

Subject: Re: Natural Steps and pesticide-use

Date: Fri, 12 Aug 2005 14:45:35 -0700

From: M E Craver <mecraver@shaw.ca>

To: Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

CC: Corrie Kost <corrie@kost.ca>, Ernie Crist <ernie_crist@dnv.org>, Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>, fonvca@fonvca.org, Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>, Senior Management Committee <managecomm@dnv.org>, James Ridge <James_Ridge@dnv.org>

Dear Corrie:

He said! She said! It is going to take a special Mayor and Council with backbone to make tough decisions about pesticide-use, among other hot issues (ie. Alpine Rec Study, Commercial Dog Walkers, etc. etc.) that clearly have a solid division between sides. Let's hope that the best men/women run in the election this coming October/November, and get elected for that job. We have to find a way of getting the electorate excited again -- not just "same old, same old". No matter what the end result is, there will always be a group of people dissatisfied with the hard decisions made. In the end, one of us is going to be very unhappy. I just hope it will not be me :-\ . See you in September, when we can debate the issues in person? Take care.

--Monica--

Corrie Kost wrote:

Dear Monica,

Please see comments below...

M E Craver wrote:

I think we are at an impasse, folks. Nothing is perfect in life. In everything there is a force, and an opposing force. Yin and yang, as it were. We will not be able to satisfy everyone with decisions. But it comes down to what we are adding to our soil, water and air. Two CN Rail accidents in the last couple days have dumped chemicals into the water. Whether we add these chemicals gradually, or in one big load, the fact is many do not "break down", and have a cumulative effect --that is

NaOH will nicely wash away when it rains. Oil products are another matter. Certified chemicals don't get approved unless they "break down". Of course "natural" products are exempt from this requirement.

obvious. Even government studies have "proved" that. The power that chemical, drug, and oil corporations have over government decisions is undeniable, but is it right?

Money talks but only people can vote - unfortunately not often enough, and often un-informed.

Who can truly say what the "safe" amount of chemical pesticides are? Why are people fixated on having "lush, green lawns, devoid of weeds", anyway? Why are we not looking for alternative ground covers that do not need the constant "priming" with pesticides and chemical fertilizers to exist? Green lush lawns, devoid of weeds, are existing in an unnatural state.

People enjoy their gardens. The choice of what they grow, how they grow should be up to them (as long as it does not impact neighbours - which can be pretty severe for those who let weeds run rampard). I think we still have bylaws limiting height of weeds ie. the "natural" stuff that grows in the wild.

One suggestion would be to start tossing out the turf, and adding native ground cover that needs no such priming by pesticides and chemical fertilizers, etc.

Perhaps we should place bylaws to the effect that any new home built, whether on new land, or existing land, will have to use native ground cover as opposed to green lawn turf, laden with chemical pesticides. I do not mind the native yarrow spreading over my lawn or the buttercups, daisies, white clover, etc. The long gangly dandelions that get unruly looking get plucked by hand. Watching the butterflies, bees and birds enjoy my lawn, pesticide free, is a welcome benefit, I enjoy!

Please no more big brother - I can just see the "plant police" going through the yards looking for roses, tulips etc.

Beauty is in the eye of the beholder. Lush green weed free lawns are "boring" and dull to me. They also signify possible pesticide use, and I

avoid it with my dog, as much as possible. But that is just me, and maybe some others?

Lush green weed free lawns don't always require pesticide use. Studies indicate there is no danger to dogs treading on lawns just treated with Weed-and-Feed. In fact they are safe even for babies to crawl on then and lick the grass - although I would not advise it.

Change starts small, and grows as people "warm" to a new idea. But we will not be able to please everyone, nor convince everyone that this is the best direction to take.. In this case, it is just a suggestion, and I believe, a valid one to look at.

As for suggestions ...

What about use of pesticides indoors?

Ironically the bylaw does not regulate the sale or use of pesticides indoors – even those meant to be used outdoors only. Many studies have shown that indoor air contains at least five (typically 10) times higher concentration of pesticides than outside air. Pesticides that break down within days outdoors can persist for years in carpets. This accounts for DDT being found in carpets some twenty years after it was outlawed. Of course toxins in carpets are not just restricted to pesticides. Levels of volatile organics proved much higher indoors than out. The chief source were ordinary consumer products such as air fresheners, cleaning compounds, moth-repellent crystals (or balls), toilet disinfectants –you name it. All this is particularly menacing to small children, who play on the floors, crawl on carpets and regularly place their hands in their mouths.

So why do local governments not act to protect us in these cases. Because enforcement is nearly impossible – as is banning the use of pesticides in our gardens. So what is the answer? Education, education, education. Give individuals the information to make appropriate decisions and the vast majority will do so.

A simple thing, like removing one's shoes before going indoors will improve the health of our residents more than a hundred bylaws of the type being proposed.

Corrie

--Monica Craver--

Corrie Kost wrote:

Dear Councillor Crist,

Call me old-fashioned - but I think what counts is the truth in this matter. Denigrating corporations or impugning the motives of government seems like a desperate attempt to avoid the truth - that pesticides are safe to use as directed. I find it odd that we don't hear a peep from certain groups when governments declare something unsafe, yet those same groups consistently cry foul when governments declare something safe. Why is that?

As for who has told lies - neither "side" has an unblemished record. We live in the safest society in history. Live the longest ever. Governments had nothing to do with that?

Now for the Myth of the Day:

“Natural” products are safer than “man-made” products.

It may come as a shock to know that fully 50% of chemicals that occur in nature are carcinogenic – the same % as in man-made chemicals – and natural chemicals vastly outnumber man-made ones. The most deadly substance known to man is the “natural” product botulin.

I know we have the same goals. I wish we could find some common ground here.

Corrie Kost

Ernie Crist wrote:

A MESSAGE FROM ERNIE CRIST

The previous e-mail was sent to you by mistake, I guess, I pressed the wrong button. Below is the corrected version - my apologies.

Ernie Crist

Subject: RE: Natural Steps and pesticide-use

The real issue and the one that Dr. Kost completely missed is not whether or not pesticides are safe or not per se but the fact that it is the corporations and the government, largely under corporate control, who told us that they are harmless. That point is crucial to the argument.

The question as to whether you can trust or not trust what it says on a label attached to a corporate produced can of pesticides reminds me of an old proverb which goes something like this "he who lies but once will not be believed again though may he speak the truth". Did you notice that the door is always left open by stating "harmless if used according to instructions". Are corporations lying? yes, they are, or at least exaggerating more often than not. Have they lied in the past? indeed they have - over and over again. There is hardly a day where we do not learn from reports that this is the case, including that pesticides and chemical agents are harmless. People pay dearly for those lies sometimes with their lives.

The key issue is that corporations today are the principle controllers of society including all levels of government and their agencies. Corporate influence reaches into every nook and cranny. This includes education, science, immigration, our economy, even the judicial and justice system and certainly our media and everything else of importance. Morality is that which serves corporations. If you don't believe this, watch the next TV program containing more than its share of gratuitous violence made possible by corporate paid commercials. Does this mean they are lying all the time, no. Does that mean they are not making good products? No, it does not mean that either. What it does mean, is that we cannot trust them to speak the truth.

In a society where corporations constitute the principle power, it is up to government to establish controls commensurate with the need to protect its citizens. Governments are supposed to be neutral but they are nothing of the sort, not anywhere but especially not in Canada and the US. Governments in both countries are today mainly extensions of global and mainly US corporations. Governments are doing the corporate bidding in each and every step of our lives.

The matter has been dealt with extensively over the last 50 years, including by some of the most outstanding scholars and intellectuals such as Sir John Kenneth Galbraith who, in his book "The New Industrial State" analyzed the corporation and its role in the modern state. Noam Chomsky, a distinguished American scholar and intellectual, dealt extensively with the corporate controlled media in more than one of his

books.

The public, through its democratic system i.e. the electoral process, has a certain influence over its government and the state but it is marginal at best. It is much like controlling the flight of a Boeing 747 from one of its passenger seats. Do you honestly believe that the newly elected MP Don Bell will risk his career to represent the interests of his constituents? Or do you think he will do as he is told by his corporate friends who have elected him and who are looking to him for help to push their agenda in Ottawa.

If the State were indeed neutral, Canada would not have a dollar worth 82 cents. Canada, because it has untold natural wealth and a hard working and skilled work force, could easily have the highest standard of living in the world; so why does it not? Take a guess? Do you honestly believe that the number one representative of corporate America in Canada namely the American ambassador would dare state in public and while in Canada that "we will develop the Alberta Tar Sands" unless he knew that the government of Canada is subservient to corporate America?

Or do you think that the Government of Canada would dare take money from the Unemployment Insurance Fund taken from the workers of Canada and put it into general revenue for the benefit of corporate Canada? Or do you think it is an accident that the very first step of the Campbell Liberals, following their election, was to give a tax break to corporations while eliminating social programs and having a good time downloading to municipalities?

And now Dr. Kost is asking us to trust what it says on the label of a can of pesticides sold by one of those corporations - I don't think so. And that is the issue which underlies all other issues. I did ask several housewives who have used some of the pesticides in question whether they trust what it says on the label and the answer was virtually a unanimous NO. The children got a skin rash and the dog got a cough, some of them said. I rest my case.

Ernie Crist

-----Original Message-----

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

Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 11:01 PM

To: Ernie Crist

Cc: Corrie Kost; M E Craver; Brian Platts; fonvca@fonvca.org; Mayor and Council - DNV; Senior Management Committee; James Ridge

Subject: Re: Natural Steps and pesticide-use

Ernie Crist wrote:

Dear Mrs Craver:

It is my opinion that anybody who uses harmful pesticides is an extremist - gullible maybe but an extremist just the same.

I fully agree. I just disagree that pesticides like 2,4-D in Weed-and-Feed, when used as directed, are harmful - either to the user, the neighbours, or the environment.

The evidence that pesticides are harmful is overwhelming and so is the fact that the producers of these harmful pesticides will do anything within their power to keep on producing regardless of damage to human health and/or the environment.

The evidence is certainly not overwhelming. In fact, from the scientific point of view there is no evidence at all that pesticides like 2,4-D is harmful when used as directed.

The last line of defence and their last refuge will be to accuse those who are opposed to their frenzy to make profit, of being ideologically motivated - this does not frighten me, of course, indeed I personally consider it to be a badge of honour for what could be more patriotic then to fight for a healthy environment and against those who, for money's sake, poison the globe. Unfortunately there are people who are intimidated by such tactics and give up the struggle, which is the purpose of the campaign in the first place.

I have no vested interest in any companies promoting pesticides. I rarely use ANY of these products. I am a strong common-sense supported for a healthy environment. I am not intimidated by either side of any debate.

I am for reason over emotion, for fact over guesswork, and dealing with issues in a sustainable fashion. The risk, if any, of using government approved pesticides is being taken by the private user, on private property. There is no external impacts that science is aware of (if the products are properly used).

Do you remember Vietnam and Agent Orange? It made a lot of money for the producers. The fact that the health of millions of children was ruined for the rest of their lives is rarely reported on. Many of the companies who waxed rich on Agent Orange are the same ones who are producing pesticides - remember it and remember it well.

Good point, but we still buy automobiles from the same factories that were used to drive the machinery of past wars. I recall WW1 companies making mustard gas (Chlorine) - and they now make it for peaceful uses - that have given enormous health benefits. Make no mistake about this - if a product should be declared unsafe - these same companies will be producing the new ones - and be making more money in the process.

However, if these extremists including those who have been misled are willing to see the error of their ways and join the ranks of progress, we should certainly welcome them with open arms.

Similarly, we should welcome with open arms, even if they won't admit their errors, those who are inadvertently setting back the environmental

movement by misleading the people with unsubstantiated fear mongering.

Corrie Kost

Ernie Crist,

From: Corrie Kost [<mailto:kost@triumf.ca>]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 1:42 PM
To: M E Craver
Cc: Ernie Crist; Brian Platts; fonvca@fonvca.org; Mayor and Council - DNV; Senior Management Committee; James Ridge
Subject: Re: Natural Steps and pesticide-use

Dear Monica Craver,

I wish life were as simple as Bush put it.. "you are either for us or againsts us". Extreme positions - both ways are almost always wrong.

Everything should always remain open to debate. That is how progress

is made.

The "Natural Steps" are just that - steps. Zero tolerance banning is

not a step - it is ideological extremism.

Corrie Kost

M E Craver wrote:

Dear Councillor Crist and Mr. Platts:

Has anyone bothered to address the criteria in the "Natural Steps Framework"? If there is sincere effort to put the Natural Steps

criteria to work within DNV, then the arguments for pesticide use automatically become null and void. We cannot keep straddling the fence and delaying the "inevitable". Either we are for the Natural Step Communities criteria, or not! If we are, pesticide-use arguments

become "moot" (modern usage: "not worth debating"). If we are not, then pesticide-use arguments become "moot" (original usage: "open to debate"). Point taken?

Monica Craver

Ernie Crist wrote:

Dear Mrs Craver:

Corporations producing toxic pesticides will be pleased to hear that there is continued support by sections of the public for the production, distribution and sale of toxic pesticides when they could be forced to produce products without causing harm to human health. Natural agents like organic food is more expensive we have been told. Of course we were also told that the Pinto produced by

the Ford Motor Company was safe. Unfortunately, some people believed it and paid with their lives.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating as the saying goes. Facts are stubborn things and the facts are that asthma related diseases among the population, but especially among children are escalating and much of this is due to the increasing use of toxins

from pesticides ending up in the atmosphere and the soil. It adds to the stock of toxic pollutants adding to the progressive poisoning of the world around us. Canada is one of the world's worst offenders and per capita is on par with the other corporate controlled power, namely

the US. It is little wonder that the US has refused to sign the KYOTO agreement.

Lack of public protest is of course music to the ears of the corporate leaders and saves them a great deal of money and bother and surely money is what this is all about. The human brain evolved through direct experience with the physical world around us. In such an environment well being translates into convenience and what

is more convenient than to poison pests from a corporate produced spray can bought in the store. Besides, we can always pretend it is not toxic, after all it says so right on the corporate produced spray can does it not?

What is apparently lacking on the part of the apologists of this corporate agenda is a fundamental understanding of the subversive, corrupting and anti social effects of the corporate mentality. It is also convenient since it saves us the trouble to challenge and go to war against powerful corporations, their paid scientists and their paid lawyers not to speak of our neighbours some of whom have also been brainwashed.

Ernie Crist

From: Brian Platts [<mailto:bplatts@shaw.ca>]
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2005 9:10 PM
To: Ernie Crist; M E Craver
Cc: Corrie Kost; fonvca@fonvca.org; Mayor and Council
- DNV; Senior Management Committee; James Ridge
Subject: Re: FW: pesticides and herbicides

Dear Coun. Crist & Ms. Craver,

Statements such as "anything which kills insects and/or bugs also kills people" rings of hysteria. This kind of thinking is not based on science, logic or even common sense. It is based instead on emotion and dogma. As Corrie Kost pointed-out, EVERY substance CAN be harmful to life; it is only a matter of dosage. For example, there are documented cases of healthy people having died from drinking copious amounts of bottled water. No one denies that ingesting or being exposed to anything at an extreme dosage can be

harmful to human health.

Consider that beer is good for killing slugs. Of course alcohol can be extremely toxic and can kill you either quickly

or over time by prolonged abuse. Yet countless studies show that moderate alcohol consumption, particularly red wine, can be excellent for your health. Consider also, do you ever swim in a pool or drink tap water? I don't need to tell you that both are treated with chlorine which, at the right dose, is about as deadly a substance as you can find anywhere, but used properly is a benefit to human health.

Don't forget you also probably wash some of your clothes with a small amount of chlorine bleach. Sodium Hydroxide which was spilled in that recent train derailment near Squamish and unfortunately killed some fish in a creek is widely used in making soap and is probably an ingredient in every cleaning substance you have in your homes. Have you or any of your kids ever picked-up head lice? Well, the only shampoo able to get rid of the nasty and socially embarrassing problem

is really just an insecticidal soap -- and you have to scrub your head

with it! Have you ever used mosquito repellent? Well, it's a chemical

too. I could go on.

The reason why some municipal governments have passed bans on safe pesticide use isn't because there is a greater awareness

or environmental responsibility at the local level, but rather, municipal governments are by far the easiest level of government for the irrational anti-pesticide movement to "pick off." As I said in an earlier e-mail, beyond the campaign to ban safe pesticides, there are people convinced -- without any scientific basis -- that cell phones or overhead power lines are causing cancers. Others say that electrical appliances are making them sick. You can even find groups demanding, in the interest of health, a ban on wearing perfume

fragrances in public.

In spite of people living longer and healthier lives than ever before,

we are increasingly, and irrationally, afraid of the latest and trendiest health scares.

When it comes to the safe use of pesticides, a one litre squirt bottle of selective herbicide or insecticide (or 2-4-D weed & feed) used occasionally in my family's garden is of no health threat to anyone. However, my adjacent neighbour's noxious "Horse Tail" weeds

and spreading blackberry vines are a direct threat to the use and enjoyment of my garden which my family takes pride in, and spends a great deal of time and money, not to mention hard work, to maintain and keep beautiful thereby benefiting the surrounding neighbourhood.

Sincerely,
-Brian

Ernie Crist wrote:

Dear Mrs. Craver;

So there is no misunderstanding on the question of pesticides - yes they are harmful to human health - anything which kills insects and/or bugs also kills people. Of course everything is relative and it stands to reason that the amount of poison needed to kill an insect is less than that needed to kill a human. Also, some humans show more resistance to poison than others. The Russian Monk Rasputin had to be given ten times the amount of poison necessary to kill an average Russian. But then Rasputin was no ordinary man, he was not even an ordinary Russian. He was, as the saying goes, one tough cookie.

On the other hand, the accumulation of poisons

in the human body does kill. It just takes longer. Nobody has ever died from one cigarette but smoking, over a longer period of time, will definitely kill. As to the contention that there is no scientific evidence to the effect that pesticides are not harmful to human health?..... This is outside the realm of logic. The burden of proof that this is NOT so does not rest with you but with those who

deny this.

Providing evidence that there are no Aliens in our midst, is NOT your responsibility. The proof that there are, rather rests with those who

claim they are here. Stephen Hawking suggested if they were here they would have surely visited him to set him straight on his theories.

I do remember a time when scientific evidence,

corporate paid scientists and corporate lawyers claimed that asbestos was NOT harmful, ditto with smoking, but asbestos was harmful and smoking was harmful. It just took the scientists a little longer to figure this out than the people with whom I worked with in the the shipyard.

The evidence that pesticides are harmful to human health is overwhelming. A visit to the cancer ward should convince anybody. I believe a lot of people have figured this out already which is why they are buying more and more organically grown food. Even my cat, Willie, prefers organically grown food to that laced with pesticides. Frogs, having been around longer than we have, apparently, know it too.

Ernie Crist

From: M E Craver [<mailto:mecraver@shaw.ca>]
Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2005 2:28 PM
To: Corrie Kost
Cc: Ernie Crist
Subject: Re: FW: pesticides and herbicides

But, Corrie, I am harmed by others' use of pesticides, whether it harms them or not. It is like second-hand smoke (and, yes, I am affected by that, too) Have you heard of homeopathic medicine? Science cannot measure the minute dilutions and the way homeopathics works, so they "pooh-pooh" it as quackery.

Just because it is "undetectable", does not make it safe. It still kills weeds and insects, doesn't it? --thus, harms us also! Meanwhile, it has been proven homeopathics works --placebo/infant studies in the Lancet Medical Journal has proven it.

It works on me, my son's hayfever, and of course, the long-lived Royal family, the Windsors.

Yes, prohibition does not work, but that should not keep us from trying to severely restrict pesticide usage. I will not bother to argue modern man-made chemical medicines. Some work, and some kill, and all have grave potential side-effects -- you just have to read the warnings in American magazines advertising these

Wonder medicines, and news as of late.. There have been many deaths by medicinal iatrogenics, both inside and outside of hospitals. We cannot always take the experts' and professionals' word concerning safety of chemical pesticides/medication. Take care. We agree to

disagree?

Monica Craver

Corrie Kost wrote:

Dear Monica Craver,

I think you may be missing an important point. You have every right to refuse to use any product. You have no right to deny others to use them if no one is harmed by them doing so.

I am now reasonably familiar with the safety factors of applying chemicals to lawns. They are typically in the range of 10,000 below any detectable effects on the person applying them - and that is when they are used more than average and over much larger lawns than we have - and with little or no clothing on! For the

adjacent lands the factor is in the millions.

Your barbeque (assuming you have one)

has a far greater impact on the neighbours!

It is also obvious that even many naturally occurring substances are harmful if care is not taken on their use. Just because things are man-made does not make them any more unsafe. Misuse by users - be it alcohol, radiation, chlorine, ammonia, sugar, pesticides is what makes them unsafe (compared to

the benefits).

As for our survival - without man-made chemicals and medicines most of us would not be alive today. This does not mean we cannot do better.

By all means - let's promote safer products, but as history has shown, prohibition

does not work!

Corrie Kost

M E Craver wrote:

Dear Councillor Crist and Dr. Kost:

It is very obvious that man-made chemical pesticides are dangerous. I am living proof of that. Lyle's grandfather was proof of that. Both of us were poisoned by pesticides.

Lyle's grandfather, now deceased, suffered from the effects of "government approved commercial application" of DDT poisoning. I am suffering from increasing chemical sensitivity from pesticide poisoning in the mid-eighties, from "government approved commercial application"

of whatever was used to curtail cockroaches in the apartment complex we were living in at the time. Remember the saying, "Unsafe at any speed"?

Pesticides, no matter who applies them, is "unsafe with any application".

Meanwhile to keep as healthy as possible, I take omega 3-6-9 oils, vitamins and minerals, and immune enhancers. And I avoid use of any chemicals, as much as possible. And no pesticides! There are natural remedies to get rid of pests from ants to mice, and they have all worked. It may require a little more work, and the results are not instantaneous -- but do work!

A relative who worked in the lawn care business, is now on disability, as the pesticides applied to the rolls of turf poisoned her. Dig deep enough, and you will find that people working in lawn care do suffer from the effects, also -- themselves, or family members. The cumulative effects are still there, so it does not matter if a weaker solution is applied or not. It may also depend on our physical make-up and DNA as to who will be "affected" and who will not. That does not mean it is safe! Of course we know that the chemical brew that is already inside our bodies from before birth and mixing in the air and water to create "who knows what?" is not good for us. So why add more to the mixture?

I have no patience for the "whining" of those lawn care folks and the people who hire them -- because there are safe and natural solutions out there! Meanwhile, my health suffers from the continual commercial application of pesticides on

neighbouring lawns. Why should I have to continually run around the house closing windows on a hot summer day, to protect myself from pesticides and chemical fertilizers being applied downwind? I am strongly on the side of Councillor Crist on this one, Dr. Kost. This

is a fight for Survival!

The chemical and drug companies work hand in hand. Cancer drugs are created by the same companies that make pesticides. They have the government in their pockets. Pesticides are "unsafe with any application". I, in the meantime, do not wish to die proving it.

Sincerely,
Monica Craver
<http://www.pesticidefreeyards.org>

<>Dear Dr.Kost:

On this one there is no meeting of the minds. I want to pursue a totally new approach - a quantum leap, as in organically grown food as in prohibiting the production, sale and smoking of cigarettes or as in treating and neutralising all effluents including storm waters, before discharging them into the water. This is a war and requires a more than business as usual approach. It is, in fact, part and parcel of a total war for survival - that is TOTAL WAR FOR SURVIVAL. <> What you are suggesting would leave a loop hole and would require a huge and utterly ineffectual bureaucracy and an even more extensive degree of co-operation from a totally irresponsible and totally ignorant people, who could not care less

about the environment.

It is like asking a shark to co-operate to save seals. This is the majority I am talking about. I listen to them on CKNW Radio on occasion - it is frightening.

My mind is made up - the production, sale and use of all pesticides other than those organically grown and derived from natural products, must be banned. That's it for me.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist

From: Corrie Kost
<mailto:kost@triumf.ca>
Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2005 8:56

AM

To: Ernie Crist
Subject: Re: FW: pesticides and
herbicides

Dear Councillor Crist,

I consider only Scientific American
and Nature as reasonably reliable.

I certainly do look at the big

picture.

That is why these type of bylaws
bother me. They can put the whole
environmental program in disrepute (eg. cry wolf syndrome).

Of course the planet is being

poisoned.

With so many people it cannot be
otherwise. There are no harmless
products. Home pesticide remedies are often
far less safe than the government
approved products. It has not been shown that
bylaws have been (all-inclusive) cost
effective nor attained the desired effect - namely
harm reduction. Note also that
"Professionals", using far more potent (read "commercial" as opposed

to

"domestic") versions of products are
far more likely to suffer related health problems and
will tend to use solutions that result

in repeat business (profit being paramount).

It is important that public facilities

play a leading role in realistic, believable, and
cost effective environmental harm
reduction.

The adage "those in glass houses
should not throw stones" comes to mind.

Corrie Kost

Ernie Crist wrote:

Dear Dr. Kost:

I read "Scientific American",
"Nature", "Discover", "Der Spiegel", I
even read "US Business" and the
"Economist" and the message to varying

degrees is, we must change course. If
"US Business" rings the alarm
bell, believe me we should all be
concerned. I don't keep those
magazines. It is a strategic

necessity.

Always remember the big picture.
We must step outside the little box.
The planet is being poisoned. It
is a fact which in typical corporate
fashion is being denied and or
marginalised. As long as we make
concessions there is no incentive to
produce truly harmless products.

Ernie Crist.

-----Original Message-----

From: Corrie Kost

[\[mailto:corrie@kost.ca\]](mailto:corrie@kost.ca)

Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2005 11:33

PM

To: Ernie Crist

Subject: Re: FW: pesticides and

herbicides

Dear Councillor Crist,

Too bad you did not save them.

You should know that every substance
on this planet is harmful to life -
it is only a matter of dosage. The
statement "pesticides are harmful or
they are not" is thus not a scientific

statement. We should deal with
this matter in a factual - not
emotional, manner. Exaggerated risk
underlies a lot of the junk science on

this issue - leading to dogma and
the resulting bad policies. I have to

believe that reason and rational
thinking will prevail. I look forward
to a reasoned debate and trust you
will keep an open mind in this issue.

Corrie Kost

Ernie Crist wrote:

Dear Dr. Kost

I did not save them. However, the evidence is overwhelming and the logic inescapable. The flaw in your position is evident in the statement "when used as indicated". Pesticides are either harmful or they are not.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist

-----Original Message-----

From: Corrie Kost

[\[mailto:kost@triumf.ca\]](mailto:kost@triumf.ca)

Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2005 5:20

PM

To: Ernie Crist
Subject: Re: FW: pesticides and herbicides

Dear Councillor Crist,

Kindly forward any and all articles which indicate that "domestic" grade pesticides are a health hazard when used as indicated on the package(s).

Corrie Kost

Ernie Crist wrote:

From: Ernie Crist
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2005 5:00

PM

To: 'Bob Huen'; DNVCouncil
Subject: RE: pesticides and herbicides

Dear Mr. Huen

Needless to say there is much logic in what you say and I would never

agree to a ban of pesticides no matter

what, as long we ourselves
are using pesticides. Unfortunately,
there is no support from the
senior

levels of government and it looks like

we at the local level have to
strike the first blow and maybe this
is the way it should be since
everything starts at the local level.

As for allowing private companies to
continue using pesticides?....
this cannot be a long term solution
either as those who live adjacent

to such properties will tell you not
to mention the big picture which

is indeed frightening to say the

least.

The scientific material made

available to me for reading in the
last few months is cause for alarm

and that is all I can tell you.
However, this matter will be returned

to Council for further discussion and
deliberation.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist

From: Bob Huen

[\[mailto:bobhuen@shaw.ca\]](mailto:bobhuen@shaw.ca)

Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2005 3:03

PM

To: DNVCouncil
Subject: pesticides and herbicides

Mayor and Councilors,

I find it amazing that you would consider banning pesticides used by professional lawn care companies but allow private individuals to purchase these chemicals and possibly misuse them. I am equally astonished that you would allow the parks board and golf courses to use

them and expose the public to them while banning the use on private property where access is controlled. You have it backwards. I suggest

banning the sale and use of these products by private individuals and

only allow trained professionals to apply them. Your plan would only lead to a much greater misuse of these

chemicals by private

individuals.

Bob Huen 920 Shakespeare Avenue North

Vancouver V7K 2Y9

Name: winmail.dat
winmail.dat Type: application/ms-tnef
Encoding: base64
Download Status: Not downloaded with message