'll continue with my written presentation.

My name is Ken Wiebe. I'm from Eco Green. We've been providing fertilizer and weed control in Winnipeg and surrounding communities for 23 years, and we service about 10,000 different homes each summer and employ about 40 Manitobans. I want to take this opportunity to talk about the difficulties and shortcomings with Bill 55, from my business perspective.

Over the past 23 years, we've focused on providing our customers with choices in organic fertilizers and options for safe, effective and affordable weed control. My company has been

applying new alternative weed control products as they have become available over the years, but, unfortunately, most don't work or are no longer commercially available. The list of alternative products that the government released to the media only includes one that may control dandelions in lawns, the one that's called Fiesta that the government endorsed at the news conference when announcing that ban last June. Unfortunately, the company that manufactures it has a monopoly on the product, meaning extremely high prices.

We've offered a lawn program with Fiesta weed control for the past two years, at a heavily subsidized price, to gain experience with using the product, and this is what I've learned so far: the biggest thing is the cost versus the expectations. Fiesta programs will cost at least twice as much as current programs, and the weed control is not very effective. Everyone understands the idea of paying more to get more, but, with Fiesta, customers have to pay more to get less; that's a tough product for me to sell.

Single-spraying applications to clear the weeds out for 40 or 50 dollars, like today when we had hundreds of phone calls in our office, will not be possible. Even the Fiesta manufacturer will tell you multiple treatments with specific timing are required to kill weeds. Total weed control is not possible with Fiesta. At best, it will suppress weeds and reduce their numbers.

Neglected properties with mature weeds or a large variety of weeds are not controllable. There are many common noxious weeds for which there will no longer be effective controls, such as Canada thistle. Large properties, sports fields or commercial properties are particularly cost prohibitive. There have been many articles about the struggles with maintaining sports fields in Ontario, including an article in Maclean's last year.

Seniors and those on fixed incomes can't afford the cost of new products, and cross-border shoppers and friends of farmers will buy and apply products on their own.

Experience in Ontario shows a 50 per cent drop in the number of customers able to pay for this service, and, of course, fewer customers mean fewer employees. Many lawn care companies have ceased business in Ontario since the ban was enacted.

The challenges with Bill 55—well, not being sure the regulations makes it difficult for us to plan the future. Not knowing which products are going to be

available makes planning and testing new programs, services and their costs impossible. Many companies base their business model on being able to—on being prepaid for services starting in September for the following year. How do we do this if there's no regulations, details and time?

Many commercial properties are on multi-year contracts with the prices based on using traditional products and costing. It's difficult to honour these contracts when the rules have changed.

Bill 55 seems to target lawn care companies like mine. It's hard to compete with homeowners when we don't have a level playing field. It makes it difficult for our company to have restrictions that do not apply to homeowners. Any restrictions should be equal for all. Giving an additional year for homeowners to stockpile and use less expensive, more effective products while we have to use more expensive, less effective products is unthinkable. If anyone should have a period of grace, it should be companies that are trained and provincially licensed and IPM accredited like mine.

Until now, we have relied on Health Canada for a list of federally regulated products and follow the label instructions for safe use. Since Manitoba is now dismissing Health Canada and taking over that responsibility, what are the criteria being used to identify the approved products from the others? How is the testing being done by the Province to ensure the safety of our families? And how might future new products be tested and approved for use in Manitoba?

In conclusion, I'm disappointed on many levels with the proposed legislation. We can argue back and forth endlessly about this study or that study about who to really trust, but the fact remains that a ban doesn't address all the issues and creates many new ones. It's too bad we couldn't have rolled up our sleeves and come up with an effective made-in-Manitoba solution, a solution that balanced effective weed control with pesticide exposure and public safety. There are so many better ways to accomplish this rather than borrowing from the mistakes made in Ontario and Nova Scotia.

We are a prairie province that relies heavily on agriculture. Why are we willing to risk the economic future of this province? Instead, Manitobans will be stuck with paying more for less; others will opt to venture off on their own by finding and using products illegally on their lawns.

It's not too late to offer Manitobans a better choice, a choice that's safer and greener without all the weed problems; it's not too late to have a real conversation to make this work. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Mr. Wiebe, I can assure you that our review has looked at the science of replacement products such as Fiesta, and indeed the Landscape Manitoba says it does kill weeds. But it's our understanding that the level of control is as good as or better than the standard treatment, which is Killex. So that's information that we have from independent sources.

But, Mr. Wiebe, I think that your comments are important to the committee, and the government will certainly continue to take them into consideration and we will now attend to the work of the regulations.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Martin.

**Floor Comment:** Can I comment on that or not?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Sure, please, Mr. Wiebe.

**Mr. Wiebe:** Our experience doesn't show that to be the case at all. We sprayed Fiesta on the weekend again to our customers that take that program, and I can tell you, guaranteed for sure the results are not even close to the same. And it's surprising to me that you would recommend something like this without doing any testing on yourself to make comments like that. It's just, it's a surprise.

**Mr. Martin:** Mr. Wiebe, I appreciate your sharing your information and especially your active use of Fiesta as a product that you do offer to your customers, so you're able to share that direct experience with us.

You made a comment in your presentation about yourself and, obviously, members of Landscape Manitoba being trained and provincially licenced and IPM accredited. For those members of the committee who might not be aware of what that process is, I'm wondering if you could just give us the Coles Notes version of sort of the training or the accreditation that you'd receive as opposed to myself as just a Joe Homeowner.

**Mr. Wiebe:** Okay, thanks. Yes, well, in addition to in-house training that we do with our employees, all pesticide, all applicators need to have a provincial pesticide applicators licence. There's a core and then a landscape golf course, that's—it's two large binders

that have to be studied and they have to write a test to get their licensing, which has to be renewed annually.

And then, as a company, we have to be IPM accredited, which means we have to prepare—we have to go through a bunch of material and then provide a written sort of exam that we have to pass, in which case the company becomes IPM accredited, which means we understand the principles of using less pesticides and teaching our customers in terms of the proper care of their lawn, which we do. We have newsletters that go out with each of treatments teaching people about mowing and aerating and watering properly and all those sorts of things.

And then, additionally, to have our licence as well, we need to be insured and provide proof of insurance to the Province. And so there's all those steps that we comply with.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

I will now call Natalie Reimer Anderson.

Do you have any material for the committee?

**Ms. Natalie Reimer Anderson (Private Citizen):** I do.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay.

Please proceed when you're ready.

**Ms. Reimer Anderson:** Thank you for taking the time to hear us all out tonight. My name is Natalie Reimer Anderson, and I am a mother, a holistic nutritionist and a health educator working at a Winnipeg naturopathic clinic. I am also a private business owner, a taxpaying citizen, a former teacher in the school—in the Manitoba school system and a proud Manitoban. I am not a scientist, but I am really adept at common sense.

I am here tonight while my nine-year-old and seven-year-old sons, Seth and Max, are playing flag football—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Sorry, we just—you can't have the pictures. Sorry, you're not allowed to have exhibits. So go ahead.

**Ms. Reimer Anderson:** —in the public park. I never miss a game, but tonight is an exception because I want to secure healthy, chemical-free parks and playgrounds for children like Seth and Max to play on for years to come.

\* (21:40)

In my years working in both education and health care, I reinforced the message that it is the cumulative effects of the choices that you make that determine your health. Now, more than ever, we understand through epigenetics that our choices largely determine whether we develop disease or maintain health.

I believe that public cosmetic pesticide spraying eliminates the individual's choice in pursuing their optimal health; it takes the right to choose away from us. We can remove some chemicals and pesticide residues by choosing organic, growing our own food, or choosing natural products; however, we don't get to avoid the most dangerous poisons when we want to do something as simple as go outside to play or to have a picnic in the park.

As a mother and health coach, I promote being active and getting outdoors as much as possible. It is a strange irony that one of the best and most natural actions we can take for our health is threatened by environmental poisons that many don't know are lurking in the grass: toxins that are, frankly, unnecessary.

When we take proactive steps to be healthy, as we are encouraged to by this government, our efforts are thwarted by chemical exposure to cosmetic pesticides.

I believe it is the cumulative effect of exposures over a lifetime, beginning in utero, that build up a toxic overload leading to many of the illnesses I work with clients to reverse: obesity, autoimmune conditions, infertility, cancers, inflammatory conditions and gut dysbiosis, because these exposures are over a lifetime eventually resulting in many different manifestations of disease, the cause and effect is not immediately apparent. That's where common sense comes in.

The first step in the process of recovering or preserving health is mitigating the toxic overload. Our children don't ever get to that point if they're protected early from unnecessary chemical exposure. If we clean up our environment with this province-wide cosmetic pesticide ban, we can see fewer of our tax dollars spent on what I call sick care. Instead, put the revenue to better use in education, and this is a step towards proactive health care.

I believe it is the burden of industry to innovate in order to stay on top of the changing market. To any business owner who feels this will hurt his or her

bottom line, I challenge you to embrace the spirit of innovation that originally propelled you into entrepreneurship. There are going to be a lot more dandelions to cut.

I believe it is the burden—or sorry, I think the world is ready for a shift, and, as a proud Manitoban, I would love to see our province be one of the first to truly acknowledge, through legislation, that our children's health is more important than weed-free aesthetics. To be a forward-thinking province, we need to take bold action and lead with the heart and do what is right by our most vulnerable citizens. After all, we are the heart of the country.

Thank you for your consideration.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Well, thank you very much for staying. It's a quarter to 10. We really appreciate your patience tonight and your insightful remarks. Thank you.

**Mr. Martin:** Just, again, I mean, it's a long haul to sit here all evening and listen to the presentations. I mean, the—and to miss, obviously, your two sons' sporting event, flag football, I think you had said evening, so—but I do appreciate you participating.

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

We will now call, for the last time, Eva Pip. Eva Pip here? Her name will then be removed from the list.

We will now call Danielle Sanderson.

Do you have any materials for the committee?

**Ms. Danielle Sanderson (Private Citizen):** No, no.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Proceed when you're ready.

**Ms. Sanderson:** Okay. You'll have to excuse my non-orthodox—I'm not too familiar how to do this. I'm just a regular mom, taxpaying citizen. I represent just a lot of how—I've come to support the ban.

Like a lot of my neighbours, we talk about this thing, and yet we don't have the time to come here. I appreciate a lot of what the woman who came before me was saying, because that was my circumstance. You know, we have children to look after, they have sporting events, sometimes they get sick, they have homework, and so on. And so a lot of people that care about this ban aren't here today to speak up, but that's why I'm here, to just say that we trust our government to care for the well-being of our children and for our health and well-being before profits.

And, as much as I appreciate business and I appreciate the dynamics that it puts the businesses under, you know, because of previous ways that they function and having to change the way they do things, I appreciate the obstacles that are before them if this bill goes forward. But the reality is that we don't want to worry about whether when we go to the park our kids are rolling in poison and how it's going to affect our respiratory systems.

Some children are more sensitive than others. I've had a home daycare in the past and, you know, I had one child that was asthmatic and very sensitive to cleaning products. I had to make sure everything didn't—was odour-free and so on. A lot of children are like this, and I appreciate that our government is going forward and presenting this bill, and a lot of people support it. And we would rather have dandelions or ant hills than have to worry—or is my child going to develop early cancer or things like that.

I'm not here to debate different scientific researches that are pro and forth but more so here to state that parents are concerned about this and prefer moving forward, like the lady said, at a different perspective of how we look at our lawns and how we look at our parks and are more open to looking at dandelions than being concerned that it's perfectly beautiful and aesthetically pleasing. And so that's what I'm here to say.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Thank you for taking the time.

**Mr. Martin:** Same comment. I mean, obviously, sacrificing your own personal time with your children to share your comments is always appreciated.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you.

We will now call Marg Friesen. Since Marg isn't here, she will drop off the list.

Ron Thiessen. So I don't see Ron Thiessen here. He will now drop off the list.

I will now call the final presenter, Bill McDonald. So I don't see Bill McDonald here.

That concludes presenters.

Is there any—seeing none, that concludes public presentations.

Is there any other persons in attendance who wish to make a presentation? No? Seeing none, that concludes public presentations.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Chairperson:** We will now move clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 55. During the consideration of the bill, the table of contents, the preamble, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order. Also, if there's agreement from the committee, the Chair will call clauses in blocks that conform to pages, with the understanding that we will stop at any particular clause or clauses where members may have comments, questions or amendments to propose. Is that agreed? *[Agreed]*

We will now move to clause-by-clause consideration of the bill.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 55 have an opening statement?

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Well, I really appreciate the comments. I think they've represented a lot of the different views on this topic over the last number of years in Manitoba, and, indeed, across Canada. This has been a compelling debate from all different sides. I think when government has to look at the legislation that it promulgates, I think one of the main tests it always has to keep in mind is the well-being of children and the application therefore of the precautionary principle. So that has largely guided our work on this.

When people talk about the science of this kind of legislation, you necessarily have to include in that not only the testing of the different pesticides—and we will, of course, defer to PMRA's federally regulated products in the end result, but we're going to choose those with the lower risk—but, as well, you have to consider the science of health, the health sciences. And we've been guided, in large part, by the Ontario College of Physicians—family physicians, and the Pediatric Society in the United States, as well as other studies.

So I thank the presenters that came here tonight and stayed with us, and I look forward to moving through the bill clause by clause.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We thank the minister.

Does the critic for the official opposition have an opening statement?

**An Honourable Member:** No, I'm good.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I thank the member.

Shall clauses 1 and 2 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I hear a no.

**Mr. Martin:** I have an amendment to clause 2, Mr. Chair.

\* (21:50)

**Mr. Chairperson:** Clause 1—pass.

Shall clause 2 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I hear a no.

**Mr. Martin:** Mr. Chair, I'd like to put forward an amendment to the bill

*THAT Clause 2 of the Bill be amended by adding the following after the proposed clause 40.6(d), which is: uses related to protection of an individual's health that are shown to be medically—in a nutshell, Mr. Chair—oh, sorry.*

All right, so I move

*THAT Clause 2 of the Bill amended by adding the following after the proposed clause 40.6(d):*

(d.1) uses related to the protection of an individual's health that are shown to be medically necessary;

**Mr. Chairperson:** It has been moved by Mr. Martin

*THAT Clause 2 of the Bill be amended by adding the following after the proposed clause 40 point—*

**An Honourable Member:** Dispense.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Dispense.

The amendment is in order. Is the floor—the floor is open for questions.

**Mr. Martin:** Mr. Chair, in a nutshell, this amendment really just expands upon the exception that the government already outlines in terms of protection of public health. We just extend it to a singular individual who's saying they may have a particular allergic reaction to a noxious weed. Should they be able to show that through medical documentation, that they would be able to use the



product that is most beneficial in terms of them dealing with that particular allergy.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** It would appear that that would be covered by (e)—or, I'm sorry, by (d). It would be protection of public health, and noxious weeds as well, of course, are going to be dealt with. There are high-risk noxious weeds that are important to continue the fight against in Manitoba, so the regulations will address that.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Is the committee ready for the question?

**An Honourable Member:** Question.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Shall the amendment pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Yes.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** The amendment is accordingly defeated.

So shall clause 2 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I hear a no.

**Mr. Martin:** Mr. Chair, I move

*THAT Clause 2 of the Bill be amended by renumbering the proposed section 40.9 of subsection—as subsection 40.9(1) and adding the following before the proposed subsection 40.10(01):*

**Regulations must not apply differently to commercial and non-commercial activities and purposes**

**40.9(2)** A regulation made under subsection (1) must not apply differently to commercial and non-commercial activities, purposes and pesticide use.

**Mr. Chairperson:** It has been moved by Mr. Martin

*THAT Clause 2 of the Bill be amended by renumbering—*

**An Honourable Member:** Dispense.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you. The amendment is in order.

The floor is open for questions.

**Mr. Martin:** Mr. Chair, you've heard comments by some of the presenters here that are simply asking for a level playing field when it comes to the

implementation of the proposed ban on pesticides. I think it would allow commercial users of those products an equitable amount of time, as with residences, to use any stockpiled pesticides that they may have. And, again, allow them the opportunity to make sure that their customer bases is fully educated about alternatives that the government will advocate through their regulatory regime.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** I fail to see how this is going to have a useful outcome in that, if the member is talking about the grace period for homeowners for the first season, that is, to ensure that we bring Manitobans with us in this legislation, but it's important that the legislation apply to retail and applicators who are professionals. We think that is the—that is an important focus. In other words, in the first year, we are particularly going to focus on the supply by the commercial sector and proceed accordingly. And that would—and that is by way of policy.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you.

Is the committee ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Shall the amendment pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Yes.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** The amendment is accordingly defeated.

#### Recorded Vote

**Mr. Martin:** A recorded vote, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Chairperson:** A recorded vote has been requested.

*A COUNT-OUT VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 4, Nays 6*

**Mr. Chairperson:** The amendment is accordingly defeated.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Chairperson:** Shall clause 2 pass?

**An Honourable Member:** Pass.

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I hear a no.

Do you have an amendment?

**An Honourable Member:** Oh, sorry, my mistake.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Clause 2—pass; clauses 3 and 4—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

The hour being 9:55, what is the will of the committee?

**Some Honourable Members:** Committee rise.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Committee rise.

**COMMITTEE ROSE AT:** 9:56 p.m.

### WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

Dear Committee Members:

On behalf of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities (AMM), I would like to provide comments about Bill 55: The Environment Amendment Act (Reducing Pesticide Exposure).

At the annual AMM Convention in November 2011, AMM members passed a resolution opposing a ban of cosmetic pesticides. Although Bill 55 will not ban all cosmetic pesticides, the AMM has presented a number of concerns that we feel are still valid with the introduction of this Bill.

While AMM members support measures to protect children's health and promote public safety, we have indicated in the past we feel it would be more effective to focus on public education.

As well, the AMM would like to emphasize that all pesticides are subject to the same scientific evaluation by the Health Canada Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) under The Pest Control Products Act. This includes 'cosmetic' pesticides intended for urban or residential use as well as organic pesticides. The AMM has confidence in current federal regulation of pesticides, and Health Canada already takes sensitivities of certain groups such as children and pregnant women into account in their reviews. However, members of the public may not be aware of the approval processes all pesticides must go through before they are made available in Canada, and this should be a focus of public education efforts.

Moreover, many of our members are concerned about the effects pesticide restrictions in urban areas may have on the spread of pests and invasive species to nearby rural areas. Many noxious weeds and other invasive species pose a real environmental threat to native Manitoban species. As well, since municipalities are responsible for noxious weed control under The Noxious Weeds Act, the AMM is

concerned that a cosmetic pesticide ban will increase municipal weed control costs and make noxious and invasive species impossible to manage in a cost-effective way.

Additionally, the AMM urges the Province of Manitoba to consult with the AMM and the Manitoba Weed Supervisors Association (MWSA) on regulations to be developed as a result of this legislation, particularly on the prescribed pesticides to be identified in regulation whose use is prohibited according to sections 40.4 and 40.5 of Bill 55: The Environment Amendment Act.

Finally, it is particularly important for the Province of Manitoba to cover for any enforcement and public education costs, instead of downloading these responsibilities to local governments.

The AMM appreciates the opportunity to provide these comments. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Doug Dobrowolski  
President, Association of Manitoba Municipalities

I would like to congratulate the Provincial Government for taking this important step in protecting the health of Manitobans young and old, as well as Manitoba's wildlife, pets, bees, butterflies, aquatic species, and the environment.

This legislation is especially important for the children of Manitoba, as numerous scientific studies have provided alarming evidence that exposure to these toxic chemicals leads to serious negative health effects. ADHD, Autism, learning disabilities, and respiratory problems are potential implications of pesticide exposure to a fetus or child. Adults aren't immune, with Alzheimer's, Parkinson's Disease and cancer linked to pesticide exposure as well.

The reality is that the use of these chemicals do not provide positive health benefits and the minimal social or aesthetic value lawn pesticides may provide are not worth the risk. Health Canada has maintained the safety of other pesticides in the past, such as DDT, only to ban their use as more studies and information became available. We need to take a precautionary approach and limit our exposure to chemicals where ever possible.

The pesticide industry is worried about their profits. Lawn care companies can easily transition to safer alternatives, while the pesticide industry will be encouraged to develop and market less toxic

chemicals. Unnecessary pesticide exposure will be reduced, and our economy will survive and probably thrive, as was seen after Nova Scotia introduced lawn pesticide legislation.

As these chemicals accumulate in our bodies and longer, more frequent exposure will wreak more havoc, it is smart to restrict the use of lawn pesticides. We would urge you to consider other landscapes as well, like indoor environments, gardens and golf courses.

Thank you  
Lise Smith

---

I have been involved in the Canadian ag chem sector since 1972. In 2000 I helped develop a lawn care supply company to develop programs and products for lawn care companies in the Halifax area. Halifax was the 1st city to ban the use of synthetic pesticides. Subsequently we have moved the business to Ontario from where we supply customers both here and in BC. One of our major customers is a national franchise who is often highlighted on Global TV.

Our/their lawns look just fine and I can attest that where both homeowners and municipalities having been following pesticide-free turf care programs, their lawns have become easier to maintain. However, this doesn't simply mean eliminating pesticides and not changing lawn care practices accordingly! Instead of simply killing weeds and insects and hoping turf is left (an extermination industry approach), a proper agronomic approach (as opposed to the common myths that are pervasive in this market) is used to fix the soil and implement proper maintenance techniques (aeration, cutting, fertilizing choices and timing, etc.) resulting in thick, green, drought-resistant turfgrass.

I support your consideration to ban the use of synthetic pesticides in lawn care and non-farm gardens.

If I can supply you with more background or information, please feel free to contact me.

Regards,  
Frank B. Reddick P.Ag  
Turf Logic Inc.

---

The Canadian Environmental Law Association (CELA) is a non-profit, public interest organization founded in 1970. CELA is an environmental law

clinic – within Legal Aid Ontario - dedicated to providing legal services to low income people and disadvantaged communities, and advancing the cause of strong environmental protection through advocacy, education, and law reform.

We write to support Manitoba's proposed ban on lawn pesticides. However, we urge the Manitoba government to strengthen this proposed legislation so that it includes not only lawns but also gardens and golf courses. Toxic pesticides used in gardens and golf courses threaten drinking water, pollinators, and children's health -- and are unnecessary.

Members of our staff have worked on pesticides issues for over 25 years. We have been at the forefront of Canadian activity summarizing the research about human health impacts, particularly to children. We were extensively involved in efforts to reform the federal Pest Control Products Act and the enactment of Ontario's law to comprehensively ban the cosmetic use of pesticides. We are currently involved in research and client representation efforts to curtail the use of pesticides that are implicated in dramatic losses of bees and other pollinator species.

While the federal and provincial governments in Canada have made important advances in recent years to recognize, reduce, and in some cases prevent, exposure to pollution and hazardous substances, including pesticides, serious problems remain. More children have asthma than ever before. Cancer in children, though rare, is the leading cause of illness-related death in children aged one year or older. Several cancers are on the rise among young adults in Canada raising concern about exposure to carcinogens during vulnerable periods of development including in the womb. Very large numbers of children across Canada experience a wide range of learning, behavioural and developmental disabilities. Emerging but rapidly expanding scientific evidence points to the ability of many different chemical exposures to disrupt the human endocrine system contributing to impacts on reproduction, development, and the later development of cancer. Many complex, and not entirely understood, factors contribute to these various health outcomes. However, scientific evidence is increasingly revealing that exposure to environmental contaminants, including pesticides, is one of these many interacting factors.

We also know that we are faced with the double challenge of reducing ongoing emissions of toxic substances as well as facing ongoing exposure from

historical sources that remain persistent in the environment. Scientific evidence confirms that we should focus on minimizing or eliminating exposures during sensitive life stages, to avoid harm to development in the womb and in early childhood. We also should be ensuring safe food and water supplies and ensuring good air quality, indoors and out, and minimizing exposure to toxic substances in consumer products. Given these multiple challenges, we should take every opportunity to minimize or eliminate exposures to toxic substances that are unnecessary and easily eliminated. The cosmetic use of pesticides falls squarely into this category.

We therefore strongly urge you to expand the scope of Manitoba's proposed limits on pesticide use and include the additional areas of gardens and golf courses. These are areas where there is already extensive experience across Canada with bans on such cosmetic pesticide uses. Just as there are diverse means of ensuring beautiful lawn and turf using widely-available non-toxic products, the same is increasingly true for vegetable and flower gardens and golf courses.

In conclusion, the Canadian Environmental Law Association congratulates Manitoba for being the first province in western Canada to ban lawn pesticides. We strongly urge the government to expand the legislation, as noted above, to make it even more protective of human and environmental health.

Thank you.

Yours truly,  
Kathleen Cooper  
Senior Researcher and Paralegal  
Canadian Environmental Law Association

Canadian Organic Growers Toronto wishes to express its support for Manitoba's proposed ban on lawn pesticides.

Pesticides pose threats to the province's waterways and drinking water. They also put at risk Manitoba's fish, amphibians, and beneficial insects. Pesticides have been implicated in major bee die-offs. The federal Pest Management Regulatory Agency says neonicotinoid pesticides recently caused the death of these vital pollinators in Ontario and Quebec.

Canadian Organic Growers Toronto urges the government to strengthen its legislation by also banning pesticides used on gardens and golf courses.

These properties can be kept weed-free using non-toxic products.

We are very pleased that Manitoba is the first province in western Canada to ban lawn pesticides. We only hope the government expands the legislation to include golf courses and gardens. This will make the law more protective of water, family pets, wildlife, and local kids.

Thank you,  
Elizabeth Chrumka  
Canadian Organic Growers Toronto

The Council of Canadians is a national volunteer organization that works to protect Canada's social programs and the natural environment. We are writing to express our support for Manitoba's proposed ban on lawn pesticides.

Pesticides are a significant threat to Manitoba's rivers, streams, lakes, and drinking water. They also put at risk our fish, amphibians, and beneficial insects. Pesticides have been implicated in major bee die-offs. The Pest Management Regulatory Agency says neonicotinoid pesticides recently caused the death of these vital pollinators in Ontario and Quebec.

We ask the government to strengthen its proposed legislation by also banning pesticides used on gardens and golf courses. These properties can be kept weed-free with effective non-toxic products.

The Council of Canadians-Winnipeg Chapter is very pleased that Manitoba will be the first province in western Canada to ban lawn pesticides. We only hope the government expands the legislation to include golf courses and gardens. Doing so will make the law an even stronger instrument for protecting our water, our wildlife and, most important, our children.

Thank you.

Mary Robinson, Chair  
Council of Canadians-Winnipeg Chapter

On behalf of Environmental Defence, I am writing to support the proposed ban on lawn pesticides. As you know, six other Canadian provinces -- Ontario, Quebec, and the Maritimes -- have passed common-sense legislation prohibiting non-essential pesticides. As one of Canada's most

respected environmental organizations, Environmental Defence is delighted to see Manitoba joining this group.

Pesticides are harmful to both people and nature. The science shows that people exposed to these poisons are at increased risk for cancer, birth defects, and neurological illness. Tragically, the most vulnerable are children: young people who live around pesticides are at greater risk for leukemia, a sometimes-fatal blood cancer.

Pesticides are also a grave threat to birds, amphibians, and beneficial insects. Of particular concern are bees: pesticides have been implicated in massive bee die-offs. Even the federal Pest Management Regulatory Agency admits that neonicotinoid pesticides caused the death of these vital pollinators in Ontario and Quebec in 2012.

Our only concern with Manitoba's proposed legislation is that it does not go far enough. We would urge the government to extend the ban so it includes not only lawns but also gardens and golf courses. Toxic products used on the latter threaten drinking water, pollinators, and children's health -- and are wholly unnecessary. Gardens and golf courses can be beautifully maintained using widely-available non-toxic products.

In conclusion, Environmental Defence applauds Manitoba for being the first province in western Canada to ban lawn pesticides. Our only request is that the government expand the legislation, as noted above, to make it even more protective of human health and the environment.

Thank you.

Tim Gray  
Executive Director  
Environmental Defence

On behalf of the Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario (RNAO), I am writing to support the proposed ban on lawn pesticides. The RNAO is the professional association representing registered nurses (RNs) in all settings and roles across Ontario. As one of Canada's largest nursing organizations, we are very pleased to see Manitoba taking this important step.

There are many epidemiological and laboratory studies linking a range of health problems to pesticide exposure. The problems include: cancer, birth defects, reproductive damage, neurological

and developmental toxicity, immunotoxicity, and endocrine disruption. The risk to health comes not only from active ingredients, but also from so-called inert substances. Finally, synergistic and cumulative effects can heighten health damage due to pesticides. Tragically, the most vulnerable are children: young people who live around pesticides are at greater risk for leukemia, a type of blood cancer.

Pesticides are also a major threat to natural systems, proving harmful to birds, amphibians, and beneficial insects. Of particular concern are bees: pesticides have been implicated in massive bee die-offs.

While we strongly support Manitoba's proposed legislation, we believe it does not go far enough. We urge the government to extend the ban so it includes not only lawns but also gardens and golf courses. Toxic products used on the latter threaten drinking water, pollinators, and children's health -- and are wholly unnecessary. Gardens and golf courses can be maintained using widely-available non-toxic products.

In conclusion, the Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario congratulates Manitoba for being the first province in western Canada to ban lawn pesticides. Our only request is that the government expand the legislation, as noted above, to make it even more protective of environmental health.

Thank you.

Warm regards,  
Doris Grinspun, RN, MSN, PhD, LLD (hon),  
O.ONT.  
Chief Executive Officer  
Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario

I am writing to briefly state that parents and children should not need to feel hesitant about playing, sitting, rolling, sniffing, picking, throwing, or picnicking on grass. Put simply, a lawn should be a safe and friendly place to explore, relax or play without risking lasting and cumulative effects of chemical exposure. A ban on cosmetic pesticide use on lawns is a simple way to reduce the amount of toxic substances in our environment, whenever it is possible to do this it should be done for the health and safety of citizens, insects and animals.

I also urge that the limits and scope of the ban be expanded and strengthened to include both gardens and golf courses to further ensure that Manitoba is

doing all that it can to make this a safe and healthy place to live.

Sincerely,  
Jodie Harpe-Lesperance

---

The Cosmetic Pesticides Working Group of the Manitoba Round Table on Sustainable Development provides the following comment on Bill 55:

The introduction of Bill 55 is a great achievement and positive step forward for the health of the people of Manitoba.

The following amendments are suggested to strengthen the Bill and provide equitable protection to Manitobans without compromising social or economic outcomes.

Section 40.5 Should be extended to all public greenspace and parks. Should be extended to all education institutions including Universities and Colleges. Should be extended to golf courses.

Section 40.6(c) Eliminate golf course exemption.

Section 40.7(2) Home and Garden Centres should not be allowed to sell prescribed pesticides.

The Act should come into force Aug 31st, 2014, or as soon as possible.

Many thanks for your consideration of these comments. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require clarification.

Kristina N. Hunter, M.Sc.  
Vice-Chair, MRT on Sustainable Development  
Senior Instructor, Environmental Science and Studies  
Department of Environment and Geography  
Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources  
University of Manitoba

---

Good evening, Members of the Standing Committee on Inter-Governmental Affairs. I am pleased today to speak in support of Bill 55 – The Environment Amendment Act – Reducing Pesticide Exposure.

I have been thinking back on my own history of concern about pesticide exposure. Working and volunteering for many years in the environmental field made me actually aware of the vast breadth of toxic substances people and our environment are exposed to on a daily basis and the impacts these

exposures have on ecosystems, wildlife, and humans. Early on, I asked myself, how could we reduce our exposures in the face of an industrial system in which so many are unavoidable. An obvious answer is to eliminate those that are by anyone's definition "unnecessary", and cosmetic pesticides are clearly in that category.

Learning about the early Canadian municipal by-laws, primarily in Quebec, I could see that physicians and other health care professionals were raising the alarm about possible connections to a wide range of illnesses and disease in humans, and particularly in children. Here at home I could observe a family member and several friends as they experienced acute respiratory impacts in the presence of lawn care chemical use.

I and others in the citizens' group called Campaign for Pesticide Reduction Winnipeg wondered why we could not have a cosmetic pesticide by law in Winnipeg. Then began meetings with Councillors and participation on Winnipeg's Weed Control Advisory Committee, where I heard about the desire of many City managers to reduce and move away from chemical use. That was heartening, if ineffective at the time, but it was also where I first experienced the vitriol of the chemical industry in the face of any opposition to its practices and products.

With the help of Councillor Harvey Smith, CPR succeeded in our bid to get a buffer zone established around the play structures in Winnipeg's city parks. A small step, but we were encouraged.

Around the same time, bylaws restricting smoking started to come into play. In the face of hugely financed opposition from big tobacco, health advocates were finally getting heard in the corridors of power. Another win for reducing toxic exposures. I mention tobacco because there are many parallels to lawn care chemicals. Both were products in search of a market and massive profits for their makers. Both were relentlessly promoted by slick pr firms as improving image – making women more bold and men more cool in the case of cigarettes, and making suburban homes more "perfect" in the case of lawn care chemicals. Deliberate avoidance of the health impacts and the addictive qualities of these substances, is also a common thread.

At the Manitoba Eco-Network, we started the Organic Lawn Care project, in response to the many inquiries we received from people interested in a healthy green space around their homes. Research

and practice over the years for that project firmly convinced me that chemicals were not only unnecessary for lawns and gardens, but actually detrimental to a healthy and beautiful yard. Organic lawn care companies in Ontario and elsewhere have borne out that knowledge.

Next came the incredible scenario of the chemical industry fighting the town of Hudson Quebec's cosmetic pesticide bylaw. In a hugely expensive David and Goliath case, the industry went all the way to the Supreme Court, where Hudson decisively won the right on behalf of all jurisdictions in Canada to act in the best interests of the health and welfare of their citizens by applying the Precautionary Principle to the question of lawn care.

Buoyed by this knowledge, Winnipeggers participated in City hearings and all but unanimously recommended cosmetic pesticide restrictions, only to be stymied by Council's ineffectual response. As other municipalities and entire provinces moved to act for the health of children and ecosystems, concerned citizens here continued to lobby at all levels for similar protections for Manitobans. The weight of evidence for health impacts continued to build – The Ontario College of Family Physicians surveyed a vast body of literature, and concluded that especially children and pregnant women should avoid pesticide exposure whenever possible. Other august health institutions came to similar verdicts.

A report from the Round Table on Sustainable Development recommending legislation in Manitoba prompted the first tentative explorations of the issue by the Provincial government. In the face of millions spent by industry on scare tactics to lobby against any kind of ban, the majority of Manitobans spoke up and told the government they wanted restrictions. The government listened and today we have before us Bill 55, making Manitoba the first western Canadian province to introduce legislation to reduce pesticide exposure.

The Bill is clear in acknowledging the risks to children, to the sick and to the elderly: chemicals will be banned from use around child care centres, schools and hospitals. For this, the government should be applauded.

The language of the Bill is enabling. Much will depend on the regulations that are enacted. The regulations must ensure that the prescribed list of disallowed substances include all those that have

been implicated in potential health risks, both as active ingredients and in formulations. They must allow for a process to determine which new formulations and substances should be restricted as they become available. It is my view that the regulations should include the range of toxic insecticides that are used for cosmetic purposes, including the most egregious neurotoxins associated with the developmental and neurological diseases in children. The regulations must ensure that the many exceptions mentioned in the Bill do not render the legislation meaningless. Prescribed chemicals must not be easily available for other uses. In fact, the Bill should be strengthened by removing exceptions for chemical use on golf courses and in gardens.

We must not be sidetracked by the industry's reliance on Health Canada approval. Health Canada determines what they deem to be an acceptable measure of risk when approving use of a substance. This does not mean that a product has been thoroughly tested in real life conditions. Nor does it mean that a product is safe. Examples abound of approved substances which have later been removed from the market after people have become ill and died.

In conclusion, this Bill may be a small step in the context of our population exposures to chemical toxins, but make no mistake, it is an important one. With sensible and tough regulations to guide this legislation, the landscaping and lawncare industry will survive and thrive on a new, ecological and child friendly approach to maintaining turf, as is the case in Ontario, Quebec and Nova Scotia. Manitobans will breathe easier. Our children's risk for devastating chronic disease will be reduced. Manitoba will have clearly stated its resolve to move toward a healthier future.

Today, it is unthinkable to smoke in public places and especially around children. That happened because concerned people spoke out in the face of big tobacco and its well-heeled public relations. Governments listened and chose a healthier plan. With resolve, the same will be true of exposures to unnecessary chemical pesticides.

Anne Lindsey  
member of Campaign for Pesticide Reduction  
Winnipeg, and the Cosmetic Pesticide Ban Manitoba  
coalition.

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Debates and Proceedings  
are also available on the Internet at the following address:

**<http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/index.html>**