## Industry Spokesmen Discuss Pesticide Law

"The biggest problem we'll have in this industry is understanding and not implementing the new pesticide law."

That is the summary statement by Dr. Charles E. Rieck of the University of Kentucky at Lexington, Ky., highlighted in a presentation of the F e d e r a l Environmental Pesticide Control Act (FEPCA) of 1972 during the Southern Weed Science Society.

FEPCA, now known as the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), with amendments is scheduled for final Implementation in the fall of 1976. It is the Federal act that controls the handling, distribution, use and registration of pesticides and applicators, both commercial and private, that apply these agriculture chemicals.

James A. Sample, editor of WEEDS TREES AND TURF, explained that "as concerned professionals we must consider carefully the trade-offs available between environmental and human health, weed control and pesticide exposure and others. The choice of material by the applicator must be based on



Light weight, easy-to-use, poison bait is automatically dispensed underground into pocket gopher runways.





James A Sample (left), editor of WEEDS, TREES and TURF, discusses the Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act of 1972 with Thomas A. Evans, and John Lenard, technical representatives for E. I. DuPont and Chemagro chemical companies, at the Southern Weed Science Society.

evaluation of the benefit to hazard, not solely on the basis of toxicity."

At the present time, the Federal government is attempting to establish a restricted chemical list of pesticides that are deemed "dangerous" solely on the basis of toxicity ratings. Some state regulations have gone beyond the Federal search and established restricted use lists— North Carolina, for example.

The restricted list, a consistent labelling section, applicator licensing and provisions for law enforcement are key measures in the FIFRA legislation. It is also the areas for some confusion by the various states represented at SWSS.

Industry spokesmen, Thomas M. Evans and John Lenard, technical representatives for E. I. DuPont and Chemagro chemical companies, respectively, presented views for North Carolina and Louisiana.

Evans noted that while most states will seemingly go along with the Federal standards others will move faster in the implementation. Such is the case for North Carolina. While the USDA will require applicators to be trained and licensed by 1976, the NC State law requires the same permission by October of 1974.

Lenard also noted that while many states will be and have set up numerous Pesticide Advisory Boards the manpower and budget requirements for licensing and enforcement will always be on the increase. In Louisiana, for example, the budget for 1977 is allocated for over \$866,000 and a total of 44 employees. This compares to less than 10 employees in the state for 1974 and half the budget. Sample pointed out that the initial phases of FIFRA will largely be voluntary. Particularly so in the training and preparation for licensing. But, Dr. Rieck pointed out that such voluntary provisions of the new law are actually few and that most parts are open to forced compliance.

"But, until we figure out how to economically enforce the law," said Dr. Rieck, "it will have to be a voluntary system. I have no doubt but what the Federal government will figure out how to do that, too."

Thus, Dr. Rieck urged the more than 1,000 weed scientists, extension personnel and agrichemicals representatives present at the SWSS meeting to carefully review the FIFRA law and gain a better understanding and while there is still time.

## Chemical Composition of Trade Names Studied

A federal agency and a private firm in Philadelphia are cooperating in a research project to identify specific chemicals to which American workers are exposed.

The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) has contracted with Auerbach Associates, Inc. for a 20-month study of up to 40,000 trade name products made by some 5,000 manufacturers.

These trade name products were identified by NIOSH as part of its National Occupational Hazard Survey, a two-year study designed to collect information relating biological, physical and chemical exposures to workers in industry.