



[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'

[Post Reply](#)

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

Thread Tools ▾ Rating: ★★★★★ ▾ Display Modes ▾

03-25-2007 #1

Civic 
Registered User Join Date: Aug 2003
Posts: 33

 **City - Pesticide debate moves online**

Is this an issue that will finally be resolved at City Council after many years of debate?

Pesticide debate moves online

By Jordan Press Whig-Standard
Local News - March 25, 2007

The debate over banning cosmetic pesticide use in Kingston will likely move from the real world into the digital realm.

Citizen input and a two-week debate will be held online about a proposed bylaw that would outlaw the use of pesticides for cosmetic purposes.

Public meetings will also be a part of the pesticide consultation.

Hydro One has asked for an exemption under the bylaw. In a letter to the committee, the company wrote that its use of herbicides weren't for cosmetic purposes, but for safety and operations reasons.

 **Quote**

03-26-2007 #2

Bill(2) 
Registered User Join Date: Jun 2003
Posts: 75

 **Pesticide Use - debate and decision**

Hopefully a decision will be rendered. Mind you, just because a decision is made it doesn't mean that it will be enforced, or not overturned down the road (as recent experiences have shown.) 🙄

At least by opening up for a public forum - input, even if it is electronic input, people will have their say, both ways.

It makes one think - is this the new way of gathering public feedback?

Bill Visser



04-16-2007

3

Jeffrey Lowes 🌐

Registered User

Join Date: Oct 2003
Posts: 116

Educate Yourself Before You Speak

I would encourage people to take part in the debate, but come to the table after you have taken the time to educate yourself.

I am against this by-law if the funding for it will come from cuts to other programs. Something that is currently regulated at other levels of government should not be paid for or handled at the municipal level.

In London the cost will exceed a million in the first few years. I am sure Kingston has the skill to take on one more project and keep the cost under control 😊

Please visit at least two of the sites below before voting on the City of Kingston site.

<http://www.pmra-arla.gc.ca/>

<http://www.ontarioipm.com/>

<http://pestinfo.ca/documents/AMO-PesticidesBrief.pdf>

<http://www.pas.gov.on.ca/scripts/en/BoardDetails.asp?boardID=761>

http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/DBLaws/S...sh/90w05_e.htm

<http://content.calgary.ca/CCA/City+Hall/Business+Units/Parks/Pest+Management/Pest+Management.htm>

<http://www.calgary.ca/DocGallery/BU/...ations/ipm.pdf>

<http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/epd/ipm/doc...we/default.htm>

http://www.nysipm.cornell.edu/teaching_ipm/why.asp

<http://www.epa.gov/oppbppd1/PESP/reg...03/r2-2003.htm>

<http://www.atl.ec.gc.ca/epb/envfacts/ipm.html>

<http://www.gov.pe.ca/af/agweb/index.php3?number=1009071>



04-17-2007

4

Jeffrey Lowes 

Registered User

Join Date: Oct 2003
Posts: 116

Ontario Pest Management Research and Services Committee

Ontario Pest Management Research and Services Committee
2005 Executive Summary

Author: Hugh Berges - Horticultural Technologies/OMAFRA
Creation Date: 24 May 2006
Last Reviewed: 24 May 2006

| OASCC Index Page |

Ontario Pest Management Research and Services Committee 2005 Executive Summary - Printable PDF version

<http://www.omafra.gov.on.ca/english/...rsc/opmrsc.pdf>

Pest Management

The Ontario Pest Management Research & Services Committee (OPMRSC) met on December 8, 2005 to consider cross commodity pest management issues. Dr. Ken Campbell of the Pest Management Centre (PMC), Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada (AAFC) presented an update on the progress of the PMC relating to minor use research. Issues identified by the technical working groups were considered along with those forwarded from the Ontario Horticultural Crops Research and Services Committee, the Ontario Field Crops Research and Services Committee and the Ontario Weed Committee.

Several issues were identified and discussed, including the increased incidence of invasive alien species (insects, diseases and weeds) and their continued use as non-tariff trade barriers. The need for improved access to low risk, environmentally friendly crop protection materials, including biological and biorational materials, continue to affect the industry at all levels. The delivery of IPM services is still a concern, especially in areas of the province where there is no IPM consultant available. While AAFC and the Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) continue their activities related to the development of reduced risk strategies, these can only be implemented if there is an adequate integrated pest management (IPM) infrastructure in place. Concern was expressed over a perceived shift in pesticide application. That is, the new lower risk pesticides now being registered are being marketed with the concept of insurance instead of controlling the pest when it is present at economic levels. This approach could potentially lead to increased pesticide use. Human resource issues in the research and technology transfer communities continue to concern the committee. Finally, extreme disappointment was expressed by the Ontario Field Crop Protection Sub-Committee regarding the response to Recommendation # 2 from last year regarding Integrated Pest Management Research in the new OMAFRA – University of Guelph Research Program Structure.

Four recommendations were formulated from the reports and discussions.

1. Lack of a strategy for delivery of IPM programs and reduced risk strategies for Ontario,
2. Loss of current registrations for minor crops as a result of the additional cost of registration for changes in formulation to currently registered products,
3. Occupational exposure data requirements for greenhouse related URMULEs and their lack of harmonization with the US requirements, and

4. Request that PMRA approach municipalities that are making illegal recommendations of non-registered pest control products.

In response to concerns expressed in 2004, an ad hoc committee of the OPMRSC was struck to develop general guidelines for the technical working groups. This was completed and presented to the committee for comment/approval.

Recommendations Arising From Gaps/Barriers, 2005

Non-Harmonized requirements for occupational exposure studies for greenhouse pesticides means PMC should continue to accept a leadership role in generating dislodgeable foliar residue (DFR) data required by PMRA for the registration of priority pesticides in the future. Additionally, the PMC take a lead role in negotiating with the PMRA the reasonableness of their demands for occupational exposure (OE) data and whether other scientific approaches could equally well satisfy their demands for DFR and other OE data. The PMRA show leadership and educate the municipalities on the requirements of the Pest Control Products Act and where necessary enforcement of the Pest Control Products Act.

OMAFRA investigate, review and evaluate existing delivery models and move to adapt a model to address the gaps in IPM delivery in Ontario.

The PMRA reduce the data requirements for bridging data required to add uses from an old to a new pesticide formulation. The additional costs force manufactures to drop some uses which are critical to minor crop areas.

For a complete copy of the report go to : <http://www.uoguelph.ca/research/omaf...ms/oascc.shtml>

| Top of Page |

For more information:

Toll Free: 1-888-466-2372 ext. 64554

Local: (519) 826-4554

Email: research@omafra.gov.on.ca

| Research, Education, Laboratories & Risk Management Home Page |

| Central Site | Feedback | Search | Site Map | Français |

| Home | What's New | Calendar | Products | News Releases |

<http://www.omafra.gov.on.ca/english/...rsc/index.html>



05-25-2007

5

Jeffrey Lowes

Registered User

Join Date: Oct 2003
Posts: 116

Basic Illusions

There is a basic illusion in Kingston and all the way through Ontario over the debate on the uses of pesticides. The illusion is the professionals are the problem. Then there are people who are not being truthful on the issue and it is questionable on their motives.

In response to Mr. Nabil Mailloux letter April 17, 2007, integrated pest management, or IPM, is a approach to managing with the environment rather than against it.

The truth of the matter is people who are in the lawn care industry and the local golf courses have approached the City of Kingston asking for a by-law with industry IPM standards. They are not the problem, uneducated people are.

Integrated Pest Management is not a rubber stamp.

“Integrated Pest Management (IPM) is a holistic approach to pest control that uses all available methods in an attempt to keep pest populations below damaging levels”

<http://www.atl.ec.gc.ca/epb/envfacts/ipm.html>

This method is studied, developed, practiced and advanced by the provincial governments of Canada and supported and researched at the Federal Level. It is studied and developed at many higher levels of education including Cornell and the US EPA

<http://www.epa.gov/oppbppd1/PESP/reg...03/r2-2003.htm>

It has been reviewed and updated currently at the University of Guelph Turf Grass Institute, not some back room operation.

<http://www.uoguelph.ca/GTI/>

It is more than grass; it is an approach to the total urban environment. I am an environmentalist, not a person who has aversion for grass. Anyone with such a narrow focus is missing the bigger picture.

The City of Calgary has taken a very in-depth approach and developed a plan.

<http://content.calgary.ca/CCA/City+H...Management.htm>

The review in Ontario is currently done by a bunch of lawyers, doctors and other PhD's contrary to Mr. Craig Simpson letter Tuesday April 17, 2007.

Ontario's Pesticide Advisory Committee

C.M. Switzer, Ph.D. Plant Physiologist
J.R. Bend, Ph.D. Pharmacologist/Toxicologist
H. Berges, B.Sc. Agr. Agrologist
C. Hunter, M.Sc. Plant Pathologist
R. Jin, M.D. Community Medicine/Public Health
D. Leong, Ph.D., P.Eng., CIHOccupational Hygienist
B.H. McGauley, M.Sc.F. Forest Pathologist/Urban Forester
W. Michalowicz, M.Sc. Environmental Biologist
G. Rachamin, Ph.D. Toxicologist/Pharmacologist/Public Health
S. Sang, Ph.D. Ecologist/Biologist
T. A. Scarr, Ph.D. Forest Entomologist
G. Stephenson, Ph.D. Environmental Toxicologist (Herbicides)
I. Wile, B.Sc.A. Aquatic Biologist

<http://www.omafra.gov.on.ca/english/...rsc/index.html>

Having a ban is ambivalent to the environment. People fail to see the cost of a ban where the products would still be on the store shelves. In London Ontario they have set aside 600 K a year for enforcement and education. In Kingston we could end up spending over a million dollars over the next three years on this bylaw if we don't think it through.

Referring to some as “Unaccountable business people” when they (the same business people) have been asking for industry standards that require reporting and audits summarizes the lack of education or effort to properly understand this issue.

Contrary to what some people think this council has been taking the time to review material on this issue. Not only the costs are a concern but because this is regulated at other levels of government, councilors have been asking themselves why they should take on something that has not been downloading on them.

In Belleville the council sent a clear message to the province that this is not there responsibility and they decided to apply the tax dollars on programs that have been down loaded, like childcare.

There is an underlying impact of closing the door on research jobs that could come to Kingston to further the study of the IMP approach. We are just starting to develop this industry in our BIO-Tech sector. The Canadian Development Agency has been exporting this method in order to reduce the levels of pesticide in third world countries while improving food production.

<http://www.ciat.cgiar.org/beans/partners.htm>

<http://www.epa.gov/oppbppd1/PESP/str...6/ipmina06.htm>

Is there a substitute for a municipal by-law? Yes, it is called IPM, unless we have another knee jerk reaction and just ban everything and hope for the best.

Jeffrey Lowes



09-16-2007

6

Lydia
Registered User

Join Date: Jul 2003
Posts: 1,216

Some Inconvenient Truths

Hi Everyone

I recent received a letter from someone who tried to get a reply from our levels of governments, municipal, provincial etc. and indicated that no one spoke with him.

I believe the person deserves to be heard and responded to. Here is the content of the letter that was send to me. Let's all respond to this person as to whether we agree or disagree with these views.

SOME INCONVENIENT TRUTHS

I pay taxes to four levels of government. Direct taxes are paid to the Municipal, Provincial and Federal governments and indirect taxation is paid to County government. In combination, huge number of politicians, bureaucrats and civil servants are employed to provide services to me, the taxpayer. When combined with all other public services paid for by taxpayers including teachers, health care employees, police, etc it is easily understood why taxpayers should be concerned with government wastage at any level.

The Federal government provides the facilities, expertise and regulations to test and license for use products that are deemed safe. Included in this program are the so called cosmetic pesticides. Although roughly 12000 products are not approved for use, some 200 are. Again, some of my tax dollars pay for this service and I am glad they do.

I am now faced with the situation at the municipal level of a local government using more of my tax dollars to enforce a ban on a product – cosmetic pesticides, for which a higher level of government has used my tax dollars to approve. Bear in mind, the Municipal government lacks the facilities and expertise to test and discount the work done by the Federal government. Politicians shouldn't wonder why they lack credibility. Quote. The Canadian Cancer Society is very concerned about the use of potentially carcinogenic (cancer-causing) substances for the purpose of enhancing the appearance of, for example, private gardens and lawns as well as parks, recreational facilities and golf courses (ornamental use). We base this concern on the conclusions of the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) that state that some substances used in pesticides are classified as known or possible carcinogens. In some cases, evidence linking pesticides and cancer will not be scientifically definitive, but may be suggestive and growing. Since ornamental use of pesticides has no countervailing health benefit and has the potential to cause harm, we call for a ban on the use of pesticides on lawns and gardens. Unquote. This position comes from their

website and the underlining is mine. Although clearly not a ringing endorsement of pesticides, nor is it condemnation. Clearly there is no link. As an aside, I would think that the large number of people who use gardening as a relaxing hobby would disagree with the statement concerning the health benefits. An Internet survey was conducted in Kingston. 2200 people responded with an apparent majority of respondents agreeing to the ban of pesticides. Of course, this random survey with 2200 respondents out of 116,000 citizens or 36,000 homeowners represents a statistical representation of nothing. Why did a majority of people agree with banning pesticides? Simply put, the "ban pesticide group" are better organized than the "don't ban pesticide group". In a similar vain, it has been stated that 1200 communities have banned pesticides, therefore we Kingstonians are somehow backward and behind the times. In reality, all it means is that perhaps 100,000 or more communities haven't.

A writer to the Whig Standard's editorial page suggested that 6000 people died every year in Canada due to exposure to pesticides. This is nonsense. That number would represent 16 people every day including winter. Demographically, it would imply that six people die every day in Ontario. That would represent an epidemic situation. I have yet to hear an outcry from Provincial Health authorities and the issue of pesticides has not been prominent in the upcoming Provincial election.

I do not agree with a ban. However, I would be more satisfied if I was convinced that a true majority of Kingstonians were in favour of the ban. I believe that an important issue could be resolved by having a referendum during the next Municipal election. A simple question on the ballot would produce a satisfactory answer and might even convince more citizens to engage in the democratic process. This, of course, will not happen. Some Municipal politicians and "ban the pesticide" activists actually don't care what people want. Attempts at public consultations are nothing more than a smoke screen to hide the fact that the decision has already been made to ban cosmetic pesticides. It has nothing to do with logic, truth or democracy. It isn't really even an issue of public safety.

Every time a Municipal, Provincial or Federal Government bans a legal activity or an approved product without public consensus, we all lose a little more freedom.

Once the ban takes place, then unlike the smoking ban, it should apply to everyone. NO EXEMPTIONS. After all, we are all equal, or are we?

-- Lydia



09-21-2007

#7

posting
Administrator

Join Date: Feb 2003
Posts: 854

City of Kingston, Pesticide Meeting, 2007-09-20

CKWS-TV NewsWatch Regional News

Pesticide Meeting

September 20, 2007

DOCTORS ARE WEIGHING-IN ON KINGSTON'S PESTICIDE DEBATE.

A PHYSICIANS GROUP SAYS THE PROPOSED BY-LAW IS TOO NARROW, AND THE PESTICIDE BAN SHOULD BE APPLIED TO VEGETABLE GARDENS, SHRUBS AND FLOWER BEDS AS WELL.

THE GROUP MADE THAT RECOMMENDATION TO A COMMITTEE LAST NIGHT -- WHICH IS STUDYING A CITY-WIDE PESTICIDE BYLAW.

RIGHT NOW, THE MAIN EMPHASIS IS TO BAN THE "COSMETIC USE" OF CHEMICALS ON LAWNS.

BUT CITY COUNCILLORS ARE ALSO GRAPPLING WITH EXEMPTIONS, LIKE GOLF COURSES.

LOCAL LAWN CARE REPRESENTATIVES SAY THEIR INDUSTRY IS BEING UNFAIRLY TARGETED.

JEFF LOWES

"NOTHING THAT WE DO IS DETRIMENTAL TO THE HEALTH OR TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND WE'RE VERY CONFIDENT IN SAYING THAT WE HAVE SOME VERY CONSIDERATE PEOPLE OUT THERE OPERATING AND WE'VE JUST BEEN LAMBASTED BY THIS COUNCIL ON THIS ISSUE."

GIDEON FORMAN

" WE'D LIKE TO SEE THE BY-LAW FOR PESTICIDES STRENGTHENED HERE AT PRESENT IT JUST COVERS LAWNS AND WE'RE SAYING THAT'S TOO NARROW.

IT SHOULD COVER ALL PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PROPERTY LAWNS, GARDENS SHRUBS AND BUSHES THAT 'S THE ONLY WAY WE'RE GOING TO PROTECT EVERYONE INCLUDING KIDS HERE IN KINGSTON." ONTARIO LIBERALS SAY IF THEY'RE RE-ELECTED -- THEY WILL TAKE STEPS TO ENACT PROVINCE-WIDE RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF PESTICIDES.



09-22-2007

8

Lydia
Registered User

Join Date: Jul 2003
Posts: 1,216

Location Please

Exactly Where is this debate going to happen on September 20th?

-- Lydia



09-23-2007

9

posting
Administrator

Join Date: Feb 2003
Posts: 854

 **Hamilton Pesticide by-law to be enacted, 2007-09-23**

Hamilton, Ontario

CATCH News – September 23, 2007

Pesticide bylaw decision this week

The draft bylaw limiting the cosmetic use of pesticides will go the Board of Health tomorrow morning and could be finalized at Wednesday evening's full council meeting. At a meeting of the pesticides sub-committee this past Thursday, councillors Brian McHattie, Brad Clark and Robert Pasuta discussed the public input received on September 13 and agreed to recommend some changes to the proposed bylaw.

The draft minutes of Thursday's sub-committee meeting show that Clark continued to support the bylaw version presented on September 13, but Pasuta argued for amendments.

"Councillor Pasuta commented that from the input received at the public meeting, he did not hear that people wanted a ban, but rather, to reduce. He noted his concern with respect to agriculture, and could agriculture be kept out totally i.e., cannot survive on organic crops."

Pasuta was particularly worried about banning spraying of fruit trees in rural areas that are not classified as agricultural. The sub-committee agreed to add fruit trees to the items classed as "outside the scope of the bylaw", and to specify "livestock and poultry" as within the definition of exempted agricultural uses.

Changes were also made with regards to Integrated Pest Management – an approach that gives preference to non-chemical methods while reserving the right to use pesticides. The new wording limits that approach to city owned lands.

Councillors noted that several presenters on September 13 had advocated Integrated Plant Health Care (IPHC) should replace Integrated Pest Management (IPM).

"Staff responded that the current city policy is based in IPM, and that IPHC would require additional cost to the city," note the minutes. "Councillor McHattie reported that he has a meeting with staff to investigate whether IPHC could be introduced into the City in an incremental manner. With respect to the by-law in its current form, something could be added which indicates that the City is aware of the principles of IPHC, and will consider investigating this approach in the future."

Conservator Society observers at the sub-committee meeting lamented that it did not re-examine the exemption for sport fields. They are now calling on the public to lobby Pasuta as well as councillors Bernie Morelli, Sam Merulla, Tom Jackson, Chad Collins, Scott Duvall and Terry Whitehead to ensure they support the bylaw.

The Board of Health meeting is in the Albion Room of the Convention Centre starting at 9:30 am – the same location as Wednesday's 7 pm council meeting.

CATCH (Citizens at City Hall) updates use transcripts and/or public documents to highlight information about Hamilton civic affairs that is not generally available in the mass media. Detailed reports of City Hall meetings can be reviewed at www.hamiltoncatch.org. You can receive all CATCH free updates by sending an email to info@HamiltonCATCH.org.



09-24-2007

10

[Jeffrey Lowes](#)

Registered User

Join Date: Oct 2003

Posts: 116

What Doctors?

Quote:

Originally Posted by [posting](#)
CKWS-TV NewsWatch Regional News

Pesticide Meeting

September 20, 2007

DOCTORS ARE WEIGHING-IN ON KINGSTON'S PESTICIDE DEBATE.

A PHYSICIANS GROUP SAYS THE PROPOSED BY-LAW IS TOO NARROW, AND THE PESTICIDE BAN SHOULD BE APPLIED TO VEGETABLE GARDENS, SHRUBS AND FLOWER BEDS AS WELL.

THE GROUP MADE THAT RECOMMENDATION TO A COMMITTEE LAST NIGHT -- WHICH IS STUDYING A CITY-WIDE PESTICIDE BYLAW.

RIGHT NOW, THE MAIN EMPHASIS IS TO BAN THE "COSMETIC USE" OF CHEMICALS ON LAWNS.

BUT CITY COUNCILLORS ARE ALSO GRAPPLING WITH EXEMPTIONS, LIKE GOLF COURSES.

LOCAL LAWN CARE REPRESENTATIVES SAY THEIR INDUSTRY IS BEING UNFAIRLY TARGETED.

JEFF LOWES

"NOTHING THAT WE DO IS DETRIMENTAL TO THE HEALTH OR TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND WE'RE VERY CONFIDENT IN SAYING THAT WE HAVE SOME VERY CONSIDERATE PEOPLE OUT THERE OPERATING AND WE'VE JUST BEEN LAMBASTED BY THIS COUNCIL ON THIS ISSUE."

GIDEON FORMAN

" WE'D LIKE TO SEE THE BY-LAW FOR PESTICIDES STRENGTHENED HERE AT PRESENT IT JUST COVERS LAWNS AND WE'RE SAYING THAT'S TOO NARROW.

IT SHOULD COVER ALL PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PROPERTY LAWNS, GARDENS SHRUBS AND BUSHES THAT 'S THE ONLY WAY WE'RE GOING TO PROTECT EVERYONE INCLUDING KIDS HERE IN KINGSTON." ONTARIO LIBERALS SAY IF THEY'RE RE-ELECTED -- THEY WILL TAKE STEPS TO ENACT PROVINCE-WIDE RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF PESTICIDES.

Dear Mr. Lowes,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me earlier today. As I indicated in our conversation, Mr. Gideon Foreman is not a registered member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario.

Sincerely,

Brian Goldig
Manager, Physician Advisory Service
The College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario

Copy of a part of an email sent out today:

There has been information presented as fact at different council meetings in a number of municipalities, where as the information was hearsay. Based on rules surrounding hearsay evidence in the courts, most of what has been presented would be considered inadmissible and not the object of truth. The onus on the lawn care professionals at this point, is the mitigation of damages caused by bylaws that prevents the operations of their trade. Even the Town of Hudson has made changes to their bylaw allowing the operation of accredited companies with tools necessary. We are not questioning the ability of the public to vent their concerns on a matter, but rather present the truth and separate fact from fiction.

The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) has recently released the attached report on attributable causes of cancer in France. This study is the first of several IARC will be undertaking into the subject matter; France just happens to be the first. This builds on earlier work in this area. The summary table you will find on page 170 provides the results of these earlier studies (Doll & Peto, 1981; Olsen, 1997; Doll & Peto, 2005; Danaei, 2005). Each of these studies has concluded that most cancer cases are attributed to tobacco, alcohol, infectious agents, obesity, occupation and physical inactivity.

With specific regard to pesticides, on page 139 IARC concludes:

"Given the lack of evidence linking pesticide exposure to human cancer risk, no cases of cancer can be

attributed to either occupational or non-occupational exposure to this group of agents."

This is because -- as the report states -- "Very few currently available pesticides are established experimental carcinogens, and none is an established human carcinogen."

We are not questioning the ability of a municipality to create a bylaw, but if a bylaw is created based on inappropriate information then it should be corrected. There is an onus of fiduciary responsibility on behalf of a municipality to verify information presented when it is the bases of a bylaw. Early this month the EPA support claims that products used with in the industry do not cause cancer and this claim is also support by the American Cancer Society. We would hope people understand precautionary principal applies when there is a lack of evidence. We still support the notion that any product used improperly can cause harm. This is not the case when a professional handles a product; this is why we have pharmacies and driver's licenses.

Jeffrey Lowes



09-25-2007

#11

Dogma
Registered User

Join Date: Nov 2006
Posts: 368

Misinformation mill

Jeff -

I agree with your concern that (non) and armchair experts have the eyes and ears of the public or more importantntly interest groups in the community. Yes, there is a concern and an overdue bylaw for pesticide use - but a balanced informed discussion / public information does not seem very forthcoming any time soon.

I also understand this is part of modern human nature to be critical and way on the side of caution - especially for health related issues.

I would be interested to publically hear from the local Health Unit - are they not (the) local governing agency specifically responsible for this communities health & safety? They have doctors, health practisioners, nursing and health officers.

Best of luck with the de-misinformation drive!



09-25-2007

#12

Jeffrey Lowes
Registered User

Join Date: Oct 2003
Posts: 116

Exposing the Frauds

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. According to The College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario records neither one is a medical doctor. If challenged with this information at a public meeting they will admit they are not medical doctors. This occurred in Kingston on September 19, 2007 when Mr. Foreman appeared as a delegation.

<http://www.cityofkingston.ca/pdf/cit...genda-0907.pdf>

<http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/domino/peti...256FB6006132C2>



09-25-2007

#13

Lydia
Registered User

Join Date: Jul 2003
Posts: 1,216

Truth by the Medical Profession

Thank you Jeffrey for informing the public of this situation. Jeffrey, I am against bans because I believe we can learn and do what is proper. People do not use chemicals just for the fun of it.

If someone is not being truthful about their position, how can we honestly trust anything that person says?

Why should we follow someone who is being untruthful? People can only form their decisions from the information that they come across. If the information comes from someone who can't tell the truth about themselves, how can I trust their credentials and their points of view?

Council has to decide whether they have the real facts on issues. If they have listened to the side that colours the issue incorrectly then Council will have to deal with the consequences.

It is for that reason, I hate bans of any kind, however, I can understand why laws should be created and enforced. If we are going to have a ban on pesticides then EVERYONE, EVERY BUSINESS, EVERY GOVERNMENTAL GROUP, should never use them again.

-- Lydia



09-26-2007

#14

Dogma
Registered User

Join Date: Nov 2006
Posts: 368

Doctor of what? PhD

Further to the insinuation that:

Quote:

Dr. Gideon Foreman of the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment and Dr. Kazimiera J. Cottam. According to The College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario records neither one is a medical doctor.

I would just like to question what PhD do they hold?

As of now, so what they do not currently hold a "general medical" certificate as a consultant to this committee.

A PhD in "Environmental" Science would likely be much more appropriate. (Not to take away from your assumed credibility issue...)

But, as I see it - One *could* easily assume (with no real proof) ...they maybe M.A or PhD's in the environmental subject.

I can only *assume* you have no hard proof otherwise? Or have confirmed their academic achievements?

So, until you do - One should not assume otherwise.



09-26-2007

#15

Jeffrey Lowes

Registered User

Join Date: Oct 2003
Posts: 116

But I play a doctor on stage?

Doctor of what? PhD

Mr. Foreman is not a doctor but he might play one, in one of the plays he has produced or written in Toronto. There is no record of any PhD but I have recommended him for a BS Award with a couple of councillors. Sept 19th we heard from this group. Once challenged, Mr. Foreman had to admit he is not a doctor nor are all the members of his activist group. This was a surprise as sometimes members show up in lab coats during public meetings. I think councillor Foster was taken aback as she had introduced him as a doctor. If members of the media would like to speak to a real doctor on the issue of pesticides, I can supply a list of qualified doctors that are listed with the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario.

Jean Cottam is an writer from Ottawa, I believe she has a PHD in Russian Lit

<http://webhome.idirect.com/~kjcottam/welcome.htm>

http://www.writersunion.ca/ww_profile.asp?mem=152&L=

These are the people your council are listening too



Page 1 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 07:38 AM.

Powered by vBulletin® Version 3.8.0
Copyright ©2000 - 2009, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.
Copyright (c) 2003-2008 - Kingston Electors