

**Subject: [Fwd: Pesticide Bylaw]**

**Date:** Tue, 19 Jul 2005 13:00:24 -0700

**From:** Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>

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

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

**Subject:** Pesticide Bylaw

**Date:** Tue, 19 Jul 2005 11:01:14 -0700

**From:** John Hunter <[hunterjohn@telus.net](mailto:hunterjohn@telus.net)>

**To:** FONVCA <[fonvca@fonvca.org](mailto:fonvca@fonvca.org)>

Like the false alarm bylaw, look at the HUGE gaps in logic and evidence in the pesticide bylaw (which was iced)

John

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

**From:** John Hunter [<mailto:hunterjohn@telus.net>]

**Sent:** July 12, 2005 3:46 PM

**To:** 'Ernie Crist'; 'James Ridge'; 'Mayor Harris'; 'Alan Nixon'; 'Jim Cuthbert'; 'Councillor Maureen McKeon Holmes'; 'Richard Walton'; 'Lisa Muri'

**Cc:** 'Corrie Kost'; 'Council Remuneration'; 'FONVCA'; 'Pat Higgs DNV'; 'Allan Orr'; 'Brian Platts DNV'; 'Cathy Adams DNV'; 'Corrie Kost DNV'; 'Doug MacKay Dunn Home'; 'Eric Andersen DNV (new)'; 'Peter Thompson DNV'; 'Maureen Bragg'

**Subject:** RE: PMRA | Questions and Answers about 2,4-D

Dear Mr. Crist

We may well meet in either place and renew this debate! But the debate I raise is NOT whether chemicals are good or bad. I am NOT pro use of chemicals. Monica and I do use borax and baking sugar for ants, for example.

-but IF Staff had addressed the effect of analogous bylaws in other jurisdictions in their report (a fatal failure in my view)

AND

If in fact, for the reasons Mr. Charles postulated ([the letter to Council](#)), or other reasons, pesticide use had INCREASED in those jurisdictions

(and I don't know, but if your knowledge is from that Staff report, you do not either)

**don't you think you might have second thoughts about the bylaw?**

That is my point, other than a second session of Council allowing whoever arranges the agenda to “jam” them.

If Mr. Charles is right, and it's an “if”, your bylaw might be another of the many examples of the “law of unintended consequences”.

John

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

**From:** Ernie Crist [[mailto:ernie\\_crist@dnv.org](mailto:ernie_crist@dnv.org)]

**Sent:** July 12, 2005 3:32 PM

**To:** John Hunter; James Ridge; Mayor Harris; Alan Nixon; Jim Cuthbert; Councillor Maureen McKeon Holmes; Richard Walton; Lisa Muri

**Cc:** Corrie Kost; Council Remuneration; FONVCA; Pat Higgs DNV; Allan Orr; Brian Platts DNV; Cathy Adams DNV; Corrie Kost DNV; Doug MacKay Dunn Home; Eric Andersen DNV (new); Peter Thompson DNV; Maureen Bragg

**Subject:** RE: PMRA | Questions and Answers about 2,4-D

Dear Mr. Hunter:

I am truly sorry that you were disappointed. I was reading a story in the "Scientific American" a highly reputable publication and I am convinced that if I go to Hades, it will not be because I voted in favour of this B/L but if I do I will certainly argue the case with the Devil.

Ernie

---

**From:** John Hunter [<mailto:hunterjohn@telus.net>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 12, 2005 2:57 PM

**To:** James Ridge; Mayor Harris; Alan Nixon; Jim Cuthbert; Councillor Maureen McKeon Holmes; Richard Walton; Ernie Crist; Lisa Muri

**Cc:** 'Corrie Kost'; Council Remuneration; FONVCA; Pat Higgs DNV; Allan Orr; Brian Platts DNV; Cathy Adams DNV; Corrie Kost DNV; Doug MacKay Dunn Home; Eric Andersen DNV (new); 'Peter Thompson DNV'; 'Maureen Bragg'

**Subject:** FW: PMRA | Questions and Answers about 2,4-D

You can always count on Corrie! Great research Corrie.

PS Mayor Harris analogy last night in Council chambers claiming resistance to the “no pesticide/herbicide bylaws” is analogous to resistance to the anti-smoking bylaws in pubs and the spectre of job in that case (which job loss did not happen) is defective, I suggest.

Those anti-smoking bylaws were aimed at the customers primarily (you can't smoke in this and that place), although enforcement devolved to some extent on the business owner. This pesticide bylaw is aimed at both the customers AND the lawn care businesses – it forbids the business, practically speaking, from operating in DNV. It basically bans the business from operating in DNV UNLESS on public lands (they WILL get an exception) – there is sure to be an exemption for golf courses and parks, not so for residents, despite the platitudes. Talk about hypocrisy, as many speakers pointed out. “Natural pest control means won't work for DNV, but for you taxpayers . . .” That did NOT happen to pub owners.

The proper analogy would be that government had banned professionally run pubs and forced people (as in prohibition days) to set up “speak-easys” as in the 1930s. And they tried in the 1930s, with the known results.

When will governments learn? You cannot stop socially acceptable things like pot, booze, and prostitution. The trick is education to make them NOT socially acceptable, not to use a stick as some would have, including C. Nixon and Crist to my disappointment. There has been lots of rhetoric but no solid evidence presented to council that they should overrule the feds, to my knowledge. Trotting out a few examples like DDT does not a solid case make.

The truly sad thing about last night's Council is a staff report which makes unsupported statements. Page 3: "This will effectively eliminate the use of many pesticides on residential properties, particularly the herbicides." Not a shred of evidence in the report to back this up, and no rebuttal to the letter from Mr. Charles which suggests, as I read it, that the bylaws have BACKFIRED in other jurisdictions. That is, professional lawn care was replaced by amateurs like me who use far more chemicals to do the job than the licensed, trained professionals. And I can sympathize with his points – if you threaten to fine me \$10,000 as this bylaw does, I'll use weed and feed (FAR worse) rather than the bit of spot spraying I do. My lawn is not going to end up like that weed infested mess at the bottom of my street (DNV property I assume, on Dollarton) or that up and coming weed mess on the Dollarton Hwy near Maplewood.

For staff to bring this to Council without any evidence pro or con that bylaws of like nature in other cities work is VERY disappointing. In fact, when the only input (it was in the Council package at the front desk) is that the bylaws have backfired elsewhere, it is to me inconceivable that this would come to Council. Was Mr. Charles wrong or biased? Who knows? But how can this topic go unaddressed in the report?

It seems a bit of a repeat of the staff Report to Council on the Burrard agreement a week or so ago, which contained no useful summary of the issues, the history, or anything that a responsible Council member should want to know. And the agreement vote is scheduled on the same night the band has a 15 minutes delegation to Council on the Band's history; as C. Walton pointed out, how can an intelligent and candid discussion take place? We don't need this type of performance.

Please Council members, don't let this sort of thing continue. Councillor Nixon spoke of disrespect for all Council in "vitriolic" e-mails to himself re pesticides. Well, with respect, you have to earn respect and you do that partly by demanding businesslike behaviour of yourselves and staff. Accepting the "jamming" you got on Burrard and pesticides will not do it. And accepting recommendations to pass an arguably intrusive bylaw with ZERO info in the report on whether they work elsewhere will not do it.

Sincerely and with deep disappointment

John Hunter, P. Eng.  
Office Phone: (604) 929-3415 Home Phone: (604) 929-4436  
Fax: (604) 929-7168 Web: <http://www.jhunterandassociates.ca>