

**Response to Bill 61 The Nonessential Pesticides Control Act.**

**Maureen F. Reynolds B.A. B.Ed. R.M.T.,**

**Member of Pesticide Free Nova Scotia**

**Previous Member of the Pesticide Bylaw Advisory Committee for the HRM**

**A Director of Real Alternatives to Toxins in the Environment**

**Past Board Member of the Environmental Health Association of Nova Scotia**

**Previous Member of the Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities for the HRM**

**Phone (902) 477-1721**

**36 Inverness Avenue**

**Halifax, NS**

**B3P 1X7**

**[mfreynolds@eastlink.ca](mailto:mfreynolds@eastlink.ca)**

Mr. Landry and members of the law amendments committee, I would like to thank you for this opportunity to speak about Bill 61 The Nonessential Pesticides Control Act.

My name is Maureen Reynolds. I am a director of an organization called Real Alternatives to Toxins in the Environment who ran a successful campaign to get the first pesticide ban in a Provincial Capitol city. I am also a past member of the Pesticide Bylaw Advisory Committee for the Halifax Regional Municipality. Recently I was given a provincial award for Excellence in Environment and Health for the work of the last 15 years trying to get protection for our children from involuntary cosmetic pesticide exposures.

We heartily agree with the concept of Bill 61 and congratulate the government for this legislation, which bans the sale and use of cosmetic pesticides. Evidence from jurisdictions that have already used regulatory approaches to restrict the use of landscape pesticides has found this the most effective method. This Bill is a proactive precautionary step that will put us on equal footing with other provinces like Ontario and Quebec who have taken similar steps.

This is a health issue because cosmetic pesticides pose an unnecessary risk to human and environmental health. Other health groups agree that cosmetic pesticide usage should be banned. Medical experts from groups such as the Canadian Cancer Society of Nova Scotia, the IWK Hospital, and the NS College of Family Physicians are in agreement. Dr Robert Strang, Chief Public Health Officer of NS stated in a letter to RATE that, "with regards to landscape pesticides, there is sufficient evidence of both potential human health and environmental harms and the ability to achieve the benefits without the use of pesticides that pesticides should not be used for landscape purposes."

We strongly support proposals to ban pesticides on lawns and outdoor trees, shrubs, flowers or other ornamental plants.

In section 4 (3) of the Bill we would like to see the legislation extended to include "noncommercial vegetable gardens, walkways, driveways and patios", as were included in the Ontario legislation. Not to include them will increase health risks and make enforcement of the Bill more difficult, both in sales and landscape usage.

We applaud the means suggested in section 8 to provide enforcement of regulations; with effective enforcement in place, compliance is more likely to occur.

We hope that this bill will remain as strong as it is and not be weakened. The effectiveness of this legislation will depend upon the regulations. We are glad that the government has stayed away from the IPM approach in this bill because the inclusion of Integrated Pest Management or IPM under the regulations would be unacceptable to us as well as medical health Authorities. Under IPM pesticides will be used and promoted and will not lead to a decrease in usage or a protection of our children or communities. IPM should not be included in cosmetic pesticide legislation or regulation.

We are very happy that the government has decided to create a list of pesticides that can be used rather than those that cannot. As part of their regulations the province of Ontario included a 'white list' method and established a list of least toxic pesticides or biopesticides based on the listings of the of the Federal Government's Pest Management Regulatory Agency's (PMRA) class 11 products. There are several other objective lists that could be used besides the PMRA's least toxic products list. We need a list to include truly risk-free materials.

We had hoped that golf courses would be included in this legislation. Very often they are in the midst of residential areas where people are affected by pesticide drift and they often have watercourses that can be polluted with pesticides. At the very least, there was a hope that dedicated organic courses like "Fiddler's Green" in Antigonish could be included in every municipality in Nova Scotia to provide golfers with a safer choice.

In summary, the intent of this Bill is extremely laudable and we hope that the bill is only made more protective of health by any amendments put forward and the government would not let the regulations put the cosmetic pesticide ban in jeopardy.

Thank you for your time.