

**Subject: RE: FW: Private use of pesticides**

**Date:** Sun, 18 Sep 2005 18:32:47 -0700

**From:** "Ernie Crist" <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>

**To:** "Ernie Crist" <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>, "Brian Platts" <bplatts@shaw.ca>, "M E Craver" <mecraver@shaw.ca>

**CC:** <fonvca@fonvca.org>, "Mayor and Council - DNV" <Council@dnv.org>, "Senior Management Committee" <managecomm@dnv.org>, "James Ridge" <James\_Ridge@dnv.org>

Before you will all chastise me for my error - it was Samuel Johnson not Samuel Johnston.

Ernie

---

From: Ernie Crist  
Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2005 5:28 PM  
To: 'Brian Platts'; M E Craver  
Cc: fonvca@fonvca.org; Mayor and Council - DNV; Senior Management Committee; James Ridge  
Subject: RE: FW: Private use of pesticides

Hello:

I think you should take a positive spin on this issue. At least people are becoming aware of the smells and fragrances, sweet, not so sweet, deadly and harmless.

There used to be a time, even in my youth, when people, to use Samuel Johnson's definition who (with the exception of the lady sitting next to Samuel) all stank equally bad so nobody gave it a second thought. The nose, it appears, is a creature of culture.

Personally, when I was a youngster, I frequented my grandfather's farm who, among other animals, also had horses. The result is that to this very day I am partial to the smell of horse manure and that is a good thing for it helped me through many a District Council meeting without, as far as I can tell, lasting ill effects. The curious thing is when all people stank equally bad for lack of soap and water they apparently still managed to find each other attractive or we would not be here.

Ernie Crist

---

From: Brian Platts [<mailto:bplatts@shaw.ca>]  
Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2005 4:12 PM  
To: M E Craver  
Cc: Ernie Crist; fonvca@fonvca.org; Mayor and Council - DNV; Senior Management Committee; James Ridge  
Subject: Re: FW: Private use of pesticides

But Monica, moss killer is nothing but iron oxide. To keep it from growing back you apply harmless lime which is essentially antacid for your lawn. I have no objection to people who let moss grow in their yards, but it certainly doesn't hold up well like strong healthy when grass children play on it.

I too read that Lions Gate Hospital has banned fragrances. I mentioned to Ernie in a previous e-mail that banning the wearing of fragrances in public buildings will be the next fad based on 'health' concerns. Some people say that electrical appliances are making them sick. It never ends. Personally, I'm offended and made nauseous by the odor of people who have bad hygiene. Maybe we should employ sniffers at the doors of public buildings to weed out people who smell from either BO or too much

perfume (no, I'm not serious!)

Cheers,  
-Brian

M E Craver wrote:

Re:

Quote from the homeowner (letter below) as to why he/she must use herbicides:

" However, there are still instances (such as when moss invades a lawn) where there is no natural way to eliminate the pest, short of replacing the lawn entirely. That is impractical, so I must resort to a herbicide. In our damp climate and acid soil moss is a common problem."

This is the attitude that defeats common sense. It seems a grass lawn is not "natural" to this area of the homeowner's lawn. Damp climate and acid soil? What can one grow there, instead, without use of herbicides? -- fighting a constantly losing battle in this case. Calling moss a pest? There are beautiful moss gardens around the world that are wonderful to look at. Work with what you have. Moss is not a noxious weed, etc. that must be destroyed. He/she does not have to resort to a herbicide. You do not have to mow moss, either. Thank you.

--Monica Craver--

PS. Yes we do have bigger problems to worry about. What do people think of the latest ban on wearing perfume in Lions Gate Hospital? Can people truly be "allergic" to the synthetic chemical concoction of perfumes? Lions Gate Hospital thinks so. I am "allergic" to the synthetic chemical concoction of pesticides. Who speaks for me and others who suffer from chemical sensitivity, whether through pesticides, perfumes, etc.?

Ernie Crist wrote:

Dear Mr. Platts:

Thank you for challenging my remarks. You are absolutely right, many people, first and foremost the members of the Waterfront Task Force worked very hard to address this shameful scenario in Deep Cove and on the Waterfront in general. In the heat of the argument I lost sight of this crucial fact.

I believe that the waterfront issue has to be kept alive and brought to the attention of the public again. This is especially so since this present District Council has done absolutely nothing to address this issue. Clearly they felt obliged to pay their political debt to their supporters including the CCA and keep the public from accessing and enjoying land belonging to the public.

I also believe that the "Save Our Shores" Committee should remind the public through letters to the editor of the history and the ongoing efforts and challenges of saving the foreshore for the public and making the water safe for people to use. That this shouldn't be so is quite scandalous. My apologies to you for not mentioning the role played by you and your Committee on behalf of the citizens of this community.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist

---

From: Brian Platts [<mailto:bplatts@shaw.ca>]  
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2005 4:15 PM  
To: Ernie Crist  
Subject: Re: FW: Private use of pesticides

Hi Ernie - I know you were only trying to make the point that many persistent environmental problems go unnoticed or without great public outrage, however, you were not alone in attempting to address the issue of boats in Deep Cove illegally dumping their holding tanks. That problem was a major issue that the Waterfront Task Force tackled. We recommended that the Deep Cove Yacht Club be phased out, with proper pump-out stations installed for boaters generally. Based on the referendum, 48% of of the voters agreed. I can certainly recall many citizens over the years speaking-up about the pollution problem in the Cove and there has been a number of letters to the editor too, demanding action. It's just not that simple to say that the public turns a blind eye. I think the reason why some people, like me, are opposed to pesticide bylaws is that municipalities don't have the facilities or the ability to do solid scientific research necessary to make informed decisions. At some point citizens have to rely on some level of government for regulation, and Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency is most qualified in this area. As a basic principle I feel that responsible property owners should have the right to use legal products to keep their yards and gardens beautiful and green.

Sincerely,  
-Brian

Ernie Crist wrote:

---

Subject: RE: Private use of pesticides  
Importance: High

Dear Mr. ....

Not far from where you reside beaches have been closed again by Health Authorities since as a result of pollution, it is not safe and people can no longer swim. This scenario has occurred with predictable regularity each and every year for the last 30 years. I find this to be utterly disgusting.

Not far from where you reside also, boats are routinely emptying their human waste into the ocean since successive governments have been unable and/or unwilling to install appropriate facilities as one would expect in a developed country trying to attract tourists and host the 2010 Olympics.

However, what I find most objectionable is that the public not only tolerates this disgusting situation but actually turns a blind eye to such barbaric backwardness. I have made numerous attempts via Council initiatives to address this problem in the past. I do not recall a single instance where the public in the District came out and/or spoke in support of any of these initiatives, but gets exited because they are in danger of not using pesticides on their lawns - truly a peculiar "civilised" society, so called.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist

---

Cc: FONVCA (E-mail)  
Subject: Private use of pesticides

Dear Mayor and Council,

Colour me disgusted! I understand you are considering another unenforceable (at least, without incurring considerable unnecessary expense) bylaw, this time to prohibit use of pesticides within the District.

I am in principle opposed to any additional restrictions on the rights of individuals, including property owners, to make their own informed decisions regarding the use or misuse of their persons and property. If the District decides not to use herbicides and pesticides on municipal property, that's good. If certain herbicides or pesticides that are PROVEN carcinogens are to be banned, that's ok, too (but a federal responsibility). But a general ban of all herbicides and pesticides, affecting all individuals, is going after a gnat with a cannon, and that's bad. It will become just one more bylaw that will be widely ignored, because it will be recognized as being a senseless further intrusion by government into the private lives of individuals.

Good government earns respect. Good laws will be obeyed. Bad laws will be disobeyed, and if not enforced will lead to disrespect of government. Surely our police and bylaw officers, and our courts, have more important issues to deal with than the occasional use of a herbicide to knock down some noxious weeds? Or a pesticide to get rid of noxious pests (such as carpenter ants, and wasps)?

Why waste the District's money and resources considering a ban on the use of products that are controlled and made legally available by our federal government?

Just so you know where I'm coming from -- a few years ago I re-landscaped our front yard, and engaged a Master Gardener to provide advice and assistance. She told me of several ways to avoid, and get rid of, various weeds. I have followed her advice with considerable success, and greatly reduced my use of herbicides and pesticides. However, there are still instances (such as when moss invades a lawn) where there is no natural way to eliminate the pest, short of replacing the lawn

entirely. That is impractical, so I must resort to a herbicide. In our damp climate and acid soil moss is a common problem.


I simply do not agree that municipalities should be regulating the use of herbicides and pesticides by individuals. Nor do I agree that District Council, or staff for that matter, have the expertise to make decisions regarding the use of pesticides by such as the members of the BC Landscape Nursery Association. I refer you to the article by Cyril Doll included in Brian Platts' email to you, and to the various statements on this matter by Dr. Len Ritter, executive director of the Canadian Network of Toxicology Centres, which none of you seem to be familiar with (or have chosen to ignore).

Education is the way to go. You have made a good start in that direction, and you should keep it up. There is no need for the "big brother's big stick" approach. It won't work, and I doubt if you fully realize the cost attached if you attempt enforcement, and how little real difference this bylaw will make. What we don't need at this time is a useless bylaw that will simply result in increased municipal taxation and interference with the private lives of residents. Instead of blindly jumping on the environment bandwagon, take a deep

breath and do some wise reconsideration. I'm sure if you do, you will decide not to proceed with yet another bylaw, and we all will be the better for it.

Sincerely,

---

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  <a href="#">winmail.dat</a> | <b>Name:</b> winmail.dat<br><b>Type:</b> application/ms-tnef<br><b>Encoding:</b> base64<br><b>Download Status:</b> Not downloaded with message |
|--|--|