



200 - 2006 West 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Vancouver, BC V6J 2B3  
www.wcel.org

tel: 604.684.7378  
fax: 604.684.1312  
toll free: 1.800.330.WCEL (in BC)  
email: admin@wcel.org

January 15, 2010

Ministry of Environment  
c/o Cindy Bertram  
PO Box 28159 Westshore RPO  
Victoria, B.C. V9B 6K8

\*\*\* BY E-MAIL AND MAIL \*\*\*

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

### **Re: Consultation on Cosmetic Pesticides**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Ministry of Environment's [Cosmetic Use of Pesticides in British Columbia – Consultation Paper](#) (the "Paper"). We are pleased to see that the province is entertaining the possibility of restricting the unnecessary use of cosmetic pesticides.

### **Summary of Submissions**

We strongly support prohibiting the use of pesticides for cosmetic purposes in British Columbia. As we have discussed in our publication, [Pesticides and Your Health](#), copy enclosed, there are very real health threats associated with pesticides, and the use of pesticides for purely cosmetic purposes cannot easily be justified. We are proud to be one of the 18 health and environmental groups which yesterday [called for a province-wide ban on lawn and garden pesticides](#). These submissions further elaborate on our support for a ban, and explain how such a ban relates to your stated objectives including:

- Protecting human health, including the right of the public to control what enters their bodies;
- Adopting a precautionary, science-based approach aimed at avoiding unnecessary risk and uncertainty;
- Supporting the shifts in culture and the reduction in unnecessary pesticide use contemplated by integrated pest management; and
- Being simple and efficient to implement and enforce.

We note that the Paper, while open to the possibility of a ban, also examines options to regulate, without banning, cosmetic pesticide use.

Non-cosmetic pesticides are not, of course, less dangerous than cosmetic pesticides. Non-cosmetic uses that are often more dangerous to humans than cosmetic pesticide use would

include control of indoor rodents and insects (lack of ventilation, increased duration of exposure, less selective poisons in some cases) and food production (pesticides directly applied to a food source). We, along with the 17 other groups that have called for a ban, are asking you to prohibit cosmetic pesticide use not because such pesticide use is inherently more dangerous than other uses of pesticides, but because such use is inherently *unnecessary*. Because there is no substantial benefit to cosmetic pesticide use, their risks and the public concern associated with them cannot easily be justified. Thus the focus on cosmetic pesticides makes sense primarily in the context of the discussion of a pesticide ban.

If you are considering merely regulating pesticide use, then the question becomes not “what pesticide use can we eliminate as unnecessary?”, but “what regulations will best protect the environment and human health?” That being the case, we support extending a number of restrictions on the sale and use of pesticides to **non-cosmetic pesticides**, and have commented accordingly on these options. However, we stand with the hundreds of thousands of British Columbians who would like to see a province-wide ban on the use of pesticides for cosmetic purposes.

## **Detailed Submissions**

These submissions follow the format of the Ministry’s Response Form, except where noted.

### **1.1 What are your thoughts about the Ministry’s pesticide objectives?**

### **1.2 How should these objectives be applied in developing policy and/or legislation to further safeguard the environment from cosmetic use of pesticides?**

The Paper lists the Ministry’s “pesticide objectives” with little in the way of explanation. It is not even clear, for example, whether the Ministry sees these objectives as all having the same importance, or whether they are listed in order of priority.

We will deal with both our thoughts on the objectives and how they should be applied in relation to cosmetic pesticides at the same time. We will comment on four of the objectives.<sup>1</sup>

## **Protection of human health and the environment**

Obviously we feel that “Protection of human health and the environment” should be paramount in regulating pesticides. To that objective we might add protecting the “security of the person”, in that members of the public have a right to be able to avoid exposure to unwanted chemicals even where the evidence of human health impacts are unclear.

---

<sup>1</sup> The fourth objective, “being appropriate and effective”, is so vague that we cannot comment on it meaningfully. Is “pesticide use”, ministry policies or the Ministry itself intended to be “appropriate and effective”? “Appropriate and effective” in achieving what goal? Would any ministry adopt as an objective the goal of being “inappropriate and ineffective”? Not surprisingly, we do not believe that it is appropriate or effective to allow the use of pesticides for purely cosmetic purposes, although doubtless others will disagree.

There is clear evidence that pesticides are making their way into human bodies and that at least some of them, alone or in as yet untested combinations, are having significant impacts on human health. Our publications, including *Pesticides and Your Health*<sup>2</sup> and the *Citizen's Guide to Pesticide Use and the Law in BC*, discuss some of the health concerns we have in relation to pesticides.

Cosmetic pesticide application is likely to occur in densely populated areas and in circumstances where people may be exposed to pesticides without their knowledge or consent. Given that protection of human health should be a priority for the Ministry, and given that there are no or minimal economic, human health or other benefits of cosmetic pesticide use, banning cosmetic pesticides promotes the protection of human health.

### **Having a science-based approach**

Despite the Ministry's frequent reference to the concept of a "science-based approach", the concept has not been defined and is unclear, which is problematic. Certainly the Ministry's decisions should be informed by scientific evidence. However, science has its limitations in making societal decisions – such as what is an appropriate level of risk or who bears the onus of demonstrating (through science) the safety of a pesticide.

To the extent that the Ministry is saying that its decisions will be based upon the best science available, we heartily agree.

However, the phrase "science-based" is sometimes held up in opposition to a "precautionary approach." This is a false dichotomy – the precautionary approach relates to how to manage situations in which there is uncertainty in the science, and is very compatible with an approach based on science. The limits of science in dealing with uncertainty are well understood.<sup>3</sup>

However, the Precautionary Principle, despite being a principle of international law that has been recognized by the Canadian courts as being applicable to Canadian pesticide laws,<sup>4</sup> is not mentioned as an objective of the BC Ministry of Environment. This is a disturbing omission.

Since there are known risks associated with using pesticides, and limited benefits associated with cosmetic pesticide use, a precautionary science-based approach favours a cosmetic pesticide ban. Indeed, the Supreme Court of Canada endorsed this view in *Spraytech v. Hudson*.

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.wcel.org/resources/pesticide\\_guides/pesticides\\_health\\_english.pdf](http://www.wcel.org/resources/pesticide_guides/pesticides_health_english.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> For a useful discussion of the role of the precautionary principle in addressing scientific uncertainty, I would refer you to the comments of Stuart Lee and Katherine Bennett, Ph.D.s, on the Canadian Government's then proposed policies on the precautionary principle, available at <http://www.sehn.org/canpre.html>, last accessed December 16, 2009, particularly at Part II.

<sup>4</sup> *Spraytech v. Hudson*, [2001] 2 S.C.R. 241; *Wier v. BC (EAB)*, 2003 BCSC 1441.

## Supporting the practice of Integrated Pest Management (IPM)

While we do not necessarily endorse the use of IPM as a philosophy,<sup>5</sup> we recognize that IPM, appropriately used, can result in significant reductions in pesticide use over conventional pesticides. We will focus in these submissions on the meaning of the term.

Integrated Pest Management has been defined as:

... an approach to dealing with pests ... using a single cultural, physical (mechanical), chemical or biological management strategy, or a combination of strategies... With IPM, the combination of environmental and economical management strategies is not aimed at eliminating pests, but at keeping pest numbers low enough to minimize ... damage... IPM does not mean the elimination of pesticides, rather it promotes their use only when needed, that is, after other management options have been exhausted.<sup>6</sup>

The *Integrated Pest Management Act* defines it as:

A process for managing pest populations that include the following elements:

- (a) Planning and managing ecosystems to prevent organisms from becoming pests;
- (b) Identifying pest problems and potential pest problems;
- (c) Monitoring populations of pests and beneficial organisms, damage caused by pests and environmental conditions;
- (d) Using injury thresholds in making treatment decisions;
- (e) Suppressing pest populations to acceptable levels using strategies based on considerations of:
  - (i) Biological, physical, cultural, mechanical, behavioural and chemical controls in appropriate combinations; and
  - (ii) Environmental and human health protections.
- (f) Evaluating the effectiveness of pest management treatments.

The IPMA definition is a useful summary of some of the important factors that an IPM approach should consider.<sup>7</sup> In relation to cosmetic pesticide use the definition raises some important questions:

---

<sup>5</sup> Despite the attractiveness of the IPM approach, IPM is often a vague concept, and we are aware of too many circumstances in which unnecessary use of pesticides has been justified under a supposedly IPM approach. Most control of pests in most contexts can be achieved by organic operators without the use of pesticides through methods consistent with a strict IPM approach. However, IPM operators rarely achieve elimination of pesticides in similar circumstances.

<sup>6</sup> Cloy, Nixon, Ptaky, *IPM for Gardeners: A Guide to Integrated Pest Management* (Timber Press: 2004), pp. 8-9.

<sup>7</sup> We have criticized the IPMA and its Regulations as providing insufficient direction as to how this “process for managing pests” is to be implemented. The definition itself says nothing more than that the “elements” must be “included”, meaning that there is nothing stopping a pesticide user from (for example) setting inappropriate injury thresholds or considering the environmental risks of spraying a toxic pesticide, but then going ahead and doing so anyhow. Unlike the text-book definition quoted above, the IPMA does not require that pesticides only be applied “after other management options are exhausted.” See Gage, A. and R. Saha. *A Citizen’s Guide to*

- Can a cosmetic objective be achieved by “planning and managing ecosystems to prevent organisms from becoming pests?” In the context of one of the major uses of cosmetic pesticides, the urban lawn, the answer is clearly that lawns can generally be managed to avoid dandelions and other weeds from becoming pests. This can be achieved by moving away from the monoculture lawn (an ecosystem which encourages the growth of pest species). However, even retaining the monoculture lawn, it can be achieved through a range of well accepted approaches.
- Managing ecosystems purely for cosmetic values is in tension with true IPM, which requires that ecosystems be at least in part managed to prevent organisms from becoming pests.
- Do pests that are unsightly or cause an unsightly appearance cause “damage” or achieve an “injury threshold” in the way contemplated by IPM? Conversely, if they do, is a property owner or even a professional lawncare company likely to set an “injury threshold” based upon anything more than the aesthetic sensibilities of the property owner (or possibly the cost of treatment)? Experience shows that in many cases the “injury threshold” in cosmetic cases is set at zero (i.e. one dandelion is one dandelion too many).
- Section (e) requires pest suppression strategies to reduce pests to an “acceptable level” to be selected by reference to “environmental and human health protections”. Given that no human or economic harm is actually caused in the case of cosmetic “pests”, on what basis could any risk to human health or the environment be considered “acceptable”? Surely the strategies should avoid any such risk.
- “Cultural” strategies referenced in (e), above, refers to changing individual and public perceptions about what are pests and what types and levels of cosmetic perfection are necessary. IPM therefore recognizes that sometimes the most appropriate solution to a cosmetic problem that cannot be dealt with through non-chemical solutions is to live with it.

In short, cosmetic pesticide use is at best a bad fit with, and arguably inconsistent with, the Ministry’s goal of IPM. While IPM can be used to achieve cosmetic results, we do not believe that using pesticides to achieve purely cosmetic results can be justified under a true IPM approach.

---

Pesticide Use and the Law in BC (West Coast Environmental Law, 2007), pp. 19. However, the definition, while not providing useful direction as to how to evaluate the information considered in the IPM process, is useful as an indication of the types of information which should be considered. It is for this purpose that we refer to it in these submissions.

## **Cost-effective compliance and enforcement**

While it is difficult to disagree with the desire to be “cost-effective”, it would be helpful to have some understanding of what the Ministry means by this term in this context. Cost effectiveness should not undermine effective enforcement action. Rather, the Ministry should strive for effective compliance and enforcement, at a reasonable cost.<sup>8</sup>

The IPMA Regulations as a whole are extremely difficult and expensive to enforce effectively, requiring, as they do, extensive field work, base-line data and expert opinion to determine if an unreasonable adverse effect occurs as a result of pesticide use. We have little confidence that a high level of compliance is currently occurring under the Act.

However, as it relates to cosmetic pesticide use, an outright ban of the sale and use of cosmetic pesticides is far easier to enforce than regulations which allow use of pesticides under limited circumstances. In many cases compliance will arise from the restrictions on the sale of pesticides intended primarily for cosmetic pesticide use; the lack of availability of the pesticides from legitimate sources would be a major factor in achieving compliance. Moreover, any observed application of pesticides could immediately give rise to questions about compliance.

Under an approach which merely restricts cosmetic pesticide use, Ministry staff will need to investigate complaints of cosmetic pesticide use to determine if they were carried out by individuals with the correct training or certification and in the correct way – clearly a less cost effective use of compliance and enforcement efforts.

### **2.1 Do you have any comments regarding new restrictions addressing the cosmetic use of pesticides?**

### **2.2 How would you define “cosmetic use of pesticides”?**

### **2.3 Are there any business sectors or particular uses that you feel should not be subject to restrictions on the “cosmetic use of pesticides”? If yes, what is your rationale for recommending exclusion of these sectors or uses?**

As above, we support a ban on the use of cosmetic use of pesticides.

We understand “cosmetic use of pesticides” to mean the use of pesticides for aesthetic reasons – to deal with organisms that are considered an eyesore or cause unsightly conditions but which do not directly negatively impact human health, the environment or property.

Conceptually the use of pesticides on residential fruit trees and in gardens is in many cases not purely cosmetic. However, given that such use is not generally necessary in a non-agricultural setting, and the risks associated with the use of pesticides (both because they are being used in a residential area, on food crops, and being applied by untrained users), we would support a legal definition of cosmetic pesticide use that included such uses.

---

<sup>8</sup> We note that much of the current compliance and enforcement action by the Ministry is complaints driven. This may be cost-effective, but completely ineffective in achieving compliance and protecting the environment in more remote areas.

We expect the golf industry – which is based on providing large-scale grassland – to lobby aggressively for an exclusion from any prohibition on cosmetic pesticides. There may also be pressure for an exemption related to landscaping for the hotel or other hospitality industries. We note that the technology exists to manage landscapes, even on this scale, without chemical pesticides. For example, while still rare, there are a number of golf courses world wide which are maintained organically, including Blackburn Meadows Golf Club on Saltspring Island.<sup>9</sup> We see no particular reason that hotels or golf courses should be exempted from a ban on cosmetic pesticide use.

That being said, to the extent that the government considers an exemption, we note that this is not a choice between an outright ban and no restrictions on cosmetic use in such industries. Ontario, for example, has introduced additional regulations surrounding golf courses alongside its ban on cosmetic pesticides.

Given the large areas managed by the golf industry, their often close proximity to residential and urban areas, and their use by members of the public, it would be quite appropriate to ban cosmetic pesticides from golf courses. However, if the government decides not to prohibit cosmetic pesticide use on golf courses, to:

- (a) Require the development of Pest Management Plans for private golf courses;
- (b) Strengthen requirements for IPM planning under the IPMA Regulations in relation to golf courses (and generally);
- (c) Requiring golf courses to record and report publicly on pesticide use.

**3.1 Do you feel that creating additional classes of pesticides would be an effective way to regulate pesticides used for cosmetic purposes? Why or why not?**

**3.2 If you do recommend the establishment of new classes of pesticides for regulation, what criteria would you suggest for establishing categories and assigning pesticides to particular categories?**

We do not support allowing chemical pesticide use, but would support a list specifying a small number of safe non-synthetic pest control options. In the end it is less important whether the list is focused on products or active ingredients, and more important how the list is developed. We are not opposed to the development of a limited list – focused not on every pesticide that might make a claim to safety but on non-synthetic alternatives which are demonstrably safe.

The Paper discusses four possible approaches to classes of pesticides being used to create “restrictions” on cosmetic pesticide use. We note that Approaches B and D both stand in contrast to the current “Excluded Pesticides” list contained in Schedule 2 of the IPM Regulation, which, in addition to listing active ingredients, lists whole classes of pesticides intended for a particular purpose. The Paper does not address the relationship between Schedule 2 Pesticides and the proposed list(s) related to cosmetic pesticides. We do not support the use of the current Schedule as a list of pesticides which can be used for cosmetic purposes.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> In addition to Blackburn Meadows, examples include Australia’s Kabi Golf Course and New York State’s Sebonak Golf Course.

<sup>10</sup> Schedule 2 includes a number of pesticides which contain substances which are known or suspected to have significant health or environmental effects, either specifically or through the pesticides listed by category.

As between Approaches B (listing allowed active ingredients) and D (listing allowed products), it is difficult to comment in the abstract. Indeed, the Discussion Paper may be somewhat skewed in favour of Approach B for this reason, as it lists the very concrete examples of “active ingredients” as “corn meal gluten” and “soap”, both of which are non-synthetic alternatives that it is difficult to imagine being banned. However, there are pesticide products that have different risks associated not merely with their active ingredients, but also the supposedly inert ingredients. Your ministry, for example, recently published a literature review related to the toxicity of glyphosate pesticides containing the “inert” POEA to amphibians.

As stated above, we are not opposed to the development of a very limited list – focused not on every pesticide that might make a claim to safety but on non-synthetic alternatives that are the safest of the pest control options available for cosmetic uses.

### **3.3 What rules would you recommend for the sale and use of pesticides in any new categories?**

Pesticides which are solely for cosmetic pesticide use should be banned from sale.

All other pesticides, other than those on a list of allowed pesticides, should only be sold to licensed pesticide applicators (see answer 4.1, below).

### **3.4 What suggestions or recommendations do you have to address products or product types involving a pesticide that may have both cosmetic and non-cosmetic uses?**

As above, we would support requiring licensed professionals to apply pesticides in non-cosmetic situations, and eliminating sale of most pesticides to the general public.

### **4.1 If pesticides are to be used, do you feel that people who apply pesticides to their own property for cosmetic purposes require any special training? If so, what training do you think is needed?**

We remain opposed to any cosmetic pesticide use (with the possible exception of a short list of pesticides that can be used), no matter the level of training of the home owner. That being said, it would be appropriate to require that **non-cosmetic** pesticides, particularly in or near residential neighbourhoods, be applied by a licensed applicator (whether the owner or a hired company).

Non-cosmetic pesticides are not, of course, less dangerous than cosmetic pesticides. Non-cosmetic uses that are often more dangerous to humans than cosmetic pesticide use would include control of indoor rodents and insects (lack of ventilation, increased duration of exposure, less selective poisons in some cases) and food production (pesticides directly applied to a food source). We, along with others, make the recommendation that cosmetic pesticide use be prohibited not because such pesticide use is inherently more dangerous than other uses of



pesticides,<sup>11</sup> but because they are inherently *unnecessary*, and therefore their risks and the public concern associated with them cannot be justified. Thus the focus on cosmetic pesticides makes sense primarily in the context of the discussion of a pesticide ban.

If you are considering merely regulating pesticide use, then the question becomes not “what pesticide use can we eliminate as unnecessary?”, but “what regulations will best protect the environment and human health?”

Therefore, we would support a general requirement that all pesticides applied in residential neighbourhoods (or generally) be applied by a licensed applicator. But this does not, in our view, excuse the use of pesticides for an unnecessary cosmetic purpose. Such pesticides should still be banned.

#### **4.2 Do you feel that pesticides should only be used if an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program has been undertaken? Do you have any comments or suggestions for the ministry to improve the effectiveness of IPM training or requirements in relation to the cosmetic use of pesticides?**

We do not feel that cosmetic pesticide use can be justified under a rigorous approach to IPM, and do not feel that an IPM program can be meaningful in the context of a cosmetic pest. See our answer to question 1.2, above.

While we do not have comments or suggestions related to improving the use of IPM “in relation to the cosmetic use of pesticides”, given our suggestion that licences be required for other residential pesticide use, we will take the opportunity to generally comment on IPM requirements under the IPMA.

The IPMA and its regulations are inherently flawed in that they use mere list of factors to be considered, set out in the definition of IPM, as a decision-making structure, without providing meaningful direction as to how those factors are to be evaluated and how choices are to be made based upon the factors. It’s not surprising that the current definition does not provide this function, as it was developed in the context of the old *Pesticide Control Act* to define the issues to be considered by a statutory decision-maker who was arms length from the pesticide user, and whose decision could be reviewed by the Environmental Appeal Board and ultimately the courts. However, the absence of meaningful direction makes no sense without direct government oversight, where the party applying the pesticide (or his or her employee) is judge and jury on whether, when and how the pesticides will be applied.

The obvious and easiest remedy would be to restore a public oversight role. If the Ministry does not wish to review each application of pesticides (or each PMP in the case of those provisions), it would at least make sense for the Ministry to have the power to review and modify a planned application of pesticides where a member of the public provides evidence that it is not reasonable under IPM principles.

---

<sup>11</sup> The primary reason that cosmetic use is sometimes less safe than the use of other pesticides is because of its use by untrained individuals – a consideration that applies equally to home owner application of non-cosmetic pesticides.

Failing the restoration of an appropriate government-oversight role, the IPM Act and Regulation should be amended to provide meaningful direction as to how these factors are to be evaluated and decisions made. This might include, for example,

- requiring an economic evaluation of the harm that will be suffered at possible injury thresholds (ie. generally \$0 in the case of cosmetic pesticides) levels,
- setting minimum injury threshold levels for a range of circumstances below which chemical treatment should not be considered, and
- establishing a prioritization of non-chemical treatment with chemical treatment only becoming an option after alternative treatments have been attempted over an appropriate time-frame or where there is an immediate emergency to human health or the environment which cannot be addressed through non-chemical treatment.

**5.1 Do you have any comments or suggestions regarding appropriate notification and/or signage when a pesticide has been used (for cosmetic purposes)?**

**5.2 Would you want to be informed if a neighbour is intending to use a pesticide (for cosmetic purposes)? If yes, how and when should notification be required?**

We reiterate our opposition to the use of cosmetic pesticides. If the Ministry decides not to ban the use of cosmetic pesticides, or in the case of non-cosmetic use, we think that notice of use is a minimum requirement. We would suggest that such notice should be personal notice for any person who has property “in the vicinity”<sup>12</sup> of the area to be treated, as well as posting a publicly visible sign.

It would doubtless be frustrating to find that a neighbor is planning to apply a pesticide in close proximity to your property and that you have very limited rights to object unless and until the pesticide actually affects your property (in which case you would have a right, but it would likely not be cost-effective to pursue in court).

That being said, despite the frustration, notice allows neighbours who are chemically sensitive or otherwise concerned about pesticide use to (a) try to dissuade their neighbours from the planned use; and (b) take measures to protect themselves from exposure. We anticipate that the requirement to post notice may itself represent a significant deterrent to cosmetic pesticide use in many cases.

We note that even without notice conflicts between neighbours often occur over cosmetic (and non-cosmetic) pesticide use when a neighbour becomes aware of the use. Notice provisions, by providing additional visibility and information, may well increase the frequency of such conflicts (while also providing an opportunity to resolve the conflict before pesticide use actually occurs). We believe that an outright ban on cosmetic pesticides has the significant advantage of avoiding such neighbour-to-neighbour conflicts.

---

<sup>12</sup> To adopt the rather vague language of the *Integrated Pest Management Regulation*, s. 28. At a minimum this should include notice to adjacent land owners and tenants, but we would recommend setting a minimum radius (perhaps 50 metres).

**6.1 Do you have any comments or recommendations regarding existing or new requirements governing the sale of pesticides that could be used for cosmetic purposes?**

**6.2 Do you feel that public access to all or specified classes of pesticides should be restricted or controlled? If yes, in what ways should access be restricted?**

**6.3 Should vendors be required to provide information to prospective purchasers of a pesticide prior to sale? If yes, what information should be provided and how?**

**6.4 Do you feel that sales of pesticides intended to be used for cosmetic purposes should be restricted to buyers who hold special authorization or training? If yes, what authorization (e.g., licensing) and/or training would you recommend?**

As above, we support a ban of cosmetic pesticides since such pesticide use is unnecessary and does not justify the risks associated with those pesticides. Consequently, we feel that pesticides that are intended primarily for cosmetic purposes should not be sold in British Columbia.

We do not feel that asking vendors to provide information on cosmetic pesticide use will address the fact that such use is not unnecessary in human wellbeing, environmental and economic terms.

Pesticides that remain available for sale because they have a valid non-cosmetic pesticide use should only be sold to licensed applicators, as above.

**7.2 Do you have any comments or suggestions for supporting compliance and cost-effective enforcement of any new restrictions on the cosmetic use of pesticides?**

As noted above, a simple ban on cosmetic pesticide use is, in fact, far easier and cost-effective to enforce than a more complicated set of regulations. The requirements are less likely to be misunderstood by the public, leading to greater compliance, and restrictions on the sales of cosmetic pesticides would help ensure compliance. Moreover, non-compliance is more easily detected, documented and proven.

**8.1 Do you have any additional comments or suggestions for the ministry regarding statutory protections to safeguard the environment from the cosmetic use of chemical pesticides?**

We hope that whatever action the Ministry takes will not prevent local governments from taking more stringent actions to regulate cosmetic pesticides. To this end, we recommend amending the *Spheres of Concurrent Jurisdiction – Environment and Wildlife Regulation*, under the *Community Charter*, to remove restrictions on local government regulation of excluded pesticides and pesticides on non-residential lands and to clarify that pesticides may also be validly regulated under the *Public Health Regulation* under that *Act*.

## Conclusion

Thank you once again for the opportunity to comment on the regulation of the use of pesticides for cosmetic purposes in British Columbia. We reiterate our request that such pesticide use be banned in the province.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew Gage". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Andrew" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Gage".

Andrew Gage,  
Staff Lawyer

cc. Kathryn Seely, Canadian Cancer Society (by e-mail only)  
cc. Lisa Gue, David Suzuki Foundation (by e-mail only)