

Fourth Session – Forty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
Standing Committee
on
Agriculture and Food

Chairperson
Mr. Ian Wishart
Constituency of Portage la Prairie

Vol. LXXVI No. 1 - 6 p.m., Wednesday, October 5, 2022

ISSN 1708-6647

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Forty-Second Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
AL TOMARE, Nello	Transcona	NDP
ASAGWARA, Uzoma	Union Station	NDP
BRAR, Diljeet	Burrows	NDP
BUSHIE, Ian	Keewatinook	NDP
CLARKE, Eileen, Hon.	Agassiz	PC
COX, Cathy	Kildonan-River East	PC
CULLEN, Cliff, Hon.	Spruce Woods	PC
DRIEDGER, Myrna, Hon.	Roblin	PC
EICHLER, Ralph	Lakeside	PC
EWASKO, Wayne, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
FONTAINE, Nahanni	St. Johns	NDP
FRIESEN, Cameron, Hon.	Morden-Winkler	PC
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GOERTZEN, Kelvin, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
GORDON, Audrey, Hon.	Southdale	PC
GUENTER, Josh	Borderland	PC
GUILLEMARD, Sarah, Hon.	Fort Richmond	PC
HELWER, Reg, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
ISLEIFSON, Len	Brandon East	PC
JOHNSON, Derek, Hon.	Interlake-Gimli	PC
JOHNSTON, Scott, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
KHAN, Obby	Fort Whyte	PC
KINEW, Wab	Fort Rouge	NDP
LAGASSÉ, Bob	Dawson Trail	PC
LAGIMODIERE, Alan, Hon.	Selkirk	PC
LAMONT, Dougald	St. Boniface	Lib.
LAMOUREUX, Cindy	Tyndall Park	Lib.
LATHLIN, Amanda	The Pas-Kameesak	NDP
LINDSEY, Tom	Flin Flon	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Malaya	Notre Dame	NDP
MARTIN, Shannon	McPhillips	PC
MICHALESKI, Brad	Dauphin	PC
MICKLEFIELD, Andrew	Rossmere	PC
MORLEY-LECOMTE, Janice	Seine River	PC
MOSES, Jamie	St. Vital	NDP
NAYLOR, Lisa	Wolseley	NDP
NESBITT, Greg, Hon.	Riding Mountain	PC
PEDERSEN, Blaine	Midland	PC
PIWNIUK, Doyle, Hon.	Turtle Mountain	PC
REDHEAD, Eric	Thompson	NDP
REYES, Jon, Hon.	Waverley	PC
SALA, Adrien	St. James	NDP
SANDHU, Mintu	The Maples	NDP
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield-Ritchot	PC
SMITH, Andrew, Hon.	Lagimodière	PC
SMITH, Bernadette	Point Douglas	NDP
SMOOK, Dennis	La Vérendrye	PC
SQUIRES, Rochelle, Hon.	Riel	PC
STEFANSON, Heather, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
TEITSMA, James	Radisson	PC
WASYLIW, Mark	Fort Garry	NDP
WHARTON, Jeff, Hon.	Red River North	PC
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	NDP
WISHART, Ian	Portage la Prairie	PC
WOWCHUK, Rick	Swan River	PC
<i>Vacant</i>	Kirkfield Park	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FOOD

Wednesday, October 5, 2022

TIME – 6 p.m.

LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba

**CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Ian Wishart
(Portage la Prairie)**

**VICE-CHAIRPERSON – Mrs. Cathy Cox
(Kildonan-River East)**

ATTENDANCE – 6 QUORUM – 4

Members of the committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Johnson, Wharton

Mrs. Cox, Ms. Naylor, Messrs. Wiebe, Wishart

APPEARING:

Hon. Jon Gerrard, MLA for River Heights

PUBLIC PRESENTERS:

Anne Lindsey, private citizen

Katharina Stieffenhofer, private citizen

Glen Koroluk, Manitoba Eco-Network

Wendy Buelow, private citizen

Cameron Wilson, Neudorff North America

Yanik Sourisseau, private citizen

David Hinton, Manitoba Nursery Landscape Association

Josh Brandon, Social Planning Council of Winnipeg

Shirley Forsyth, private citizen

Steve Rauh, private citizen

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:

Denys Volkov, Association of Manitoba Municipalities

Joanne Seiff, private citizen

Murray Cunningham, Environmental Health Association of Manitoba

Ben Raber, private citizen

Vicki Burns, private citizen

Meg Sears, Prevent Cancer Now

Randall McQuaker, private citizen

MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

*Bill 22–The Environment Amendment Act
(Pesticide Restrictions)*

* * *

Clerk Assistant (Mr. Tim Abbott): Good evening, everyone. Will the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Food please come to order.

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

Hon. Derek Johnson (Minister of Agriculture): I nominate MLA Wishart.

Clerk Assistant: Mr. Wishart has been nominated. Any other nominations?

Hearing none, Mr. Wishart, please take the Chair.

Mr. Chairperson: Our next item of business is to elect a Vice-Chairperson. Are there any nominations?

Mr. Johnson: I nominate MLA Cox.

Mr. Chairperson: MLA Cox has been nominated. Are there any other nominations?

Hearing no other nominations, MLA Cox is elected Vice-Chairperson.

This meeting has been called to consider Bill 22, The Environment Amendment Act (Pesticide Restrictions).

I'd like to inform all in attendance of the provisions of our rules regarding the hour of adjournment. A standing committee meeting to consider a bill must not sit past midnight to hear public presentations or to consider clause by clause of the bill, except by unanimous consent of the committee.

For written submissions, written submissions for the following members have been received and distributed to the committee: Denys Volkov, Association of Manitoba Municipalities; Joanne Seiff, private citizen; Murray Cunningham, Environmental Health Association of Manitoba; and Ben Raber, private citizen.

Does the committee agree to have this document appear in Hansard transcript of the meeting? *[Agreed]*

Prior to proceeding with the public presentations, I would like to advise members of the public regarding the process for speaking in committee.

In accordance with our rules, a time limit of 10 minutes has been allocated for presentation with another five minutes allowed for questions from this—from committee members. Questions from members must not exceed 30 seconds in length with no time limit on the answers.

Questions must be addressed to the presenter in the following rotation: first, the minister sponsoring the bill; second, the member of the official opposition; and, third, an independent member.

If a presenter is not in attendance when the 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 the second time, they will be removed from the presenters list.

The proceedings of our meetings are recorded in order to provide a 'verbatim'—verbatim transcript. Each time someone wishes to speak, whether it is an MLA or a presenter, I first must call that person's name. This is a signal for the Hansard recorder to turn the mics on and off.

During presentations—list is over here somewhere.

Bill 22—The Environment Amendment Act (Pesticide Restrictions)

Mr. Chairperson: I will now call on Margaret Friesen, private citizen.

Point of Order

Hon. Derek Johnson (Minister of Agriculture): Were we—point of order.

Were we were going to maybe decide on rotations? Possibly we could have consideration for in-person, out-of-town presenters to present first.

Mr. Chairperson: Is there agreement to consider that? *[Agreed]*

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, and—we will vary the order, then, by—and call on first any in-person, out-of-town presenters, if there are any.

Seeing none identifying themselves, we will—*[interjection]* Yes. We'll revert to the order as presented here.

Okay, going back to where we were, Margaret Friesen, private citizen, as first presenter.

Not seeing her in attendance, she will drop to the bottom of the list. We'll move on—and she'll be called again when we get to that point.

Second person on the list is Shirley Forsyth, private citizen. I'll call again Shirley Forsyth, private citizen. No one here coming forward, dropped to the bottom of the list and will be called again at that point. *[interjection]* Yes.

Third person on the list is Katharina Stieffenhofer, private citizen. Call again—*[interjection]* They will be called again. Okay, we will continue down the list.

Fourth person is Anne Lindsey, private citizen. She's here. We're—oh. She's here? Is—we're in agreement to revert to—*[interjection]*

An Honourable Member: Point of order.

Point of Order

Mr. Chairperson: Point of order, Mr. Minister.

An Honourable Member: Can you continue, Mr. Chair—*[interjection]* Yes, recognize me.

Mr. Chairperson: Minister Wharton.

Hon. Jeff Wharton (Minister of Environment, Climate and Parks): We were calling Anne Lindsey, and I think we should continue with calling Anne Lindsey. I believe she's here.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, well we—*[interjection]* We will revert back at due course.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: So, currently, we are calling Anne Lindsey, private citizen.

Anne Lindsey, thank you for coming. Are you ready to make your presentation?

Anne Lindsey (Private Citizen): Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Begin your presentation.

A. Lindsey: Thanks very much for having me here and the opportunity to present this evening.

I am a member of the coalition known as Cosmetic Pesticide Ban Manitoba. We are a group of volunteer representatives from environmental and health organizations from around the province. We work actively towards reducing unnecessary chemical exposure from chemical—from cosmetic pesticides.

* (18:10)

I would like to note a letter that we sent to Ministers Wharton and Gordon, endorsed by more than 30 prominent health and environmental groups, including the Manitoba college of physicians, the Winnipeg Humane Society, Learning Disabilities Association of Manitoba, Manitoba Health Coalition, David Suzuki Foundation and so on more than three months ago on this topic. We have not received a response.

My main focus this evening will be on human health, and I understand that others will speak to impacts on ecosystems and water. So, my personal first awareness of cosmetic pesticides—when my children were very young. So, we're going back 40 years. It's not something that we used at our home, but we started to notice they were being used on things like soccer fields, in parks. We also noticed a strong odour in neighbourhoods after chemical trucks were spraying.

At the same time, we were becoming aware of mosquito fogging, the chemicals used on food products and air pollutants. And as a conscientious young parent, I wanted to ensure the safest possible environment for my children, so we tried to avoid chemicals when we did not have to be exposed to them. Didn't have a lot of information back then, but I had an inherent sense that we were surrounded by a lot of chemicals.

Once I started work in the environmental movement at the Manitoba Eco-Network, I started to become more aware. I was exposed to experts, various NGOs and different policy work at the provincial, national and international level that indicated that the miraculous chemicals that we've all become so accustomed to using in everyday life had lots of undesired impacts on health and ecosystems. This included pesticides being used to keep lawns and green space weed free.

I hope the committee members have taken the time to consult research on this, and I'm going to give one example. The Ontario College of Family Physicians in 2012 did a systemic review of pesticide health effects. They reviewed hundreds of studies and concluded that exposure to pesticides is strongly linked to a wide variety of human health problems—and I'm going to name them—including: adverse reproductive, neurological and respiratory outcomes, Parkinson's disease, asthma, obstructive lung disease, ALS, diabetes and some cancers. I name them because who amongst us has not had a family member or friend who's been affected by these illnesses?

Who's most at risk? Amongst other groups, our children. Both prenatal exposures and exposures in the early years can lead to birth defects, learning disorders and certain cancers. These facts alone mean that restrictions and bans on cosmetic pesticides should be a no-brainer.

The Ontario college concluded that unnecessary pesticide exposure should be avoided, and that echoes Health Canada in their 2007 publication, and I quote: It is good practice to reduce or eliminate any unnecessary exposure to pesticides. Unquote.

I want to emphasize that these chemicals are unnecessary by nature. They are used for purely aesthetic purposes. And we know that green space and lawns can be created and maintained without the use of chemicals. At the Eco-Network, we developed educational programs to assist people who wanted to keep their lawns and green space looking nice without the use of chemicals. Hundreds, if not thousands of people took those workshops. They were able then to reduce their family's exposure, but unfortunately, when restrictions don't exist, individuals may not use them but families are still exposed in their neighbourhoods, parks and so on. People breathe in these chemicals when they walk to school, when they spend time outside. This is why restrictions on sale and use are so important.

Municipalities led the way on this issue. The town of Hudson in Quebec in 1991 had a bylaw restricting chemical—the use of cosmetic pesticides. They were challenged by two big corporations, ChemLawn and Spraytech, which said they didn't have the right to pass such a bylaw. However, every court, up to the Supreme Court of Canada, agreed with Hudson that they had every right to protect the health and welfare of their citizens, and this became a landmark ruling in Canada.

More municipalities followed, and then provinces. Manitoba was late to the game, but in 2014, we joined the majority of Canadians under protection from cosmetic pesticides. So we've benefitted from six years of cleaner, healthier environments here.

As far as I know, Manitoba would be the first jurisdiction to roll back such restrictions if Bill 22 passes. This is a major move backwards, and it's a great shame. It puts people and ecosystems at risk.

I just want to address a couple of points that seem to be driving this legislation. The first one is to do with

costs, and I'm aware of the lobbying by rural municipalities about how much more it costs them to maintain green space.

In fact, the Canadian association of physicians for environment conducted a study a few years back now, looking at municipalities and different jurisdictions under cosmetic pesticide bans, and they found that none of them were spending significantly more to maintain acceptable green spaces.

I'm wondering if committee members have asked themselves, what are the costs to health-care system from the potential outcomes of exposure to these chemicals? They are hard to quantify, for sure, but inevitably, they will be much higher to society at large.

What about the heartache, stress and loss to families when cancers and neurodevelopmental problems arise? Should we be known as the province that puts the aesthetics of weed-free lawns ahead of people's health? Not to mention the impacts on animals, ecosystems and waterways, which some of the other presenters will be addressing.

The second piece that seems to be commonly touted by the government is Health Canada's approval of use of cosmetic pesticide as directed by the label. I just want to draw your attention to some other submissions that call—speak to the inadequacies of the pest management regulatory agency's process.

Briefly, it is risk based. That means PMRA decides whether the risks of exposure are acceptable. They don't say it's safe. Surely, determination of risk is something that families can decide.

Second, they rely primarily on industry studies. They don't consider the impacts of the chemical soup that I mentioned earlier; the fact that chemicals—cosmetic pesticide chemicals don't exist outside of all the other chemicals that we're constantly exposed to.

And, third, they have a strong history of withdrawing approvals when new information comes out, and that means that people have spent years being exposed to these chemicals before the approval has been withdrawn.

I just want to repeat, in conclusion, that caution from Health Canada, quote: It is good practice to reduce or eliminate any unnecessary exposure to pesticides. Unquote.

Bill 22, if passed, will do the opposite. It will increase exposure to unnecessary pesticides. Quite simply, more people will be harmed.

I and the Cosmetic Pesticide Ban Manitoba coalition, strongly urge that Bill 22 be withdrawn, and that concludes my remarks.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Thank you, Anne Lindsey for your presentation.

I would remind members of the committee, before we call for questions, that the questions are in the following rotation: minister sponsoring the bill; member of the official opposition; and independent member.

Are there questions for Ms. Lindsey?

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Ms. Lindsey, for coming down tonight; really appreciate you providing the information that, obviously, you and your organization work hard at every single day.

And certainly we appreciate that. That's why democracy, and that's why committee, is so important; that we can understand from regular Manitobans exactly what their feelings are as we go forward providing policy and legislation for the betterment of Manitobans.

One question I did have for you is—and you made a comment near your closing about risk is something that families can and should decide. I think we agree with that comment, definitely.

We know that we're dealing with a federally approved product. I know that you had cited some areas that were in conflict of that. You also talked about some other issues with the federal requirements.

Could you maybe highlight some of the areas again that you heard from the federal side that are contradictive of the 350 scientists that say that cosmetic pesticides are safe?

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Lindsey, and a reminder to those asking questions, 30 seconds to ask questions.

Thank you.

A. Lindsey: I would just like to contradict your final comment, that Health Canada does not say that pesticides are safe. In fact, I think it might even be illegal to say that pesticides are safe, but I—don't quote me on that.

* (18:20)

Sure, they have a lot of scientists at the PMRA. As noted, they take a risk-based approach, which

means they decide for us what is the acceptable risk when using chemicals that they're approving.

To my mind, if there is a risk, as highlighted by the many physicians that are a part of the Ontario College of Family Physicians, of any of the illnesses and diseases that I spoke about, my choice would be to say for an unnecessary exposure, I won't take that risk.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Lindsey.

Ms. Lisa Naylor (Wolseley): Thank you so much for being here tonight. I appreciate your comments, and I appreciate all the work that you've done in the community on this important issue.

You closed with a quote—just towards the end, there was a quote. I believe it was from Health Canada. I just wanted to clarify that.

Could you repeat that quote again for the record? I just wanted to hear that in full. *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Sorry, my error. MLA—or, sorry, Ms. Lindsey. Please, go ahead.

A. Lindsey: Yes. The quote—should I repeat that, then?

The quote is from Health Canada. It's a publication in 2007. I think it's called pesticides in health. The quote is: It is good practice to reduce or eliminate any unnecessary exposure to pesticides. Unquote. And so, that is a blanket exposure to pesticides that they're talking about.

But I will point out that even though that was 2007, the kinds of cosmetic pesticides that we're talking about really haven't changed since then. It's the same kind of chemicals that are still being used and, therefore, I think it is worth it to take this advice from Health Canada.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): The minister has—

Mr. Chairperson: MLA, sorry, go ahead.

Mr. Gerrard: The minister has repeatedly referred to 350 scientists, but has never given out a list of these, and we suspect that a large majority of those are not involved in assessing this particular group of chemicals.

But I think that the important point that you make is that safety for kids is important, and I suspect that it's not just health, but education, extra expenses, because you've got kids with learning problems, and kids with learning problems very often are frustrated,

go on to be juvenile delinquents and crimes. So there's a cost in the justice system.

Has anybody really done an assessment of what the total cost is?

A. Lindsey: Not that I'm aware of.

I think it goes without saying that even, probably, a single person that has to be hospitalized for cancer, probably the cost for that over the course of that person's life will be in excess of any extra costs that a municipality has to incur by rejecting the use of chemicals. So, I don't—you know, it would be interesting to see those kinds of costs quantified.

But I think common sense tells us that if we don't really need to use these substances, then why are we doing it. It makes no sense at all.

Mr. Chairperson: Time for questions has now expired.

Thank you very much for the presentation, Ms. Lindsey.

We will call the next presenter, and I will remind the MLAs present that 30 seconds is all that's allowed for questions, and we will enforce that. *[interjection]* Oh, we're going back?

We will call Katharina Stieffenhofer, private citizen.

Ms. Stieffenhofer, would you please proceed with your presentation.

Katharina Stieffenhofer (Private Citizen): My name is Katharina Stieffenhofer. I am an award-winning documentary filmmaker with an interest in environmental justice and community health. I'm also a passionate vegetable and flower gardener, and I grow plenty of healthy foods without the use of chemical pesticides or synthetic fertilizers. I also enjoy urban and forest foraging for wild foods and medicines.

I am strongly opposed to any rollbacks of the non-essential pesticide ban as proposed in Bill 22, which should be withdrawn, as it is a step backward. We desperately need to reduce the accumulation of toxic chemicals in our environments and their harmful effects on the health of all life forms.

I have been diagnosed with breast cancer twice. And I agree with the Canadian Cancer Society's directive of a phase-out of cosmetic pesticides on golf courses; sporting facilities; home, vegetable and fruit gardens.

Therefore, I'm asking for an expansion of the cosmetic pesticide ban rather than a rollback, including the following.

Golf courses and sporting facilities: Pesticides used should be phased out of golf courses and sports facilities, especially where children often are or if they are located next to residential and public areas.

Pesticides should be used as the last option, in the smallest possible amount, and only where needed to make a place usable.

People should stay away from treated areas for at least 48 hours after the last amount of pesticide is applied.

Home, vegetable and fruit gardens: The use of pesticides in home or personal vegetable and fruit gardens should also be phased out. Although the pesticides you use at home may be milder than those used for agriculture and you may use them less often, there is still risk.

In the agricultural industry, there are usually more rules in place to reduce exposure, such as training for people who apply pesticides to properly use equipment that protects them, plans to reduce residue levels and pesticide drift and rules to limit access to sprayed areas.

Non-essential cosmetic pesticides should not be readily available to consumers, but should be locked up like prescription drugs because they pose potential health risks. Cosmetic Pesticide Ban Manitoba states the following on its website: More than 30 health and environmental organizations are appealing to the Manitoba government to maintain the province's restrictions on non-essential uses of pesticides. The Manitoba College of Family Physicians, Manitoba Health Coalition, Manitoba Lung Association, Manitoba Public Health Association, Learning Disabilities Association of Manitoba and the Winnipeg Humane Society are among the organizations speaking out.

The groups have endorsed an open letter to Jeff Wharton, Minister of Environment, Climate and Parks, and Audrey Gordon, Minister of Health, warning that resuming the use of currently banned pesticides will increase health risks for Manitobans, particularly for children. Allowing the use of riskier lawn pesticides will also increase chemical runoff into waterways, harm essential pollinators and increase risks for pets that play on treated lawns.

Jeff Wharton, Minister of Environment, Climate and Parks, said the Province turns to Health Canada when it comes to evaluating pesticide products and all products used in the province are federally approved. Health Canada ensures that pesticide products do not present except-unacceptable risks to Canadians and the environment. Pathways of exposure, including dietary drinking water and residential exposures are considered in the risk assessment. I'm quoting what Mr. Jeff Wharton said.

The problem is that Health Canada registers pesticides not based on safety, but on acceptable risk. My question to Health Canada: What are these acceptable risks? Is, for example, the possible or probable development of cancer in humans an acceptable risk?

*(18:30)

In 2015, the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer identified glyphosate, the active ingredient in the herbicide Roundup—the world's most commonly used herbicide—as a probable human carcinogen. Yet, Health Canada still maintains that glyphosate is safe.

During research for my documentary film, *From Seed to Seed*, 2018, I phoned Health Canada to inquire about the scientific sources they based the safety—and I put this in quotation marks—of glyphosate on, and was told that they rely on industry-supplied data, i.e., by Monsanto and Bayer, who assure Health Canada that their product is safe.

Now, that is clearly a conflict of interest. When I asked why Health Canada does not do their own independent scientific reviews of these herbicides, I was told that would be too expensive. Think about that.

Into the Weeds, a new documentary film, 2022, by Jennifer Baichwal, should be mandatory viewing for anyone making policy decisions involving the herbicide glyphosate, Roundup. The film is available for free streaming on CBC Gem. This film was the opening film of *Hot Docs* this year in Toronto, and it also was the season opener of *The Passionate Eye* on CBC.

Into the Weeds: Dwayne "Lee" Johnson vs. Monsanto Company follows former groundskeeper, Johnson, and his fight against Monsanto, a multi-national agro-chemical corporation acquired by German pharmaceutical giant, Bayer, in 2018.

Johnson's case was the first to go to trial in a series of lawsuits involving tens of thousands of plaintiffs who claim that Monsanto's weed killer, Roundup, and its other glyphosate-based herbicide, Ranger Pro, caused their cancer. Bayer maintains that it's safe to use.

The documentary follows the ground-breaking trial, including the release of the Monsanto papers, internal documents which reveal that, for decades, Monsanto had been influencing studies about glyphosate's potential to cause cancer. The film introduces other plaintiffs whose lives have been upended by their non-Hodgkin's lymphoma diagnosis, while also looking into the wide-spread and systemic effects of the world's most widely used herbicide.

In the film, a team of lawyers gained access to internal emails that demonstrate clearly that Monsanto knew that glyphosate causes cancer, but suppressed this knowledge and tried to discredit any scientists who tried to prove that glyphosate is a carcinogen. Moreover, the film proves that Monsanto manipulated scientific research and even influenced the FDA to rule in their favour. So, how much confidence should anyone have in any data provided to Health Canada by Monsanto/Bayer about the so-called safety of glyphosate? Just please let that sink in.

The World Health Organization unit finds that 2,4-D herbicide possibly causes cancer in humans. A widely used farm chemical that is a key ingredient in a new herbicide developed by Dow AgroSciences, possibly causes cancer in humans, the World Health Organization research unit has determined in 2015.

2,4-D, one—

Mr. Chairperson: My apologies, Ms. Stieffenhofer, but time has expired. *[interjection]*

Leave? Yes. Leave to continue? *[interjection]*
Okay. Is there agreement for leave to continue?
[Agreed] [interjection]

I have to interrupt and recognize you again, Ms. Stieffenhofer. Please continue, Ms. Stieffenhofer.

K. Stieffenhofer: Thank you, thank you.

I just wanted to say that 2,4-D, which was one of the ingredients in Agent Orange is also an ingredient in Killex—the herbicides Killex and PAR III, which are readily available for use by homeowners, and it is a possible human carcinogen. As—and there's evidence that it damages human cells and in a number of studies caused cancer in laboratory animals. Yet, Health Canada maintains that 2,4-D is safe.

Remember thalidomide and how the equivalent of Health Canada failed to protect Canadian citizens from severe birth defects. It took Health Canada three months after they'd been notified that the chemical had been withdrawn in Germany and England before they took it off the market.

The widespread practice of pre-harvest glyphosate desiccation seven days before harvest has increased glyphosate in our food and our environment, including groundwater. Subsequently, Health Canada requested to increase the allowable level of glyphosate in foods and drinking water. Thankfully, the Liberal government paused this request.

The European Union uses the precautionary principle, i.e., if a pesticide is not proven to be safe, it is not registered. In the EU there is no safe allowable level of pesticides in drinking water. This choice indicates the political will of legislatures to avoid risking the health of its citizens, the environment, and all life forms. It is a choice.

Hopefully, the legislatures at Health Canada and the Manitoba government will adopt the wisdom of the precautionary principle and for the safety of our children and grandchildren will choose to protect the health of Canadians and Manitobans by banning the use of cosmetic pesticides altogether.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Stieffenhofer, for your presentation.

I'll now call for questions from the committee.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you so much, Mrs. Stieffenhofer, for your—Ms. Stieffenhofer—for your presentation. Very fulsome.

I appreciate the information and, as I said earlier, that's why these committee meetings are so important to hear from Manitobans. And I'm sure I speak for everyone around the table in wishing you all the best during your health journey as well, with being a cancer survivor as well.

So, I just wanted to say that we agree when you, quote, therefore I'm asking an expansion—*[interjection]*—oh, I'm out of time? Oh, you guys have got to stop that.

Mr. Chairperson: It's pretty fast. Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Ms. Stieffenhofer, did you want to respond to that?

K. Stieffenhofer: I did not understand. Could you repeat the question? I did not hear—understand the question.

Just speak up a little bit, please.

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, ask the question.

Mr. Wharton: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I'll be very, very quick.

We have actually—our government is expanding in Bill 22 to ensure that we are protecting the areas that you are specifically mentioning—playgrounds, picnic areas, dog parks, provincial parks, municipal playgrounds. We recognize—we, by the way, will have some of the strongest legislation west of Ontario. Alberta and Saskatchewan currently do not have any restrictions on the items that I just mentioned.

So, I just want to get that on the record.
[interjection]

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Stieffenhofer, please. Now you can respond.

K. Stieffenhofer: Can I—oh, sorry. Thank you. Learning.

But you would still allow for any homeowner to go out and to buy Roundup, glyphosate or Killex off the shelf and to use as they see fit. And what about lawn companies? Would they be allowed to use Roundup anywhere they please?

* (18:40)

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your answer.

Ms. Naylor: Thank you very much, Katharina, for being here tonight. And I know all the work that you've done on the environment and educating people, including me, over the last few years. I—so I want to thank you for taking the time.

And I just—you referenced the—Into the Weeds, and I would also, you know, I echo that that's a really important documentary for folks to watch. And I was struck by the fact that it is leading, like, some of those lawsuits, multimillion-dollar lawsuits, are leading Health Canada to start to re-evaluate glyphosate, which I think we should be ahead of the game and not waiting for that.

I guess my question: Is there anything else you want to say about that product or that you didn't get a chance to say?

K. Stieffenhofer: Thank you for that question.

I really, really strongly encourage anyone thinking about the question of cosmetic herbicides, and herbicides at all, and Roundup glyphosate in particular, please take the time to watch Into the Weeds, available free for streaming on Gem CBC. And you will be, I think, blown away—blown away—but these are facts. They could never, ever have a documentary that can, you know, can be challenged in court. So everything in this documentary is true and vetted by lawyers. So that is the truth and really an eye-opener.

And I hope you go and take a look at that before you make any decisions, any decisions on cosmetic pesticides. And since we are with Agriculture and Food, I think it also affects how we grow our food.

Mr. Gerrard: You've talked about the link between pesticides and cancer. Is there any link between pesticides and breast cancer, for example?

K. Stieffenhofer: Yes, there is a link between pesticides and breast cancer.

But my dear dad, a farmer all his life, died of pancreatic cancer in 2013, and he was a conventional farmer and had lots of contact with pesticides, and his neighbour, best friend, farmer that he farmed together with, a year before him died of cancer.

So, I think it's anyone who is in close contact with these toxic chemicals, with these pesticides, is at higher risk of contracting cancer.

Mr. Chairperson: So thank you, Ms. Stieffenhofer. Time for question has expired, so thank you for your presentation.

I'm going to ask the committee for leave to extend the question period to 45 seconds. Do we have agreement on that? *[interjection]* Oh, technically, we are waiving rule 92(2)(c). Agreement to do that? *[Agreed]*

Thank you very much for the co-operation of the committee.

I will now call the next presenter. Calling Al Mackling, private citizen.

Calling once again: Al Mackling, private citizen. Not here? Go to the bottom of the list.

Calling Steve Rauh, private citizen. Steve Rauh, private citizen? Not in attendance. Go to the bottom of the list.

Calling Glen Koroluk, Manitoba Eco-Network.
[interjection]

For everyone's information, then, on the committee, before we begin the presentation, we cannot waive that rule, so 30 seconds is all you're allowed for questions. I know it's a challenge, but please try and comply. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Koroluk. And now, if you're ready, please proceed.

Glen Koroluk (Manitoba Eco-Network): I'd like to address the question that was brought up previously by Honourable Jeff Wharton in regard to the extra protections that were being brought in with this bill.

That may be true, but if you look at a city as—you know, the size of Winnipeg, all that area that the bill is protecting is less than 15 per cent of the area. So, the majority of land and land use in Winnipeg will be a lot of lawns, private lawns. So, it's a bit of a moot point there.

Good evening. My name is Glen Koroluk, and I'm the executive director of the Manitoba Eco-Network.

Since 1988, Manitoba Eco-Network has promoted positive environmental action by supporting people and groups in our community. Our programming focuses on policy advocacy, engagement and consultation processes, and developing capacity-building tools that benefit the environmental non-profit sector and our member groups.

We are a public-interest environmental organization seeking to promote and facilitate good environmental governance and the protection of Manitoba's environment for the benefit of current and future generations.

We are disappointed with Bill 22 and ask that this bill be withdrawn. It is a step backwards in a time when we know we have to reduce exposure to chemical pesticides.

There is ample evidence in the form of scientific and independent peer-reviewed research that concludes chemical pesticides impact human health, the environment—especially our aquatic ecosystems—and biodiversity.

In fact, Environment and Climate Change Canada's own website states that households use chemical pesticides and fertilizers to improve the look of their lawns and gardens. These chemicals can pollute lakes and rivers that may be sources of drinking water for some communities. Chemical pesticides are also toxic to many forms of life, and can threaten beneficial species such as bees, that are important pollinators. That's Environment Canada.

According to the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment, CAPE for short, to protect human and environmental health and safety, the control of pests should centre on fundamental principles of public health and environmental protection, including the application of the precautionary principle. And you've heard that many times already tonight. Farmer hazard prevention, health promotion and environmental justice.

Furthermore, CAPE emphasizes that exposure to non-essential pesticides creates additional costs for the province's health-care system and affects the lives of those who struggle with illnesses and conditions associated with such pesticide exposures.

And, as we've discussed already tonight, as we know, there are shortcomings as to how the Pest Management Regulatory Agency—PMRA—of Health Canada—how it registers and regulates pesticides.

The Pest Management Regulatory Agency uses a risk-based approach in their assessments, and not the precautionary principle. As pointed out by the standing committee on health in their statutory review of the Pest Control Products Act, a lack of evidence is—a lack of evidence of risk is not the same thing as evidence of no risk. The onus must be on the manufacturer to prove there are no health risks. As noted by Ecojustice Canada, the European Union achieves this balance: if proof of the product's safety is not supplied, then it would not be registered there.

For this reason and others, that is why a province, territory, municipality or Indigenous government has the legislative and regulatory authority to prohibit the use of a registered pesticide in its jurisdiction, or it may add more restrictive conditions on the use of a product than those established under the Pest Management Regulatory Agency.

Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency is currently undergoing a transformation process that will strengthen its oversight and its protection of human health and the environment. The transformation process will also make the PMRA more transparent to people in Canada.

* (18:50)

The European Union's 2020 biodiversity strategy includes proposals for illegally binding targets to reduce pesticide use and risk by 50 per cent by the year 2030, as well as a ban on the use of pesticides in protected areas and other ecologically sensitive areas.

As stated by the European Commission, the proposal to reduce the use of chemical pesticides, translates their commitment to halt biodiversity loss in Europe into action. Canada must match this commitment and establish a legislative framework for achieving pesticide use reduction targets.

Unfortunately, Bill 22 sends Manitoba into the wrong direction.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Koroluk. We'll now have questions.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Koroluk, for your presentation.

Certainly, again, lots of valuable information for the committee. And in particular, I pay special attention to your comment about the Health Canada Pest Management Regulatory Agency, currently undergoing a transformation process that'll strengthen its oversight.

Well, we couldn't agree more with that, and certainly we'll work in lockstep with the federal government as they continue to ensure that Manitobans, particular Canadians, are safe when applying products such as cosmetic pesticides.

So, certainly agree with that and I thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Koroluk.

G. Koroluk: Was that a question?

Yes, well, I hope that the Province of Manitoba is pushing for stronger legislative framework than it's currently proposing from Bill 22, so.

Ms. Naylor: Thank you so much for being here this evening and for all the work you do in the environment sector. I appreciate—I think in my 30 seconds, I just want to correct this notion that this is stronger legislation.

One of my concerns is that, you know, now—so, it can't be used around schools, but the municipalities can put it on the boulevards outside of schools. Someone running a home daycare could live next door to someone spraying their lawn.

What do you think about that?

G. Koroluk: Well, okay. So, I think one of the—I mean, our organization is calling for the withdrawal of this bill. But one of the egregious aspects of this bill

is that there's no remedies for people if there's an environmental injustice that occurs.

So, let's say—you know, I live in the West End. I have a small lot. And both my neighbours are spraying like crazy. Let's say I have a grandmother who's old and susceptible to chemicals. And my daughter's having a baby. So (a) I'm not being notified of them spraying. I'm right next door. There's no buffers or anything.

And so that's a real problem because the people should have the right to know and they should be notified. And that whole process—you know, people have to make an informed decision. So, there's nothing in Bill 22 that does that.

So, I mean, that's very problematic. Right now, there's nothing a citizen could do. They can't go to court. They can't fine their neighbour. It's crazy.

Mr. Gerrard: I wonder if you would take that further.

What sort of remedies would you see where there is toxic effects of these cosmetic pesticides? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Oh, sorry, Mr. Koroluk. My fault.

G. Koroluk: Sorry, yes.

The first choice is not to use them. So, they should be banned. We should be following what's happening in the European Union.

Having said that, and if that's not the approach, then we need legislation that allows citizens to go to court.

Right now, CEPA, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, is before the House, and there's—you know, there's a campaign to make that bill more stronger in giving citizens the right to sue because right now, there's no legislation in Manitoba or even at the federal level where ordinary citizens like us could take someone to court if we're being harmed.

Ms. Naylor: On that note—on that line, thinking about legalities, certainly we know that companies like the owners of Roundup—Monsanto—and others have been sued for the harms their chemicals have caused.

Do you know of any municipalities or governments anywhere that perhaps have been sued because of bringing back or rolling back harmful legislation like this?

G. Koroluk: No, I'm not aware, but I'm sure there is.

I—you know, we would have to get a lawyer to check up on that. If you want to hold the bill, I could do that research if you want, get back to you.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, time has expired, I believe. Yes. Thank you very much for your presentation.

Next presenter is Wendy Buelow, private citizen.

And you're ready to go? Okay, please proceed with your presentation, Ms. Buelow.

Wendy Buelow (Private Citizen): Okay, my name is Wendy Buelow. Thank you for the opportunity to present at this committee. I'm speaking against Bill 22, the environment act on pesticide restrictions.

So, along with the concerns for human health with which the others have spoken of so well, I'm advocating for the insect and natural world and the biodiversity that insects need. I'm a volunteer with the David Suzuki butterfly ranger program, and to be clear, I'm not representing the foundation in any way; I'm here on my own.

But we've had lots of education and scientists presenting to us for the past three years and really digging into, you know, habitat and pesticides and why we're way—you know, we're losing all our species and so on. And I've got a whole bunch of links at the very end of my presentation tape.

This is—may sound alarmist, but many of you might know this already, but we are, actually, in the middle of an insect apocalypse. And here is from a few years ago, the National Geographic, it says, you'll miss them when they're gone, and we're losing them.

So some stats. We've lost 76 per cent of our flying insects in the last 27 years, and that's actually a stat from 2017 and from the Krefeld Entomological Society, and there's a peer-reviewed article in my notes at the end. And right now 40 per cent of our insect species are actually threatened with extinction, and the reasons are climate change, habitat loss and pesticide use.

And the one thing that we can have an immediate effect on to maybe turn this thing around or at least stop it somewhat would be the continued banning of the toxic pesticides and not only keeping the same rules but let's in—make stronger protections. We really need a lot stronger protections in our private and public spaces.

Importantly, like, the pesticides we're talking about today are for cosmetic, and that's—I'm not talking about agricultural purposes. But, like, there's a

weird thing about the current law. Like, we can use pesticides in our gardens and our vegetables and flowers and things, I believe, but not on our lawn, but, like, we'd be eating, like spraying stuff on stuff we'd be eating and flowers that are attracting butterflies, and it just kind of caught me, like, anyway. I don't know if that's true or not, but I think it is.

Back to the insects. Why should we care? A famous quote by E.O. Wilson is: Insects are the little things that run the world. And without them we're kind of hooped.

They have a PR problem, insects. They can look weird and possibly scary, and a lot of people don't like insects. You know, mosquitoes—ugh. But, in reality, only about 3 per cent of insects are actually considered pests. The rest are beneficial. They're out there doing their thing. Some just are whatever they are; they're just living their own lives; they're not bothering us at all.

* (19:00)

Reasons we should protect them is ecosystem services. So, that's a selfish human reason. Insects pollinate plants. One third of our food crop, and it's all the stuff most people like the best, like raspberries, strawberries, apples, peas, zucchinis, nuts, blueberries, blah, blah, blah, chocolate—see, we don't grow it here, but that's a big one. That's all pollinated by bees and insects.

Here's an example of what can happen if we don't smarten up: in southwest China, where wild bees have been eradicated by excessive pesticide use and a lack of natural habitat, farmers have been forced to hand-pollinate their trees, carrying pots of pollen and paintbrushes from which to individually pollinate every flower, using their children to climb up to the highest blossoms of the fruit trees, like apples and pears. And this is part of an article that I've got at the—cited at the end.

Okay, another—insects decompose waste and organic matter. Very messy without them. We'd have, you know, just waste everywhere.

Insects control pest populations, so insects control other insects. Nature in balance has predators for what we may consider pest insects in our gardens. Pests don't pick and choose the beneficial—or, pesticides don't pick and choose. Like, they're not going, that one's a pest, this one's a good one; they don't—everything's gone, you know, like, when you're doing the pesticide thing.

Insects are beautiful and inspiring. For example, the monarch butterfly and its journey. I mean, who doesn't know about that. And we do know that now, monarchs are an endangered species—or, endangered, threatened, near extinction; I'm not sure about my wording.

And, No. 5, insects feed birds. And I don't know if any of you are birders, but I am. That is kind of how I got into the insect thing. But, birds don't feed their babies, like, nuts and seeds and things we might put in our little bird feeders and that. They eat larvae. They eat insects and caterpillars and larvae and stuff like that, so they need soft food. And a chickadee may feed approximately 6,000-9,000 larvae and insects to one clutch of baby birds. So that's a lot. And so, they've got a—if somebody comes along and sprays down a tree full of, you know, undesirables, that's like, the food source. We lose our birds.

Okay, so, in cities and non-agricultural lands, we can do something to help the insect populations. As I said, agriculture is another story. Conventional farming uses pesticides, and change can be very difficult financially for farmers, and maybe that's the future coming up sometime.

This bylaw amendment would allow anyone to purchase and use currently banned pesticides on lawns, driveways, ditches, close to waterways, pretty much everywhere except for a few places mentioned: children's playgrounds, dog parks and provincial parks.

Some of the pesticides—I'm not going to go through them, because they did. I want to get to something else.

Okay, the one pesticide I really wanted to tag, which they didn't talk about was the 'neonicanoids'—neonics, I'll call them, and a lot of place—you know, golf courses and stuff—use them.

And I talk about a possible use for cosmetic pesticides is to grow the perfect lawn, and it is a colonial idea. Lawns did not exist here, I don't believe, before colonization. They are in—considered an ideal of high status brought to North America by Europeans.

And many feel—people feel that, to be a good neighbour, we should have a perfect lawn. And most lawns are made up of an actually invasive, like—a foreign species, an invasive species: Kentucky bluegrass, from Eurasia.

Anyway, these non-native lawns need lots of care: water, mowing and then we think we need weed management, but maybe we don't.

I talk about—I want to talk a little bit about golf courses in my last minute forty-three.

So, my family and friends love golf. And there—every year, there's, like—I just brought—these are, like, tons and tons of chemical notices of stuff they want to use, and it's all the things that they've talked about and more. Products list cancers like non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, sarcoma.

Okay, so, here's the weird thing. On one hand, this proposed amendment will protect dogs in the dog park, but they're not going to protect golfers like my friends and family on the golf course. Like, why do dogs get the protection? So, I resent that. I wish we could do a little more for our golfers.

And some golf courses are rising to the challenge on their own and it's working—a program called Monarchs in the Rough. And—my notes. So, I'll just jump ahead to the end.

In closing, we have some pretty big global issues going on right now, and we can be working on climate change. Goes along with global warming of the planet. Let's reframe the way we look our landscape, see beauty and diverse landscape and—that's better suited to our climate and support wildlife.

People care deeply about our large animals in crisis, such as the polar bears and the white rhinos, and let's care about the little guys, too. So, let's care about the bees and the other insects which are going extinct because of all these different things. But pesticides is a big part of it, and let's—I'd like to really see greater restrictions.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you. Time has expired.

Thank you, Ms. Buelow, for your presentation.

Does the committee have questions for her?

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Ms. Buelow, for your presentation. Certainly appreciate understanding, again, some of the concerns that you have with respect—I know it's hard to hear—respect to bees and birds, of course. We certainly share those concerns, too, as well.

And I take special note—just a comment, I only have about 10 seconds left, so just a comment, though, with golf courses: I mean, municipalities and golf

courses in other areas will have a choice whether they choose to use a cosmetic pesticide or not. It's not mandatory that everybody needs to go out and buy a cosmetic pesticide.

So, it's just giving them more choice.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Buelow. Thank you, minister.

W. Buelow: Yes, just to answer with the golf course: I agree it's a—but I would like to see—I think it's so easy to use the conventional here. Let's get our pesticides out and let's do what we've done every year, and this is what we do and this is how we manage it.

But I think it—they need a push to change. I think we need guidance. And when the government would give good, strong guidance on, you know, clamping down on this use—I mean, like, they're massive lists of stuff they use. They use everything in the book.

And there's also these young workers out there—like, they're, you know, good jobs for kids. They get out there and—I kind of just hope they're managed properly, but that's what I can say. I think there's options, but I think government can be a leader.

Ms. Naylor: Thank you very much, Wendy, for being here and for sharing your perspectives.

I don't have a lawn. I have a pollinator garden in my—the front of my house. So instead of lawn, from one side of the property to the other stretches my garden, and on any given summer day, there's hundreds, if not thousands, of pollinators in that garden.

So, what should I expect to happen if the City comes along and sprays the boulevard in front of my house that's just separated by a sidewalk from the boulevard to my garden, where there's thousands of bees on a summer day? Do—like, would they be affected by that spray a few feet away? Do you know?

If you don't know, that's—

Mr. Chairperson: MLA—or, Ms. Buelow, please.

W. Buelow: Well, most of this stuff drifts and the bugs are—like, if you're already attracting—you've got a banquet in your yard. Sounds pretty fantastic. And, you know, not everybody can do that, but it's—when you put it in place, it's great. But you're attracting them and then these same bees that have been so happily attracted by your beautiful plants are all of a sudden going on the poison, like some sort of toxic chemical, like—I'm not sure what they would be spraying for, but it could poison them.

That's all.

Mr. Gerrard: Yes. I'm interested in your comments on birds. And I'm aware that there have been drastic and very dramatic declines in some insectivores. Barn swallows are on the endangered list in some areas. Chimney swifts.

I wonder if you'd comment further on the impact on birds.

W. Buelow: Some of that would be habitat loss, because we're losing all our big old barns and the chimneys that these birds did colonize in. Also, I think it's—we're—just have less and less insects, and that's their main food source.

* (19:10)

And so, when we're losing our insects—and especially, like, I spend a lot of time in Dunnottar on the shore of Lake Winnipeg and we've got quite a good bird population there. We have our barn swallows, and it's pretty wonderful.

But we have a pretty good insect life. We're losing—we don't have our monarchs this year, for some reason, but we've got great insect life and we have so many birds there.

And you come to the city and we spray for canker worms, we spray for mosquitoes. We're got this other stuff going on and it's kind of a dead zone in Wolseley, anyway, for a lot of birds, which it shouldn't be because we have great trees there, so.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you.

Any further questions from the committee?

Thank you for your presentation.

Committee will call Cameron Wilson with Neudorff North America. Is that an online—so, could Mr. Wilson turn on his camera and unmute?

We seem to have you there now. We're not hearing you yet.

Cameron Wilson (Neudorff North America): How about now?

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Are you ready to do your presentation, Mr. Wilson?

C. Wilson: Yes, I am.

Just to confirm, do you have the brief that I supplied?

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, we're ready to go. Please proceed with your presentation.

C. Wilson: Thank you for inviting me to speak on Bill 22, the environmental amendment act, pesticide restrictions. My name is Cameron Wilson. I'm a graduate of the University of Manitoba, Department of Agriculture, and a holder of several patents on low-risk pesticides.

I have worked on the development of low-risk pesticides for greater than 25 years. Currently in Canada, several provinces ban or restrict the use and sale of pesticides for cosmetic purposes, including Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, PEI, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Newfoundland-Labrador. Their common intent is to minimize adverse impacts to human health and the environment.

Bill 22 significantly reverses this intent and outcome in Manitoba. My presentation will provide the standing committee with information so that members can make a science-based decision regarding the widespread use of almost any pesticide for cosmetic use in Manitoba.

My first comment is about why provinces, US counties and many European countries have implemented cosmetic pesticide bans or restrictions. Such bans and restrictions target the older synthetic herbicides that were first registered in—for use in the 1940s, '50s and '60s in Canada. These groups of pesticides, for example, 2,4-D, are now known and been proven to be toxic to small animals, birds, aquatic organisms and pose a risk to human health.

Many of these targeted banned herbicides are listed by the World Health Organization and, if you have my brief, you'll see in Appendix 1 the classification of this group of herbicides. These are classified as possible cancer-causing agents. Interesting enough, they're classified in the same area as T-DDT, which we're all familiar with.

The intent of cosmetic pesticide bans is twofold: to reduce the levels of these substances in our environment, and to limit the exposure and risk of these substances to people, especially children.

Limiting uses of pesticides of concern does work. Ontario implemented a province-wide cosmetic pesticide ban in April, 2009. In 2014 an assessment study reported a significant decline of the presence in cosmetic pesticides in surface waters ranging from 16 to 92 per cent, and the quote is it took—Todd and Struger 2014.

If Bill 22 is passed and the result—the result will be increased and widespread exposure throughout Manitoba of many of these older, high-risk herbicides

for the sole purpose of applying them to lawns and urban boulevards.

The lower risk herbicides are readily available and already allowed under the current environmental act. The impact of Bill 22 is significant. It introduces the widespread use of the high-risk pesticides for cosmetic purposes. Bill 22 is not needed.

My second comment relates to the information presented on March 14th of this year at the government's news conference, announcing the introduction of Bill 22. First, reference was made to a public consultation undertaken in 2016, and the proposed amendments in Bill 22 are based largely on that survey conducted, now six years ago. However, in that survey, only 15 per cent of the respondents reported that they had a basic or full understanding of the issues of pesticides. In other words, 85 per cent of respondents did not have any—have even a basic understanding of the issue.

Second, as the news conference—at the same news conference, the public was told that low-risk pesticides currently allowed for cosmetic use are too expensive and ineffective. Those comments are disputed. Regarding cost, when new innovative herbicides first come into market, the price may be relatively higher due to development, field testing and registration requirements, especially when compared with herbicides developed 60 or 70 years ago. Typically, the longer a product is on the marketplace, the price decreases. The information below, and it'll be in your handout, show a price comparison for typical homeowner products.

In figure 1 you'll see, this is from Home Depot in Winnipeg in July, that Killex, which is a conventional herbicide, Weed B Gon is a low-risk, in this case the Weed B Gon is actually a little bit cheaper in the 5-litre size, and in the 1-litre concentrate the synthetic is slightly cheaper. So you can see they're very similar in price.

In some cases, a new lower risk pesticide such as Weed B Gon is actually less expensive than the synthetic counterpart, as I mentioned. In other cases, a new herbicide may have a higher cost, but the difference in cost for the average-sized lawn is not substantive. In discussing cost, proponents of Bill 22 have not mentioned that herbicide costs for professional lawn-care operators are only one component of their fee. In actuality, labour is the No. 1 cost of the—of most lawn-care operators, not the cost of the herbicide.

Regarding performance, Health Canada requires field tests before a herbicide is approved for use. Field trials worldwide have demonstrated that new lower risk herbicides such as Fiesta are effective in controlling weeds in lawns. Such alternate pesticides also have other multiple advantages: no strong chemical smell, low-to-no toxicity to fish and mammals and no surface water concerns. If you look at your briefing note, figures 2 and 3, you'll see some turf sprayed with Fiesta and untreated, so you can clearly see that after two applications it truly does work. And in figure 3 there's a graph showing Fiesta compared to a conventional three-way herbicide and untreated, and you'll actually see that the low-risk product is faster, and after two applications at 56 days they have equal activity. And this was done on dandelions in turf.

I'll continue. Third, on March 14th, the public was told, if Health Canada has approved a pesticide, that it is deemed safe for use in Manitoba. Again, this comment requires clarification. First, Health Canada does not ever deem or proclaim a pesticide as safe. Health Canada sets the bare minimum standard for how a pesticide can be used in Canada and identifies any danger or concerns on the approved label.

The example below is a label of a herbicide that Manitoba proposes under Bill 22 amendment provides for use in Manitoba. This herbicide contains three herbicide active ingredients. This product has a poison statement on the front label and the poison statement is one of the worst toxic classifications given by Health Canada. See figures 4 and 5 of my brief. This product, to be allowed under Bill 22, also includes an environmental hazard statement. Warning specified: toxic to small wild animals, birds and aquatic organisms.

Available alternate low-risk pesticides currently already allowed under the environmental act have no to low toxicity to non-target organisms. Considering the number of fish-bearing rivers and lakes in Manitoba, introducing back the old herbicides have great potential over time to damage the sports and commercial fishing industries of Manitoba.

* (19:20)

Also considering the frequent heavy rains and flooding, like in 2022 over southern Manitoba, introducing back unknown and unregulated quantities of high-risk pesticides in Manitoba for only cosmetic purposes poses a great and unnecessary risk to local communities.

Also consider home daycares, and this was mentioned earlier. Think about how many children are cared for in home daycares throughout the province. What if the neighbour to your daycare proceeds to spray their lawn with a pesticide that is currently not allowed, and the spray drifts to your daycare and your garden. How will Manitoba police this? If a child at a daycare gets sick, who's liable?

What are the consequences when a pesticide applicator sprays a boulevard near a school with a herbicide with a poison label? Should a City of Winnipeg or Portage la Prairie or Brandon employee be forced to spray these older herbicides if their use is allowed?

I encourage the Standing Committee members and Manitoba government to consider the questions of care, community and liability. It is our collective responsibility and duty to protect our children and families, our elderly, pets, pesticide applicators, waterways, animal life and sustaining environments as best we can with science, intellect and good sense.

If Bill 22 is approved, the widespread application of high-risk chemical pesticides will be allowed and we—and will occur.

If Bill 22 is approved, Manitoba will be the only jurisdiction in the world that I am aware of to rescind its allowable cosmetic pesticide uses to once again allow herbicides of concern, setting a bad precedent.

I ask the committee and the Manitoba government to review and rethink the proposed amendments in Bill 22. Bill 22 is flawed. It is not based on accurate understanding of pesticide composition and federal regulation.

Mr. Chairperson: Time has expired, Mr. Wilson. Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Wilson.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Wilson, for presenting tonight and presenting under this—well, this new COVID—post-COVID way, of course. We're still doing it through Zoom and Teams, so it's great that you can join us from wherever you are tonight. So, welcome and thank you.

And I guess just a quick comment: Have you had the opportunity to go through the bill page by page and line by line?

C. Wilson: Yes, I have looked through the bill.

An Honourable Member: Follow up?

Mr. Chairperson: I got to go around.

Ms. Naylor: Thank you, Mr. Wilson. I really appreciate your comments and the amount of knowledge and understanding that you have about these products.

I know you got cut off at the end, so I'm going to use my question to allow you to finish whatever you were saying at the end.

C. Wilson: Yes. Sorry, thank you.

It is—my—I was finishing with: Bill 22 is flawed. It is not based on accurate understanding of pesticide composition and the federal regulation, and it does not benefit the majority of Manitobans.

Bill 22 should not be approved.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Gerrard: You're very clear that the bill can result in the widespread use of high-risk pesticides.

I just want you to help us, once more talk about why these would be high-risk pesticides.

C. Wilson: As already demonstrated in other provinces, US counties and countries, they determined that the risk of exposure, in particular to children and waterways, of these particular group of herbicides is of concern. We know this already.

As I mentioned already, this would be the first jurisdiction in the world that we're aware of to go backwards on this.

As it says right on the label, toxic to fish, toxic to mammals, toxic to birds.

Mr. Wharton: Over 60 per cent of respondents said that the current restrictions were too strict, and over 70 per cent wanted to see them reduced or rescinded.

I guess my question to you, sir, Mr. Wilson, is: What do you tell—as VP of operations for Neudorff America, what do you tell 137 municipalities in Manitoba that are applying four to five times more product at four to five times more the rate over the last six years?

C. Wilson: I would challenge that they actually have not been applying products and probably will not in the future because of labour shortages and labour costs. That—this survey was, again, based on 15 per cent people having a basic understanding of the survey.

Mr. Chairperson: Does the committee have any further questions?

Mr. Wharton: Again, thank you, Mr. Wilson.

And, again, we would agree that it is policy makers and governments that should be at the table providing the best science and the best information to their citizens on any area, whether it be Health Canada-approved food products, drugs, vitamins, children's toys, vaccines, alcohol, cannabis or car seats.

Certainly, I appreciate your time tonight, Mr. Wilson, and look forward to any further comments you may have.

C. Wilson: Thank you for the time. And as you know, you just mentioned it, provinces determine the uses of some of the areas you've mentioned.

And again, I'll just end with what has been determined by the World Health Organization and other municipalities and other counties and countries.

Mr. Chairperson: Less than a minute less.

Ms. Naylor: I'm just going to repeat the question I asked someone earlier about the risks of drift.

What are the risks of drift? Like, how far do these products drift when they're sprayed on lawns or they're sprayed outside of schools or they're sprayed in municipal parks?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Wilson, 30 seconds.

C. Wilson: The risk of drift is a function of how strong the wind is, and it will harm all non-target broadleaf plants. So, your pollinator garden, if you have broadleaf flowers, they will be damaged. Trees will be damaged. Drift to people that don't wear respirators will occur, and again, to the daycare kids next to a homeowner spraying.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Wilson. Time has expired.

We will call the next presenter, which is Nicolas Sourisseau, private citizen.

Mr. Sourisseau, I have your name correct?

Yanik Sourisseau (Private Citizen): It's Sourisseau.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, and when you're ready, please begin your presentation.

Y. Sourisseau: Hello, my name is Yanik Sourisseau. I am an apolitical husband and father of two school-age children. I have lived in Winnipeg and rural Manitoba my entire life and was very dismayed to hear of the proposed changes. I felt compelled to come

forward today to ask you to reconsider this amendment, without any bias to any party or any way of thinking, merely the consideration of what is good for children, our loved ones and our pets.

During the previous reading of Bill 22, there were a combination of arguments for these amendments that, when placed side by side seemed logical and compelling but in reality, none of which are valid in this case.

Firstly, and it—I struggle with the audience, I apologize, but these changes have nothing to do with agriculture, despite the great arguments made by some of the other speakers. And it seems inappropriate and confusing to discuss amending these laws in the context of food production and agriculture, when the discussion and proposed amendments are regarding the cosmetic use of these chemicals, of which there is growing controversy.

That said, if the desire is to associate with agriculture, I also encourage you to watch *The Passionate Eye* documentary, *Into the Weeds*, from CBC, where farmers acknowledge the risks associated with pesticides, referring to lymphoma as a farmer's disease and how they choose to live with it as a means to an end in making a living.

Secondly, the argument for the challenges faced by municipalities to manage weed control on public property, like shoulders, parks and boulevards, is very flawed. I was easily able to find numerous references to rural municipalities where they can—they are allowed to submit for allowances for land management under the Pesticide Use Permit program, which they do. That means there is nothing stopping them from using anything they want with just a little planning and prior notice.

Thirdly, the paper-based survey, with limited distribution and uptake, that has been referenced by this administration with 70 per cent support for these amendments, was conducted in 2016, six years ago, four years before a global pandemic highlighted the weakness of our medical system, the fragility of our planet's ecosystem and a significant portion of our population voiced strong concerns over the credibility of Health Canada.

* (19:30)

It would seem only logical to consider re-submitting the survey again, notwithstanding the fact that there are thousands of new homeowners, taxpayers and voters added to Manitoba since the survey was conducted. Don't they deserve a say?

Finally, the strongest argument used by this administration for these changes has been Health Canada's position on these chemicals as safe, again, as if it's absurd for Manitobans to have thoughts that might not align with Health Canada. Considering the current political climate brought on by the pandemic, it feels very ironic that I am demating this position, this current administration.

That said, when Health Canada modifies its positions on a chemical, it does so after there is so much overwhelming data, it would be criminal not to pivot. When it does, there is nothing that can be done for the years that it was already used.

In the 1990s, Bisphenol A was safe in baby bottles until it wasn't. DDT was a safe insecticide until it wasn't. It took grassroots citizens and ecologists to start raising concerns about DDT. These concerns were largely discounted until they weren't. And it was confirmed to be a carcinogen and an endocrine disrupter that accumulates in animal fat cells and is found in human breast milk to this day, despite being banned in the '70s.

Mr. Chair, 2,4-D, one of the chemicals you plan to allow, found in Killex and PAR III and a favourite of the lawn-care community was classified as probably carcinogenic in 2015 by none other than the World Health Organization. You may not be aware that it was created during World War II for chemical warfare and used heavily during the Vietnam War conflict. It gives me no comfort to know that it's been watered down for residential use.

Another good one, chlorpyrifos. Chlorpyrifos is a pesticide that has been improved for use since the 1960s. It is being used as we speak by the City of Winnipeg to combat Dutch elm disease. A little trivia, this chemical was designed by the Nazis as part of their chemical warfare arsenal. Chlorpyrifos has finally been concluded to be acutely toxic and associated with neuro-developmental harms in children. Prenatal exposures to chlorpyrifos are associated with lower birth rate, reduced IQ, loss of working memory, attention disorders and delayed motor development. Health Canada has only recently suspended all licences for purchase of all variants of this chemical as of the end of this year. And we're still allowed to use it for one more year, luckily.

What I'm trying to illustrate is that Health Canada-approved does not mean safe. Unlike cosmetics and pharmaceuticals, agrichemical companies are not required to provide sufficient evidence that agricultural chemicals are safe to introduce in the

environment before they can be sold. That approach is, of course, as you've heard many times, the precautionary principle. There is enough research indicating that the health and environmental problems associated with these products are cause for concern and more than enough evidence to indicate that we should not be cavalier about their use.

Further to this, Health Canada's conclusions rely almost entirely on industry-funded studies. This data's typically not made available for public viewing or for peer review, which is normal in other scientific research. However, in agrichemicals, this information is considered proprietary and therefore protected. Frustratingly, these studies are rarely, if ever, conducted in concert with other chemicals such as already present in the soil, air or waterways. Nor do they consider the adjuvants that are part of larger cocktails when they will be used, and they are almost never considered for their impact over the long term. And chemicals find themselves in unanticipated locations through drift or migration, like on our pets or in our household dust.

On top of that, while there is an expectation of impartiality, in order for a chemical to be restricted, Health Canada has the politically sensitive challenge of weighing the financial burden to industry over the environment and human health. Even if they do move to restrict chemicals actively used in agriculture, they know they will face legal challenges and appeals from the agrichemical industry.

So, for the most part, as previously stated, Health Canada has only required products be taken off the market after decades of use have revealed undeniable harm to humans or the environment. This means you and I are the test subjects for all of these chemicals. For the purposes of simply protecting our children and pets in their yards and their neighbourhoods, the Province does not have these same challenges. We're only talking about restricting non-agricultural cosmetic use of these chemicals.

Do you really, really want to be the first province to repeal our cosmetic pesticide ban? What will the Province do if and when Health Canada does change their position on something like 2,4-D? Do you—do you leave the Province exposed to litigation by every Manitoban affected by a corresponding illness. The lawsuits that continue to plague Bayer-Monsanto over glyphosate have reached over \$11 billion and counting, with over 30,000 lawsuits pending. By reversing a law that protects people, you become an accomplice. Is that the legacy you're striving for?

What we can do is recognize that these chemicals don't need to be used to maintain an impossible standard on lawns and boulevards. This concept of pristine monocultures comes from a climate that doesn't exist here. This may be necessary in modern farming practices; this is not the debate. But it has no justification on cosmetic surfaces.

In conclusion, our government has elected to represent and act in the best interests of all of its people, not just populism. It's not just about an opinion of outspoken minority of landowners. It's there to create environmental and health regulations that protect life. Please, please don't rubber stamp this. I'm only asking for some vision and integrity from our government.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Sourisseau.

Before we go on to questions, we also have on our list a Yanik Sourisseau. Is that you as well?

Y. Sourisseau: Yes. Sorry.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, thank you. We will strike that one.

Now, questions from the committee?

Mr. Wharton: A comment, Mr. Chair, if I may. And thank you, Mr. Sourisseau, for your presentation. Greatly appreciate it.

And one area that stuck out just near the end of your presentation was about Health Canada. And, again, the Manitoba Eco-Network had made the comment, as well, of a stronger regulatory framework being looked at now when it comes to cosmetic pesticides. Certainly, our government will definitely follow what the federal government obviously deems safe as they continue to go through that rigorous process.

So, I can tell you today that that's exactly what we'll continue to do, is to follow the science.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you.

Mr. Wilson, would you like to respond to that? *[interjection]* Oh, I'm sorry. I—Mr. Sourisseau.

Y. Sourisseau: I would like to respond.

Actually, and the point that I've been trying to drive home is that Health Canada's accountability is

almost unilaterally towards agriculture, and the companies that market those products and lobby for those products are focused almost entirely on agriculture.

And their concern is any form of bans are a slippery slope from those companies, and it's a challenge for Health Canada to look at the narrow focus of simply landscaping. And that is more the jurisdiction of municipalities and provinces.

And that's what I'm asking for.

Ms. Naylor: Thank you very much for your presentation. It was quite informative.

And you noted something—a note that I made here about Health Canada's studies on pesticides. And you said something that I wasn't previously aware of—that none of these studies are peer-reviewed. And when I think about science, I know that studies that aren't peer-reviewed aren't meaningful—aren't really meaningful in science.

So can you just elaborate on that a little bit more because I think our government members need to understand the difference?

Y. Sourisseau: So, one of the things, for example, that the Monsanto Papers revealed is that many of the—even ones that are presented as peer-reviewed always have a thread back to the agrichemical companies, and so that there is literally no one getting to actually review and have their opinion valued who isn't already vetted and approved.

And again, that's for public record. If—anecdotal-ly, they haven't officially proven glyphosate is bad; they've proven Monsanto is evil, and that's why they're losing all their lawsuits.

So that's the issue with reading their papers; it's not that—if we could already prove it was banned, then it'd be banned all over the globe. But they can prove they are evil, and that's why they're losing all of their lawsuits.

Mr. Gerrard: You talked early on about the risks particularly to children from the use of some of these cosmetic pesticides.

* (19:40)

I wonder if you'd expand a little bit on that?

Y. Sourisseau: Honestly, I think that that probably isn't appropriate for myself to do that. I'm neither a scientist or an agriculture professional. My information is accumulated by very intelligent, smart people, like some of the speakers here, that have made a career

and a near-lifetime of educating themselves and learning about these things.

But I will say that the data is there. It is easily found. It is easily sourced, and these are not on sketchy, dark websites. These are not clandestine organizations presenting this information. And it's there for the people that want to learn about it.

Mr. Chairperson: Does the committee have any further questions for Mr. Sourisseau?

Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Sourisseau.

Committee now calls Troy B. Bailey, private citizen. Mr. Bailey?

Go to the bottom of the list.

Committee now calls Vicki Burns, private citizen.

Oh, a written submission has been received from Vicki Burns, a private citizen, who wished to present but was unable to be here this evening. Ms. Burns has provided a written submission, which will now be distributed to all members.

Does the committee agree to have this document appear in the Hansard transcript of this meeting?
[Agreed]

That presentation will be distributed.

Committee now calls David Hinton, Manitoba nursery and landscape association. Do you have a presentation to have distributed as well?

David Hinton (Manitoba Nursery Landscape Association): I do.

Mr. Chairperson: Staff will do that, and when you are ready to do your presentation, you can begin.

D. Hinton: Good evening, everyone. It's great to be here, and I think we have, you know, a very important topic here that we need to talk about, and I really appreciate the opportunity to do this.

My name is David Hinton, and I would like to just give the Manitoba Nursery Landscape Association's opinions and recommendations on this important subject regarding the use of herbicides on lawns in Manitoba.

We are pleased that the government has decided to clarify and update the regulations regarding the products used to protect the health of Manitoba's landscapes. The current legislation is arbitrary, confusing and not well understood. It is also unenforceable, and compliance with the current regulations is really low. Better public policy that works for all

Manitobans is necessary, and these changes are long overdue.

Just a little bit about the Manitoba Nursery Landscape Association. Since 1958, the MBNLA has represented the horticulture profession in Manitoba. Our members grow, install, maintain the green infrastructure in the province. Member businesses include garden centres, greenhouses, landscape install and maintenance contractors, tree-care companies, nurseries and lawn-care companies. We believe we have a unique understanding of this issue, as we work with Manitobans every day to improve and maintain their landscapes.

Our members are directly affected by the regulations introduced by the previous government, and we applaud the changes that the government is proposing.

I have personally been involved with the MBNLA since 2004 and served many roles over the years, including president. I've also sat on the board of the Canadian Nursery Landscape Association as the Manitoba rep. The CNLA, the Canadian Nursery Landscape Association, represents over 4,000 horticultural businesses across Canada.

I've been around the bend with everybody, and I've seen what's happened in many of the provinces across Canada.

So, the current situation: you know, Manitobans take great pride in their homes and businesses. You can just visit any home improvement store on a Saturday morning, you'll find countless homeowners looking for products and services to improve their corner of the world.

The landscape is a natural extension of the home, and many property owners consider the area outside their house just as, or even more important than, what's on the inside.

And we know Manitobans want a choice. MBNLA delivered over 15,000 postcards to the previous government back in 2013 from Manitobans who do not want the province to restrict their ability to control weeds on their lawns. And since 2015, when the regulations came into effect, homeowners have been increasingly frustrated with their lack of ability to maintain their properties.

Trees, shrubs, flowers, turf grass are important in many ways. They are not cosmetic, but actually have a very positive environmental impact. Healthy landscapes produce oxygen, absorb carbon dioxide, reduce runoff and cool the surrounding areas.

Maintenance of these areas is vital to maximize these benefits, and weed-control products play an important role in helping—keeping these areas healthy.

The previous government introduced legislation that allows the use of only certain weed-control products on lawns surrounding our homes, businesses and public places. The current rules are arbitrary and confusing, and have created many problems for our association members.

Property owners are not satisfied with the approved tools because of the increased cost, and the reduced effectiveness. The following issues are experienced by our members every day in Manitoba.

So, No. 1, retailers who have to enforce the law—so, many of these products are sold at, you know, hardware stores—think Canadian Tire—and many of the staff there are young, part-time students, and they're the ones who are enforcing this law. So when an old, crusty guy like me goes in there and says, hey, I need some Killex for my garden, okay, okay, you can have it, it's for your garden, here you go, and out the store I go. Right?

So, that's not a good way to enforce these regulations, right? Having a part-time, 16-year-old kid determining who's going to get the products or not.

In the lawn care—in the lawn maintenance side of things, we're seeing many, many people just taking their lawns completely out. So now, where we used to have plants and areas for pollinators and all those beneficial insects that we've been hearing about, now it's just rock.

So, the rock looks okay for a little while, but then the weeds start to grow in it as well. And then when it rains, none of the water is absorbed into that rock. It all runs off into our sewers, making it, you know, more expensive for cities and municipalities to handle all that water.

One of the things with these approved products is that they must be applied at much higher rates, and we have to use them so much more often. So it—we're actually using a lot more pesticides with these products than we used to, right? The quantities are through the roof, and you have to use them over and over and over again to kind of get any kind of results that people are happy with.

One of the big things, too, is the lack of enforcement. And we don't fault the province for this, but it's just basically impossible to enforce these rules. So businesses and homeowners are hiring maintenance

companies that are breaking the law and applying traditional weed controls. The unlevel playing field that this has created is a huge disadvantage for legitimate lawn-care companies who are applying approved products because of all the increased costs.

Maintenance companies can now provide better results at a lower cost by choosing to break the law. And it's severely hurt businesses who follow the rules. What used to be a well-run industry, well-regulated industry, is now just a free-for-all out there. And many companies have gone underground, applying unapproved products for much less cost and getting better results.

The big reason that companies are doing that is because there are very few cost-effective alternatives. There's really only one, from Neudorff, who made a presentation earlier tonight. They have a lot to lose, I guess, if, you know, the market's opened up here. Because they are the only supplier, and the cost of their products is extremely high. Believe me, I know.

There are limited tools. The allowed list—you know, there's quite a few products on this allowed list, but for most of it—this regulation is about weed control on lawns. So we don't use glyphosate or Roundup or any of these products that have been mentioned earlier today. Those products kill everything. If it's green, it dies.

* (19:50)

So, in the lawn-care business, and what homeowners are concerned about, are getting rid of, typically, broad-leaf weeds, the thistles, the dandelions, the plantain, that sort of thing that are polluting their lawns. That's what they want to get rid of. Nobody is using glyphosate on areas like that at all. I mean, it's not really an issue in the lawn-care business.

But most of these products that are allowed for use on lawns, as I said, kill all the plants, that—these are all these approved products. But really, there's just one on the list that is effective, or somewhat effective on broad-leaf weeds, and the list has not been updated since 2014.

And that's one of the big things that this current regulation really inhibit any kind of development of new products because the manufacturers are going to look at it and say okay, if it's not on the list, we can't sell it in Manitoba. We can't sell it in Ontario. So there's no market; there's no reason to go through any kind of registration cost with Health Canada, which

typically would take you, you know, 10 years, 15 to 20 million dollars, I think, is the number that is bandied—thrown around to get a product to market now.

So, it costs a huge amount of money to do it. And if it's not on the approved list, there's no chance of selling it here in Manitoba, so there's no reason to go through it. So, it really limits the amount of products that are coming down the pipe. Even if they are really low-risk, really good products—no chance in Manitoba.

So, we think—MBNLA really believes that the decision to rely on Health Canada Pest Management Regulatory Agency for science-based regulation is the way to go here. It's really the only logical choice. They're the experts. They make sure that the products are safe. We need to get Health Canada at this table here to justify and defend themselves against the onslaught of criticism that they've taken here. But I believe that their best interest is in making sure that, you know, the products are safe for Manitobans and for everybody in Canada.

Pesticides are vital for a safe and healthy society. As you're aware, pesticides are used throughout the country in many—

Mr. Chairperson: Time has expired, Mr. Hinton. Thank you very much for your presentation.

Does the committee have any questions for the presenter?

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Hinton, for providing us the information tonight from Manitoba Nursery Landscape Association.

Certainly it's—this process in committee and everybody around the committee table respect all our presenters, and we need to hear all sides of the issue, and I thank you for providing the table tonight the other side of the issue, as well.

And certainly, we respect both and certainly, this helps inform policy as we go forward, so I appreciate the time.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Hinton. You're—any comments, Mr. Hinton? No? Okay.

Ms. Naylor: Thank you for your presentation.

One thing that you mentioned is that you network with other landscapers around the country, so can you tell me why maintenance companies from almost every BC municipality and all six provinces east of Manitoba are able to be successful despite strong

pesticide bans, but Manitoba landscapers can't be successful with these same regulations.

Why is that?

D. Hinton: We're using these restrictive products—or, the approved products. The cost is a lot more for homeowners to do that. We have to apply a lot more product and everywhere, in all provinces, there's a lot of underground activity happening, right?

So, the enforcement is very difficult, and as legitimate companies are trying to do the right thing, use the right products. It's very difficult to have, you know, a landscaper with a backpack in his trailer offering to do it for half the price or a quarter of the price.

Mr. Gerrard: Yes, the—just an extension of the last question.

I mean, this is one jurisdiction where there's a lot of backpedalling from what the original legislation was, and yet in other jurisdictions people have been able to manage with the legislation without having all the problems that you're talking about.

D. Hinton: Those problems exist in all the other jurisdictions—absolutely. We were promised a made-in-Manitoba solution here in 2014. That did not really happen. We just copied, you know, basically, the list from Ontario.

The approved list was put together behind closed doors. I'm not sure—they didn't really rely on Health Canada. Some of the products on that approved list are pretty dangerous—skin burns. You know, they're not friendly products, but they're on that list.

So I'm not sure how the list was put together, but these problems are across the board. Like, these are not just Manitoba specific. Everywhere where this type of legislation has come in and they have ignored Health Canada, this is the result.

Mr. Johnson: Thanks again, Mr. Hinton.

Could you—the legislation came in in 2014. Can you provide us with a little bit more detail on some of the challenges? We've heard in a written statement from AMM tonight about some of the challenges they've had with the current legislation.

Could you provide the table some more information, maybe a deeper dive, per se, on some of the challenges you've found in the past six years?

D. Hinton: I'd be happy to, yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Hinton—sorry.

D. Hinton: So, further challenges.

You know, the lack of public education is huge. We were promised that, you know, there'd be a big rollout of information for the public out there, but really, most people are totally confused on what they can do, where they can buy products, you know.

And to have all those phone calls coming into all the different lawn care companies' offices and everybody's trying to explain these rules, it's very difficult. It's painful trying to educate homeowners on what can be done, what should be done, you know, when you can use a product. It's okay to use it in your garden, but don't turn around 180 degrees and spray it on your lawn. That's against the law.

Like, completely arbitrary rules like that are very difficult for the public to understand, and they just don't get it. They don't understand it and they don't follow them.

Mr. Chairperson: MLA Wiebe, there's less than 30 seconds.

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): I appreciate that and I want to thank you, Mr. Hinton, for your presentation.

You know, I walk around the neighbourhood. I see, you know, not to pick out any companies in particular, but Lawn Man or Weed Man signs all over. It looked like really nice lawns. These are lawns that are being—having this current—

Mr. Chairperson: Time has expired.

Mr. Wiebe: Can I finish my question?

Mr. Chairperson: Leave to finish the question or comment? *[Agreed]* Okay. Follow the rules.

Leave for Mr. Wiebe to conclude his question and leave for the—

Mr. Wiebe: I assure the minister we're just asking the presenter a question.

So my question simply is: you focused in on the fact that the list of approved products was frozen in 2014, as you put it. Obviously, other jurisdictions are, you know, doing this kind of similar legislation.

Are other products out there? If we were to update that list at this point, would that make more sense? Again, you're, you know, it seems like in your industry, folks want to follow the rules; they want to do what's right and they want to produce nice lawns, so—

D. Hinton: Yes. For the broadleaf we control in lawns there is, what—that's it; that's all there is. Again, it has to be Health Canada approved, right. So the manufacturer has to go through that registration process, and right now there is just one.

So, yes, we get results with it. It costs a lot of money and there is a lot of pesticide application to get those results. Many reapplications, and the quantity that we have to apply to get those results is so much higher than with the traditional products.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you.

Time for questions has expired. Thank you, Mr. Hinton, for your presentation.

D. Hinton: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: I would call Josh Brandon, Social Planning Council of Winnipeg.

He will go to the bottom of the list.

Go down the list—*[interjection]*—oh, Josh is right there. Okay. We're going to bring him out—we have Mr. Brandon there now. Can we see and hear you well enough?

* (20:00)

Josh Brandon (Social Planning Council of Winnipeg): Hello. Can you hear me?

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, we can. When you're ready, please proceed, Mr. Brandon.

J. Brandon: Thank you for the opportunity to present here today on Bill 22, The Environment Amendment Act (Pesticide Restrictions).

I'm presenting on behalf of the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg. We're a non-profit organization. For over 100 years, we've been working for better lives for Winnipeggers and Manitobans to build sustainable communities that are caring, just and equitable.

I'm presenting today because regulating non-essential uses of pesticides is an important way to build healthier lives and protect the environment we all share.

In 2014, Manitoba instituted the existing legislation to reduce the use of cosmetic pesticides in Manitoba. The legislation restricted the use of pesticides for non-agricultural purposes on lawn and associated areas. At the time, polling by Probe Research found that 60 per cent of Manitobans supported these restrictions.

And at Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, we supported that legislation also because of the risks to children and pets where they are most likely to be exposed, lawns or areas where family members play. These are not areas where we should be applying potentially toxic pesticides. These uses also pose unnecessary risks to our environment, particularly our waterways.

So why do we need restrictions on pesticides? The current ban represents sound, science-based public policy. Independent, peer-reviewed evidence has established that serious health risks are associated with human exposure to chemical pesticides. Assessments of pesticide health risks have been reported in four systemic analyses of peer-reviewed health studies, including one by the Ontario College of Family Physicians in 2012 that examined 142 studies and another by the PEI public health office in 2015 that reviewed 365 studies.

This body of research indicates that health risks associated with exposure to pesticides includes a range of harmful impacts affecting adults, such as diabetes, cancer, neurological disorders, as well as adverse reproductive neurological development and respiratory outcomes that are particularly significant for children, pregnant women and newborns. When cosmetic pesticides are a source of such exposure, these are preventable harms.

The province-wide opinion poll in 2015 found a clear majority of respondents favoured restricting non-essential uses of pesticides. Understandably, people want to live in healthy neighbourhoods where they and their children are not exposed to avoidable pesticide health risks.

In addition to human health benefits, restricting non-essential uses of pesticides helps protect the health of pests, reduce risks for pollinating insects, reduces pesticide contamination of waterways and preserves biodiversity.

We've heard from the government about the baseline set by Health Canada. The baselines that Health Canada sets are minimum standards for the uses of pesticides. Nothing in Health Canada's regulations prevents provinces from introducing higher protections for their residents and constituents. In fact, the majority of provinces have done so.

So the question each of you must ask yourself when considering this legislation: Does Manitoba wish to be among the minority of jurisdictions that

have reduced protections for your constituents to the federally regulated minimum?

The bill we are considering today will unnecessarily weaken protections Manitobans depend on. In consideration of these points, we recommend that the bill to amend The Environment Act regarding the pesticide restrictions be withdrawn.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Brandon, for your presentation.

Would members of the committee like to ask questions?

Mr. Johnson: If yourself and the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg don't agree with the federal regulations, have you and your group had success with presentations to modify Health Canada's approved list?

J. Brandon: Thank you, Minister.

I have had the opportunity to present on several occasions to Health Canada and the PMRA about pesticide regulation, and we would welcome changes in the review process that are under way. And, as some of my colleagues before have noted, we welcome the government of Manitobans' efforts to improve those regulations, and we hope that they will be presenting with us to strengthen those regulations.

But, as I said, nothing will prevent the Province of—nothing in current regulations prevents the Province from introducing higher protections for residents and constituents.

There have been a number of legal cases starting at—in the case of Hudson, Quebec, saying that municipalities have that right also. Provinces definitely have that right, and that's why the majority of provinces have regulations and standards that are higher than the federally regulated minimums.

Ms. Naylor: Thank you, Josh—oh, I'm going to look at the camera, I—instead of your face over there—thank you for presenting here tonight. And I know that there was a press release, I believe, back in the spring, that your group did with a number of other organizations.

What were some of the other organizations who have spoken out repeatedly against the changes to this legislation?

J. Brandon: Thank you, Ms. Naylor.

We were in partnership with a coalition of 30 health and environmental organizations, including

the Humane Society, Green Action Centre, but also important health organizations like the Canadian Cancer Society, the Lung Association.

So this is a wide-ranging coalition of groups that recognize the harms to human health and the environment of allowing non-essential uses of pesticides.

And I hope that the government listens to those experts about the potential harms and risks of weakening existing regulations.

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you for your presentation.

One of the things that the 30 groups that you're involved with have emphasized is the adverse effects on neurodevelopmental aspects of children.

I wonder if you would elaborate a little bit more on that?

J. Brandon: Thank you for that question.

Now, I think we all have children that are close to us that we care about, and any risks of neurological developments would be particularly concerning for all of us.

You know, I'm not a scientist that could—or, a medical expert that can talk specifically about what those neurological disorders are, and, you know—but the—how they progress, but I know that any risk in those areas would be a red flag for me and for everyone in our community, I think.

This—for the sake of having fewer dandelions in your yard, why would you put the health of children at risk, particularly when some of these risks are so concerning and disturbing?

Mr. Chairperson: Are there any further questions? Thirty seconds remaining.

Thank you, Mr. Brandon, for your presentation.

Time has expired? Yes.

We'll go back to the top of the list and call the people that were called previously.

Margaret Friesen, private citizen?

* (20:10)

Shirley Forsyth—*[interjection]*—okay, Margaret Friesen will now be removed from the list.

Shirley Forsyth, private citizen? Shirley Forsyth will be removed—*[interjection]*—oh, virtual, okay. Sorry, my mistake. Shirley Friesen, private citizen, virtual? Forsyth, sorry. Shirley Forsyth. A moment to get online here.

Can you unmute the microphone and turn your video on, Ms. Forsyth? We're not seeing anything yet—oh.

Shirley Forsyth (Private Citizen): Oh, oh my goodness.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, can you hear and see us, and can we hear you?

S. Forsyth: Yes, I can—I'm sorry, I've never done this before. It just—all of a sudden, it prompted up to join, so I joined. It's been very—

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, we are now hearing you, so when you are ready, please go ahead with your presentation.

S. Forsyth: Okay, I don't have very much to say that hasn't already been said. It's been a lot of really excellent presentations.

I live in the centre of the city, so I'm really concerned about the fact that boulevards in a lot of the areas are the only areas that children have to play on, or adults or a wee garden on the boulevards, because there is a lack of green space. And I don't think that's been taken into consideration, that the only green space that is available in, sort of, the many mature areas of the city, exists on the boulevards, and you could spray chemicals that potentially could be toxic. I'm very concerned about this one.

I'm a retired nurse. Many years ago we had, I remember, a young person coming into the emergency, and I worked there. He got—mixed up the pesticides wrong, and he, sort of, died within a week. So, it left a really—he was farmer, a young farmer with a young family. So I know that these things can be very dangerous.

And I worked for a while on—with kids—children with leukemia, and lawn pesticides was thought to be a risk factor, and that kind of has stayed with me for life.

So I really just can't, in good conscience, support a law that would facilitate greater use of pesticides and—on green space that mostly, you know, children have access to, such as the boulevards and—which is not covered in this legislation.

I guess that's all I have to say. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Forsyth.

Does the committee have any questions for the presenter?

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Ms. Forsyth, for taking the time to—and stay on for the last couple of hours, to provide some information to the table. Certainly appreciate that.

And thank you again for sharing some of those real personal points that you shared with the table, as well. As a father of two and a grandfather of five, I certainly respect the fact that we have to protect our children and protect our families and protect our pets as well.

And that's why Bill 22 will be strengthened, again, to ensure that playgrounds and schools and daycare centres and dog parks and picnic areas will be protected from cosmetic pesticide.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Minister.

Ms. Forsyth, did you have any comments?

S. Forsyth: That doesn't address my concern about the boulevards in mature areas of the city, where children play on the boulevards because they may not have front lawns.

Ms. Naylor: Thank you very much for your presentation and for the personal stories that you shared.

I really appreciate your focus on boulevards, coming from living in the inner city and being—you know, seeing that that is a place, you know, certainly, where people play, where children play, also where dogs play. I keep hearing the minister reference dog parks, but in reality, the majority of dogs walk on the boulevards, and that's what families do. So I really appreciate your point on that and also reminding us that many, many Manitobans don't have the luxury of a big place to play, and the boulevards are essential.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Forsyth, do you have any questions?

S. Forsyth: No, just thank you for listening to me.

Mr. Gerrard: I wonder if you would talk about other areas where children play that it would be important to protect, because there's a lot of areas where children play that are not now being protected.

S. Forsyth: Sorry. Kids will migrate to any green space.

And, like I said, a lot of these mature centres like empty lots or if they're—they can find one any place where they still can find a place to throw a ball or a Frisbee or whatever is in style right now. Kids just need—and play with their dogs, run with their dogs, get some exercise.

It's just really important that these green spaces be kept as safe as possible.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you. Honourable minister?

Mr. Wharton: No, I'm good. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you.

Any further questions for Ms. Forsyth?

Thank you very much Ms. Forsyth for your presentation.

Moving down the list, I will call Al Mackling, private citizen. No.

I will call Steve Rauh, who has a virtual presentation, I understand? Yes. Can you turn your video on and unmute, Mr. Rauh? We're seeing nothing yet. Can you see and hear us?

Steve Rauh (Private Citizen): I can see and hear you.

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, and we can hear you. So, when you're comfortable, Mr. Rauh, would—

S. Rauh: I—yes. Sorry about this, there's a power outage in the Riverview neighbourhood, and so I've been trying to get this—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Rauh, please go ahead with your presentation.

S. Rauh: Okay. Well, I'll just make a quick, simple presentation. The bill that was passed that restricted the use of pesticides changed my life a little bit.

This is Pulmicort—I'm sorry, this is Bricanyl. This is an asthma medicine that I use when I get a severe attack and I want quick relief.

And this is Pulmicort. This is an asthma medicine that the doctors have told me if I have sustained asthma, which means if I use this more than two or three times a week, I'm to take the Pulmicort daily, twice daily, to keep my lungs from getting scarred.

The research study—

Mr. Chairperson: Please, Mr. Rauh—please do not use props. We can't really put them in the record. If you can speak it in, please do so. *[interjection]* Mr. Rauh, go ahead.

S. Rauh: Yes, and the recent studies on Pulmicort show that it causes a problem with the brain, as do some—the use of steroids, which the—has now been

identified as brain fog. And so they—the recent recommendation is to use as little of it as possible.

So my choice is to use one or the other when I get asthma, but what would be best is that I not get asthma.

Prior to the passage of the pesticide reduction—cosmetic pesticide reduction bill of 2014–2008–2014, whenever it was—I would ride my bike around the city and people would have their lawn signs on, and it would show that there had been pesticides sprayed on their lawn, and I would get pretty serious asthma attacks.

'Subsequent' to its passage and the tremendous reduction in the use of the pesticide, I can ride my bike anywhere in the city and not get an asthma attack. And so, during the summer, when I love being outside, I can be around, go around, and not get any asthma. And all summer long, I have not had to use medicine.

If that—if you pass the pesticide—rescind the pesticide act, that's going to change my experience of Winnipeg. I'm going to be asthmatic all year round. And that will harm my health.

And I'm sure I'm not unique in this, and I'm not a child, I can manage my asthma, but I know children who have a very difficult time managing their asthma.

* (20:20)

So, I recommend that you not rescind this bill, that it has led to a considerable improvement in the quality of health, especially in this—the reason the lung association, I'm sure, supports the current ban on cosmetic pesticides. And that is just one example of a not—I'm not talking about cancer or neurological disorders; those are much more difficult medical problems—but one example of the benefit that has accrued for me personally, and I'm sure for many, many other people who have asthma.

That's my comment.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Rauh.

Are there any questions from the committee for the presenter?

Mr. Wharton: Thank you so much, Mr. Rauh, and thank you for sharing your story and some of the challenges you're having, and certainly appreciate that. That's one of the reasons why we hold these committees, and they're a great opportunity for the democratic process to move forward.

I don't have any comment other than I hope your power comes on again soon and please stay well.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Rauh, did you have any comment?

S. Rauh: Well, the protection of health is not just a question of majority versus minority. Health protection needs to be done for pretty much everybody, and it's the reason that we have laws that show us—that require us to drive a car in the right way, and it ought to be the reason we have laws that require us to minimize the dangers to the people who are sometimes in a minority when it comes to their health.

This is not about a democratic process. This is about a process—a community process that ensures health and well-being for everybody.

Ms. Naylor: Thank you very much for your comments, Mr. Rauh.

I appreciate hearing—I mean, I'm well aware of the long-term health risks with exposure to some of these pesticides and herbicides, but hearing your very immediate response—positive response—to the legislation change is helpful.

Can you elaborate? Has there been a reduction in visits to the doctor, other medical costs to the Province, like any specific reduction just from you having reduced incidences of asthma?

S. Rauh: Like I said, I'm now 73, so I've been around a while, and I've been able to manage my health.

But, yes, I have had a few more visits to the doctor when my asthma has gotten worse. My personal costs and the costs to the health system and insurance system has gone up because I've had to use more medicine previous to the pesticide reduction act, and so I'm going to guess that it is costing the health system, especially when we're talking about young people with asthma.

And asthma seems to be on the increase in recent years, in recent decades, I should say, rather than the decrease. It's an issue that—a health issue that we know how to manage, not cure. And there are a lot of other issues that we're having difficulty managing, like ADD and ADHD, which are some of the neurological conditions that have been associated with uses of pesticides.

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you for your presentation, and a very clear illustration of the impact of the law which was passed in 2014 to ban cosmetic pesticide use and a noticeable impact on your health.

So thank you very much for your story and—because it illustrates quite clearly the difference before and after the previous legislation was passed.

S. Rauh: Yes, I would—it is a noticeable impact on my health.

If anyone in the room would like to hold their breath for two minutes and then tell me how they feel, you can get an idea of what it's like to have asthma, because sometimes for hours you have a very hard time breathing. And there is a famous psychiatrist named Sullivan [*phonetic*] who put loss of breath at the top of any form of anxiety that a person can have, because you can go without water for days but you can't go without breath for more than several minutes.

So, asthma is a particularly difficult health issue to manage, and if we're going to increase the incidence of asthma through the use of cosmetic pesticides in a city that has currently, through the last several years, been able to reduce that problem, I think we're moving in the wrong direction.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you.

The committee have any further questions?

Thank you, Mr. Rauh, for your presentation.

We're return to calling any further members that were called before and not available.

Troy B. Bailey, private citizen. No? He's dropped off the bottom of the list, then. Okay.

During the meeting, we have received written submissions from Meg Sears, Prevent Cancer Now, and from Randall McQuaker, private citizen.

Does the committee agree to have these documents appear in the Hansard transcript of the meeting?
[*Agreed*]

Being circulated—this concludes the list of presenters we have before us. Is there anyone present in the room wishing to make a presentation?

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Seeing none, we will now proceed to the clause-by-clause. Thank you to all of the presenters for your time and your patience this evening.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 22 have an opening statement?

Mr. Wharton: Again, I'm very pleased to be here tonight, and Bill 22, The Environment Amendment Act, in committee. And, certainly, was a great evening

for the table, and I'm 'preciate' all the presenters that were here. Thank you again for all those that presented to Bill 22.

Bill 22 will amend The Environment Act to allow Manitobans to use federally approved cosmetic pesticides on their lawns. At the same time, the bill enhances protections for children and pets.

We heard from Manitobans. The current legislation is not working. Manitobans want to be able to use products that are already approved through Health Canada's robust scientific approval process.

The current available products in Manitoba are expensive and not effective. Repeat treatments are needed to have any impact whatsoever. Households and municipalities have little to show for these efforts except extra costs. Green spaces have become overrun with weeds. This affects use and limits recreation opportunities in our province.

Instead, the bill gives Manitobans choice. Manitobans are free to use products they know Health Canada has thoroughly reviewed to ensure they are safe. Our government is committed to science-based decisions. We know Health Canada are the experts on pesticides.

Health Canada thoroughly reviews pesticides and deems them safe when used according to the label. The label has easy-to-follow directions to increase safe handling, including personal protective equipment, surface water setbacks and application timing and amount.

Over 350 scientists are dedicated to review—the review of pesticides. They use the most recent data and science available to assess risk to human health and the environment. Any pesticide must go through this review before it can be sold in Manitoba.

Out of an abundance of caution, the bill with 'restrict' use in municipal playgrounds, picnic areas, dog parks and provincial parks. Pesticides will use—will—pesticides' use will remain restricted at schools, child-care centres and hospitals.

Permits will still be required to use pesticides in golf courses, parks and campgrounds that are used by the general public. These permits have conditions that ensure safe pesticide use and protect communities, such as the need to use licensed pesticide applicators. Licensed applicators must meet national certification standards. They are trained to apply products correctly to reduce risks to Manitobans.

* (20:30)

Our government has done more to protect people than any other in the Prairie Provinces. Our prairie neighbours have no ban on cosmetic pesticides and do not protect sensitive areas. I am confident that this is the safe and responsible approach Manitobans have told us they want.

Thank you. Merci. Miigwech.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Minister.

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

Ms. Naylor: This bill amends the Environment Act to remove the prohibition on applying certain pesticides to lawns, as well as remove the provincial regulation on the sale of those pesticides. This legislation is a disappointing step back regarding the health and safety of our communities and environment.

Bill 22 allows for the return of environmentally damaging and dangerous cosmetic pesticides, which the previous NDP government prohibited for use on lawns across Manitoba to keep communities safe.

Bill 22 is deeply concerning for the health and well-being of our children, pets and anyone who uses greenspaces. Many Manitobans have long advocated for fewer chemicals in our water, on our land, and in our air, and it is disheartening to see that Manitoba is the only jurisdiction in Canada going backwards on this issue.

Rolling back legislation that protected our environment does not advance our fight against climate change, our fight for improved health care, and it certainly—those points had been made clear to this committee tonight by community members.

I also would like to disagree with the minister's comments on two points: the claims of enhanced protection for children and pets. This legislation does not do that. And as we've heard multiple times tonight, Health Canada has never deemed any pesticide as safe, but rather as what is an acceptable risk.

I'd like to thank any and all presenters that were here tonight who contributed their voices and perspectives by speaking to this important issue and contributing to the democratic process, and I especially appreciate folks who have shared some of their own personal health experiences in relation to pesticide use.

So thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: We thank the member.

During the consideration of the bill, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order.

Also, is there agreement from the committee—with 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 which members may have comments, questions or amendments to propose. *[Agreed]*

Clause by clause.

Clauses 1 through 3—pass; clauses 4 through 10—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

The hour being 8:33, is the business of the committee concluded? *[Agreed]*

What is the will of the committee?

Some Honourable Members: Committee rise.

Mr. Chairperson: Committee rise. Thank you.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 8:35 p.m.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

To Whom it May Concern,

On behalf of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities (AMM), I am writing to provide some comments regarding Bill 22: The Environment Act (Pesticide Restrictions).

Firstly, the AMM wishes to thank Minister Jeff Wharton and the Province of Manitoba for introducing amendments to the Environment Act to give Manitobans, including municipalities, greater flexibility to use federally approved weed control products. The AMM also wishes to thank the Department of Environment, Climate and Parks for working in partnership with our organization and members on the development of Bill 22 draft definitions for new sensitive areas.

Manitoba's 137 municipalities, including the City of Winnipeg, have been negatively affected by The Non-Essential Pesticide Use Regulation. Since 2015, the AMM has called on the Province of Manitoba to reverse the ban on federally approved weed control products since The Non-Essential Pesticide Use Regulation increased costs tenfold for some municipalities that were forced to use alternative products which proved ineffective. For example, the City of Steinbach has estimated that the costs associated with its weed control program have risen more than tenfold while using alternative products

such as Fiesta. In effect, local Councils are forced to decide whether to increase their weed control budgets or to cease weed control activities all together in certain areas of their municipalities due to the financial constraints caused by this regulation.

In addition, the AMM has expressed its confidence in current federal regulations regarding the approval of pesticides, as the review process undertaken by Health Canada's regulatory agency is rigorous and encompasses public safety review mechanisms. Banning cosmetic pesticides approved by federal government agencies not only reduces the ability of municipalities to effectively manage weed control programs, but also results in unnecessary financial constraints on municipal budgets. Moreover, aligning with federal regulations will allow municipalities to effectively manage weed control programs while mitigating financial pressures on municipal budgets. As municipalities continue to deal with both inflationary pressures and pandemic related financial pressures, the legislative amendments will help provide relief to local communities.

While we are in support of the proposed amendments, it is vital that Department of Environment, Climate and Parks develop informational materials that clearly outline where and how federally-approved products can be used. While Bill 22 restricts the use of cosmetic pesticides in municipal playgrounds, picnic areas and dog parks, some municipalities have schools and playgrounds next to municipal recreation centers or share property lines. For these unique circumstances, it is critical that forthcoming resources highlight where cosmetic pesticide use is allowed and that environment officers are aware of these parameters to ensure consistency across the province. Moreover, as the next general election takes place on October 26, 2022, the AMM suggests that the Department of Environment, Climate and Parks work with our organization to enhance communication among newly and returning elected officials regarding these new legislative amendments.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Denys Volkov
Executive Director
Association of Manitoba Municipalities

My name is Joanne Seiff. I am a resident of Winnipeg. I am against Bill 22 and do not want the province to change its legislation on cosmetic pesticides to allow

for more dangerous spraying to take place again. I do not agree with the current bill and do not want to increase pesticide spraying that will damage our biodiversity. I also don't want the run off to damage our waterways. Please do not pass this legislation.

Dandelions don't hurt anyone. Pesticides cause cancer and other health concerns.

Please take the opinions of Manitobans who care about the environment into account and get rid of this bill. This choice to protect our environment costs nothing —reintroducing these pesticides will only damage our watershed and environment further.

Thank you for hearing my concerns,

Joanne Seiff

The Environmental Health Association of Manitoba, Inc. is a not-for-profit, non-governmental, non-partisan organization run entirely by volunteers and funded by donations. Goals of EHA-MB are to promote education and information on environmental sensitivities and environmentally induced illnesses to the public, educational institutions and medical community in Manitoba and to provide information and support to individuals in Manitoba suffering from environmental sensitivities and environmentally induced illnesses.

EHA-MB is strongly opposed to any loosening of restrictions on cosmetic pesticide use in Bill 22 or any other Manitoba legislation. Pesticides, even when used according to the label, can make people with environmental sensitivities very ill and can pose threats to the health and well-being of children and pregnant women.

Pesticides do more than kill "weeds." Exposures, even at very low levels, also make people sick and that adds to the economic burden for our already beleaguered health care system. The extent to which persons can be affected by exposure to even minute amounts of chemicals is underscored by the recent death of a woman with severe chemical sensitivities in Ontario because she could not find safe low-chemical housing. She chose to end her life through MAiD (Medical Assistance in Dying). We have Manitobans who find themselves in similar circumstances who are made gravely ill from exposure to chemicals such as pesticides used on lawns. Some have chosen to leave their families and long-time homes to live in low-pesticide places. They have become insecurely housed and marginalized from mainstream society.

There is other ample evidence in peer-reviewed journals that pesticides such as those used on lawns can be detrimental to health on the short term and the long term.

Link to Prevent Cancer Now (PCN): https://preventcancer.ca/?s=cosmetic+pesticides&ct_post_type=post%3Apage%3Asubmissions Link to Cosmetic Pesticide Ban Manitoba: PBM: <https://cosmeticpesticidebanmb.com/>

Please also consider this extract from the Chief Provincial Public Health Officer Position Statement: Cosmetic Pesticides

Last reviewed: December 2015

Manitoba Health, Healthy Living and Seniors website: <https://www.gov.mb.ca/health/cppho/docs/ps/pesticides.pdf>

"Simply stated, if pesticides are not needed, they should not be used. Pregnant women and children should always be priority populations for avoiding risk, regardless of the nature and magnitude of that risk. Whether they live in rural Manitoba or urban centres, their exposure to pesticide should be minimized."

There appears to be nothing in amendments to Bill 22 to ensure that exposure of "pregnant women and children" is minimized as per the position statement of Manitoba's Chief Public Health Officer.

This is a prime opportunity for the Government of Manitoba to prevent illness of its residents. Even small amounts of pesticide can lead to illness in highly sensitive individuals. Also, there are likely "windows" when the fetus is particularly vulnerable to development and pregnant women should be given the opportunity to avoid "one-hit" exposures.

A great need for use of cosmetic pesticides e.g. for application to lawns, has not been demonstrated. Therefore, the best common sense way to ensure that exposures are minimized is to retain i.e. not repeal relevant Sections such as (but not limited to) 40.4, 40.5, of "The Environment Act."

Please contact me if there are any questions or if clarification is needed.

Respectfully submitted,

Murray Cunningham
President

Environmental Health Association of Manitoba

Hello,

This document is to communicate serious concerns regarding the loosening of cosmetic pesticide regulations, from different areas of consideration. It is the government's responsibility to be an environmental steward, and to protect the health of the people and wildlife to this effect. It is in this spirit that I hope you consider the following document, which will engage with various aspects of this issue.

A Job Seeker's Discovery / A Self-Soothing Industry

In 2012, a colleague of mine let me know that he was also working in a sales position for 'Weedman', the company led by David Hinton, who I understand is the spokesman for the Manitoba Nursery Landscape Association. My colleague described the position as a great financial opportunity, and I was certainly looking for an opportunity at that time.

I set up an interview with the company. Upon arrival I was greeted by a very friendly sales manager, who quickly identified that I would be a fit, and we got along well.

After the initial interview, I mentioned that I had some concerns with the safety of the products being used.

He assured me that 2, 4d was totally safe, and went as far as to cite a story of someone in the company drinking a shot glass of the undiluted product and 'was just fine'.

I sat on this information, and then did my own research on 2, 4d.

Based on what I found out, which will be highlighted in the next section, there were in fact Serious Health Concerns, not only with the direct ingestion of these products, but being exposed to the vapor they off-gas until full breakdown.

This is similar in lack of honesty to the statement from David Hinton made last March,

"Our green spaces contribute so much to our quality of life and produce enormous environmental benefits, but are continually being threatened by extreme climate conditions and invasive species such as the emerald ash borer," he said."

Here David is portraying Non-biodegradable, Hormone Disrupting Carcinogens, being disbursed in a wanton fashion direction into the soil, groundwater etc, as part of the solution to provide 'Enormous Environmental Benefits' and to somehow stop the emerald ash borer (?).

I understand people like to feel good about the work they do, even when they are spraying chemicals into the environment that are obviously going to harm people, wildlife etc. The owner needs to find a way to alleviate concerns, not only of the public, but their own staff as well.

I refer to this kind of mentality as 'self-soothing', dealing with the emotions of the situation without actually addressing the problems, and minimizing them, such as with the shot glass story above.

I can also certainly appreciate that to show up at a home, take 10 minutes to spray the lawn, than leave with no regard to the chemical exposure for those in the neighborhood and receive a good payment for said 'service' is a very desirable opportunity for some. However, this action and the words of Mr Hinton above preclude someone from a 'good corporate citizen'.

Suffice to say I did not take the position, and told the sales manager, nice fellow as he was, that I didn't believe anyone drank a shot glass of 2, 4d concentrate, and that I wouldn't be taking the position.

This would not be my last significant encounter with Weedman, as will be documented a few sections down.

Health Concerns Regarding Herbicides

It is somewhat unfathomable that in current year, and with all the knowledge we have regarding our ever more toxic environment, humanity dealing with various forms of endocrine disorders, birth defects, behavioral issues, faltering sperm counts and various other forms of health problems of 'unknown origin', as well as a general recognition that we need to value our health, that we would even be having a discussion about the re-normalization of some of the most aggressively toxic agents that people are exposed to in a residential environment.

While it is at least understandable that these products would have been utilized in commercial agriculture, it is truly incredible that people started using these products as toxic as these in a residential setting to begin with. This behavior of both consumers and marketers to this end began with the 1947 film 'Death to Weeds' by Dow Chemical.

This film, and all the marketing that followed created the concept of the 'weed free lawn', as people from rural settings were arriving in cities. People were instilled with the belief that this is what 'good neighbors' and 'good homeowners' did, toxic load to

be processed by the endocrine systems and wildlife of the neighborhood of no concern.

Indeed, the reduction of these chemicals is the only achievement of the previous government, with whom I do not share a broad agreement on many issues with, that I can identify.

However they implemented this without the conviction needed to persuade people about the prospect of, and benefits of Clean Air, Respecting Wildlife (including pollinators), and the avoidance/elimination harmful chemicals in everyday life, taking a cumulative toll on the health of people of the community.

In this way they missed a very Real Opportunity to gain buy-in from the people of Manitoba, a mistake which they never reversed, leaving people instead to only focus on the supposed 'negatives' of not being able to use these products, all while industry groups are so concerned that people might not want to eat foods laden with these chemicals that they have to ignore and publicly minimize legitimate health concerns.

That the previous government missed this opportunity does not mean the current government has to double down on bad health choices, due to people who stand to financially gain from ignoring the health impact of these chemical agents.

So what of the safety of these products?

There are 2 main categories of products in use; a: 2, 4d, 'broadleaf weed killer' type product designed for use on grass, and b: Roundup/Glyphosate formulations designed to kill all plants.

2, 4d type products

It is often said that 2, 4d is the most studied synthetic chemical in existence in terms of safety. This is misleading for a number of reasons.

First, assuming one agrees with the methodology of using uni-varied analysis to look for One Particular Disease per study, which many believe is an outdated and near useless methodology, there is an alarming lack of consistency within the manufacturing of 2, 4d on it's own.

The article Four Corners investigation finds dangerous dioxins in widely used herbicide 2,4-D from Australia details how Dioxins, The most carcinogenic category of substance on Earth, is repeatedly being found in 2, 4d products that the Australian government had deemed as 'safe', and was

being used by thousands of people, blissfully unaware., which illustrates that even with so-called checks and balances of a modern commonwealth country these products were not up to Basic Safety Standards, even within that government's own standards.

If you can smell the chemical, you are ingesting it.

There are various forms of 2, 4d, that, even when properly manufactured, that have varying toxicity versus each other, Salts, Ester formats and others, with different timeframes for breakdown etc.

It is stated on the National Pesticide Information Center (US) that the Half-Life In Soil is 1-14 days, One form of 2,4-D, the butoxyethyl ester, had a much longer Half-life in aquatic sediment of 186 days.

Furthermore much of this chemical is blowing inside people's homes through windows and window A/C units, where it will Not have access to the bacteria which breaks it down in soil and water. So, it will provide exposure for the people and pets of that home, potentially for years to come, at which time it will degrade into presumably but not necessarily less harmful secondary chemicals.

As bad as that sounds, the reality is actually worse. In a residential setting, the chemicals are offgassing as they break down.

The method of action of 2, 4d is that it pushes a plant to 'Grow it's self to death'. There is some broad analogy to cancer/'Excitotoxins' here that I think most honest people would have to acknowledge.

In terms of safety measures, people are advised to wear long sleeves and pants, gloves, goggles, ventilator, and are advised to wash hands immediately after, change and wash clothes, and avoid 'touching' the grass for hours or days.

These safety measures, which were mandatory in the approval of the products involved, are followed to various degrees by homeowners and companies, provide some insight into the true danger of these products, especially when one considers that they do off-gas active ingredients until they break down fully. In theory, one should be using the safety equipment above when one is walking by an area that has been treated let alone having a child play on a neighboring lawn etc.

Again, if you can smell the product, you are ingesting the product.

The most known danger of 2, 4d is a form of cancer known as non-hodgins lymphoma. The rates of Non-Hodgkins Lymphoma are steadily going up over time.

According to the AP, 33% of people tested had signs of 2, 4d in their urine, which went up to 40% 10 years later.

There are a plethora of health issues that can be found simply by searching '2, 4d effect on' and referencing a certain organ.

For Example here are the impacts on the pancreas, as we are in epidemic levels of HypoGlycemic and Type 2 Diabetes: Assessing eco-toxicological effects of industrial 2,4-D acid iso-octylester herbicide on rat pancreas and liver ' Our observations indicated that this herbicide potentially is a cancer initiator.' ,

Hepatic, renal, and pancreatic damage associated with chronic exposure to oral and inhaled 2,4-dichlorophenoxy acetic acid (2,4-d): an environmental exposure model in rats

'There was a difference in ALT (alanine aminotransferase) levels between groups exposed to 2,4-D. The groups exposed to oral 2,4-D had a higher incidence of steatosis [Degeneration is a nonspecific entity that can arise from any number of etiologies that perturb cell function and is often an early indicator of necrosis.], and exposed to high doses had increased liver inflammation.'

Etc. Of note is the more recent nature of some of the references, only from the last few years.

The fact that 2, 4d is 'rapidly excreted by the body' to various degrees, which is somehow pointed to as a measure of safety, ignores the fact that our organs do not encounter these substances in nature, and it's ability to cope is not indicate that these substances are harmless, and ignores any damage done to endocrine system in this excretion feat.

However, even if you look past all of that regarding the most prominent active ingredient, what is being forgotten here is that these products are not only simply containing 2, 4d.

In most 2, 4d type products, this ingredient is paired with with Dicamba and Mecoprop-P. as well as various forms of surfactants (penetrators), pthalates/xenoestrogens, preservatives and other 'trade secret' substances, that are Not Subject to Review.

Many of these substances broadly fall into a category called 'excitotoxins', referring to the fact that they

stimulate cells to death (similar mechanism to 2 ,4d and dicamba making plants 'grow themselves to death'.

Beyond the fact that Health Canada does not evaluate end user products, thus does not evaluate the effects of these various chemicals being used Together on Human/Environmental health, I will touch on these other ingredients briefly;

Dicamba

Dicamba was first registered in 1967. Dicamba, like 2, 4d also functions by increasing plant growth rate, leading to senescence and cell death.

Like 2, 4d it is also linked to Non-Hodkins Lymphoma, again accounting for the poor methodology of testing for only one negative health outcome in a study, instead of a more broad spectrum holistic approach for any and all negative health impacts. In an evaluation of liver and intrahepatic bile duct cancer, there was an association with increasing use of dicamba that persisted across lags of up to 20 years.

The half-life for dicamba in the two forest-types soils was 32 and 26 days, respectively, while the half-life in grassland soil was 17 days. When tested on agricultural soil from the Midwest, the half-life of dicamba under aerobic conditions was 31 days and under anaerobic conditions, the half-life was 58 days. Again this does not address product that ends up in a person's home, blown onto a person's skin etc.

Mecoprop-P

This is the least studied of the components of these formulas, therefore there is not a lot of safety data available. The U.S. EPA has classified mecoprop as toxicity class III- slightly toxic. Reported half-lives generally range from 3 to 21 days, again with no information on breakdown in a homesetting, on concrete etc, or how it's toxicity might be altered by pairing with other active or non-active ingredients.

Surfactants

These are the penetrating agents that push the active ingredients into cell walls. They are generally derived from modified fats, such as Polyethoxylated tallow amine (POEA). These agents ensure not only penetration into leaves, but also into our skin as we walk by, into our lungs as we breathe, even into our eyes. This means they act as a kind of 'toxicity multiplier', another aspect that is totally ignored in terms of safety evaluation. It is of note that humans

absorb more chlorine from bathing than they do from ingestion.

Phthalates

Phthalates, known in the biology world as 'gender benders' due to their powerful hormone disruption capacity, are used as plasticizers to increase stability and flexibility, to prevent brittleness, as a solvent for fragrances, and as inert ingredients. It is presumed the reason for their addition to these formulas is for stability of the petroleum base.

Human exposure to phthalates is evidenced by presence of their metabolites in human urine and other biological samples. Phthalates have been found to leach or migrate from PVC-containing items (including pesticides) into air, dust, water, soils, and sediment. Multiple studies have examined the association between the presence of PVC in the home flooring and walls, a presumed indicator of phthalate exposure, with the development of asthma and allergies in children.

Other 'Trade Secret'/ so-called 'Inert' Ingredients

I highly recommend you consider the points made in this National Institute of Health Document: Unidentified Inert Ingredients in Pesticides: Implications for Human and Environmental Health,

Especially the sections on 'Inadequate Assessment of the Hazards of Pesticide Formulations' 'Inert Ingredients Can Increase Toxicity of Pesticide Formulations', 'Inert Ingredients Can Increase Exposure to Pesticide Formulations' and 'Inert Ingredients Can Increase Ecotoxicity of Pesticide Formulations'.

Roundup/Glyphosate

This section will be a little bit shorter, as the surfactants, phthalates discussed above, also apply to glyphosate.

Glyphosate came to prominence in the 1970s. Monsanto was criticized for claiming Roundup was biodegradable, when it is in fact incredibly persistent.

It is said to have a half life in soil of 180 days, with no mention of half life on concrete, in a home, etc.

What is a little different is the mode of action, as well as public attention to health concerns.

The mode of action of glyphosate is to inhibit the ability of a plant to process nutrients, as opposed to 2, 4d, which forces a plant to grow to death.

This limiting of ability to process nutrients, stays in the soil, leading to lower nutrient content of plants later planted there, and also human's ability to process nutrition after exposure.

Glyphosate can predispose plants to diseases indirectly by reducing the overall growth and vigor of the plants, modifying soil microflora that affects the availability of nutrients required for disease resistance, and altering the physiological efficiency of plants. Recommend you read the Glyphosate: Its Environmental Persistence and Impact on Crop Health and Nutrition, and as well Glyphosate, pathways to modern diseases III: Manganese, neurological diseases, and associated pathologies.

As a Powerful Antiseptic Agent, glyphosate wrecks havoc on our own microbiomes when we breathe it in.

Also of note Glyphosate-based herbicides: Evidence of immune-endocrine alteration and Glyphosate-based herbicides: evidence of immune-endocrine-microbiome alteration

And from The impact and toxicity of glyphosate and glyphosate-based herbicides on health and immunity:

Finally, there is the small matter of the massive settlements Bayer/Monsanto has paid out regarding the Cancer thought to be caused by glyphosate/Roundup. Generally these companies wouldn't volunteer billions of dollars to prevent going to court if they believe their product was not responsible, which speaks volumes.

The Retail/Home Consumer Experience

No less than 6 times, I have entered a large big box store, including hardware stores that I don't go to often, and without actively seeking it out, see so-called 'restricted' product stored without the prescribed locked cages, intermingled with all other kinds of assorted product.

When I go to alert a manager, they inform me that 'the reps just put it on the shelf', seemingly without their knowledge.

If I was running a store, and there were regulations, designed to protect people, that had actual government enforcement, you can bet I would have serious words with said rep, and if it continued would simply ban them from the store and have a conversation with their superior, that is assuming I hadn't made the common sense decision to simply stop selling such harmful products.

I don't believe it would be unreasonable or excessively costly to send an inspector to these stores on a monthly basis, and you would obviously expect better compliance if they knew this kind of enforcement was commonplace. In this way the province abdicated their responsibility, just as it is attempting to do now with the dissolution of these restrictions, combined with the lack of public education as to the Dangers of these products.

A neighbor of mine who was unaware of the danger of 2, 4d and Glyphosate was open to safer options once I explained the concerns. -However, going online to the local hardware store I was shocked to see they were sold out of all but the harmful options, presumably no longer in cages at the store.

Finally, I have another neighbor, who though now agrees with me about the danger of these products, had stored a bottle of roundup in his garage for 10+ years, and as we know these products off-gas, and also ferment in the strong temperature changes, even through the seals in the bottle, and as a result his whole garage and all the items in it are now totally and absolutely permeated with this odor, containing an unknown amount of active ingredient, pthalates etc, which he is exposed to whenever using his garage.

In this sense, a person Doesn't Even Have to use the Product for it to be Harmful! He only had to own it.

As with the case of garages, these products are offgassing as they sit on the shelf in a hardware store, exposing especially staff, but also anyone who walks in the store. The smell is strongest right next to the products.

My Personal Experience with these Chemicals

I have been very sensitive to chemicals since I eliminated all the non-biodegradable cleaning chemicals in my life in approximately 2003. It seems to be one of those things that you cannot appreciate until you take a break and then are re-exposed, much like the ex-smoker who cannot deal with cigarette smoke.

The exception to this would be our first exposure as a child, perhaps some of us can remember the strange sensation or smell of various chemicals that were somewhat 'shocking' at the time, which we then become desensitized to over time, only to be somewhat reminded of by media reports describing the dangers of endocrine disrupting chemicals etc.

With all of this in mind, I was already hesitant to work for Weedman, even if the chemicals were much more benign than they turned out to be.

It was then fate, when at my new home in the West End of Winnipeg in 2014, I saw the weedman fertilizer roller on my immediate neighbors yard. I let the applicator know I has chemical sensitivity, and can they please make sure they didn't spray my lawn, to which he agreed.

Perhaps a month later, I awoke mid day (after working the night before) to a powerful disorientating, headache inducing smell coming off my yard, a flowerbed to be exact. They had Specifically soaked my flowerbed with 2, 4d.

To make matters worse, this was next to my front door, the screen door being my main window I could open, and the home had no Air Conditioner.

I called Weedman perhaps 3 times, explained what happened, and told I'd receive a call.

When no call came I inquired into a regulating body, and eventually spoke with a man named Randy Webber, an Environment Officer, who kindly came to my home took pictures and documented what had happened. His notes are enclosed with this document.

A few days later, a man from Weedman, I believe was David Hinton but cannot be sure, showed up on my property at 10 am and woke me up -again I was working nights at the time. I was bothered by the fact that he felt entitled to come on my property, just as they felt entitled to spray my property in previous days, woke me up without any appointment etc. It seemed there was an entitlement to do whatever he wanted.

He agreed they had sprayed my flowerbed. When I asked about windspeed etc he interrupted me to tell me it had all be within limits, therefore Acknowledging this was done on purpose.

This event launched a 3 year battle between myself and my neighbor at the time, with my neighbor spraying my lawn nearly every day, sometime multiple times and at all times of day, and even going as far as to put a plastic plant between our houses that he would soak in these chemicals, knowing they would retain the smell and off-gas indefinitely, as well as fogging malathion by an open window around 3am.

I had no choice but to move away and get a peace bond against this person, and the whole experience was very informative as to the commitment people have to these products, including a person who was in their late 60s and on a breathing machine.

However, it kind of makes sense, if you had been told stories such as the one I mentioned earlier of someone

drinking a shotglass of 2, 4d concentrate and being 'just fine', and persuasion tactics such as these, combined with the lack of attempt to get buy-in from the previous government, that many members of the public want access to these chemicals again.

The reports from the two environment officers are available upon request.

In my current home, I live close to a large industrial building.

In summer of 2020, they sprayed their massive lawn with 2, 4d, for the first time since I moved in. This was on the side of the street with the only sidewalk, and a large volume families with strollers, children etc using that sidewalk to go to the nearby park are the norm.

Upon informing the administrator of the issue, which I thought was more neighborly than reporting them I was told 'they were finding a new company' and it shouldn't be an issue moving forward.

Last Year, 2, 4d was again sprayed on their full lawn and boulevard. When I mentioned this again she mentioned something about there being a debate on this issue of the chemicals.

As there was no rain last year, which can help spur the breakdown of these chemicals, I could not use my front lawn or Front/Main Window for five weeks of summer.

It was at that point that I called enforcement, and, Thankfully and Gratefully, they did not use 2, 4d this year.

While it was Genuinely Wonderful that I could call for enforcement, the fact that two separate Lawn Care Companies used 2, 4d when they thought no one would notice is Extremely Troubling and indicates that they did not believe there would be any repercussions, as well as a callous lack of care for the people who would be breathing these agents indefinitely, as they get in their truck and leave the area.

So when I hear industry types such as David Hinton lamenting that 'enforcement Is difficult', on the provably harmful product that he wishes to spray into a neighborhood etc, I view it in a similar way as a thief trying to persuade that shoplifting is hard to enforce and why bother, or some similar examples.

The whole approach is totally disingenuous and callous.

Now I have what could be referred to as 'Severe Chemical Sensitivity, especially with the herbicide

category of chemicals, due to what is referred to as 'Repeated and Prolonged Exposure'.

When I walk to the grocery store (I don't drive), I make mental notes of where the smells are coming from so I can cross the street away from the chemicals, at those points. This has varying degrees of effectiveness, depending on the wind. I will then often be able to smell these agents in my clothes, making an otherwise unnecessary shower a part of my routine upon arriving home.

There has not been one single time from when the sprays start in April/May through August that I have walked to the store without this kind of chemical exposure, again each home using different formulations, each with different chemicals, all of which have not been evaluated at finished products for safety.

When I smell these chemicals from my yard, I will take a walk through the neighborhood to identify the source, then identify which way the wind would be blowing that would preclude my ability to open a window, sit in the yard etc. I also start looking for rain in the forecast, in hopes it will speed up the degradation of these products.

I do not call enforcement on neighbors, this is where actually seeking buy-in from the public would have been helpful.

It is a very natural conclusion to come to that 'it's just a little chemical', however the daily Exposure of living in a community was not taken into account when these products were approved, long sleeve and goggle requirements and all.

In this way the commercial applicator could be seen as actually having the lowest exposure of anyone in the neighborhood, as they are spraying and leaving before the chemical has a chance to start drying/aerosolizing in the few minutes they are actually there, and with the protective equipment.

They may indicate that it should not be stepped on until dry, or perhaps 3 days, however this does not address the chemical aerosol exposure that the people of the area will experience for weeks.

Physical effects I experience from even brief exposure include: headache, nerve pain, dizziness, foggy thinking and some panic, as I try to maneuver away from these agents.

I do believe certain health issues I am now experiencing are in direct relation to repeated and prolonged exposure to these issues.

The windows in my current home are old, and not sealed, as common with many older homes. I have purchased several costly air purifiers specifically to clean the air of herbicides that enter my home.

Canary in the Coal Mine

It may well be asked - 'Why don't the people I know react with these chemicals? Doesn't that mean they aren't so bad?'

People are varied, and have different strengths and weaknesses. Some people may have better functioning endocrine systems, which are able to 'cushion the blow', at least for a time. Substances affect different people in different ways.

People may Never put together that their chronic headaches, joint pain, inflammation etc may be caused by a chemical agent they are being repeatedly exposed to, with or without their knowledge.

Finally, there is the 'Canary in the Coal Mine' approach to understanding this, whereby we pay attention to the chemical agents that are causing our fellow human obvious acute malady, as a clue that said chemical agents are worthy of a reevaluation in terms of their safety profile and application.

If it is obviously harming one person, it is foolhardy to simply believe that because there are no obvious or acute symptoms in others, that there is no negative effect. With the cancer rates as high as they are, and climbing, it seems we can only play whack-a-mole with symptoms for long, and we would be wise to reduce our toxic load in general wherever feasible.

As a side note, I wish to point out that there has been at least on person who's life has been terminated, with government 'M.A.I.D.' assistance, due to unbearable chemical sensitivity.

I only bring this up only to highlight how substantial this issue is in some people's lives. Indeed, if a person cannot breathe the air without pain, it may have some profound mental and spiritual implications for some people.

Brief Comparisons to Other Industries

Things do not occur in a vacuum, and to this end here are some comparisons to other industries which I believe show Much Less Harm than the Pesticide Sector, yet have rightly been designated as dangerous:

Asbestos

Though we can all acknowledge asbestos is a carcinogenic substance, I don't believe anyone could dispute it is safer than the pesticides discussed above,

for the reason being that, if installed with caution, and left undisturbed, No One is Exposed to it's Toxicity. This is the polar opposite of herbicides, which anyone breathing while walking by will have exposure to, both through airways, skin etc, which is then re-applied regularly.

While asbestos was used in insulation capacity, ie keeping people, homes, businesses warm, cosmetic use of herbicides, are, cosmetic.

If asbestos risk/benefit analysis indicates it should not be used, Harmful Cosmetic Herbicides should not even be considered.

Tobacco

It has long been acknowledged that tobacco is bad for health, however, much like in this case, Industry players fought it all the way. Much as David talks about 'green spaces and quality of life' and attempting to somehow connect herbicides in a positive way with this, we all know there were Tobacco Products 'Trusted by Doctors' and 'Doctor's Choice', well after initial concerns had been demonstrated.

Indeed we go out of our way not just to keep tobacco smoke (which unlike herbicides, dissipates in minutes, not a half-life of weeks or months) not just out of indoor buildings but also away from public doors, or any place where people might be exposed.

This is simply not the case with Herbicides, where people will breathe and be exposed simply by sitting on a lawn adjacent to one that had been sprayed.

Some workplaces even acknowledge 'Third Hand Smoke', in which smoke particles on one jacket will migrate to surrounding clothing, for example. These workplaces have different jacket areas for smokers and non-smokers for this reason.

Because of the undisputed nature of the harms of tobacco for many years, society at large has a better and more agreed upon understanding of how tobacco's harms can spread in this way, which is noticeably absent from the herbicide discussion, even though the herbicides are arguably much more stable than the toxic smoke material from tobacco.

It is indeed quite astounding how a 'small amount' of chemical can impact the health of so many, whether they recognize it or not, very reminiscent of one smoker in a restaurant.

Conclusion

It is not my intention, or the intention of the other people who share their concerns with herbicides, to

put down the people who have unwittingly been using such harmful products.

People should not be expected to become experts on every substance in their home, and doubly so in the days of pre-internet, and doubly so in a category of product with such wilful distribution of slanted/less than forthright information from 'Industry Experts' such as David Hinton. Maybe someone I know drank a shot of concentrate - Then did 400 pushups! Or whatever the antidote of the day is.

Indeed, one of the greatest forms of Wisdom and Maturity is to admit when one has been 'had', by someone who may or may not have had the same lack of information.

It can be painful to acknowledge that, and more so to acknowledge that one's own family and neighbors may have been harmed to one degree or another by this lack of information.

However there is no Shame in recognizing that one had been on the wrong path, and to correct this path as early as possible.

I urge the Government to reverse course, Strengthen Enforcement and more importantly Actually Begin Education/Awareness of the benefits of Clean Air, Clean Water, Respect for Wildlife including bees and pollinators and the Dangers of these products and actually seek buy-in from the public.

If that means people are more likely to seek out Organic Food, due to some concerns about their use in the food system, that would be their right to make an informed choice, one way or the other. It is their health after all.

Perhaps the humble dandelion and other sources of food for our precious pollinators would not be so maligned, as any other yellow flower.

As for these companies, there are effective alternatives for both categories of herbicides, in Fiesta (iron based product) for grass, and Acetic Acid based products for broad spectrum. Even if there wasn't, that still wouldn't justify the use of the 2,4d and glyphosate products for cosmetic purposes.

People have a Right to be Properly Informed and Decide what goes into their body, as opposed to pretending these chemicals are benign so people won't be 'scared off' of eating them, an entirely backwards approach for any society that claims to value the health and respect the intellect of it's people.

Finally, as stewards of the land, the Precautionary Principle must be invoked. There is no 'undo' button

when it comes to cumulative health impacts, especially in light of newer research and our evolving knowledge of health impacts and impact on wildlife including pollinators.

Thank you for your attention to the points made in the above document.

Ben Raber

I am presenting this submission to state my objection to the changes proposed which would allow the application of cosmetic pesticides to lawns and grounds, both publicly and privately owned. I am presenting as a private individual although I am currently the chair of the Manitoba Eco-Network and a former Executive Director of The Winnipeg Humane Society.

My opposition to the use of cosmetic pesticides is based on the potential threat to human and animal health. As far as I know there are no medical associations that are promoting the use of cosmetic pesticides but there are numerous organizations that are calling for the use of cosmetic pesticides not to be reinstated. Here in Manitoba, the Manitoba College of Family Physicians, Manitoba Health Coalition, Manitoba Lung Association, Manitoba Public Health Association are among the organizations speaking out. As well, The Winnipeg Humane Society is speaking out on behalf of animals and humans alike. In total, there are than thirty health and environmental organizations who are appealing to you to maintain Manitoba's restrictions on non-essential uses of pesticides.

I understand the need to use some pesticides in agricultural situations, until we can move toward a more regenerative mode of agricultural production. But to use substances that are designed to kill, strictly for aesthetic purposes makes no sense.

The following study by the official publication of The College of Family Physicians of Canada reviewed studies published between 1992-2003 on non-Hodgkin lymphoma, leukemia, brain, breast kidney, lung, ovarian, pancreatic, prostate and stomach cancers. There findings are summarized in the following statement. Cancer health effects of pesticides - PMC (nih.gov) "Most studies on non-Hodgkin lymphoma and leukemia showed positive associations with pesticide exposure. Some showed dose-response relationships, and a few were able to identify specific pesticides. Children's and pregnant women's exposure to pesticides was positively

associated with the cancers studied in some studies, as was parents' exposure to pesticides at work. Many studies showed positive associations between pesticide exposure and solid tumours. The most consistent associations were found for brain and prostate cancer. An association was also found between kidney cancer in children and their parents' exposure to pesticides at work. These associations were most consistent for high and prolonged exposures."

According to the Canadian Cancer Society 2 in 5 Canadians will be diagnosed with cancer during their lifetime and 1 in 4 will die from cancer. Cancer is the leading cause of death in Canada. My question to you is why would we want to increase those odds? Surely, we value the health of humans and animals more than the appearance of our lawns and gardens. Ideas about what constitutes a beautiful yard are changing and the appearance of a completely weed free lawn is no longer considered the most desirable. Our concept of what is considered a weed is really quite culturally related. In some other countries dandelions are considered beautiful and are used in salads, for medicinal purposes and in general for their bright colour.

The final point I want to make is that the risk we are putting on the health of our children and pets by using cosmetic pesticides is greater than for adults because they are most likely to have the greatest contact with areas where the pesticides have been applied. Both children and pets are walking on the grass, sometimes rolling in it as they play. Pets tend to lick their fur and ingest more of it and both children and animals inadvertently bring it into their homes on their feet, paws skin, etc.

The following excerpts are from *Childhood Cancer Rates Are Rising. Why?* (webmd.com) The National Cancer Institute (NCI) says there has been a significant increase in the overall rate of childhood cancers in recent decades -- up 27% since 1975 in kids under age 19, according to data collected by the NCI's Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) Program.

"When you see an increase like that -- that fast -- in a short period of time, most likely it is going to be driven by some exposure to environmental factors," says Catherine Metayer, MD, PhD, an adjunct professor at the University of California, Berkeley, School of Public Health. She and her team just won a \$6 million grant from the National Institute of

Environmental Health Sciences to study the causes of leukemia in children

In conclusion, please reconsider taking this step backwards to reinstate the use of cosmetic pesticides. The risks to the health of our precious children and animals is simply too great.

Respectfully submitted by,

Vicki Burns

Dear Committee;

We are writing in support of the medical, health promotion and environmental communities, who uniformly oppose rolling back restrictions on pesticides use for "cosmetic" or non-essential purposes. In particular, the Manitoba Medical Officer of Health stated in 2015,

"Simply stated, if pesticides are not needed, they should not be used.

Pregnant women and children should always be priority populations for avoiding risk, regardless of the nature and magnitude of that risk. Whether they live in rural Manitoba or urban centres, their exposure to pesticide should be minimized."

Prevent Cancer Now (PCN) includes scientific and medical experts, working to "stop cancer before it starts." PCN regularly participates and consults with the Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) and is well versed in the limitations of the federal assessments and registration. The federal government is a fallible first line of regulation, but across Canada provinces and municipalities have stronger restrictions to protect pregnant women, children and other vulnerable populations, biodiversity and ecosystems. This is your role.

Prevent Cancer Now, and Breast Cancer Action Manitoba submitted a scientific brief previously, in support of the current law, attached as Annex 1. There is strong evidence that pesticides contribute to development of chronic diseases, including cancers. While these conditions may be multi-factorial, there is good reason to eliminate readily preventable contributors to ill health.

Pesticides are used intentionally to kill and harm unwanted species, and these short-term solutions may ultimately backfire and be ineffective over the long term. Please find attached as Annex 2, explanations with scientific references, for Manitoba to protect its

people and lands from pesticides, beyond the basic federal restrictions.

Finally, supporting soil health and biodiversity at the base of all life, in the soil and sediments, supporting "pest" predators and diverse alternative landscapes not only leads to more interesting landscapes, it is essential to counter at least in some small part today's twin ecological crises of climate and biodiversity loss—these are only hastened with toxic pesticides used on lawns and gardens.

We implore you, for the health of your electorate and Manitobans' environment, to ensure that pest "control" is based on least-toxic ecological approaches, and not to roll back these protections.

PCN welcomes questions, and is available to assist with further information. Sincerely,

Meg Sears, PhD
Chair, Prevent Cancer Now

At first glance, it may appear that pesticides are well-regulated in Canada. After all, pest control products approved for use by Health Canada are subject to detailed reviews by scientists and professional staff at the federal Pest Management Regulatory Agency.

And yet, many doctors, medical researchers, parents and health groups say the process is flawed and inadequate. They are not reassured. Why not?

1. "Acceptable" Risk?

As set out in Section 2(2) of the Pest Control Products Act, the standard to be met for regulatory approval of pesticides is "acceptable risk." Under federal legislation, it is not necessary that a pesticide should carry no risk to human health or to the environment, but rather that any identified risk is deemed acceptable to the Minister responsible for the Act. While "no risk" would be a challenging bar to clear, "acceptable risk" leaves a wide opening for interpretation. Effectively, it allows for the approval of pesticides that carry known health or environmental risks, as long as the risks are judged acceptable to the Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA). As one might expect, the federal regulator (and industry) may have quite different ideas about what risks are acceptable than do some stakeholders, such as physicians and parents of young children.

Further, in assessing risk, the regulator sometimes faces situations where information is missing or unavailable (for example, water monitoring data or epidemiological studies). In such instances, faced

with scientific uncertainty, many feel that the PMRA should adopt a more precautionary approach, pending corroborating evidence that risks are (or are not) acceptable. This is one reason why some stakeholders are skeptical about pesticide approval decisions.

(By the way, the Agency itself does not use the word "safe" in its decisions. They do not claim that pesticides are safe. Instead, they declare whether or not risks are acceptable.)

2. New Evidence Brings New Restrictions

It is unsettling to some that, after initially reviewing and registering pesticides, the PMRA keeps having to change its mind about how, when and whether pesticides can be used. As noted, approvals are issued when it is judged that identified risks are "acceptable." But when evidence comes along documenting previously unknown risks, the PMRA finds itself having to impose new and more restrictive conditions on pesticide use. These changes may entail increasing the requirement for buffer zones (2,4-D, 2005), requiring additional protective gear (dicamba, 2008), cancelling some previously permitted uses (carbaryl, 2016), imposing new conditions on use (glyphosate, 2017), or other changes (re-entry time, bromoxynil, 2019), up to and including deregistration (chlorpyrifos, 2021). Indeed, reviews of dozens of pesticides have resulted in additional risk reduction measures. When new restrictions are so often required as a result of re-evaluations, it creates concern about why the regulator apparently didn't get it right in the first place, leaving many people understandably doubtful about the pesticide approval process and about the acceptability of other pesticides.

An example: when the insecticide chlorpyrifos was first approved in Canada in 1969, regulators did not know that it would have serious and harmful effects on children's neurological development. Further reviews by the PMRA in 2000, 2003 and 2007 resulted in new restrictions on use, but allowed the pesticide to remain on the market. In all, chlorpyrifos was in widespread use with the stamp of PMRA approval for more than 50 years. In May 2021, in the wake of strong and convincing evidence that it is highly toxic to children's brain development, chlorpyrifos was deregistered and banned for all uses in Canada. Those exposed to the chemical over the years, or whose children were exposed, might understandably feel that their confidence in regulatory approval was misplaced.

3. Pesticide Reviews Not Up To Date

Even though the PMRA has made efforts to update some of its procedures (as recently as the spring of 2022, and continuing), many older pesticides that are still in use today have not been re-evaluated under an improved regulatory regime. The PMRA has acknowledged that they are far behind in re-assessing pesticides that are due for their 15-year review as required by federal legislation. And while the PMRA struggles to catch up, these older pesticides remain on the market. Further, the provision in the Act requiring re-evaluations only every 15 years allows for an extended period of use following original approval, during which additional research bearing on pesticide risks may have been published (but not yet taken into account in regulation). This time lag undermines confidence in the currency and reliability of pesticide approvals.

4. Incomplete Evidence

In assessing the acceptability of pesticides, the PMRA draws on evidence available at the time from chemical manufacturers, interveners, and other sources such as published literature. A problem here is that it isn't always obvious where scientists and researchers should look for potential adverse human health or environmental impacts. So where no evidence is available in a particular area because the scientific studies documenting adverse impacts don't (yet) exist, such potential concerns do not figure in the regulatory decision or are glossed over because there is "no evidence of harm." Risks are therefore determined to be acceptable. Even when concerns are identified, it can take several years before properly designed studies can be carried out, peer reviewed and reported. In the meantime, the subject pesticides can remain in use.

An example: The PMRA has acknowledged that there is a growing body of research on pesticides as endocrine disrupting chemicals. But research on the topic to date is by no means comprehensive. So although there are significant gaps in the body of knowledge around endocrine risks, pesticides carrying such risks (judged to be acceptable) remain on the market, with regulatory approval. To address gaps in evidence, many feel that the PMRA should require more independent research and take a more precautionary approach before concluding that pesticide risks are acceptable.

5. New Kinds Of Harm

In the past, a familiar statement about toxic substances was taken as a truism: "The dose makes the poison". Which meant that, while a larger amount of a chemical might produce adverse effects, a much smaller amount would have none, or at least none of any consequence, it was felt. For some exposures, that turns out to be quite wrong.

For some pesticides, researchers are learning that exposure to even very small amounts (that fall within allowable exposure limits under regulation) can have harmful impacts on health, including when exposure occurs within critical windows of fetal development. These impacts (called monotonic dose responses) are being more fully explored in current research. In the meantime, many observers feel that such risks are not adequately reflected in the pesticide regulatory process.

6. Compliance And Enforcement

When pesticides are applied, the requirements and conditions specified on the label must be strictly followed. In fact, pesticide product labels are legal documents, and failure to comply is an offense under the PCPA and associated regulations. Realistically, however, the PMRA can't have a compliance officer standing at every user's elbow whenever someone applies a pesticide. So following the rules becomes more or less a voluntary exercise in practice. It is understandable if a user might feel at the time of application that if a smaller amount is specified, then a bigger amount would do a faster, better job.

That is not the case, but the resulting over-use (when it happens) increases the burden of pesticide exposure across the community. Of course, one would want to have faith that all users will strictly and unfailingly follow label directions, but enough doubt exists concerning the rate of compliance to erode confidence in this area.

7. Avoiding Pesticides Is Recommended

As for non-essential uses of pesticides, we should remember that Health Canada itself advises, "It is good practice to reduce or eliminate any unnecessary exposure to pesticides." -- Health Canada, "Pesticides and Health" (2007)

Randall McQuaker

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Debates and Proceedings
are also available on the Internet at the following address:

<http://www.manitoba.ca/legislature/hansard/hansard.html>