**A Consultation to Amend *The Pest Control Products Regulations, 1995***

**June 16, 2014**

**Return by August 15, 2014**

**Introduction:**

The Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture’s Crops and Irrigation Branch (CIB), as a part of a scheduled regulatory review, is proposing to make amendments to *The Pest Control Products Regulations, 1995*. The objective is to update and modernize *The Pest Control Products Regulations, 1995.*  As part of a broad consultation process, the Ministry is soliciting feedback on the proposed amendments from a wide range of stakeholders.

The proposed regulatory amendments are categorized into **A**. Administrative/Housekeeping changes,

**B**. Regulatory Modernization changes, and **C**. Substantive changes.

**Instructions:**

The following document is a summary of proposed changes to *The Pest Control Products Regulations, 1995*. Please provide your comments directly in this document and return it to the Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture – Crops and Irrigation Branch.

This document provides a brief description of the Issue and Current Situation, the Proposed Revision, and the Implications of the proposed change to Pesticide Applicators, Pesticide Vendors, Pesticide Service Providers and others including the general public.

Thank you for your participation in this revision of *The Pest Control Products Regulations, 1995*

When completed, please fill out the area below and mail the completed response to:

*The Pest Control Products Regulations Consultation*

Crops and Irrigation Branch, Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture

Room 125; 3085 Albert Street

Regina SK S4S 0B1

If your organization would like an electronic copy of this document and/or would like to file comments electronically, please contact Mr. Richard Wilkins at richard.wilkins@gov.sk.ca to receive an electronic copy.

**Response from:**

(Please provide the following contact information where available)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name:** | **Paule Hjertaas** | **Organization:** | **Saskatchewan Network for Alternatives to Pesticides (SNAP Inc) www.snapinfo.ca** |
| **Telephone:** | **306-584-2835** | **Date:** | **5 August 2014** |
| **Address/P.O. box number** | **15 Olson Place** | **Telephone:** | **id** |
| **City/Town** | **Regina** | **Fax:** |  |
| **Postal Code** | **S4S 2J6** | **Email:** | **dp.hjertaas@sasktel.net** |

Please provide your comments on the following:

**A) Administrative/Housekeeping Changes:**

 **Issue:**

The following is a list of housekeeping and administrative changes the Ministry will undertake to update *The Pest Control Products Regulations, 1995.*  Several definitions pertinent to the regulations will be updated. Aspects of the regulations pertaining to backflow control devices will be to update and harmonize with neighbouring jurisdictions. The Ministry will also harmonize the licence categories to reflect current National Standards of the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Committee on Pest Management and Pesticides.

These efforts will refresh the Regulations, update required definitions and increase harmonization with other Provinces across Canada. These administrative/housekeeping items will provide clarity to Regulations without any impact on the users of pest control products.

* 1. Cite *The Pest Control Products Regulations, 1995* as being enabled under Section 3(2) of *The Pest Control Products (Saskatchewan) Act*.
	2. Change the designation “Department” to “Ministry”.
	3. Define the term “use”**.** The term is intended to include all activities and only those activities listed on and authorized in accordance with product label.
	4. Backflow control devicesto ensure protection of environment and water bodies.
	5. Definitions of various licence categories for applicators.

**B) Modernization Initiatives:**

 The modernization efforts the Ministry has put forward for comment will help in making the Regulations relevant to current industry practices. They will also enhance the protection of the environmentand harmonize our Regulations with other Provincial jurisdictions. These proposed amendments will provide much needed clarification on relevant aspects of the Regulations.

1. **Issue:**

According to current Regulations, the **aerosol fly sprays and products** that are registered for topical application (for anti-parasitic purposes) and are classified as Commercial/Agricultural/Industrial products by the Pest Management Regulatory Agency can only be sold by pesticide vendors with dispenser training. However, most of these products have the formulations and concentrations that are same as the domestic products commonly sold over the counter.

**Current Situation:**

Under current regulations, retail outlets such as Peavey Mart or Western Feeds that do not carry any other agricultural chemicals need to have a trained dispenser and a facility vendor license just to sell the Commercial/Agricultural/Industrial categorized topical aerosol sprays.

**Proposed:**

To exempt aerosol fly sprays and products registered for topical application (for anti-parasitic purposes) from the requirement of a vendor’s licence to sell. This will allow stores such as Peavey Mart or Western Feeds to sell these products without violating the Regulations. This is consistent with the current exemption in the Regulations for veterinary products.

**Implications of proposed changes:**

**To Pesticide Applicators**: None.

**To Pesticide Vendors**: General farm retail stores would be able to sell these products without a Vendor’s licence.

**To Pesticide Service Providers**: None.

**To Producers**: None.

**To Others**: None.

**Comments:**

**SNAP strongly disagrees with this initiative, especially because the product is an aerosol. It is no longer acceptable to believe that because a product is diluted, it means it is safer (4) In fact, diluted products contain more formulants, which are still mostly secret in Canada. Even the class 2 formulants which are suspected carcinogens or neurotoxins do not have to be disclosed on labels. (6) There are still many formulants untested for health effects.**

**SNAP believes that all pesticide vendors should be licensed, even domestic. I have not had time to review the regulations of every province to see if domestic vendors are licensed anywhere in Canada, but the PMRA (pers.comm) seemed surprised that Saskatchewan had** **no licensing requirements for domestic vendors. The federal *Pest Control Products Act (1)* and Regulations (2) are clear in saying that *registration is not a guarantee of safety* and that it is against the law to say or imply that they are. In addition, it has become obvious and widely accepted that the “dose makes the poison”, the base of our regulatory system, is flawed as many effects occur at very low doses and are often different from those at higher dosages.(4)**

**There are many new less toxic and/or non-chemical registered pesticide products for the domestic market (such as diseases for dandelions, pheromone products) which are generally not currently available in stores. Even domestic vendors (Loblaws for instance) stores that have advertised only alternatives are still selling all the regular domestic pesticides such as 2,4-D.**

 **Health effects**

**Furthermore, I just got sick getting into Rona’s store in Regina because the whole entrance was lined up with *Off* products and there were pallets of herbicide through the store. I have been to Canadian Tire when I had to walk besides a ceiling high wall of *RoundUP* to reach the door after paying. Walmart and other vendors fill up shelves that had all the pesticides with *Back to School* and then *Christmas* toys for children. I have seen store workers cleaning up pesticide spills with bare hands from burst bags or using the regular mop and no protective clothing to clean spilled pesticide liquid off a floor. I have had to abandon my shopping cart several times and rush home, too sick to continue shopping, because of pesticides in stores.**

**Carrying alternatives**

**In 2007, SNAP attempted to survey domestic vendors to see if they were carrying less toxic alternative products such as traps, pheromones, or others. (3)**

**It has been shown in the USA and eastern Canada that consumers get most of their education from vendors, and that vendors need to carry alternatives and know how they work for consumers to buy them. That is why SNAP designed this domestic vendor survey.(3) However, it could not be administered except to a few stores where people brought it personally because Sask Agriculture did not even have any list of domestic vendors in Saskatchewan. In the surveyed stores, it became obvious that only 1 or 2 of the alternatives were sold, usually Safer’s soap, and nothing else.**

**SNAP believes that domestic vendors have to take training adapted to their needs, like commercial vendors. They need to understand that the chemical products they sell are dangerous, and train staff adequately to deal with spills and emergencies. They need to provide safety clothing when needed and dispose of the spill properly. Furthermore, they need to be aware of registered alternative products and how to use them, and be encouraged to carry them.**

**No chemical pesticide should be sold indoors, especially where food is sold, or where there are children items sold at the time or in the future. Unfortunately, plastic always leaks odors, and also absorbs them. There is always air contamination from pesticide containers.**

**Garden center areas also need their own regulations to protect human health. SNAP has had reports of people who don`t use pesticides getting sick trying to buy a sprinkler at a garden center after having to walk besides aisles of pesticides to get there. This is unacceptable.**

**In garden center areas, ‘green” products (which should exclude pyrethrins(5)) should have a separate shelf well identified and far enough away from regular products that there is no cross contamination. Basic non-chemical supplies like hoses, sprinklers, tools have to be stored well away from chemical pesticides, and one should not have to walk in front of toxins to buy them. Some hoses bought by the community garden were absolutely unusable because they smelled so much like pesticides that I could not even stand being downwind from them.**

**I had to buy bedding plants this spring from a local greenhouse. I was assured the plants had not been sprayed but touching the containers made my hands numb which makes me think that they stored their supplies with the pesticides over the winter. Cross contamination is sure to happen in such situations.**

**All these points should be part of domestic vendors regulations to ensure some protection of human health (both workers and consumers) and hopefully start a transition to safer alternatives in the pesticide market.**

**References**

1. <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/P-9.01/> section 6(7) Prohibitions
2. <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-2006-124/index.html>, Section 21 Advertising Prohibition
3. <http://www.snapinfo.ca/programs/programs> see Retailer survey form 2009 (Updated with new in 2009)
4. <http://www.snapinfo.ca/info/health/endocrine-disruption>  “There is now **universal consensus** (US EPA, US National Institute of Health (NIESH), the World Health Organization (WHO) (also quoting the Endocrine Society, the European Commission, the European Environment Agency, the European Society for Paediatric Endocrinology and the Pediatric Endocrine Society), the American Public Health Association (APHA) and even the American Chemical Society (to which pesticide companies and their scientists belong,**that the endocrine disruption effects are caused by chemicals at concentrations normally found in the environment.”**
5. <http://www.snapinfo.ca/info/pyrethrins>
6. <http://www.snapinfo.ca/issues/formulantsinerts> ``Of  these 3173 formulants, only 25 have to be listed on labels with the 9 allergens subdivided in 35 formulants for a total of 51 (1.6%) formulants that have to be listed on labels The 593 list 2 (potentially toxic) formulants remain secret, as do known toxins in other categories.``
7. **Issue:**

It is a common industry practice, particularly in the Aerial Applicator category, to have **Global Positioning System (GPS)** equipment as part of their standard equipment suite. However, GPS equipment is not included in the current Regulations as part of spray records. The requirement to produce these records needs to be articulated in the Regulations.

**Current Situation:**

The Regulations currently call for an applicator to produce his records upon request. However, GPS records are not specifically mentioned in the Regulations.

**Proposed:**

To include the requirement of GPS records, along with the other records kept by the applicator, to be produced upon request by Ministry officials.

**Implications of proposed changes:**

**To Pesticide Applicators**: Aerial and Ground applicators who use equipment that have GPS will need to keep these records and upon request provide them to the Ministry officials.

**To Pesticide Vendors**: None.

**To Pesticide Service Providers**: Aerial and Ground applicators who use equipment that have GPS will need to keep these records and upon request provide them to the Ministry officials.

**To Producers**: None

**To Producers**: None

**To Others**: None.

**Comments:**

**SNAP strongly supports this change. It would make investigations easier.**

1. **Issue:**

Current Regulations **do not specify a** **time frame for applicators, vendors or service providers to produce requested set of records**. As there was no specified time frame, the Ministry is experiencing a recurring problem of delayed compliance. In such cases, there is no contravention of the Regulations as the records are being produced but not in a timely fashion. This is significantly delaying the investigation of complaints received.

**Current Situation:**

The requirement for keeping records and producing records (upon request) is denoted in Section 16 of the Regulations. However, it does not specify a time frame for submission.

**Proposed:**

To define a specified time frame to produce the requested records. A requirement to make records available within a 2 week time frame from date of request will expedite the investigation and action by the Provincial Pesticide Investigator.

**Implications of proposed changes:**

**To Pesticide Applicators**: Upon request, applicators will have to supply records within a 2 week time frame or potentially face an enforcement action.

**To Pesticide Vendors**: Upon request, vendors will have to supply records within a 2 week time frame or potentially face an enforcement action.

**To Pesticide Service Providers**: Upon request, they will have to supply records within a 2 week time frame or potentially face an enforcement action.

**To Producers**: None.

**To Others**: None

**Comments:**

**SNAP strongly supports this change that would facilitate investigation.**

1. **Issue:**

The Regulations currently allow individuals to apply pesticides under the **direct supervision** of a licensed applicator. Direct Supervision currently means within auditory hailing distance. With currently available technology, it is possible to use a cell phone or similar technology from a few miles away and still be considered ‘within hailing distance’.

**Current Situation:**

The Regulations currently allow individuals, who do not hold an applicator’s licence, to apply pesticides under the direct supervision (define as being with in auditory hailing distance) of a licensed applicator.

**Proposed:**

To specify that ‘direct supervision’ of unlicensed applicators includes ‘being within visual and auditory hailing distance’.

The purpose of this proposal is to clarify the standard of supervision expected when a business employs an untrained person to apply pesticides under the direct supervision of a licenced applicator. This is intended to improve safety and appropriate use of pesticides in Saskatchewan for both the worker and the general public.

The proposed amendment modernizes the Regulations by recognizing the advancements in technology. Today’s technology has expanded the distance of auditory hailing to the point where a supervisor cannot effectively monitor the action of a subordinate and immediately correct his actions. It also establishes a responsibility for the business to supervise the activities of its workers effectively.

**Implications of proposed changes:**

**To Pesticide Applicators**: Increases the duty of care when supervising untrained workers.

**To Pesticide Vendors**: None.

**To Pesticide Service Providers**: Increases the duty of care when employing untrained workers.

**To Producers**: None.

**To Others**: By strengthening the definition of direct supervision, it is intended to provide greater safety to the untrained employees, grater safety to the general public and the environment.

**Comments:**

**SNAP strongly supports this change, but does not think it is sufficient.**

**The Alberta regulations specify training for applicator assistants, whatever th are. SNAP believes it insufficient to only train one person per facility or business. There should be some type of basic training for anyone selling or using pesticides and there should be guidelines for what that training should be and the length of it. Or better, an official mandatory class rather than leaving it to each business to figure out what is important or not.**

References

1. [Pesticide Sales, Handling, Use and Application Regulation](http://www.qp.alberta.ca/574.cfm?page=1997_024.cfm&leg_type=Regs&isbncln=9780779743391);

**Issue:**

**Insurance requirements for Aerial Applicators for pesticide drift/chemical trespass** is out dated and does not reflect the current economic value of a crop.

**Current Situation:**

Currently the Regulations require pesticide drift/chemical trespass liability insurance in an amount that will provide at least $25,000 coverage for each occurrence. Recently the Prairie Protective Fund, the major insurer in the industry, raised their deductibles to $20,000 for herbicide drift. Requiring applicators to have $25,000 coverage does not reflect today’s economic realities.

**Proposed:**

The coverage limit needs to be either updated or removed.

If updated, the Ministry would like to establish a limit that actually reflects the current value for agricultural commodities.

If the establishment of a reasonable minimum limit is not possible, then the Ministry proposes to remove the insurance minimum from the Regulations. In that case, the amendment would denote the requirement for insurance and let the industry association or the marketplace determine the level of insurance required.

Stakeholder feedback will be considered before making the final decision on this proposal.

**Implications of proposed changes:**

**To Pesticide Applicators**: Aerial Applicators will require increased insurance amounts which in turn increase the cost of the insurance.

**To Pesticide Vendors**: None.

**To Pesticide Service Providers**: Pesticide Service companies that employ aerial applicators or provide aerial application services may be required to increase the amount of insurance they carry which in turn will increase the cost of the insurance.

**To Producers**: By modernizing the insurance requirements, it provides increased protection for farmers who may incur a financial liability if their pesticide service provider does not carry enough insurance to cover an incident of chemical trespass.

**To Others**: By modernizing the insurance requirements, it provides increased protection for those who experienced a spray drift or chemical trespass incident.

**Comments:**

**Do you prefer updating insurance amounts\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ or eliminating them \_x\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Why?**

**Aerial applicators have been having a free ride. They have to become responsible for the extent of damages they cause. SNAP believes that if an organic grower loses his or her certification for 3 years because of crop contamination from aerial spraying, he should be fully compensated. If one has to replace all furnishings in a house because of contamination and has a contaminated garden, the price of replacement organic vegetables should be paid for by whoever contaminated in the first place.**

**Every year SNAP gets calls of people whose house, garden, livestock, etc have been directly sprayed by aerial applicators, or suffered from severe drift from ground spraying. Many Saskatchewan residents fight with health issues caused by frequent chemical assault.**

**The biggest issue about aerial sprayers and others is that Sask Agriculture puts more emphasis on education than action. One case that was reported to me from last year ended up this way. There was definitely proof of large amounts of pesticide in the yard but the aerial applicator was only “educated”.**

**As far as SNAP is concerned, the education aerial applicators take for getting their license is the education. If it is not appropriate, upgrade it. Inspectors are there not to educate but prosecute. If they don’t, they send the message that applicators can do whatever they like and there are no consequences. I suspect the word goes around, leading to more spray incident occurrences and victim harassment.**

**Example
An organic farmer with at least a mile of organic land around her house asked the aerial applicators to please detour around her land after they had previously flown low over her house. She was told she was harassing them and indeed they had the RCMP either phone or visit her, I can`t remember. Then they overflew the house very low while she was in the garden and she got quite sick.**

**I understand that aerial applicators fall under Transport Canada`s jurisdiction, and that Transport Canada does not consider that overspraying of a yard, house or people is a health or dangerous issue. (1) However, the chemicals used to spray crops are dangerous and can make bystanders sick, especially because they are not wearing any of the mandated protective clothing because they do not expect a pesticide exposure. The problem is worse when it has contaminated all their house, furnishings and their food. (see C3 for more discussion)**

**Reference**

[**http://www.snapinfo.ca/issues/aerial-pesticide-application**](http://www.snapinfo.ca/issues/aerial-pesticide-application)

C) **Substantive changes to the Regulations:**

 The Ministry is proposing to put forward three substantial changes to the Regulations. The intent of these changes is to address gaps between the Regulations and current practices in the industry and/or the regulatory practices in other jurisdictions. These provisions are also intended to:

* Address emerging trends in pest control product registration, and
* Streamline the licensing process to make it more efficient.
1. **Issue:**

It is a general industry practice with aerial applicators to have a **mixer/loader** to mix the chemicals for an application and then load the aircraft that will be making the application. However, mixer/loaders do not have any training with respect to safe pesticide handling or pesticide application.

**Current Situation:**

There are no current provisions for a mixer or loader or their training in the Regulations. They would have to work under the direct supervision of a licensed applicator. In this case that would have to be the aerial applicator. The best management practice is to not have the pilot involved in the mixing and loading of the crop protection products. A pilot would have to wear the appropriate personal protective equipment (to prevent exposure) to mix and load the crop protection products.

The National Aerial Applicators manual does not specify a training requirement for mixers/loaders. It offers only a general guideline stating mixers/loaders should be experienced and aware of the risks and take precautions.

**Proposed:**

The Ministry is proposing that there be a requirement for training and certification of mixers and loaders for (aerial) application services. As mixer/loader is the only person who can handle the pest control products, training for the mixer/loader would ensure that the pesticide is being used according to the label. Training for mixers/loaders would increase the safety of pilot, the mixer/loader and enhances protection of environment.

Currently Ontario requires mixers/loaders to complete safety training consistent with the National Standard.

**Implications of proposed changes:**

**To Pesticide Applicators**: Provides increased safety for aerial applicators, however, there will be an additional cost incurred for a mixer/loader.

**To Pesticide Vendors**: None.

**To Pesticide Service Providers**: Provides increased safety for applicators, however, there will be an additional cost incurred by the business for the extra person (the mixer/loader) and the average cost of a training course is approximately $300.

**To Producers**: None.

**To Others**: None

**Comments**

**SNAP strongly supports this change. Mixer-loaders are likely the most exposed to pesticides and definitely need training to attempt to protect them from pesticides and themselves.**

1. **Issue:**

The **Pesticide Applicator training in Saskatchewan is currently valid for five years**. At the end of that five year period, it will need to be renewed or re-evaluated for another five year term. However, the **Pesticide Applicator Licence issued by the Ministry is valid only for one year** and renewed annually.

**Current Situation:**

Currently all Pesticide Applicator Licenses are annual licences and must be renewed every year for an applicator to be valid. The license period is not consistent with the applicator training which is valid for five years.

**Proposed:**

This amendment would implement a five year licence to replace the annual licence for Pesticide Applicators. This reflects current practices in other jurisdictions without impacting the health and safety of the environment and general public. This would also streamline the efforts of the applicator licensing program and increases program efficiency.

The five year licence period would be consistent with the validity of the five year training period and would be consistent with other jurisdictions.

The five year licence option would be implemented for new applicants and upon the recertification of existing applicators.

**Implications of proposed changes:**

**To Pesticide Applicators**: Will experience an increase in initial licensing cost but no increase in overall cost. For new applicants and existing licence holders after recertification, the licence fee would be $250 ($50 annual fee X 5 years).

**To Pesticide Vendors**: None

**To Pesticide Service Providers**: When employing pesticide applicators, they will experience an increase in initial licensing cost but no increase in overall cost. For new applicator employees and existing applicator employees after recertification, the licence fee would be $250 ($50 annual fee X 5 years).

**To Producers**: None.

**To Others**: None

**Comments:**

**1. Would the cost of extra years be refundable to those who close their business?**

**2. SNAP is also thinking that if inspectors find that most of their interventions are educational, then the education has to be widespread and revamped so they can do their job of prosecution.**

**Widespread appropriate training of vendors and applicators should ensure that they have been properly educated. If they don`t remember this education, then perhaps it should be only good for 1 year rather than 5 so they can be reminded on a yearly basis. So rather than extending the license from 1 to 5 years, the education should be every year to ensure some retention of the material.**

1. **Issue:**

Saskatchewan is one of three jurisdictions that **do not require farmers/producers/landowners to have some form of training to apply pesticides**.

Pesticide manufacturers have started to specify user training requirements on product labels in order to purchase and/or use specific products. It is expected that the trend will continue with the development of new chemistries and the re-labeling of older products. The federal Pest Management Regulatory Agency views training and licensing as a means to mitigate risk of pesticide use.

**Current Situation:**

The current Regulations exempt producers from requiring a licence to purchase or use pest control products on land that they own or rent for the purpose of agricultural production. However, some pesticide labels already specify the requirement for pesticide applicator training and certification. Some of the current products with such requirement include Thimet and aluminium phosphide.

**Proposed:**

The intent of this amendment is to recognize and support a voluntary requirement/program for farmers in the Regulations. This training program will be consistent with the National Agricultural Standard. This training program will meet the needs of the product label as well as the Pest Management Regulatory Agency’s expectations for training. These actions will ensure our producers access to new chemistries and the older chemistries that are going to be re-evaluated and receive label enhancements.

**The intent of the proposed amendment is not to remove the existing exemption from the Regulations.** However, it provides an option for farmers to voluntarily undertake a recognized training and certification program that will ensure their continued access to certain crop protection products.

The Pest Management Regulatory Agency’s interpretation of producer training requirements is that it is a provincial responsibility to determine the level of training required and the appropriateness of that training.  If a Pesticide Safety Course satisfies the criteria and is recognized by the Ministry, then that would meet the Pest Management Regulatory Agency’s expectations. Without the Ministerial recognition, growers may have to attend the full Agricultural Applicators course in order to maintain access to pest control products with that label requirement.

Currently Alberta offers this type of voluntary course.

**Implications of proposed changes:**

**To Pesticide Applicators**: None

**To Pesticide Vendors**: None

**To Pesticide Service Providers**: None

**To Producers**: Producers may have to take up to 24 hours of (web based) training to be certified by a training organization.

**To Others**:None

**Comments:**

**SNAP believes that all users of commercial pesticides should have mandatory training, including farmers. Pesticides do not stay where they are applied. Unfortunately they drift and affect other people’s properties as well as the quality of air, water and the environment in general.**

**Neighbours sprayed by farmers are a regular occurrence and, especially in wet years, one regularly sees farmers applying pesticides through water running in their fields or right up to it.**

**We are now faced with Saskatchewan using astronomical quantities of neonicotinoids and RoundUP. High levels of both are widely comtaminating water (1), high enough to impact the aquatic food chain, and the health of our bees (2) necessary for pollination.**

**There is also the attitude that if a neighbour asks for accommodation by spraying when the wind blows another way, there is a tendency to harass that neighbour and make sure the drift hits them next time one sprays, or simply that no one cares what the neighbour is exposed to, even when the chemical pesticides have serious warnings about health effects and the need for protective clothing, which hopefully the farmer is wearing but the neighbour and their livestock are not.**

**It is a serious matter which no one is protected from at this time in Saskatchewan. If windows on a house are open at the time, all the indoor environment is also contaminated. Unfortunately, the natural processes that help decompose pesticides are ineffective inside houses and they persist a long time, likely necessitating major cleaning of everything, especially furniture and carpets or even a replacement of those.**

**Unfortunately, Sask Agriculture does not deal with health complaints, and the PMRA is still gathering data mostly from manufacturers to perhaps be considered at the next re-evaluation in 15 years or more. Canadian courts are way behind in prosecuting for health effects of pesticides.**

**Victims are left with no recourse under the law.**

**Again, pesticide training for all farmers may have a positive effect on their health, the health of the environment and hopefully a bit more consideration for their neighbours` well-being. It would also make the job of the pesticide inspector easier because they could prosecute rather than educate.**

**References**

**1.** [**http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi/10.1371/journal.pone.0092821**](http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi/10.1371/journal.pone.0092821)

**2.** [**http://ecowatch.com/2013/10/24/key-molecule-links-neonicoinoids-to-bee-viruses/**](http://ecowatch.com/2013/10/24/key-molecule-links-neonicoinoids-to-bee-viruses/)

1. **Please provide other comments that you may have.**

**SNAP has provided extra comments in several sections as noted below.**

**Pesticides are so widely used, both commercially and domestically, that the feeling that registration means they are safe is widespread.**

**1. SNAP believes that all pesticide vendors should be licensed, even domestic. (discussion under B1, Aerial spraying and section C 2 and 3)**

**2. The Alberta regulations specify training for applicator assistant. SNAP believes it insufficient to only train one person per facility or business. There should be some type of basic training for anyone selling or using pesticides and there should be guidelines for what that training should be and the length of it. (B4)**

**3. Saskatchewan inspectors should be prosecuting rather than educating. The RCMP does not educate your when you get a speeding ticket and the city does not educate you when you exceed your time on a park meter. Widespread appropriate training of all vendors and applicators should ensure that they have been properly educated. (more discussion under B1, Aerial spraying and section C 2 and 3) Hopefully, more prosecuting or significant fines may give the message that the government is serious about pesticide offenses and will hopefully decrease overspray incidents and environmental contamination.**

**4. If vendors or applicators don`t remember their education, then perhaps the education should be only good for 1 year rather than 5 so they can be reminded on a yearly basis. So rather than extending the license from 1 to 5 years, the education could be done every year to make sure they remember something.**

**5. Increase the length of time available to investigate by the pesticide inspector. When the pesticide inspector was still reachable several years ago, he was complaining of not enough time to investigate in many cases. He should be consulted to determine the appropriate amount of time needed for most investigations, and the time should be amended in the regulations.**

**6. Pesticide Sales Data must be available**

**In 2001, Sask Agriculture started getting pesticide sales data which were compiled for the year 2001-03. Only 64-70 % of commercial vendors reported. The figures indicated a peak of sales at 10,421,927.54 kg in 2003, mostly herbicides, with dominant sales of glyphosate products. Things have changed a lot since then with the rise of neonicotinoids and new products and likely increased sales but data has not been available.**

**Sask Agriculture and Foods quit collecting the data after the PMRA indicated that they would start doing so. There was data for a few more years, but it was not compiled. It is my understanding that vendors refused to use the on-line forms and that money was not available to enter the data manually.**

**The PMRA started collecting pesticide sales data, and the first ones for the year 2007-8 were available last year. However, when I asked for a breakdown by province, I was told that all the information was proprietary and secret and therefore was not available. This is a ludicrous position in light of the fact that at least 4 provinces publish their sales data on an annual basis, including Quebec and Alberta.**

**The PMRA also included chlorine and other disinfectants in the results and did not breakdown per use (such as as lawn care, domestic, farming and other uses (power companies, highways, municipalities, railroads, etc)) as some provinces publish, which makes their report quite useless.**

**I would like to note here that the fact that domestic vendors did not need to license in Saskatchewan prevented the province from asking for their sales records as Sask Agriculture did not have even a list of who they were so the domestic pesticide sales were never entered with Sask Ag and Foods, therefore not reported on.**

 **SNAP would like to know**

**whether Sask Agriculture has been made aware of the Saskatchewan sales data by the PMRA**

**whether these data have been shared with departments of health and environment and concerned researchers.**

**whether you would consider making them available to the public.**

**It is SNAP`s opinion that there can be no appropriate strategy for pesticides in absence of data, which are still unavailable.**

**7. Alberta also has very descriptive regulations for handling spills. If Saskatchewan`s is not up to par, it should be upgraded at least to that level for all storage and vendors.**

**8. Pesticide applications near water. Other than section 5 of the Act (Prohibition against applying pesticides to a body of water without permit) and regulations (section 5), there is no mention of pesticide applications near water or mention of buffer zones. Is this covered under another Act or regulations, in Environment, perhaps. I checked several pesticide labels and found no mention of a specific buffer zone on any I checked.**

**9. Question**

**It is unclear whether current regulations regarding storage of pesticides (section 7) also apply to domestic vendors. Considering there is no training requirement for domestic vendors and no special class license, it appears doubtful at this time.**

**If not, the regulations should apply, and the facilities should be inspected to ensure that the proper safety materials are on hand and that staff knows how to use them. Perhaps there should be a provincially produced training manual to train staff, rather than count on people to fulfill section 14 of the current regulations (Requirements of vendors) as they see fit.**

**9. Notification**

**There should be proper mandatory notification by all applicators of pesticide applications, indoors and out. The signs should include the product used, and stay up for at least several days. Pesticides do not go away when dry. They keep evaporating on a daily basis from sprayed surfaces, many for weeks and some for months.**

**10. Businesses hiring untrained people to apply pesticides and providing no protective clothing and likely no training.**

**Yesterday we were driving on Albert Street in front of the COOP grocery store at the corner of 25th. A man was spraying (seemingly herbicide) on the boulevard in front of the store. He was wearing shorts and sandals, no gloves and no other protection.**

**After the June rains this summer, we went to the farmer`s market on a Saturday morning. I got sick besides Knox United Church. It was not from the church but from the apartments across Victoria Ave where someone was spraying, agin with no protective clothing.**

**Over the years, I have witnessed several mostly young people ( think student employment) similarly applying herbicides around hotels or other private properties with absolutely no protective clothing, and likely no training whatsoever.**

**This has to be dealt with in the regulations review by either specifying that hiring untrained people for that purpose is not allowed, or mandating training for every business that may be tempted to do such a thing.**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to ***The Pest Control Products Regulations, 1995***

***For any questions you can contact SNAP at*** snapinfo@sasktel.net

***Paule Hjertaas***