



ISSN 1710-9477

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 39th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 39^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Monday 16 June 2008

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Lundi 16 juin 2008

**Standing Committee on
Social Policy**

**Cosmetic Pesticides
Ban Act, 2008**

**Comité permanent de
la politique sociale**

**Loi de 2008 sur l'interdiction
des pesticides utilisés
à des fins esthétiques**

Chair: Shafiq Qadri
Clerk: Katch Koch

Président : Shafiq Qadri
Greffier : Katch Koch

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

Renseignements sur l'index

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Telephone 416-325-7400; fax 416-325-7430
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service du Journal des débats et d'interprétation
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Téléphone, 416-325-7400; télécopieur, 416-325-7430
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
SOCIAL POLICYCOMITÉ PERMANENT DE
LA POLITIQUE SOCIALE

Monday 16 June 2008

Lundi 16 juin 2008

The committee met at 1431 in committee room 1.

COSMETIC PESTICIDES BAN ACT, 2008

LOI DE 2008 SUR L'INTERDICTION
DES PESTICIDES UTILISÉS
À DES FINS ESTHÉTIQUES

Consideration of Bill 64, An Act to amend the Pesticides Act to prohibit the use and sale of pesticides that may be used for cosmetic purposes / Projet de loi 64, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les pesticides en vue d'interdire l'usage et la vente de pesticides pouvant être utilisés à des fins esthétiques.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, I call this meeting of the Standing Committee on Social Policy to order, as you'll know, to consider clause-by-clause for Bill 64, the Cosmetic Pesticides Ban Act.

I will call the meeting to order. As you know, amendments have been received by the clerk's office by 5 p.m. I welcome legislative counsel, who's here in spirit, and proceed to—

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): There he is. You're confusing me, Doug. Welcome, Mr. Beecroft.

We have a number of amendments put forward and we'll begin their consideration. The floor is now open for general questions or comments, not specifically to any one amendment. If there be any comments, I will invite them now.

Mr. Peter Shurman: I just want to get the details on the specifics of the two amendments that were tabled by the Liberal Party.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): It seems like an entirely legitimate request.

Mr. Peter Shurman: Sometimes I am.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Apparently it is in the handout here. So you're welcome to have that, and then of course when we get to those, you're free to ask any member of the party to explain them.

Mr. Peter Shurman: I have them as well. It's just that we need explanation.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Yes, of course, when we get to the individual consideration. Any other considerations of a general nature? No, fine.

So we'll now move to consideration of amendment number 1, brought forward by the NDP, labelled amendment NDP motion 1. Mr. Tabuns.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I move that subsection 1(1) of the bill be struck out.

We're simply arguing that we should be talking about pesticides that we are going to permit in particular circumstances. Those circumstances have been defined in the legislation. "Cosmetic" is redundant, and I would move that it simply be taken out.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you, Mr. Tabuns. Any further comments?

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: The government side won't be supporting that amendment. From the start, what we've been trying to do is address the use and sale of pesticides that clearly have no countervailing benefit, things like dandelions on lawns. That's the intent of including the word "cosmetic." The intent is actually to prohibit the use and sale of those pesticides which could cause an unnecessary risk to human health and the environment. I think we need a clear definition in there.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you. Any further questions or comments? Seeing none, we'll proceed to the vote. Those in favour of NDP motion 1? Those opposed? I declare it defeated.

We'll now consider section 1. Shall section 1 carry? Carried.

Section 2: I invite Mr. Tabuns to present NDP motion 2.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I move that subsection 7.1(1) of the Pesticides Act, as set out in section 2 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

"Use of pesticides

"(1) A person shall not use or cause or permit the use in, on or over land of a pesticide unless the pesticide has been prescribed for the purpose of this subsection."

Again, the focus here is that what you should be providing is a list of materials that can be used in situations prescribed in the legislation. You are prescribing through this legislation a list that can't be used. Because chemicals can be tweaked, they can have their formulation changed in a way that allows you to rename them without substantially changing the way they operate. It's far more effective to have a list of permitted substances or chemicals, and this amendment brings in that far more stringent, far more restrictive definition.

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: We will not be supporting this amendment either. Clearly, the focus of the efforts of this whole exercise is on education and outreach. The bill has been carefully drafted this way. This isn't any accident that it appears that way. It's to ensure that the cosmetic pesticides ban can be integrated into what we have now, which is the existing comprehensive pesticides management regime. So that we can further our efforts here on compliance and enforcement, the bill should remain this way.

Municipal bylaws are able to use what they refer to as a "white list," because they're dealing simply, and can only deal simply, with the use of pesticides. This legislation is far more comprehensive and deals with the sale, transportation, storage, disposal and other elements of pesticide use.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Any further comments, queries, questions?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Could the government speak to how they're actually going to be maintaining that list in future? Chemicals come out on a regular basis. If you're going to actually protect the public, you're going to have to be evaluating them, monitoring them, checking out epidemiological studies. If you have a list of those that are permitted, then off the bat you know that what you've brought forward are ones that you consider safe, and all others have to prove themselves safe before they go on the market or before they're allowed. This gives far more public health protection.

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: We beg to differ on that. We think that the prohibition on the sale is much more clearly advanced by identifying these products in regulation under Bill 64. I think we have a difference of opinion. I respect Mr. Tabuns's opinions in this regard. It's just simply that we believe this is the better way.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you, Mr. Flynn. I'd also note for the benefit of committee members that we welcome the fact that these proceedings are being recorded for one of our presenters, but I just alert the committee that you are being recorded and videoed.

We'll now proceed to consideration of NDP motion number 2. If there's no further—

Mr. Peter Tabuns: We didn't have a vote on that.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): We're about to. *Interjection.*

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Perhaps you may be practising for downstream changes around here. That's fine.

We'll now consider NDP motion 2. Those in favour?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: A recorded vote.

Ayes

Tabuns.

Nays

Broten, Dhillon, Flynn, Levac, Ramal, Scott, Shurman.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I declare NDP motion 2 defeated.

We'll now consideration NDP motion 3. Mr. Tabuns, the floor is yours.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I move that paragraph 1 of subsection 7.1(2) of the Pesticides Act, as set out in section 2 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

"1. Uses related to golf courses, if the requirements in subsection (3.1) have been met."

The question of golf courses is one that actually led to some interesting debate in the Legislature. Mr. Flynn can speak to that. I'm suggesting that, rather than giving golf courses a pass, as this bill does, as a minimum they be required to put in place a system of pest management or insecticide management control that increases the protection for their workers and the public. This amendment is in line with the work that's being done in Markham, Ontario. It seems to be acceptable there, and I think it could be applied across the province. That's the basis for making this amendment.

1440

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: It appears we have a difference of opinion again, and that's whether this should be enshrined in regulation or in legislation. It's our feeling on this side that if the legislation is passed, the ministry will then begin to work with experts in the field to design a comprehensive set of conditions and regulatory requirements that can best meet the overall goals of this legislation, which obviously is the reduced use of cosmetic pesticides in our environment. We believe that by using the regulatory process, as opposed to the legislative process, we achieve that goal.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Any replies, rebuttals, questions, comments?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: A recorded vote.

Ayes

Tabuns.

Nays

Broten, Dhillon, Flynn, Levac, Ramal, Scott, Shurman.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): NDP motion 3 is defeated.

We'll now proceed to consideration of NDP motion 4. Mr. Tabuns.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I move that paragraph 5 of subsection 7.1(2) of the Pesticides Act, as set out in section 2 of the bill, be struck out.

For those who are in the audience and can't see it, it's a line that says simply "Other prescribed uses." I have to say to the Chair and the committee that this is far too open-ended. It really means that the government will be open to extraordinary and broad-ranging pressure to provide more and more exemptions to the act as presented.

You have the exemptions that you need here for health and safety. You have the exemptions you need for agriculture and forestry. If those exemptions are met, you don't need further exemptions. If you're talking health and safety, that is a low enough bar to let you deal with a broad range of issues that come before any government and any community.

I would suggest to the government that it would be in your interest to have a bill that dispensed with this exemption, not only because you will provide better protection for the public, but it also gives you greater credibility. On that basis, I would urge government members to support this amendment.

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: We won't be supporting this amendment, but we do have an amendment coming up that I think speaks to much of what Mr. Tabuns has been speaking to.

We believe that some exceptions in the front could be things like invasive species control, preservation of trees, the urban canopy. There's much more of an interest in and a knowledge of the impact that trees have on the ecosystem than there was before. People and companies are, I hope, going to start to develop what we hope will be a new regime of low-cost alternative products, low-risk alternative products.

In the future, we're going to have to be dealing with such issues as climate change, introduction of new pests into our environment, innovative approaches to controlling pests that don't use pesticides. We believe that we need to craft these solutions in a regulatory manner.

Should this amendment not be successful, we have an amendment that will be dealt with after this.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qadri): Are there any further questions, comments?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Tabuns.

Nays

Broten, Dhillon, Flynn, Levac, Ramal, Scott, Shurman.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qadri): NDP motion 4 is defeated.

Consideration of government motion 5. Mr. Flynn.

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: I move that paragraph 5 of subsection 7.1(2) of the Pesticides Act, as set out in section 2 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

"5. Other prescribed uses, if any prescribed conditions have been met."

The intention of this is to strengthen this section that allows for other prescribed uses to be exempted from the use prohibition. It actually ensures that other exceptions to the use prohibition that are prescribed in the regulation

are conditional exceptions only. The effect is that in order to be able to use pesticides which have been prohibited under the use ban, these other prescribed uses would have to meet all of the conditions placed on them as specified in the regulations to be drafted. Failure to meet the regulatory conditions doesn't mean that these people will just be fined or there'll be a slap on the wrist; it will actually be the loss of that exception.

Mr. Peter Shurman: Can I get an example of anything that might fall under this particular clause?

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: If you came forward with a use that you thought we should use pesticides for which isn't covered under the regulations, you would be given a prescribed set of conditions that you would have to meet before you could use that pesticide. If you did not meet those conditions, that exception would be taken away from you and you would be prohibited from that exception again in the future.

Mr. Peter Shurman: That, Mr. Flynn, could be a temporary or a permanent situation, depending—

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: Depending on the pests or if it's some sort of invasive species, or if it's something even related to public health.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qadri): Any further questions or comments? Seeing none, we'll consider now government motion 5. Those in favour? Those opposed? I declare government motion 5 carried.

We'll proceed now to NDP motion 6.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: This relates to golf courses. Given that the previous amendment failed, I withdraw this.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qadri): NDP motion 6 is withdrawn. Are there any comments, nevertheless? We'll consider, then, NDP motion 7.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I move that subsection 7.1(5) of the Pesticides Act, as set out in section 2 of the bill, be struck out.

Whether or not municipalities can actually take action is a central issue here. If municipalities had not been in a position to move on second-hand smoke, we would not have had the momentum in this province to actually take on the issue. It's very simple and very straightforward. It was the action of municipalities in Ontario, and frankly it was the action of municipalities in the United States that caused state governments to act. Taking away that power in a very key environmental and health area is a very dangerous precedent. We would not be debating pesticide bans or restrictions in this Legislature if the cities of Toronto, Oakville, Peterborough and others had not taken the action that they did. In restricting their powers in this legislation, you are setting up a situation that will make it very difficult for municipalities to take action in the future, to show any leadership—and if municipalities don't show it, you can be very certain that the chances of provincial governments acting are going to be dramatically reduced.

I have some sense of the political reason for the government moving this, but in terms of the long-run health and safety of people in this province and in terms of the long-run relationship between the provincial gov-

ernment and the municipal governments, your initiative is a mistake. I think that you should support my amendment. Frankly, you should support voting against this section of the bill so that the power of municipalities is not constrained.

Mr. Dave Levac: Just a quick question on Mr. Tabuns's rationale: Are you suggesting—and I listened carefully—that the inclusion of this will stop any other action from municipalities from their own bylaws, other than the one that we're specifically talking about?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: My read from talking to people is that they will look at your initiative on this and conclude that their actions on toxic chemicals will be subject to end runs in the future. It will minimize and undermine the momentum to actually pioneer environmental and health-protective action at the municipal level.

Mr. Dave Levac: Thanks for the clarity.

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: This is probably the most debated part of the proposal so far. I spent 18 years on a local council myself, and I think that if Mr. Tabuns and I had met during those years, we probably would have shared a similar view as to what we should be doing with pesticides.

The reason that my council became involved in this is because the provincial government refused to act in this regard. What you had was municipalities acting in default, basically, because once they had the Hudson decision and the authority from the courts to act, and after they had worked their way through that, they implemented bylaws restricting the use of pesticides.

1450

My analysis is that the provincial proposal is stronger by far in that it bans the sale, something municipalities couldn't do—would have liked to have done, but simply couldn't do. I think, by default, what we have before us is a much stronger piece of legislation than any municipality has been able to implement in the past, simply because their authority is limited.

If the debate is about municipal autonomy, then the argument could be made—and I don't want to see the argument made that a municipality would not have to meet the threshold of the provincial government. If municipalities have the right to act in an autonomous way when it comes to the issue of pesticides, then surely they would have the right to do even less than the provincial regulation brings into effect. So I think that would be a step backwards. I understand the argument. Certainly, my 18 years as a regional and as a local councillor are something that I haven't left behind by any means, but I don't think Ontarians want a patchwork of regulations.

At some point in the future, could the legislation be improved, could the regulations be strengthened? Certainly, there's a process for doing that, but I don't think Ontarians want one rule for the use of pesticides where they live, another for where they work, another for when they're at the cottage and another one when they're at somebody else's cottage. What Ontarians want is for their government to act in a way that implements a restriction on the use of pesticides that's agreed to by the

vast majority of the citizens in the province. You'd get that information from the Environmental Bill of Rights; there's a lot of support for this proposal.

In my opinion, the largest impact of this entire exercise will be the ban on the sale. If you can't get your hands on the pesticides, you aren't going to use them. It's that simple, whether you're tempted to use them or not, if you can ban the sale. So I think we all agree that that has got a lot out of the way. This is almost getting into that "How many angels can you get on the head of a pin?" thing now—we're starting to get into the details. I really think this is more of a theoretical argument than it is one of substance. The real substance is going to be the ban on the sale of pesticides.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qadri): Thank you. Mr. Tabuns.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: You covered a lot of ground in that. First of all, I'll just say that in terms of municipalities and the whole question of floor or ceiling, no one would argue that we shouldn't be protecting human health and the environment. For the province to step in and set a floor below which municipalities can't go—no one would argue with it. You don't set standards for water quality and say that we have any objection to people having a higher level of protection of their water. We don't have any objection to people intervening to make sure that their environment is safer and healthier. So I don't think your argument about simply making it a question of municipal autonomy holds up. No one's arguing that municipalities should be able to provide a lower level of protection.

The question is, will municipalities be able to continue as they have in the past under the Smoke-Free Ontario Act and set a higher standard for protection of health and safety in their community? What you've done here is roll that back and set a precedent that I think is dangerous and, beyond that, betrays a lack of respect for municipalities that actually have been the pioneers in protecting human health and safety.

When I talk to colleagues in the United States on the climate change issue, it's at the state and city levels where people are taking action on climate change and, frankly, ignoring the federal government because, as we all know, it's a dead letter for them on climate change.

What you've done, I think, is set in motion a precedent that will be highly problematic for cities and for this province in years to come. The question of patchwork was an issue that I had to deal with when I fought for smoke-free restaurants and bars in the 1990s. The simple reality is that as science moves on, as public consciousness moves on, you're going to have an understanding that some chemicals have to go. There may be cities in this province that are willing to go further than the provincial government is willing to go. There will be a patchwork. I think that if you were setting the bar high enough, no city would want to go further: that would be one thing, but you're not. You're actually rolling things back, in particular with reference to the city of Toronto.

Lastly, in terms of the sale, I think your argument has a lot of merit when you say that the strength of this bill is that it bans the sale of particular pesticides and herbicides. But, as I said earlier—and this happens in the pharmaceutical industry and in the pesticide and herbicide industry—you can tweak a chemical in a very minor way, retaining its impact but setting it up so that it is patentable and saleable. Frankly, I think a lot of companies will do that to get around your ban. Unless you show a very different approach to that of the past, unless the federal government shows a very different approach, we'll be fairly slow to keep up with changes in chemistry. I think your sale list will be outmoded, probably within five to 10 years. I think that there will then be a substantial political battle to have that list keep up with what's really on the market.

In the end, retaining the powers in the hands of the municipalities is a safety net for the protection of human health and safety. I think you are very wrong to roll back the power of municipalities in this situation.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you, Mr. Tabuns.

Interruption.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): And thank you for that spontaneous outburst.

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: Just in answer to that, I think we are performing a public good here. I think what we're doing is banning—and I don't think we should lose sight of that—the use and the sale of cosmetic pesticides in the province of Ontario. It's something that I wasn't sure, as a politician, I'd ever live to see. So I don't want to lose sight of that. I think if you look at the patent process for new drugs, or for drugs that are emerging on the market, and you look at the pesticide approval regime, they're two completely different things.

I have some sympathy for the point being put forward by Mr. Tabuns, but I also have my feet grounded in reality. This is a proposed bill that I think could be put into place in a schedule that would lead to a ban on the use and sale of cosmetic pesticides by spring of 2009. I think it's time to move forward on it.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I would just advise our observers that they would feel free to applaud on an individual basis, but not during committee hearings. Thank you.

We'll now proceed to consideration of NDP motion 7.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Tabuns.

Nays

Broten, Dhillon, Flynn, Levac, Ramal, Scott, Shurman.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): NDP motion 7 is defeated.

Now consideration of NDP motion 8; Mr. Tabuns.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I move that subsection 7.1(5) of the Pesticides Act, as set out in section 2 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

“Municipal bylaws

“(5) Despite section 14 of the Municipal Act, 2001 and section 11 of the City of Toronto Act, 2006, if there is a conflict between a provision of this section and a provision of a bylaw passed by a municipality, the provision that most restricts the use, sale, offer for sale or transfer of a pesticide prevails.”

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Any further comments?

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: Just briefly, Mr. Chair, I think the same debate would apply as we had on the previous question. But when I look at what has happened since municipalities have been placed in a position where they were forced, really, to implement their own bans, somewhere between 33 and 36 have implemented them. The proposed legislation is clearly stronger than any one of them, because it bans the sale. Even if you went down into exceptions and into other uses, whether it allowed for use in exceptional circumstances or infestations, I would make the argument that the proposed legislation is clearly stronger than, or at least as strong as, the route that has already been taken by about 33 out of those 36 municipalities. So I think it meets the test of municipal approval just in that regard.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Mr. Tabuns.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Yes, I should just note that in consideration of this matter by the city of Toronto board of health, they have asked the city solicitor to look for legal avenues to ensure that the city of Toronto can enforce its own bylaws should the act that you put in place be less protective of health and the environment than what they have in place. So you may well be opening the door to an ongoing series of legal challenges by failing to adopt the resolution that I have before you.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Any further questions, comments or queries? Seeing none, we'll consider the vote.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Recorded, please.

Ayes

Tabuns.

Nays

Broten, Dhillon, Flynn, Levac, Ramal, Scott, Shurman.

1500

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): NPD motion 8 is defeated.

That brings to conclusion consideration of amendments for that particular section, so we'll now consider the section as amended. Shall that section 2, as amended, carry? Those opposed?

Section 2, as amended, is carried.

Having to date received no further amendments for sections 3 and 4 inclusive, I'll now ask if the committee will agree to consider both sections simultaneously. Seeing no objections, shall sections 3 and 4 carry? Carried.

We'll now consider section 5, NDP motion 9. Mr. Tabuns.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I move that paragraph 43 of subsection 35(1) of the Pesticides Act, as set out in subsection 5(1) of the bill, be struck out.

Again, this is related to our proposal that the government's ability to arbitrarily prescribe exemptions be removed, and I've previously made my argument on that.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Any comments?

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: Chair, I previously had a response to that argument.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you, Mr. Flynn. If there are no further comments, the floor is now closed for motion 9 commentary. We'll now consider the vote recorded.

Ayes

Tabuns.

Nays

Brotten, Dhillon, Flynn, Levac, Ramal, Scott, Shurman.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): NDP motion 9 is defeated.

Government motion 10 is now being considered.

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: I move that paragraph 44 of subsection 35(1) of the Pesticides Act, as set out in subsection 5(1) of the bill, be amended by adding, "or five" after "paragraph 1".

This motion is required to support the amendment to section 2 of the bill, paragraph 5 of subsection 7(1.2) of the Pesticides Act previously discussed, by providing the Lieutenant Governor in Council with the authority to prescribe conditions and regulations that must be complied with in order for the prescribed use to be excepted from the use prohibition.

Again, the intent of this simply is to strengthen the section that I think all members of the committee supported.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you, Mr. Flynn. Any commentary? Questions? Queries? Going once.

Seeing none, we'll now consider government motion 10.

Those in favour of government motion 10? Those opposed? Government motion 10 is carried.

NDP motion 11. Mr. Tabuns.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I move that paragraph 48 of subsection 35(1) of the Pesticides Act, as set out in subsection 5(1) of the bill, be struck out.

Again, this speaks to allowing municipalities to pass stricter pesticide bans. Previous arguments have been made.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you. Consider now—a recorded vote—NDP motion 11.

Ayes

Tabuns.

Nays

Brotten, Dhillon, Flynn, Levac, Ramal.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Motion 11 is defeated.

NDP motion 12.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I move subsection 5(2) of the bill be struck out.

Again, this is related to the approach that would have the government list the pesticides that can be used rather than those that are banned. I think it's far more protective of human health and the environment and one that should be adopted by the government.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Comments?

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: Only to say, Chair, that we would not agree. We understand the sentiment being expressed by Mr. Tabuns and feel that we're proceeding in the right way on this matter.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you. Recorded vote on NDP motion 12.

Ayes

Tabuns.

Nays

Brotten, Dhillon, Flynn, Levac, Ramal, Scott, Shurman.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): NDP motion 12 is defeated.

NDP motion 13.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I move that subsection 35(3) of the Pesticides Act, as set out in subsection 5(2) of the bill, be struck out.

This again relates to protecting the ability of municipalities to pass stricter pesticide bans.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you. Further comments? Seeing none, a recorded vote on NDP motion 13.

Ayes

Tabuns.

Nays

Brotten, Dhillon, Flynn, Levac, Ramal, Scott, Shurman.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): NDP motion 13 is defeated.

This now brings to an end consideration of individual amendments to section 5.

We'll now consider the section as a whole. Shall section 5, as amended, carry? Those in favour? Those opposed? Section 5, as amended, carried.

To date we've received no amendments for section 6, so we'll proceed unless there are comments directly to its adoption.

Shall section 6 carry? Carried.

We'll now proceed to NDP motion 14.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Withdrawn, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you. We'll consider section 7. Shall section 7 carry? Carried.

We'll now consider NDP motion 15.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Withdrawn.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you, Mr. Tabuns.

Shall the title carry? Carried.

Shall Bill 64, as amended, carry? Carried.

Shall I report the bill, as amended, to the House? Carried.

Are there any further questions or comments, or applause? Seeing none, I declare this committee adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 1505.

CONTENTS

Monday 16 June 2008

Cosmetic Pesticides Ban Act, 2008, Bill 64, *Mr. Gerretsen* / **Loi de 2008 l'interdiction des pesticides utilisés à des fins esthétiques, projet de loi 64, *M. Gerretsen*..... SP-91**

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL POLICY

Chair / Président

Mr. Shafiq Qadri (Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord L)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Président

Mr. Vic Dhillon (Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest L)

Ms. Laurel C. Broten (Etobicoke–Lakeshore L)

Mr. Vic Dhillon (Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest L)

Ms. Cheri DiNovo (Parkdale–High Park ND)

Ms. Helena Jaczek (Oak Ridges–Markham L)

Mr. Dave Levac (Brant L)

Mr. Shafiq Qadri (Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord L)

Mr. Khalil Ramal (London–Fanshawe L)

Ms. Laurie Scott (Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock PC)

Mr. Peter Shurman (Thornhill PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn (Oakville L)

Mr. Peter Tabuns (Toronto–Danforth ND)

Clerk / Greffier

Mr. Katch Koch

Staff / Personnel

Mr. Doug Beecroft, legislative counsel

Ms. Carrie Hull, research officer,

Research and Information Services