

Subject: RE: FW: Ottawa - Mayor backs pesticide ban in 2007

Date: Thu, 20 Oct 2005 10:57:49 -0700

From: "Ernie Crist" <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

To: "Corrie Kost" <kost@triumf.ca>

CC: "Mayor and Council - DNV" <Council@dnv.org>, "Senior Management Committee" <managecomm@dnv.org>, "James Ridge" <James_Ridge@dnv.org>, <fonvca@fonvca.org>, <mbragg@shaw.ca>, <davesadler@telus.net>

Dear Dr. Kost:

Members of the medical profession and people who on a daily basis see the effects of pesticides agree that they are harmful. They are now in the majority and their numbers are growing. They too are scientists. The planet and everything in it from bugs to people are being poisoned albeit people on the whole may live longer temporarily as a result of scientific advances in other areas.

What is more serious is that the very biological underpinnings to sustain life on the planet, in the air, on the ground and in the water are being seriously impaired. The impact of pesticides on bacterial life has not even seriously begun and could be catastrophic.

The degradation of the environment takes place in virtually every area of human endeavour and on a truly massive scale. The statement that pesticides are safe is flying in the face of the findings of Universal scientific investigation including the medical profession who sees the effects in their daily practices.

The human brain is programmed to make judgments based on personal and short term comfort and convenience only and is rarely capable of making judgments beyond local and the temporary and personal convenience level.

History will prove those of us who say pesticides are harmful right and those who deny it wrong and on this premise I stake MY reputation.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist

-Original Message-----

From: Corrie Kost [<mailto:kost@triumf.ca>]

Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2005 9:20 AM

To: Ernie Crist

Cc: Mayor and Council - DNV; Senior Management Committee; James Ridge;

fonvca@fonvca.org; mbragg@shaw.ca; davesadler@telus.net

Subject: Re: FW: Ottawa - Mayor backs pesticide ban in 2007

Dear Councillor Crist,

As a scientist who has reviewed the scientific literature on this subject I can only come to the conclusion that government approved pesticides, used as directed, are safe. Local government bans on their use are neither rational nor cost effective in improving public safety. Such bans could well result in more harm to the public as people seek local remedies that are less safe.

In addition, more weeds (especially certain noxious types), may negatively impact the overall health of the community.

To draw a comparison to second-hand smoke is inappropriate as the proper use of pesticides can in no way impact others. Note that smoking is not banned - only its inappropriate use in public places is controlled. To put the issue in perspective - smoking on private property has a far greater impact on neighbours than does the use of pesticides. I don't see any bylaws being proposed to ban smoking on private properties.

We should let reason, not emotion, decide this issue.

Corrie Kost

Ernie Crist wrote:

>THE STORIES BELOW ARE PASSED ON TO YOU COURTESY - ERNIE CRIST;
>
>I see from the news stories below that, not unlike our ancestors, we
>are divided into two camps. The argument eons ago, less eloquent than
>today but just as passionate was, should we stay in the trees or commit
>to live on the ground? Now the argument is should we ban pesticides or
>not.
>Yesterday it was, should we ban smoking.
>
>Our relatives who decided to stay in the trees are still there, albeit
>in greatly diminishing numbers - trees are getting scarcer by the day.
>The descendents of those who ventured out into the grasslands on the
>other hand are now wearing set belts.
>
>If we ban pesticides I predict, two things will happen, one, the
>companies who produce them will come up with a "new and improved"
>product and they will make even more profit then they are making now.
>And the second thing I predict is that, the "new and improved product"
>will not make your neighbours cat cough or lose its fur and that is
>guaranteed it will say on the label.
>
>Ernie Crist
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: Mike Christie [<mailto:mikechristie@rogers.com>]
>Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2005 11:33 PM
>To: Recipient List Suppressed
>Subject: Ottawa - Mayor backs pesticide ban in 2007
>
>October 20, 2005
>
>Ottawa Sun
>
>One lawn day for council in weed wars
>By SUSAN SHERRING
>
>A potential ban on pesticides is proving to be a hot-button issue.
>
>Today, a city committee is bracing for a very long day -- and an
>equally long night -- as a record-setting number of public delegations
>are set to descend on City Hall to speak out on the proposed ban.
>
>When a staff report recommending a ban was released last week, it
>launched an impressive lobbying campaign on both sides of the issue.
>
>Councillors were bombarded with e-mails and their phones started
>ringing off the hook.
>
>"I've been getting e-mails from across the country, and I mean that
>quite literally. I've gotten them from Newfoundland, to Toronto to B.C.
>And from Alex Cullen," quipped Rideau Coun. Glenn Brooks.
>
>Members of the public weren't the only ones lobbying councillors.
>
>Bay Coun. Alex Cullen -- a passionate advocate of the ban -- freely
>admits he did some serious arm-twisting himself.
>
>In fact, Cullen acknowledges he told some rural councillors that if
>they didn't vote to adopt the report, he would do whatever he could to

>have the rural areas of the city included in the ban.
>
>Cullen said the exclusion of the rural areas in the staff report was
>designed to garner rural support. If they're not going to support it,
>then he doesn't think they should be excluded.
>
>That's life within the corridors of City Hall.
>
>Cullen said he wasn't doing anyone else's dirty work.
>
>"I wasn't gooning for the mayor," Cullen said. "Goon, goon, goon, it's
>not a nice word."
>
>West Carleton Coun. Eli El-Chantiry was one of the rural councillors
>paid a visit by Cullen.
>
>But he wasn't at all interested in bowing to Cullen's pressure tactics.
>
>"That doesn't work for me," El-Chantiry said.
>
>El-Chantiry admits he's struggling with the issue.
>
>He worries about pesticides getting into rural wells, but questions why

>education can't be used, instead of imposing yet another bylaw.
>
>"We all know fried foods can be bad for you. But should I be ticketing
>you if I see you eating Kentucky Fried Chicken?" he asked.
>
>This morning, the behind-the-scenes shenanigans will be replaced,
>temporarily at least, by a very public debate on the issue.
>
>A record number of delegations -- 124 at last count -- want to make
>their case about a proposed ban on pesticides.
>
>The previous record was 102 delegations, when council dealt with a
>smoking ban.
>
>With the meeting starting at 9:30 this morning, a half-hour staff
>presentation on the issue, an hour allotted for both lunch and supper,
>and the 124 delegations at five minutes apiece, will mean city
>councillors will be listening to the public until at least 10:05 p.m.
>
>And that doesn't include any questioning of the public delegations, or
>any debate of the issue.
>
>Whether the committee will be able to actually vote on the merits of
>the ban is anyone's guess.
>
>Somerset Coun. Diane Holmes, chairwoman of the committee, is hoping the

>report will get voted on today, though she will be at the mercy of her
>committee members to maintain quorum.
>
>"We'll see if we can cut down on the rhetoric," Holmes said.
>
>Those in favour of the ban on pesticides for cosmetic use will be armed

>with any number of opinions from local health experts.
>
>Those against the ban will complain that municipal politicians are
>infringing on their property rights, while others will question the
>validity of some of the medical evidence being used to substantiate the

>ban on cosmetic use.

>
>The proposed bylaw has come under heat for excluding the rurals, viewed
>by many as the only way to get the report passed.
>
>"Politics isn't about logic," acknowledged Capital Coun. Clive Doucet.
>
>Mayor Bob Chiarelli has agreed, coming out strongly in favour of the
>ban.
>
>"This isn't about property rights, it's about our health," he said.
>
>El-Chantiry isn't convinced.
>
>"They're holding a carrot in front of the rurals. What's that about?"
>
>http://www.ottawasun.com/News/Columnists/Sherring_Susan/2005/10/20/pf-1
>2
>69855.html
>
>
>=====

>
>October 19, 2005
>
>Ottawa Sun
>
>Letters to the Editor
>
>RE "Letter of the Day" by Nick Heisler (Oct. 16): I found that the
>letter regarding the article "It's been a lawn time coming" was more
>focussed on unsubstantiated cheap shots than the issue itself.
>
>The pesticide issue is a complex one and one that needs to be responded
>to in a serious manner that takes many points into consideration. No
>one that I am aware of supports using harmful or illegal products to
>control weeds for cosmetic purposes, or otherwise.
>
>As with other bylaws the city passes from time to time, much debate
>will ensue that will undoubtedly lead to a series of motions that
>either support or amend the recommendations being made by city staff.
>I will support a bylaw that protects public and animal health, allows
>room for dealing with dangerous infestations (such as the product used
>to control the mosquito population to reduce the risk of West Nile
>virus), continues to promote public education regarding alternatives
>and ensures proper maintenance of our sports fields and golf courses.
>
>If such a bylaw emerges as a final product then it will be one that
>councillors should support.
>
>Coun. Shawn Little
>Kitchissippi Ward
>
>(That sounds far too sensible to us)
>
>
><http://ottawasun.com/Comment/Letters/2005/10/19/pf-1268218.html>
>
>
>=====

>
>Oct 19 2005
>
>CBC News

>
>Ottawa City Councillors will weed through the Capital's proposed
>pesticide ban on Thursday.
>
>Hundreds of delegations are scheduled to make presentations to Ottawa's
>Health, Recreation and Social Services Committee.
>
>Chair Diane Holmes says there is enough support on the Committee to
>push the proposed ban forward to City Council next week.
>
>Holmes says the proposed bylaw is simply a reduction of the current
>pesticide usage in the city.
>
>Councillor Peter Hume says residents in his ward want a bylaw that is
>responsible.
>
>The proposed bylaw on pesticides is scheduled to take effect on Canada
>Day 2007.
>
><http://www.cfra.com/headlines/index.asp?cat=1&nid=33087>

>=====
>
>
>
>
>