Pesticide Outlook

WILL IT BE A YEAR OF THROWING OUT THE BABY WITH THE WASH?

By JIM MILLS
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Washington, D.C.

With 48 states having legislative sessions scheduled during the coming year, you must conclude that the climate for pesticides will likely get pretty hot during 1971.

Efforts will likely be made in many states to curtail or eliminate the use of many of the most effective pest control products. Several states already have developed long restricted use lists. And they have done so despite a historical pattern of regulatory competence by the state agencies. It's all part of a popular swing to "environmental protection"—with major emphasis being given to hazards, rather than benefits from using pesticides.

It's difficult to anticipate the precise form which proposed restrictions will take. But most will be based on the premise that persistence per se is bad for the environment, and that the simple solution (to complex problems) is to remove the offending chemical from the channels of trade. Such an approach can be likened to throwing the baby out with the wash water.

Legitimate interests will be hard pressed to maintain or retain their right to use specific products to solve problem situations. Pest control programs and subsequent community health and welfare are likely to suffer if the proposed legislation becomes law without providing for those uses which are legitimate and necessary.

We can expect legislation designed to tighten up the use and application regulations. Such action would aim to reduce widespread use of such chemicals by anyone other than those who demonstrated the need and competency to use them.

Prospect for New Products

This is an area of great misunderstanding. There is an assumption that new pesticides will continue to come into the market at the safe rate of introduction as they have in the past.
This is not happening. And not because of foot-dragging by industry. There are several reasons for the slowdown. These would include the increase in the number of agencies involved in the approval of new products and uses, the changing rules of what is desirable in a pesticide, and the fact that, while new materials can still be found within the various classes of chemicals, the prospects within each class have diminished greatly.

Further, several companies have dropped their research and development activities for various reasons. Others are taking a hard look at their research efforts in light of the skyrocketing costs, market potential, and prospects for successful introduction of new compounds. Analyzed against the backdrop of current emotional outpourings against the use of pesticides, the outlook for new products reaching the market in any great number is bleak. A trend is developing. Companies are looking to other lines not as subject to the type of harassment being felt within the agricultural chemical industry.

The Public View

There is no doubt that the public view of the role of pest control chemicals needs to be improved. Whether it can be done or not is the subject of much concern, both in and out of industry. Complicating the picture is the fact that what was heretofore a scientific discussion has been thrust into the public arena where simple answers are expected. Regardless of their desirability, simple answers just are not possible in such technical fields. Nonetheless, proposals to ban gain much favor. And herein lies the real danger. The total public welfare may well be at stake. The health, nutrition, structures, and well being of society depends on a great measure on the proper use of pest control chemicals.

The inaccuracies and exaggerations published about pesticides have raised a smokescreen which obscures the facts which also must be weighed — the benefits which each of us receives from the responsible use of pesticides.

We can’t ignore the problem areas, nor should we ignore the basic and overriding reason for the existence of pesticides, which is to protect the environment which supports us. Until each of us realizes, in terms which we can understand, how much of our food, health and well-being stems directly from proper use of pesticides, we are in danger of losing these benefits as a result of panic-button reaction.

Whether the story can be told in time remains to be seen. Industry, of course, is accused of bias in attempting to point out the value of its products. But the user of pesticides knows of the great good they do for all consumers. He can do much to bring sanity and reason back into the picture by relaying his knowledge to his customers.

The irony of the situation is that without the benefits gained from pesticides — the food supply, the health programs, sanitation, the protection of our buildings, our surrounding lawns and shrubs, and the management of wildlife habitat — we would be forced into a return to primitive existence, and could ill-afford to focus our attention almost exclusively on the risks which their use may entail.

Some Other Views

Three other industry leaders generally agree with Mills’ view on pesticides for the coming year.

---

FOR POSITIVE WEED CONTROL
TRIMEC® TURF HERBICIDE MAKES THE DIFFERENCE!

Now you can have positive control of hard-to-kill weeds in cool as well as warm temperatures on a variety of 2,4-D resistant weeds.

Trimec turf herbicide is a patented combination of herbicides that display “synergism” and controls hard-to-kill weeds at lower rates than normally needed with the individual herbicides you’re now using.

Gordon’s Fairway Broadleaf Herbicide is in a class by itself. It contains 2,4-D, MCPP and Dicamba in a patented formulation which controls virtually all broadleaf weed species, while the individual herbicide components do not. It is the patented “synergism” of the formulation that makes the difference.

Call 913/342-8780 today, or write Gordon’s about new Trimec Fairway Broadleaf Herbicide and other Gordon turf care products.
Perhaps the most publicized illustration of what can happen when one control method is banned before another is developed comes from the devastation of the gypsy moth. At left is an enlarged moth (normal size is 3/4-inch) taken by USDA photographer Larry Rana. The moth is held captive in a holding device while his reaction to various lures is recorded. USDA scientists have developed a powerful synthetic lure, "Disparlure," that matches the female moth's attractant. The lure can be used in traps to capture the pest without the use of insecticides. Practical use of the method is months, perhaps years in the future. Meanwhile, the gypsy moth defoliated 800,000 acres of trees this year, triple the acreage last year.

They do see a few encouraging signs.

"Since a reported 200 bills are pending in Congress and many more proposals in state legislatures, I would expect the focus to be on new pesticide legislation and regulation," commented Bill La Rue, executive secretary of the Southeastern Agricultural Chemicals Association, Raleigh, N.C.

"I expect the pesticides which are more hazardous to handle and use will be the pesticides that will be somewhat restricted."

Leavitt S. White of Du Pont Company's public relations department believes that public confidence in crop protection chemicals, for example, will depend on "greater understanding by the public that these agents are thoroughly tested, properly regulated, and that there is an increasing awareness and desire on the part of the applicator to use these chemicals carefully.

"The need for crop protection has been highlighted in 1970 by the sudden appearance of corn blight," he said. "Growers everywhere face the challenges of weeds, plant disease, and insect infestation. Their problems and successes in meeting these problems safely with crop protection agents can be more widely understood in 1971."

It is not the users of chemicals that are in trouble, says Ray Thornton, president of Cane Air, Inc., Belle Rose, La., and president of the National Aerial Applications Association, "It is the average American. He has no conception of what this country would be like without pesticides.

"As for new restrictions, the sky is the limit. I will say that you will see DDT brought back. It will never be outlawed.

"I don't believe you will see many
new products on the market. The cost and red tape will be almost prohibitive.

"The pesticide industry can improve its image by circulating our story in magazines other than our own trade journals. We've been talking to ourselves too long.

"Should banning result of a needed pesticide due to inaccuracies and exaggerations, then the publisher should be held liable.

Users of pesticides should acquaint their customers with the true facts. A positive perspective is the best approach."

Meanwhile, formation of a type of national policy on pesticides is on the drawing board. While a broad general policy probably won't be fully defined for some time, a few guidelines are emerging.

An administration official hinted at these guidelines when he spoke to members of the National Pest Control Association at the group's recent annual meeting in Portland. Dr. William Murray of the President's Cabinet Committee on the Environment explained that current plans are to pursue a sharp reduction in application of persistent pesticides to essential uses.

In addition, a general policy might someday include a classification such as the following, he said: A category of pesticides intended for general use, subject only to label restrictions; a category of materials intended for restricted use where users themselves would have to be approved (possibly through licensing by a "properly recognized authority," and a third category of prescription-only pesticides. Materials in this classification would be available only to approved users, dispensed by written permission from an "approved consultant."