



[Kingston Electors Forums ---- Kingston Ontario Canada](#) > [Kingston Local Government -- Issues and Policies](#) >
[Environment - Preservation and Protection](#)
City - Pesticide debate moves online

User Name: Remember Me
 Password:

[Register](#) [FAQ](#) [Community](#) [Calendar](#) [Today's Posts](#) [Search](#)

Environment - Preservation and Protection Water, Sewage, Pesticides, Smoking, wetlands; garbage; recycling, preservation of natural areas and our 'Commons'



Thread Tools Rating: Display Modes

09-26-2007

#16

Lydia
Registered User

Join Date: Jul 2003
Posts: 1,221

HUM who to believe???

Dogma is correct, there are many professions that have Master Degrees and Doctor's Degrees in their profession.

However, Dogma, these people would NEVER think that they have ALL the KNOWLEDGE on EVERY TOPIC THAT AFFECTS OUR SOCIETY.

Had these Doctor's(??) indicated their expertise, I wonder how people would trust them on this topic of Pesticides?

This example of these professionals just goes to show how STUPID AND IGNORANT (SOME EDUCATED PRFESSIONALS) truly are. Now arrogant of these people.

Just maybe Jeffrey and I should show you OUR PHDS AND MAYBE council would listen ONLY to our side. (By the way I don't think like Jeffrey does that Council isn't listen however, I maybe proved incorrect)

I have also known of Doctors who FAKED their PHDS' and when to jail for that reason.

Just because there is a PHD'S MD'S in back of someone's name does not indicate that they are any smarter than you and me or Jeffrey is on this topic.

People HATE CHEMICALS, PESTICIDES, That is perfectly okay with me to hear their views on this. I would never say their views are not valid, They are.

Instead of working ONLY on one side of this issue, Council would be doing a disaster thing. Why don't these ""EDUCATED"" people get of their butts and actually produce products that ARE environmentally friendly.

Instead of Bans, Let's be the first in research and development in solving the issues for everyone. Man can send a rocket to the Moon but can't get rid of a bug without polutioning the world. I don't believe that I think our young people can and should work towards getting products that can resolve our problems.

Oh yes, these people can then call themselves PHD'S of the Environment Then I would listen and do what is correct.

-- Lydia



09-26-2007

#17

posting
AdministratorJoin Date: Feb 2003
Posts: 860

Fewer gardeners rely on pesticides: StatsCan

Fewer gardeners rely on pesticides: StatsCan**CBC News September 26, 2007**

Pesticide use is declining but gas-powered mowers remain a mainstay for many homeowners, according to a Statistics Canada study released Wednesday.

The gardening industry has come into full bloom, growing by more than \$600 million between 2002 and 2006 to \$2 billion, the study found.



*Two-thirds of Canadians with lawns used a gas-powered mower in 2006, according to a Statistics Canada report.
(CBC)*

It also showed gardening was a popular hobby for many Canadians, with three-quarters of households reporting they maintained a lawn or garden in 2006.

The federal agency noted that gardening practices, including pesticide and lawn mower use and water conservation practices vary greatly across the country.

"Households east of Ontario tended to make less use of pesticides and chemical fertilizers than those in the west," the study said.

"However, Easterners weren't as likely to use water sprinkler timers or capture rainwater for lawn and garden purposes."

Pesticide use lowest in Quebec

The proportion of gardeners who relied on pesticides to keep their grass green and weeds in check has dipped slightly from 31 per cent in 1994 to 29 per cent in 2005.

Quebec — which has introduced many municipal pesticide bans in recent years, including a widespread provincial ban in April 2006 — recorded the most significant decrease in pesticide use, with the proportion dropping from 30 per cent in 1994 to 15 per cent in 2005.

Pesticide use was highest in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta in 2005, with two of every five households using the products to maintain their lawns and gardens, according to the federal agency.

Gas mowers least popular in B.C.

The study also found that two-thirds of households with lawns used a gas-powered lawn mower in 2006.

Gas mowers were the most frequently used in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island and least used in B.C.

The federal agency noted that emissions from older, gas-powered mowers can take a considerable toll on the environment and have negative effects on human health.

"In one year, the average gas-powered mower can emit the same amount of a key smog pollutant as the

average car travelling about 3,300 kilometres," Statistics Canada said.

In terms of water conservation, about 14 per cent of households used rain barrels or cisterns as a means of collecting rainwater for their lawns and gardens.

Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba led the country in use of the water-conservation devices.

About one-quarter of Canadians with lawns used sprinkler timers in 2005, with the highest proportion of users found in B.C.

The study noted that B.C. heavily promotes water conservation and regulates watering in select municipalities.



12-01-2007

#18

[K. J. Cottam](#) 
Registered User

Join Date: Dec 2007
Posts: 35

Dr. K. Jean Cottam replies:

I am retired federal military intelligence analyst: I worked in this capacity for both DND and Foreign Affairs. My PhD has nothing to do with Russian literature. I published several books on Soviet women in combat in WWII, because of my familiarity with military history and military affairs, including chemical warfare. A professional writer, since my retirement I have been devoting a great deal of time to doing research and writing on the cosmetic use of pesticides and am published in newspapers coast to coast. I am also honorary Canadian observer of the Pesticide Working Group based in Washington. We meet via periodic conference calls.

The common herbicide 2,4-D, invented during WWII for military purposes, was widely applied on Canadian lawns only around the time of the Vietnam War. Previously, lawns were maintained in a fully satisfactory condition using time-tested non-toxic methods--mowing high, overseeding and topdressing with appropriate fertilizer, and assisted by healthy soil with beneficial organisms that are destroyed by cosmetic use of pesticides.

In a condominium where I live the huge common grounds were usually highly infested with weeds when the turf was sprayed twice per year; there were fewer weeds when the grounds were sprayed once. Our grounds were not sprayed in 2007 and we have fewer weeds than ever before.

The struggle between the spokesmen for the chemical lawn-care industry and the proponents of non-toxic methods of lawn maintenance boils down to health versus profit. There is ample evidence of potential harm, especially to young children. For example, when children walk beside a lawn recently sprayed with herbicide 2,4-D, they are exposed, via inhalation, to a breakdown product more toxic than the original herbicide, the residues of which go directly to the brain, by-passing the liver which is the cleansing organ. Independent scientists consider children up to one hundred times as vulnerable to pesticide exposures as adults are.

According to a U.S. scientist, a whistle-blower who remained employed by the Environmental Protection Agency, herbicide 2,4-D is likely to be contaminated by a toxic dioxin during the manufacturing process. Dioxins are bioaccumulative--they are passed to the next generation. They have been linked to several types of cancer, male infertility, neurological diseases, diabetes, birth defects and impaired child development.

Only the so-called "active" ingredients of 2,4-D and other herbicides are tested. The formulants or "inerts" which constitute up to 90 percent of the product are untested, an industry secret. Yet the International Agency for Research on Cancer reporting to the World Health Organization considers the inerts to be possible, probable or actual cancer-causing agents

Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) merely examines secret rat data obtained in industry-selected and financed labs. Rats have detoxification genes missing in humans. Inconvenient data may be withheld from the PMRA (e.g. child, dioxin and neurological data for the re-evaluation of 2,4-D have not been provided to date to the PMRA). The PMRA does not examine epidemiological (human) studies. Because of the unsatisfactory regulatory process at the federal level, municipalities are stepping into the regulatory void.

There is no need for lawn-care companies to go out of business; all they are asked to do is to switch to

time-tested organic methods of lawn maintenance. There is nothing "holy" about the use of lawn chemicals; there is no Eleventh Commandment ordering us to use them.

Finally, I very much resent being called a "fraud" by those with a vested interest in the continued use of pesticides for cosmetic purposes. To put it bluntly, "money talks and ignorance is bliss" with reference to some city councils. Councillors should not be swayed by the opinions of those who stand to gain from the absence of a municipal pesticide bylaw; they should distinguish a monetary vested interest from a genuine concern for public health, especially that of young children. One doesn't have to be a medical doctor to be well-versed in up-to-date medical research.

Last edited by K. J. Cottam; 12-10-2007 at 09:51 PM. Reason: a missed typo corrected; used Bold for title



12-01-2007

#19

Jeffrey Lowes

Registered User

Join Date: Oct 2003
Posts: 116

When I stop Laughing

When I stop laughing,

I will respond when I stop laughing. It would be nice if we had people in Kingston that had the ability to debate this issue in Kingston and present an argument based on fact, which I think has been lacking in this debate. Maybe I will respond by Sunday. Enjoy the weekend.

Jeffrey



12-03-2007

#20

Julia Jones

Registered User

Join Date: Dec 2007
Posts: 24

Hi Folks,

Obviously what we have here is an old fashion mud-slinging campaign launched against Foreman and Cottam by a desperate pesticide industry activist. Dr. Cottam can legitimately call herself a Dr. as she holds a doctorate (Ph.D) degree. Only an ignoramus would equate a Ph.D as meaning a medical doctor! Now the proper thing to do would be for the pesticide industry activist to write back to the CPSO and say, "oops, I made a mistake, I didn't realize that a Ph.D can rightfully call themselves a doctor, I'm so sorry for falsely accusing them and wasting your time!!!" Ha ha ha ha!!!! Oh, now that's hilarious! How embarrassing!

Seems to me that it appears the intent of our resident pesticide industry activist is to shoot the messenger through smear tactics in order to deflect the debate away from the real issue - and that's controlling the harm caused by lawn pesticides through local regulation. And that's no laughing matter to me.

Julia of Kingston



12-03-2007

#21

Jeffrey Lowes

Registered User

Join Date: Oct 2003
Posts: 116

Sling Mud?

From: Elizabeth Moreau [mailto:elizabethm@cps.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, September 26, 2007 3:19 PM
To: jplowes@cogeco.ca
Cc: Olivia Craft
Subject: FW: Presenters of CPS position on pesticides

Dear Mr. Lowes,

The study referred to was published in Paediatrics & Child Health, which is the journal of the Canadian Paediatric Society, by authors who have no affiliation with the CPS. It was not written by the Canadian Paediatric Society, and does not reflect the opinion of the CPS. Currently, we do not have any position statements on pesticide use.

The reference for the study in question is as follows:

Sears M, Walker CR, van der Jagt RHC, Claman P. Pesticide assessment: Protecting public health on the home turf. Paediatr Child Health, Vol 11, No 4, April 2006.

The CPS should not be cited as this information. This has been communicated to the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment.

Regards,

Elizabeth Moreau
Director, Communications & Public Education
Canadian Paediatric Society
2305 St. Laurent Blvd.
Ottawa, Ont. K1G 4J8
Tel: 613-526-9397, ext 231
Fax: 613-526-3332
www.cps.ca
www.caringforkids.cps.ca

Last edited by Jeffrey Lowes; 12-03-2007 at 02:51 PM. Reason: typo



12-03-2007

#22

Julia Jones 
Registered User

Join Date: Dec 2007
Posts: 24

Jeffrey, since you were so thoughtful as to place the CPS's email addressed to you onto this public forum, I challenge you to also place on this forum all of your emails addressed to them, so that the public can appreciate what the context of all of this is about. (it's not clear to me why you posted the CPS' email -- are you trying to insinuate something?)

Also, since you are seemingly very open and have nothing to hide, would you be so kind as to tell us what your professional qualifications are relating to any and all aspects of the chemical lawn application industry and how much you are being paid to advocate on behalf of Kingston Lawn Care Association? Is there a website listing of all the members of the Kingston Lawn Care Association?

Thanks,

Julia of Kingston



12-03-2007

#23

Jeffrey Lowes 
Registered User

Join Date: Oct 2003
Posts: 116

Public Meeting

If you have, any questions that you would like to ask. Please bring them up at the next public meeting, I believe it is Dec 6th, and I will answer them. The context of the email from CPS was in response to a letter that Nabil Mailloux present to council on July 12th on behalf of CAPE. If you would like a copy, you should go next door and ask for one. I will bring a copy to the public meeting. In the letter it states

We could cite many studies but draw your attention to research published in April, 2006 by the Canadian Paediatric Society (CPS), Canada's most distinguished authority on children's health. The CPS examined the most common lawn pesticide in Canada, 2,4-D, and concluded that "2,4-D can be persuasively linked to cancers, neurological impairment and reproductive problems. Because of these concerns, the most respected medical authorities in Canada - including The Canadian Cancer Society, The Ontario Medical Association (Section on Pediatrics), The Ontario College of Family Physicians, and The Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario - support bylaws which prohibit cosmetic pesticide use."

I have asked if the information presented was true and the statements made in the letter reflected that of the CPS. They provided clarification.

"The CPS should not be cited as this information." So the above statement is not true.

I have only present information that is available in the public domain and I have not tried to manufacture any material or sling mud



12-03-2007

#24

[K. J. Cottam](#) Registered User

Join Date: Dec 2007
Posts: 35

K. Jean Cottam replies:

I have a bone to pick with all of you. Jeffrey Lowes, accusing someone of fraud and falsely at that can have very serious consequences and is not in the least funny. You cite a letter from Elizabeth Moreau, a spokesperson for the Canadian Paediatric Society, who claims that the Society is neutral. It is nevertheless a fact that the article about child exposure to 2,4-D by Dr. M. Sears et al was published in the CPS journal--surely not against their will? I have the article and checked it out again: it is indeed published in the CPS journal. Moreover, the CPS offer no disclaimer--at least in reference to the article specifically. Finally, Julia Jones of Kingston--you are confused. Mr. Lowes merely claimed that a PhD, such as myself, is not qualified to discuss medical issues. Obviously, this is utter nonsense. As a prize winning PhD graduate from the prestigious University of Toronto and former intelligence analyst, I am eminently qualified to discuss medical issues and many other issues as well.

Last edited by K. J. Cottam; 12-10-2007 at 09:46 PM. Reason: "is not" repeated: an error; "the" omitted; Julia of Kingston should be Julia Jones of Kingston



12-03-2007

#25

[Julia Jones](#) Registered User

Join Date: Dec 2007
Posts: 24

Dr. Cottam,

I appreciate your frustration. I'd like to point out message 12, wherein Jeffrey Lowes stated:

Our concerns at this point are two individuals presenting themselves as medical doctors and given medical evidence at City committee meetings; Dr. Gideon Foreman of the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment and Dr. Kazimiera J. Cottam.

Thus Mr. Lowes did indeed claim that you presented yourself as a medical doctor. Unless he can prove otherwise, in my opinion, his claim is without warrant and borders on libel.

Regards,
Julia



12-03-2007

#26

[Jeffrey Lowes](#)

Registered User

Join Date: Oct 2003
Posts: 116

Be truthfull

I think Julia should read post #15, I don't think Dr. Cottam would drop to the level of name calling or half truths. We both have our points based on the information we have at hand. We choose to disagree but I would hope neither one of us would choose to make up information to further our positions.

Jeffrey Lowes



12-03-2007

#27

[Julia Jones](#)

Registered User

Join Date: Dec 2007
Posts: 24

Mr. Lowes, the problem is, you should have written msg #15 first before submitting #12. In other words, get your facts straight in the first place.

And speaking of being truthful, you have not yet responded to the second part of msg #22.



12-03-2007

#28

[Jeffrey Lowes](#)

Registered User

Join Date: Oct 2003
Posts: 116

The debate is not about me.

The debate is not about me, if you friends would like to know they have my email and they can ask me at the next public meeting.

Jeffrey



12-03-2007

#29

[Julia Jones](#)

Registered User

Join Date: Dec 2007
Posts: 24

A double standard if there ever was one. So it's fair game for you to question the background of others, as long as nobody dares to question yours. Hypocrisy.

Last edited by Julia Jones: 12-04-2007 at 08:22 AM.



12-03-2007

#30

[K. J. Cottam](#)

Registered User

Join Date: Dec 2007
Posts: 35

K. Jean Cottam or Kazimiera J. Cottam (I am the same person) responds to Julia Jones of Kingston, #25, re Mr. Jeffrey Lowes' #12:

"Our concerns at this point are two individuals presenting themselves as medical doctors and given [should be giving!] medical evidence at City committee meetings; Dr. Gideon Foreman [should be spelled Forman] of the Canadian Association of the Physicians for the Environment and Dr. Kazimiera J. Cottam."

At no time have I presented myself as a medical doctor and had the intent to provide medical evidence, in

person, at the City of Kingston committee meetings. I confine my provision of evidence, medical or otherwise, to the committees of the Ottawa City Council. I have no intention to travel to other Ontario cities for the purpose of giving evidence on cosmetic use of pesticides.

Last edited by K. J. Cottam; 12-11-2007 at 05:02 AM. Reason: Making title bold and underlining it



Page 2 of 12 < 1 **2** 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 > ▾

Bookmarks



<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Currently Active Users Viewing This Thread: 1 (0 members and 1 guests)

Posting Rules

You **may not** post new threads
You **may not** post replies
You **may not** post attachments
You **may not** edit your posts

BB code is **On**
Smilies are **On**
[IMG] code is **On**
HTML code is **Off**

[Forum Rules](#)

Forum Jump

Environment - Preservation and Protection



All times are GMT -4. The time now is 06:15 AM.

[Contact Us](#) - [Kingston Electors](#) - [Home](#) - [Archive](#) - [Privacy Statement](#) - [Top](#)

Powered by vBulletin® Version 3.8.1
Copyright ©2000 - 2009, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.
Copyright (c) 2003-2008 - Kingston Electors