

Report to the
CROP, PLANT PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

To the 89th Annual General Meeting of the
CANADIAN HORTICULTURAL COUNCIL
Westin Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario
March 10, 2011

To the President and Members of the
Canadian Horticultural Council

The one constant about crop protection is change. We see changes at the Pest Management Centre (PMC) and we see changes at Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA). Charles Stevens made a good point in his report to OFVGA that is that our committee and our industry in general, spend as much as 99% of our focus on crop protection.

From travelling to various meetings and meeting our committee members from across Canada it is very obvious that all is not well in crop protection. The changes that you see on the world stage in the demand for traceability and MRLs point to CHC having to evolve into more of a leader in this.

We have prepared to work with industry quickly; I am not indicating that they do not now. The question is do we fully understand the process we have in place to handle an invasive species? Have we done dry runs on how to react? I bring this up thinking of a chemical storage I was recently in where they did a table top review of their worst case scenario: a fire. Three weeks later there was a fire. Not in the chemical storage but in a work shop nearby. They were able to activate their emergency response plan and ended up being pleased on how well it worked. I know Canada has an excellent reputation as having one of the best regulatory systems in the world but we still lack harmonization on pesticide products with our biggest neighbor. It puts us at a big disadvantage. PMRA has completed a great deal of work on re-evaluation of old actives. At last count I believe that there is 368 out of 401 reviewed. Out of that 105 were discontinued, 15 were phased out. 230 will continue to have registration with modifications, 18 will have continued use with no modifications. The one thing to remember is that we are losing products we need therefore we have to continue to be aggressive in getting new ones registered.

Emergency registrations are still an ongoing problem we continue to work on with PMRA. I believe that last year the number was around 52. I know this is frustrating for a lot of growers and it takes a lot of time and money. It goes back to what I said earlier. We have to be able to react quickly but the ideal thing is to get the right products registered on both sides of the border in the first place.

The GROU program continues to be a hot topic in Canada. With the cost of pesticides being a big number on anyone's bottom line, we are all looking for the best deal out there. It is still hard for me to understand why there is such a large difference on some pesticides that are used on the same pest on both sides of the border. We will continue to have ongoing dialogue with CropLife on this problem.

To continue to encourage both PMC and PMRA that if you are working with CropLife on screening and registration of a new product it has to be accepted worldwide. If not, you are wasting our money and your time. I recently came from a meeting with a large exporter who made it very clear that if we were to sponsor the registration of a new active we have to make sure that the active has a MRL worldwide. I recently attended a meeting with the Pest Management Advisory Committee in Ottawa and found it very interesting to talk to other commodities in Canada about their issues with crop protection. Again the underlying theme is that we cannot export without an established MRL. I find it troublesome to talk to a registrant about a potential pest control product to find out that there is not a MRL in one of the countries that you might want to ship to. To the CropLife members, I will be blunt. Find out where the crop you want your product registered on is going to be sold and get your MRLs established. To PMRA, make sure that the MRLs are harmonized. A good example is a pesticide I recently looked at that had a default of .01 in the EU and in another country a full 5. This is a very frustrating experience for an exporter. From the requests I am seeing from end users of horticultural products the MRL issue, not just the one established in Canada, is at the top of their list when they look at the total food safety program.

On another front Charles is exactly right when he referred to resistance management as being such an important issue today, it affects every level of crop protection. In my own commodity, I see resistance building to two of our currently registered pesticides. I want to thank PMRA for their decision on allowing tank mixes. This is a big benefit to resistance management. We all see changes in the pest pressures in our crops. One of the big concerns I see coming our way is the Spotted Wing Drosophila fly. This insect is now a major problem in a number of crops on the west coast. The last time I checked the wind was still blowing west to east. Crop protection has to be ready to react faster than we are. This requires commitment from all involved. Our Crop Protection Advisory Committee realizes this and it will be on our agenda. This goes back to the whole invasive species issue: CFIA, PMRA, PMC and CHC, all of us have to be involved

I would like to finish by taking time to thank the people who work on our behalf every day:

- Craig Hunter, who has a real passion for the Hort industry in Canada.
- The staff at CHC who work hard at keeping us on track.
- The committee members of our Crop Protection Advisory Committee. They bring so much to the table on pesticide issues across Canada.
- Last but not least Anne. She has such a wealth of knowledge on the whole file of the crop protection industry in Canada and such good working relations with all parties concerned. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted



Gary Brown
Chair, Crop, Plant Protection and Environment Committee
March 10, 2011