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According to The Fraser Institute, a Non-Profit THINK-TANK of Experts

- British Columbia is considering to adopt ILL-CONCEIVED laws restricting pest control product use that DO NOT accurately reflect the current state of scientific knowledge.

- A HASTY BAN of pest control products SHOULD NOT BE IMPLEMENTED until the underlying science is conclusive and a comprehensive analysis of the potential side-effects resulting from the BAN has been undertaken.

- By BANNING pest control products for cosmetic uses, British Columbia would be following the QUESTIONABLE PRECEDENT several other provinces have set.

- NO cause-and-effect relationship between pest control products and cancer has been established scientifically.

- 2,4-D Herbicide is in the same cancer-risk category as pickled vegetables and cell-phones.

- The Environmental Impact Quotient (EIQ) for SOAP is HIGHER THAN the EIQ for 2,4-D Herbicide.

- A blanket PROHIBITION lacks the careful contrasting of costs and benefits.

- Politicians should avoid enacting POORLY-DESIGNED regulations to control best control product use that may ultimately prove MORE DAMAGING than the pest control products themselves.
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British Columbia is considering to adopt ILL–CONCEIVED laws restricting pest control product use that DO NOT accurately reflect the current state of scientific knowledge.

ILL–CONCEIVED Proposal To PROHIBIT Pest Control Products in British Columbia

The BUSY–BODY TENDENCIES of British Columbia politicians are leading to the further regulation of what had previously been the refuge of green thumbs across the province — green lawns, colourful flower beds, and ripening vegetable gardens.

Since early July, 2011, the British Columbia government has been reviewing the feasibility of further regulating private gardens by adopting ILL–CONCEIVED LAWS RESTRICTING PEST CONTROL PRODUCT USE THAT DO NOT ACCURATELY REFLECT THE CURRENT STATE OF SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE.
A HASTY BAN of pest control products SHOULD NOT BE IMPLEMENTED until the underlying science is conclusive and a comprehensive analysis of the potential side–effects resulting from the BAN has been undertaken.

A HASTY BAN on the cosmetic use of artificial pest control products SHOULD NOT BE IMPLEMENTED until the underlying science is conclusive and a comprehensive analysis of the potential side–effects resulting from the BAN has been undertaken.

By BANNING pest control products for cosmetic uses, British Columbia would be FOLLOWING THE QUESTIONABLE PRECEDENT SEVERAL OTHER PROVINCES HAVE SET.
By BANNING pest control products for cosmetic uses, British Columbia would be following the QUESTIONABLE PRECEDENT several other provinces have set.

PROHIBITION of Pest Control Products in the Province of Ontario and Across Canada

For example, the Province of Ontario has restricted the sale and use of more than 250 pest control products and 80 pest control product ingredients.

These provincial PROHIBITIONS on cosmetic use of artificial pest control products may apply to lawns, vegetable and ornamental gardens, driveways, cemeteries, public parks and school grounds.

Similarly, dozens of municipalities across Canada have introduced their own restrictions on cosmetic pest control product use.
NO cause-and-effect relationship between pest control products and cancer has been established scientifically

JUSTIFICATION for the PROHIBITION of Pest Control Products

The JUSTIFICATION for a BAN on the cosmetic use of artificial pest control products is based on the « precautionary principle », which concludes any activity that might potentially constitute a « threat of harm » on humans or the eco-system should be curtailed or abated regardless of whether a « cause-and-effect » relationship has been concretely established.

For example, Canadian-Cancer-Society argues that the current evidence of a connection between cancer and artificial pest control product exposure is sufficient to justify a BAN, despite readily admitting NO « cause-and-effect » relationship has been « established scientifically ». 
2,4-D Herbicide is in the same cancer-risk category as pickled vegetables and cell-phones.

NO Evidence of a Link With Cancer

Many of the artificial pest control products that would be BANNED ARE NOT PROVEN TO BE CARCINOGENIC.

The World Health Organization only lists the common pest control product 2,4-D in the SAME CANCER-RISK CATEGORY AS PICKLED VEGETABLES AND CELL-PHONES.

And, just recently, the United States Environmental Protection Agency conducted a review of the scientific literature and concluded there was NO EVIDENCE OF A LINK BETWEEN CANCER AND 2,4-D.

If we take the « precautionary principle » to its natural conclusion, governments should also be BANNING household soap.
The Environmental Impact Quotient (EIQ) for SOAP is HIGHER THAN the EIQ for 2,4-D Herbicide

Scientists at Cornell University have developed the Environmental Impact Quotient (EIQ) as a measure of the relative impact of common pest control product ingredients on humans and the environment.

The EIQ is actually LOWER for many artificial pest control products than it is for many other mundane household items and «natural» pest control product alternatives.

For example, THE EIQ FOR SOAP IS HIGHER THAN THE EIQ FOR 2,4-D.
A blanket PROHIBITION lacks the careful contrasting of costs and benefits

PROHIBITION Imposes Costs

While politicians may think they’re doing good, a BAN on the use of artificial pest control products for cosmetic purposes imposes costs on many people.

The existence of a market for pest control products for cosmetic use suggests Canadians derive value from having these landscape-enhancing products available for purchase.

PROHIBITING the cosmetic use of artificial pest control products ignores the benefits Canadians enjoy in maintaining aesthetically pleasing green landscapes.

Furthermore, a blanket PROHIBITION on cosmetic pest control product use lacks the careful contrasting of costs and benefits that should be undertaken before any possible regulations are adopted.

A wiser approach to evaluating the merits of any regulation controlling cosmetic pest control product use would weigh the trade-offs the proposed regulation implies.
PROHIBITION May Be More Hazardous

Making matters worse, a blanket BAN might also encourage individuals to substitute the BANNED product with alternatives that can be potentially MORE HAZARDOUS.

Consider the recent case of a couple in Victoria, British Columbia, who accidentally set their home ablaze while trying to eradicate their weed problem with a blow-torch, since artificial pest control product use is BANNED in Victoria.

Though this case is anecdotal, it lends credibility to the assertion that using public policy to subvert market forces and regulate the availability of certain commodities that might potentially pose some kind of a risk is likely to give birth to other risks.

These other risks arise from the sometimes clever, sometimes careless, ways Canadians adapt to altered incentives resulting from regulation.

Conclusion

Politicians should avoid enacting POORLY-DESIGNED regulations to control pest control product use that may ultimately prove MORE DAMAGING than the pest control products themselves.
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STOP hanging around doing NOTHING against Lunatic Terrorist PROHIBITION
What can YOU do against Enviro-Lunatics?

WRITE AGAINST THE LUNATICS!

FIGHT AGAINST the CONSPIRACY to PROHIBIT pest control products in the Urban Landscape

RAT-OUT the Enviro-Lunatics with COMPLAINTS through LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Enviro-Lunatics are GOVERNMENT-FINANCED with TAX-FREE MONEY

Demand a REVOCATION of their organizations’ REGISTERED CHARITY TAX-EXEMPT STATUS!
The Whole Truth from an Independent Perspective.