

[Skip navigation](#)

**Login close**

- [globeandmail.com](#)
- [My Portfolio](#)
- [Weather](#)
- [Most Popular](#)
- [Print Edition](#)
- [Newspaper Subscription](#)
- [Globe Plus](#)
- [Globe Recognition](#)
- [Newspaper Ads](#)



# Comments

- [Auto](#)
- [Real Estate](#)
- [Careers](#)
- [Personals](#)
  
- [Home](#)
  -
- [National](#)
  - [British Columbia](#)
  - [Prairies](#)
  - [Ontario](#)
  - [Quebec](#)
  - [Atlantic](#)
  - [Politics](#)
  - [Education](#)
- [World](#)
  - [Americas](#)
  - [Europe](#)
  - [Asia-Pacific](#)
  - [Africa-Mideast](#)
- [Report on Business](#)
  - [Industry News](#)
  - [Commentary](#)

- [Market Action](#)
  - [Globe Investor](#)
  - [Globe Fund](#)
  - [Managing](#)
  - [Small Business](#)
  - [Globeinvestor Gold](#)
- [Sports](#)
  - [Hockey](#)
  - [Baseball](#)
  - [Basketball](#)
  - [Football](#)
  - [Golf](#)
  - [Soccer](#)
  - [Others](#)
  - [Columnists](#)
  - [Yesterday's Stories](#)
- [Opinions](#)
  - [Columnists](#)
  - [Cartoon](#)
  - [Editorials](#)
  - [Letters to the Editor](#)
- [Arts](#)
  - [Movies](#)
  - [Television](#)
  - [Theatre](#)
  - [Music](#)
- [Technology](#)
  - [Personal Tech](#)
  - [Science](#)
- [Life](#)
  - [Food & Wine](#)
  - [Family & Relationships](#)
  - [Work](#)
  - [Travel](#)
  - [Health](#)
  - [Style](#)
  - [Deaths](#)
- [Books](#)
- [Marketplace](#)
  - [GlobeAuto](#)
  - [Careers](#)
  - [Classifieds](#)
  - [Newspaper Ads](#)
  - [Personals](#)
  - [Real Estate](#)



## Will Dow challenge Quebec pesticide law?

- [Article](#)
- [Comments](#) ( [157](#) )
- [>](#)

MARTIN MITTELSTAEDT

Globe and Mail Update

Latest comment posted at 8:36 AM EDT 03/04/09

Company plans to make a decision this month on whether to take on Ottawa by filing NAFTA notice of intent ...[Read the full article](#)

This conversation is **closed**

- [Skip to the latest comment](#)
1. **Some Thoughts from Canada writes:** President Obama has said he supports the ascendancy of science (indeed, that was one of the reasons I voted for him), if that is the case, his administration would clearly support Dow having recourse to the courts.
    - Posted 03/04/09 at 8:09 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
  2. **Ryan Ginger from Canada writes:** For example, V.G. Gallo, who claims losses of \$355-million over an Ontario regulation blocking the use of an abandoned mine for Toronto's garbage, is actually a US investor acting as a 'front' for the main Canadian investors.

The problem with this clause is that, whenever there is an internal dispute over regulation, the claimant can appeal to the NAFTA clause by using a US investor.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 8:16 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

3. **Geoff Garver from Montreal, Canada writes:** Chapter 11 reflects our warped priorities of economic interests over environmental and social issues. Under Chapter 11, Canada, US and Mexico have waived their sovereign immunity to suit, in order to allow multi-million dollar suits by business interests. Under the environmental side agreement, complaints about weak enforcement get you a factual report with moral weight, perhaps, but no legal weight whatsoever. And in the pending Canada-Colombia and Canada-Peru trade agreements (please, no!), the Chapter 11-type provision is there, but the environmental provisions are whittled down to the possibility of asking a DFAIT bureaucrat a question and hoping for a (politically scrubbed, non-independent, so-much-for-accountability response). Surely we should expect better. And beyond these structural problems, Canada has snubbed its nose at the NAFTA environmental side agreement by failing to name members to its Joint Public Advisory Committee - a vital link to the public that is supposed to have 5 members from each country. The Canadian government hasn't named any new members since Harper came to power - and now the JPAC can't even meet because there is no quorum. Now is not the time to reward this scandalous behavior with new trade agreements.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 8:29 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

4. **J.C. Davies from Canada writes:**

'The company is irked by the pesticide ban, saying it wasn't based on sound scientific grounds showing hazards from the residential use of its product.'

Completely true. The ban is based on hysteria whipped up by the same people who also want perfume and fragrances banned.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 8:29 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

5. **Bob from Montreal from Canada writes:** Simple solution to this really - before you buy a product check to see if it is made by Dow. If it is, put it back on the shelf. Hard to believe a company like DOW would be so stupid over 2 million dollars, it will cost them so much more in legal fees and corporate image.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 8:30 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

6. **Bill Hopkins from London, Canada writes:** The Ontario ban comes into effect on April 22. The ban is based on emotion, misunderstanding of the science involved, and political posturing on the part of McGinty. The science is clear for most of the commonly used pesticides today - used according to the label, there is no significant hazard.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 8:37 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

7. **Vote Libertarian from Canada writes:** Dow...please take Ontario to court as well. I want to use your safe products.

Does anyone know if I can buy this stuff in Buffalo? Or is NY State run by ideological nut cases as well?

o Posted 03/04/09 at 8:46 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

8. **Boreal Moose from Canada writes:** DOW should reconsider legal action. This is the kind of issue where they could win the battle and lose the war. Imagine the optics of a long and drawn out fight. Imagine Quebec's students and environmentalists - the most organized and radical (in the best sense of that word) in Canada. Throw in David Suzuki and Robert F. Kennedy Jr. and you have a public relations nightmare on your hands.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 8:55 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

9. **Rusty Brown from Cobourg, Ontario, Canada writes:**  
MARTIN MITTELSTAEDT can't spell 'Colombia'?

I am very surprised.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 8:57 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

10. **Josh Taylor from Dublin, Canada writes:** I am hardly a hippie by any measure. However, the use of pesticides is crazy, even to me. They are poisons and anyone with any bit of a green thumb can avoid the need with some proper planning and elbow grease.

Filling all the lawns and gardens with poison is pure crazy! People wonder what causes cancer. This is another piece of the unhealthy puzzle.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:04 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

11. **Billy Bob from Canada writes:** The pesticide bans is nothing but ridiculous. How can you say (with a straight face) that pesticides are dangerous for our health when used to kills weeds on our lawns but those same pesticides are completely safe to continue to be used on golf courses and those same pesticides are completely safe to continue to be sprayed by farmers on the food we eat.

I guess it is also safer for our children to just start eating more allergy medicine.

I have no problem with a ban of a product if it is based on science fact , but this is simply based on hysteria by a small group of misinformed, under educated tree huggers with way too much time on their hands.

If anyone wishes to argue that, pull your head out of your a\$\$ before you speak.

There will be no ban of this product on my property. I have plenty....for anyone else....just go state side to pick it up or get is shipped from a non communist province.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:11 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

12. **john doe from toronto, Canada writes:** DOW Chemical?

DOW chemical of '**Agent Orange**' notoriety? Is thinking of suing about a cosmetic pesticide regulation?

They are SO asking for a PR disaster. I see their stock dipping just on this mention.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:19 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

13. **on the contrary you need to think my way from Canada writes:** I have said it more than once...

Corporations don't give a flying f\$%k about the environment or the health of people. They are driven by one thing only MONEY!

The mandate of corpaorations must be changed, by law, so that people and teh environment are palced ahead of GREED! Corporations will still find a way to make money, just not on the back of humanity or the earth or oceans.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 9:19 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

14. **Boreal Moose from Canada writes:** Billy Bob from Canada writes: How can you say (with a straight face) that pesticides are dangerous for our health when used to kills weeds on our lawns but those same pesticides are completely safe to continue to be used on golf courses and those same pesticides are completely safe to continue to be sprayed by farmers on the food we eat.

- 
- 1) I agree that its hypocritical to have such a double standard....but
  - 2) Maybe it ISN'T safe on golf courses and food either

- Posted 03/04/09 at 9:21 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

15. **Billy Bob from Canada writes:** Josh Taylor from Dublin, Canada writes: I am hardly a hippie by any measure.

Filling all the lawns and gardens with poison is pure crazy! People wonder what causes cancer. This is another piece of the unhealthy puzzle.

Josh, I will try and keep this as simple as I can. If the government says it is ok to eat, how can you argue it is not ok to spray on your lawn. This in itself makes it pretty clear that this is nothing but more feel good BS dished out by the Government.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 9:21 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

16. **Brye Guy from Canada writes:** DOW is very smart going after Ottawa and not the provinces. As DOW knows, Ottawa has reviewed the products (they all have been reviewed and approved by Health Canada) and Health Canada found them to be perfectly safe for use by the homeowner, the farmer, at the golf course, where ever.

The provinces have ignored the science and changed the regulations so that the products can not be sold, but they have no intention to prosecute anyone who uses the products. Since Ottawa agrees with Dow that the products should be sold, what's Ottawa defense in this situation?

So DOW gets 2 million a year for the lost of Quebec sales and then lets say another 2 million a year for the lost of Ontario sales and what do we have for our 4 million a year? Nothing.

Who can blame DOW for being concerned about this. They spend millions of dollars showing Health Canada that the products are safe. The Provinces say that their regulations aren't based on science but on uneducated and unsubstantiated public opinion and anyone knows that the vocal minority is always right. They should be demanding the 4 million per year plus all the money they spent registering their products in Canada.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 9:35 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

17. **Billy Bob from Canada writes:** Boreal Moose from Canada writes:

- 1) I agree that its hypocritical to have such a double standard....but
- 2) Maybe it ISN'T safe on golf courses and food either

I agree. It is either a dangerous nasty chemical or it isn't. If it is, then it should have been

banned from the food we eat every single day of our lives and certainly from frigin golf courses!

I wonder if I will win a prize for the nicest lawn in the city this year?

I will never let out my secret, except to say that it is something everyone eats every day.  
:)

o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:36 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

18. **David K from Guelph, Canada writes:** 'I have no problem with a ban of a product if it is based on science fact , but this is simply based on hysteria by a small group of misinformed, under educated tree huggers with way too much time on their hands.'

So, you would describe the Registered Nurses Association, Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment, The Canadian Cancer Society and the governments of Norway, Sweden and Denmark under that heading because they all support or have enacted similar bans. The stuff is poisonous it states that on the label. There is ever increasing evidence that even minute quantities of some substances can alter your body chemistry for the worse. If you can guarantee that none of the toxin you are using on your property will migrate over to mine, go ahead, have a ball. If not, get on your knees and start weeding just like I do or prepare for the mother of all lawsuits.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:38 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

19. **Billy Bob from Canada writes:** Well said Brye Guy.....

o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:39 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

20. **john doe from toronto, Canada writes:** Brye Guy writes:'They spend millions of dollars showing Health Canada that the products are safe.'

Dow has spent hundreds of millions over 40 years 'proving' that its napalm (the sole supplier in the vietnam war) and Agent Orange defoliant were 'safe'. That doesn't make it so.

I think Dow should keep its head low, or it risks a huge public backlash, especially in Quebec, and a PR disaster.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:43 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

21. **Billy Bob from Canada writes:** David K, your sounding a little muffled.....

o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:43 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

22. **D F from Regina area, Canada writes:** The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) has classified 2,4-D among the phenoxy acid herbicides MCPA and 2,4,5-T as a class 2B carcinogen - possibly carcinogenic to humans. Interestingly, the EPA in the USA did not, under pressure from DOW, cash is king apparently...

o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:43 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

23. **Honesty is the best Policy from Canada writes:**

Wouldn't a Dow go good now?

Apparently not.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:47 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
24. **dave ross from Canada writes:** Perhaps the Quebec government will enter this case, if it becomes one, as an intervenor and countersue for health costs. This would be similar to what various states and provinces have been doing with big tobacco.

I wonder if any of the Quebec asbestos companies have gone after the US or Mexico over any restrictions on asbestos?

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:48 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
25. **arthur hanks from t.o, Canada writes:** there's numerous studies looking at 2,4-D as a carcinogen and toxin. or does 'science-based' these days mean we pick and choose the results we want, and meanwhile wear pink ribbons and walk for a cure and hope it all works out?

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:51 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
26. **Paul Sheridan from Hawkestone, ON, Canada writes:** Let's see.....the Canadian government and science. Science has proven cigarettes cause cancer. Science has yet to offer any hard proof that common lawncare pesticides / herbicides cause cancer. So, let's keep selling cigarettes and ban pesticides. Alrighty then.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:52 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
27. **David K from Guelph, Canada writes:** Billy Bob from Canada writes: David K, your sounding a little muffled.....

Billy, Billy, Billy. See, your hearing is already affected (not to mention your spelling).

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:56 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
28. **Boreal Moose from Canada writes:** Brye Guy from Canada writes: Who can blame DOW for being concerned about this. They spend millions of dollars showing Health Canada that the products are safe.

---

You're hilarious.  
Put my trust in DOW Chemical!

You mean put my trust in the company that merged with Union Carbide? That brought you Napalm and Agent Orange? The largest company in the 'dirty dozen'? The company with more than 2500 (reported) chemical accidents in 10 years? Which the EPA says has repeatedly violated testing, operating, monitoring, record keeping, reporting and notification requirements of the Clean Air Act?

The company in litigation over: dioxin, dibromo-chloropropane, asbestos, nemagon?

Hee hee, Brye Guy.  
You're a freaking riot.

As far as I'm concerned, 4 million dollars to do nothing else but ram a red hot poker up their CEO's behind would be money well spent.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:01 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

29. **D. Hall from Canada writes:** I agree with those that think Dow would be setting itself up for a public relations and marketing disaster if they file this suit.

While there is definitely a solid market among grumpy old male conservatives for gas guzzlers, noisy yard equipment and chemical soups, they are a minority and a dying market. Dow should take a lesson from Chrysler and GM and try and get ahead of the curve rather than running along behind it trying to make it straight.

(Sorry for the metaphor attack - it just snuck up on me)

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:02 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

30. **B W from Canada writes:** why use pesticides? to kill weeds.  
why kill weeds? to have a uniform carpet of green grass.  
why have grass? because my neighbours expect me to.

It's hard to shake the image of the perfectly manicured green lawn.

Question though is can we mandate that chemicals can't be sold for this purpose. It seems almost like the smoking/second hand smoke debate all over again...except I'm not sure the science is as conclusive...and these chemicals are being used out doors.

Poor PR move by Dow - to try to challenge this regulation in a province that is apparently in favour of banning their products seems stupid - it set a precedent to prevent other jurisdictions from doing the same, but it will only worsen their image (exception Billy Bob and people like him :))

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:11 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

31. **Obelix le Gaulois from un village qui resiste encore et toujours a l'envahisseur, Canada writes:** Billy Bob, if that pesticide is perfectly safe then, invite me at your place and we'll drink a glass of it, together.

A vot' sante! Hips!....

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:15 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

32. **Neocon Destroyer from Canada writes:** I'm having a real hard time trying to decide which is more important. I hate that brown patch on my lawn, but my kid is sick with leukemia. After reading some of the comments here, the corporate apologists from the flat earth society have convinced me! That brown spot is more important. Thank you DOW for standing up for my rights to a green lawn. I'm sure my kid will recover thanks to a health care system that will fix that problem. For the brown spot, I rely on DOW (Death Over Wellness).

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:16 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

33. **Chris Michaels from Canada writes:** Lived near Sarnia long enough to know these DOW guys couldn't care less about about the environment -- so, I'd trust anyone's 'science' over theirs every day of the week.

Using chemical pesticides and herbicides on lawns is simply irresponsible. It doesn't take a genius to understand that it all ends up in the ground water and nearby streams.

There are plenty of organic alternatives out there these days. This is just a company panicking before their product line slips into the realm of 'obsolete'.

Regardless...it's only lawn. Who cares? If there's even a slight risk, don't bother. Weed manually - or, hire a neighbourhood kid to do it.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:16 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

34. **Honesty is the best Policy from Canada writes:**

I used to have great apple trees in my backyard. Sprayed for everything and harvested nice apples.

Then a family with small kids moved in next door and I decided I (who had learned all about poisons from the literature that came with the products I was spraying) would rather have healthy neighbour kids than perfect apples.

My lawn looks alright with a few weeds. My neighbours kids are healthy.

If your priority is a green perfect lawn I feel sorry for you and your family. And all the familys near you.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:26 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

35. **Chris Halford from Canada writes:** Bob from Montreal - I agree with you. If they want to act like this then don't buy their products. Dow is now acting like the tobacco companies, fighting a rearguard action after it has already been demonstrated that pesticides are dangerous, particularly to children, pets and pregnant women.

J.C. Davies - I guess you've got one of those perfect lawns and support the right to bear arms, etc.. We should have a serious second look at NAFTA if American companies can tell us what we should and shouldn't do in our own country. A lot of people have real physical allergies to scents.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:26 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

36. **Andre Carrel from Terrace, Canada writes:** This is about the rights of money vs. the rights of people. We should have dollars and pounds and francs and euros on election ballots, not the names of people.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:29 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

37. **1 2 from Canada writes:** Once again, big business before health and environment. . . these law suits are ridiculous.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:31 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

38. **M D from Canada writes:** We don't need pesticides. How can a corporation trump decisions made by our community?

Pesticides don't stop killing when they go into your ground water. We have a well, it just doesn't make sense.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:32 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

39. **Sir Robert Borden from Canada writes:** Paul Sheridan from Hawkestone- Science has NOT proven smoking causes cancer, only that it increases the risk. I dont think it would be too much of a stretch to say the same about 2,4-D.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:34 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

40. **Seasoned Warrior from Been down so long it looks like up to me, Canada writes:** Wonderful! We demand the right to poison your people - or we will sue you.

Since when do corporations think they have the right to interfere in the sovereignty of other countries?

If they do sue and win, the only recourse is for the consumer to refuse their products - all of them!

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:35 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

41. **Zando Lee from Vancouver, Canada writes:** ...the untrammled right to poison the World over.....

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:40 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

42. **Why do I bother? Nothing changes from Montreal, Canada writes:** Chris Michaels from Canada writes: Lived near Sarnia long enough to know these DOW guys couldn't care less about about the environment -- so, I'd trust anyone's 'science' over theirs every day of the week.

Using chemical pesticides and herbicides on lawns is simply irresponsible. It doesn't take a genius to understand that it all ends up in the ground water and nearby streams.

There are plenty of organic alternatives out there these days. This is just a company panicking before their product line slips into the realm of 'obsolete'.

Regardless...it's only lawn. Who cares? If there's even a slight risk, don't bother. Weed manually - or, hire a neighbourhood kid to to it.

Then why are these chemicals allowed on Golf Courses? If the science is so irrefutable, they should be banned there. We have 4 courses around us dumping more of this stuff into the ground water than the whole town could.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:43 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

43. **Northern Boy from Sudbury, Canada writes:** The wellbeing of citizens should always trump the bottom line of any corporations.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:51 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

44. **ah sails from Canada writes:** A better life through chemicals...of course these pesticides should be banned as should many others...Dow, Monsanto and their ilk are destroying the planet and creating a cancer epidemic..

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:51 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

45. **Rachelle W from Kirkland, United States writes:** Some of the comments here are really daft. Did you not know pesticides are killing our honeybees? What will we do without their work which produces 80% of the food we (and our animals) consume? Think.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:52 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

46. **T H from Montreal, Canada writes:** Ah, the chemical companies. There is no reason we should not trust them, especially Dow. After all, it is not like they are Union Carbide or something, or are they? And even now forgotten Union Carbide, it is not like their decisions ever harmed anybody...

- Posted 03/04/09 at 10:56 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
47. **William J Gillies from Canada writes:** Neocon Destroyer from Canada writes: 'Thank you DOW for standing up for my rights to a green lawn. I'm sure my kid will recover thanks to a health care system that will fix that problem.'

Coming soon ... another NAFTA-TILMA-investor-protection racket manoeuvre: privatization of health care.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 10:59 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
48. **Green Canada from Edmonton, Canada writes:** I notice those that are arguing against the ban are tactfully avoiding the issue of democratically produced laws and prohibitions. In the case of the pesticide ban many organizations have questioned their safety particularly for those most vulnerable and further to the point they are for cosmetic use (not any other ag use). The fact remains if the majority of a community would rather avoid being exposed to them that should be their right (as they are nonessential -- although those who are too lazy to bend over to get a weed out may argue otherwise).
- Posted 03/04/09 at 11:03 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
49. **David Stevens from FALSE DEBATE, Canada writes:** The debate is not about whether the science is there to prove pesticides are harmful. Irrelevant. That is not what DOW is arguing.

The debate is whether a Country or a Province has any sovereignty to speak of.

May we pass laws and by-laws democratically without an American owned foreign corporation giving its consent?

This clause in NAFTA is the fly in the ointment. It gives corporations equal footing with a country's government and its people. Corporations are given legal status BY the laws of a country, not the other way 'round.

'You may chose to run your country your way as long as it never interferes with a corporation's right to make money.'

I would be surprised if anyone on this forum defending DOW's attack on provincial sovereignty is actually Canadian. And remember there are paid posters on this forum.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 11:08 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
50. **john doe from toronto, Canada writes:** David Stevens from FALSE DEBATE, Canada writes: 'I would be surprised if anyone on this forum defending DOW's attack on provincial sovereignty is actually Canadian. And remember there are paid posters on this forum.'

I'd be pretty surprised if anyone is paying the pro-Dow posters on this thread! They sound more like retired, Rex Murphy-types.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 11:30 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
51. **David Sellars from Canada writes:** I assume that California or the USEPA can bring in legislation to ban cosmetic use of herbicides without a legal challenge from Dow Chemical. If that is the case then a legal challenge under NAFTA is absurd. It would

mean that Canada has less control over our own environmental legislation than US states or the USEPA. This provision under NAFTA needs to be renegotiated.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 11:25 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

**52. Gardiner Westbound from Canada writes: .**

It's hard to imagine how the government will defend against the Dow suit when the federal agency in charge of evaluating chemicals does not restrict 2,4-D use, saying it has no evidence to support suggestions the substance could cause cancer.

<http://rde.me/Mx>

- Posted 03/04/09 at 11:30 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

**53. Subhadeep Chakrabarti from Edmonton, AB, Canada writes:** Another nail in the coffin of NAFTA ,I suppose ! If big bnusinesses think they are more powerful than democratically elected governments, they need to get their backsides kicked. Period.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 11:31 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

**54. bob millington from guelph, Canada writes:** Water apparently more precious than gold; What concern needs to be given to cummulative effects on all kinds of waters. Primarily water tables underground.

Water; in my opinion is the inheritance we leave to our children and I am astounded that , given our record of indifference so far to the bio balances of earth so far; we are not extraordinarily sensitive to the health of our waters.

Water belongs to the people; the children of tomorrow; NOT the foundation of profiteering . Not to be taken for granted as the base element in wall street sorceries.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 11:33 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

**55. Lance M from Canada writes:** I shouldnt' worry too much, the feedstock for Dow is oil. Oil is a commodity in decline and thus set for increases in price. The US and Mexico are both states in trouble. Mexico could very easily fail as a state this year or next, and depending on the state of the US dollar the US may very quickly join it. Two of 3 NAFTA partners on the ground makes NAFTA a non entity. This mess springs from a paradigm that will likely fold up and pass into history in short order. This isn't particularly good news for Canada, the collapse of two major trading partners brings only economic devastation to Canadians and their communities. On the issue at hand, should an unelected corporation tell a democratically elected government what it can and cannot do in response to the will of the electorate, the answer is no. Canada may have ratified the agreement but times have changed and the law lag has not matched new attitudes. One thing Quebec could do is to revoke Dow's status as a 'person' in that province by pulling its corporate charter.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 11:44 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

**56. R L from Canada writes:** David K notes:So, you would describe the Registered Nurses Association, Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment, The Canadian Cancer Society

And on what basis are they recommending the suspension of cosmetic pesticides... and remember that is all pesticides not just herbicides to remove dandelions. The Canadian Cancer Society needs to raise funds... so how do you raise funds, create a fear.

Mind you if you read their stats... cancer is not increasing, and in fact would decrease

more as smoking decreases.

They also state that a preventative measure is to eat plenty of fruits and vegetables... well where do those come from and how do you supply a society of our type and structure with sufficient product.

Pesticides should be used only when there is a need and on a targeted basis. Preemptive measures such as better lawn care , cutting, feeding (organic or inorganic as you see fit) would help. But how does one control the Japanese beetle when it flourishes on your roses? an insecticide might be one tool in many.

Pesticides are tools and need to be used as such.. Whats even more fun is to see the growth of the Organic movement, some of it is legitimate and some of it is driving the bans with inaccurate or misleading reports.

It appears the government is responding to fears ...keeping the population safe from itself...

o Posted 03/04/09 at 11:47 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

57. **Phil H from Canada writes:** Billy Bob from Canada writes: [The pesticide bans is nothing but ridiculous. How can you say (with a straight face) that pesticides are dangerous for our health when used to kills weeds on our lawns but those same pesticides are completely safe to continue to be used on golf courses and those same pesticides are completely safe to continue to be sprayed by farmers on the food we eat.]

You don't. You decide where to draw the line between risk and reward. And when the individual gets the reward, but society gets the risk, it's pretty unfair to let the individual make the choice. Basic stuff.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 11:47 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

58. **Phil H from Kelowna, Canada writes:** john doe from toronto, Canada writes: [I'd be pretty surprised if anyone is paying the pro-Dow posters on this thread! They sound more like retired, Rex Murphy-types. ]

Rex Murphy might rant and rave, but at least he puts a little thought into what he says. (But you did make me smile.)

o Posted 03/04/09 at 11:51 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

59. **Ann Ig Norant from Canada writes:** Bob from Montreal from Canada writes: Simple solution to this really - before you buy a product check to see if it is made by Dow. If it is, put it back on the shelf. Hard to believe a company like DOW would be so stupid over 2 million dollars, it will cost them so much more in legal fees and corporate image.

-----

Thanks for the wonderful idea.

I can't understand why would anyone want to put a known deadly chemical (it is deadly in large doses) on their lawn.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 11:51 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

60. **Susan Rogan from Canada writes:** Excellent reporting. Together average people are changing the world for the better, no matter how much money the 'leaders of industry'

stand to lose.

These companies believe they have a pre-existing right to poison, abuse and pollute, and profit from it. Now they are suing Canadians for 'lost profits'. Shows what they are made of doesn't it?

Tobacco, irresponsible mining and forestry, and the 'icides' industry - (icide means 'kill'), are finally becoming regulated for the benefit of health and the environment despite their well funded lobby efforts and their well funded industry 'studies'. This disturbs Dow Chemicals.

Hopefully torturing animals in testing labs, the rampant abuse of animals in factory farming, lack of environmental standards and worker's rights in countries we import from will be the next crop of problems that the people of Canada set in our sites.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 11:51 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

61. **Jo Blo from Canada writes:** There's a difference between herbicides, and insecticides. Of course, the Eco-Nuts will conveniently lump both together under the label 'dangerous pesticides' in order to promote their vision of the utopian eco-society.

Herbicides, used according to the instruction label, are not unsafe. 90% of herbicides were used on commercial properties like golf courses, farms and municipal properties, and that will continue. They're just banning the remaining 10% used on residential properties. And that is in case some citizens happen not to be responsible enough to read the label. Following this logic, we should ban private ownership of cars in case there happens to be a few careless drivers (think of the children!).

Welcome to the Nanny state of Bantario, where the state treats all of its citizens as total imbeciles.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 11:52 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

62. **Phil H from Kelowna, Canada writes:** Gardiner Westbound from Canada writes: . [It's hard to imagine how the government will defend against the Dow suit when the federal agency in charge of evaluating chemicals does not restrict 2,4-D use, saying it has no evidence to support suggestions the substance could cause cancer.]

If I remember correctly, the federal government is responsible for both defending and also paying damages in response to challenges to provincial laws. Really quite odd, since all three NAFTA countries have federal (i.e. central and regional govts sharing power) political systems.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 11:55 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

63. **Susan Rogan from Canada writes:** For those of you who say these products are safe, read the labels! They have a skull and crossbone and many warnings of health hazards associated with these products. Furthermore you who point out that the same standards that apply to our lawns should apply to our food and golf courses are absolutely correct: highly poisonous chemicals should be banned there as well. Food first. Golf courses are attended by adults who have a choice, but they still have run-off into the environment at large.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 12:00 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
- 64. **Canadian First from Hazelton, Canada writes:** Dow chemicals can burn in Hell before they get one dollar from me. That a country would even consider giving one cent or one second thought to a pesticide on our children's lawns being beneficial to us.....Whats next Columbia suing us over Cocaine.
  - Posted 03/04/09 at 12:01 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
- 65. **R L from Canada writes:** The pesticide ban preys on fears... the 24D concern has been documented and studied and subsequently permitted to be used in Canada by the PMRA. My assumption is that the 500 plus scientists who work there might have a vested interest in what goes on in their towns and country. And they would be unlikely to accept a product that would be detrimental to their own environment.

Other pesticides have been pulled because the information is either inconclusive or suggestive that there are issues with continued use of the product.

As for the legitimacy of a Dow challenge in the courts. Well it just plays into the environmentalists rant... 'chemical companies bad... us good!'

DDT was considered as one of our worse insecticides, yet there are many regions in Africa who wish to have the product to reduce the incidents of Malaria... targeted use!

- Posted 03/04/09 at 12:01 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
- 66. **Susan Rogan from Canada writes:** Let's remember that this ban is extremely popular in Quebec.
  - Posted 03/04/09 at 12:07 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
- 67. **Jesu Pifco from Canada writes:** Revise, repeal? Time to shred Chapter 11 and turn it into toilet paper and leave more trees to hug. Hope that the likes of Sun Belt Water doesn't hamper my ability to flush the toilet with the water coming from the mountainside out back.

Rusty Brown,

Not such an uncommon mistake. When I told a fellow camper on the beach in Baja that I was from British Columbia his reaction was 'Oh, yeah, down in South America.' To avoid confusion I now say that I'm from British California.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 12:13 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
- 68. **R L from Canada writes:** Susan Rogan from Canada writes: Let's remember that this ban is extremely popular in Quebec.

Popular with those who don't garden?

I would assume the gardeners would be less happy with the ban than would those who do not garden. When one loses useful tools, its certainly an issue especially when one is faced with an invasive pest.

By the way did you know that dandelions are one of the most successful invasive species on the continent... Canada thistle (not canadian) is another.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 12:14 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

69. **Jah Nee Kah Sun from Canada writes:** Kind of hard for the company that brought us chemical favorites such as DDT, Agent Orange, and Dursban to take the high road.
- Posted 03/04/09 at 12:15 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
70. **Richard Hawrelak from Canada writes:** Check out what the scientists say about 2,4-D at <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1568222> Abstract The phenoxy herbicide 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D) is widely used to control the growth of weeds and broadleaf plants. We convened a panel of 13 scientists to weigh the evidence on the human carcinogenicity of 2,4-D. The panel based its findings on a review of the toxicological and epidemiological literature on 2,4-D and related phenoxy herbicides. The toxicological data do not provide a strong basis for predicting that 2,4-D is a human carcinogen. Although a cause-effect relationship is far from being established, the epidemiological evidence for an association between exposure to 2,4-D and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma is suggestive and requires further investigation. There is little evidence of an association between use of 2,4-D and soft-tissue sarcoma or Hodgkin's disease, and no evidence of an association between 2,4-D use and any other form of cancer. Scientists on the panel were asked to categorize 2,4-D as a "known," "probable," "possible," or "unlikely" carcinogen or as a noncarcinogen in humans. The predominant opinion among the panel members was that the weight of the evidence indicates that it is possible that exposure to 2,4-D can cause cancer in humans, although not all of the panelists believed the possibility was equally likely: one thought the possibility was strong, leaning toward probable, and five thought the possibility was remote, leaning toward unlikely. Two panelists believed it unlikely that 2,4-D can cause cancer in humans. Personally, I go along with the ban and I will be using Natures Touch, a green environmentally friendly fungus to control weeds. The cost will increase from \$279 per year to \$353 per year, an increase of 27%. The reason for Dow's delay may be they are considering selling their Agro business to help pay for the huge debt they brought on themselves by buying Rohm and Haas
- Posted 03/04/09 at 12:15 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
71. **Chris Michaels from Canada writes:** 'Why do I bother? Nothing changes from Montreal, Canada writes:  
Then why are these chemicals allowed on Golf Courses? If the science is so irrefutable, they should be banned there. We have 4 courses around us dumping more of this stuff into the ground water than the whole town could.'
- Hey -- you won't get any argument from me on this. Golf courses should be subject to the same deal. Find a safe organic way, or deal with it.
- Posted 03/04/09 at 12:33 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
72. **Susan Rogan from Canada writes:** Richard Hawrelak, these poisons might not cause high blood pressure either, that does not mean they are safe. What about asthma and other respiratory diseases? Auto immune diseases? Can on pick and choose, 'This doesn't cause cancer or Hodgkin's Lymphoma (or whatever)', and then jump to the conclusion that these poisons are SAFE? I don't think so.

RL: I know what you are saying. These chemicals are useful to gardeners. I was left in the lurch last summer when I thought I'd drive around my property touching Foxtail weeds with a little Round-Up to kill them. Figured that direct application by hand would

be safe, and that it beat ripping them up by their roots - taking the soil with me. Well, round-up has been disabled by the banning of its most effective ingredient, and it did not work. Live by the sword, die by the sword I guess. I can live with it. It took me extra work but I'm dealing with it. Foxtail by the way is extremely dangerous to dogs, we had one \$400 surgery because of it last year plus a lot of incidents that did not end up in the clinic. The dogs are at least as important to me as people's roses are to them, so I do hear you.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 12:34 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

73. **J S from Canada writes:** Can I start a law suit against all of these companies for their intent to harm the environment? I think we should form a citizens group to go after them.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 12:36 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

74. **Art Vandelai from Burlington, Canada writes:** Why do I bother? Nothing changes from Montreal, Canada writes:

*Then why are these chemicals allowed on Golf Courses? If the science is so irrefutable, they should be banned there. We have 4 courses around us dumping more of this stuff into the ground water than the whole town could.*

Chemicals are allowed on golf courses, because our governments decided in their infinite wisdom, that they did not want to confront the golf lobby in implementing a complete ban on cosmetic pesticides.

Yes, they should be banned there as well, as water runs off of golf courses into the streams and lakes just like it does from lawns, but golf course owners complained that they would be put out of business, and won an exemption.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 12:39 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

75. **R L from Canada writes:** Susan Rogan... re foxtail.. you are right that it can be lethal to dogs, as well as cattle and horses. Roundup works at the early stages of growth on foxtail but also kills the other grasses around it unless you wipe it on.

I am looking at torching the foxtail with hope that the perennial grasses will eventually replace it. It may require multiple treatments.

Digging will not do it with our infestations.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 12:42 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

76. **Erika - from Canada writes:** Straight from DOW Physical Hazards notice in the CDMS for 4,2D:

' Skin : DCP is more readily absorbed through the skin when in solution and especially when molten. Molten or hot DCP is immediately absorbed through the skin in amounts that have caused death to humans. Rapid death in humans has been caused by skin exposure without immediate decontamination. Amounts of molten DCP that cover as little as 1% body surface area (e.g. palm-of-hand-sized) could result in death. '

I'd rather keep the dandelions and use them for salads and wine.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 12:45 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

77. **s c from Canada writes:** I'll be trying the 'friendly' methods of keeping weeds and dandelions off my lawn this year. But if it doesn't work, I bought a bunch of the good old fashion weed killer at the end of last year just in case.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 12:47 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
- 78. **Erika - from Canada writes:** Oops, meant 2,4-D.
  - Posted 03/04/09 at 12:47 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
- 79. **Brian B from Canada writes:** Dow is the company that produced and promoted the use of an additive for mortar called Sarabond which later was found to be a disaster. I wouldn't mind that but they continued to promote its use when they knew it was flawed. Exactly the same for silicon breast implants. A real noble company.
  - Posted 03/04/09 at 12:50 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
- 80. **Paul Lawrence from Oakville, Canada writes:** As far as I'm concerned, Quebec and other provinces have the right to limit what products can be used.

Furthermore, it's not targeting one company over others, many companies are being affected by the ban. If they want to survive in business they should and must find alternative solutions to the ban, just as the consumers of the product have to.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 12:53 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
- 81. **Ernie Tailgate from Lethbridge, Canada writes:** Amazing! Every environmentalist is an expert - we've been using 24D in Canada for over 60 years.....yet our life expectancy keeps rising....now over 80 years - explain that to me.....
- Posted 03/04/09 at 1:08 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
- 82. **The Last Fenian from Upper Canada, Canada writes:** .

It's mind boggling that these poisons can be administered to us without our acquiescence by companies in the business of poisoning for profit but you cannot grow a marijuana plant in your backyard for your own consumption.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 1:09 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
- 83. **Angry West Coast Canuck from Canada writes:** People claiming that pesticides are 'harmless' are the ones who really have a fundamental misunderstanding of science. If you really believe it's 'harmless', I suggest you drink a glass of it. Sweeten and flavour it all you want, I don't mind. If you're not willing to drink it, why in hell are you willing to spread it around so that others can ingest it (orally, skin absorption, breathing in the fumes)? Or are you THAT selfish and ignorant?

As for those complaining that it's so unfair because golf courses and farmers get to use them, I agree. Golf courses really don't have an excuse other than that they have better paid lobbyists, and I'd favour golf courses being banned from using pesticides as well, since these wastes of space serve no real useful purpose other than to poison the water table that they've helped lower in the first place.

As for farmers, they at least have the excuse that they are feeding people. Not much of an excuse, but they've at least got one. All the cosmetic users have to suggest is that somehow their completely climate inappropriate lawns are supposed to allow them to continue poisoning the neighbourhoods? No thanks. I'm glad the move to ban these poisons is growing. It's about time.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 1:17 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

84. **gilles monenemie from Montreal, Canada writes:** Quebecers will eat Dow if they show up in town. We will give them a less friendly welcome than union carbide executives visiting Bhopal. It will spark a huge boycott of dow products if they push cosmetic pesticides on us through the courts.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 1:18 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

85. **s c from Canada writes:** Angry West Coast Canuck from Canada writes: People claiming that pesticides are 'harmless' are the ones who really have a fundamental misunderstanding of science. If you really believe it's 'harmless', I suggest you drink a glass of it.

-----

I don't drink motor oil either and don't see it being banned. Come to think of it, I don't drink pine-sol or liquid tide either and use those products much more on my floors and clothes.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 1:25 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

86. **Clark Kent from Canada writes:** 'Ernie Tailgate from Lethbridge, Canada writes: Amazing! Every environmentalist is an expert - we've been using 24D in Canad for over 60 years.....yet our life expectancy keeps rising....now over 80 years - explain that to me...'

Correlation does not necessarily mean there is causation. (Especially if usage of this chemical is linear with ml/sq. km, which would suggest little correlation, but I don't know the trends.)

By the way, people can use Google Scholar to search for actual research done on this, and not just talk about things like they know things innately. Might help. (I found articles that suggest links with home pesticide use, including 2,4-D, to childhood cancers.)

o Posted 03/04/09 at 1:26 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

87. **Robert Wager from Canada writes:** It is interesting watching the ease with which people can disregard the opinion of Health Canada, the EPA, and the European Commission scientists (literally thousands) who all state 2,4,D is safe when used as directed. It does not represent a significant cancer threat and does not persist in the environment.

But hey a quick search on the web finds soooo many so-called expert opinioons that say the opposite. Hmmm, which to choose?

o Posted 03/04/09 at 1:47 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

88. **Hans S from Canada writes:** Dow to Canada : You MUST poison yourselves!

o Posted 03/04/09 at 1:49 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

89. **D Epp from Canada writes:** How many of you championing Dow's right to sue and invoking the name of food safety have read the article closely? This is about the use of pesticides for cosmetic purposes. Yes, an invasion of Japanese beetles might pose a threat to agriculturally necessary products, so this example might not be one of cosmetics only.

But, having a few dandelions in your lawn is not a threat to agriculture or food

production.

If you have the energy to cover your whole lawn with pesticides, you should have the energy to tackle a few weeds the old-fashioned way. Dig them out. No need to expose pets, children, and the water table to unnecessary toxins for the sake of your vanity. Or, as someone suggested, pay a neighbour's kid to do the job.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 2:02 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

90. **Stan Sambey from Canada writes:** No wonder the world is going to hell in the express elevator. The amount of naivete and ignorance seen lately in these threads is staggering. Pesticides, regardless of how you want to utilize them, are poisons. They kill targeted organisms by toxicity. It's pretty simple stuff. As more and more people use them the environmental concentrations increase. Real simple math here. And then the strawman arguments of motor oil and cleaners, etc. These too are increasingly hazardous for the very same reasons the globe over. As more and more people use them, the greater the environmental concentrations. As they become more common the need to control and/or ban their usage also grows. Pretty clinical logic application here. The farms use them to control crop loss, which again reflects back on the issues of population size and loss of income. If we didn't have so many people to feed we'd need to utilize less, with the same application to profit. The weakness of the argument arises only in the exceptions allowed to commercial business. These exceptions should not be allowed. If you want to run a commercial enterprise it should only be allowed if able to do so without harming the environment. Ah, then comes the individuals that are so deeply offended by concern for the environment. We've been evolving for a million years prior to pesticides, and we'll evolve just fine without them. The continued usage of them however directly endangers our ability to evolve at all.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 2:02 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

91. **Richard Melville from Calgary, Canada writes:** 'Dow shalt not kill'

Howard Zinn

- Posted 03/04/09 at 2:04 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

92. **Stude Ham from Canada writes:**

dow has no legal leg here. unless of course the term 'expropriation' has been subverted to include such things as the banning of highly dangerous chemicals.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 2:11 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

93. **Hee Hoo Sai from Canada writes:** If Canada had not intended to follow NAFTA rules, then why did we join? Excessive exposure to chemicals causes some people to become spelling challenged, and others excessively critical about trivia, like spelling mistakes.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 2:13 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

94. **can I vote again from around-Kingston, Canada writes:** We know somebody who fertilizers their lawn... they live on a lake and contaminate the lake. All in the name of temporarily having the 'Perfect Lawn' TM

I guess you can take the man out of the city...but sadly you can't take the city out of the man.

But I must admit the sprawling lawn next to the lake with the flag pole looks rather stately.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 2:13 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
95. **s c from Canada writes:** can I vote again from around-Kingston, Canada writes: We know somebody who fertilizers their lawn... they live on a lake and contaminate the lake. All in the name of temporarily having the 'Perfect Lawn' TM

I guess you can take the man out of the city...but sadly you can't take the city out of the man.

But I must admit the sprawling lawn next to the lake with the flag pole looks rather stately.

-----

There is nothing like running around barefoot and playing with the kids on a nice thick patch of soft 'perfect lawn'.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 2:20 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
96. **A B from Ottawa, Canada writes:** People speak of this as though some evil environmental organization is out to get them and destroy life as we know it (we are talking about green lawns and golf courses...). For some reason, I have more confidence in a group of "tree-huggers" wanting to stop the use of specific chemicals than a corporation, who's track record speaks for itself, telling me I must compensate then for not wanting to be poisoned by their product.
- Posted 03/04/09 at 2:22 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
97. **Hugh Andrew from Canada writes:** We don't need NAFTA. If there is a commercial reason to trade, it will happen. Canadians should not be troubled by foreign companies questioning what Canadians want for themselves.
- Posted 03/04/09 at 2:31 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
98. **Richard Hawrelak from Sarnia, Canada writes:** I'm a retired Dow engineer. I support the ban on 2,4-D for the following reasons: American Journal of Epidemiology Copyright © 2004 by the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health <http://aghealth.nci.nih.gov/pdfs/AJIM160.876.pdf> "In conclusion, at least four pesticides widely used currently in the United States and elsewhere have been found to be significantly associated with lung cancer risk. Inadequate control of the effect of smoking and less detailed pesticide exposure information may have masked these effects in earlier studies. Since we evaluated 50 pesticides with few a priori hypotheses linking these pesticides with human lung cancer risk, we cannot rule out the possibility that these are chance findings. Replication of these results in other studies and in continued follow-up in the Agricultural Health Study will be necessary before any firm conclusions can be reached." My further comments: 2,4-D has a very low vapour pressure and as just it is not a concern from breathing the vapour. Hence, most environmental studies are concerned with oral intake and absorption into the blood system by direct exposure to the skin. 2,4-D handlers and farmers are the focal groups for study. Liquid spray application in high winds can create aerosols that are transported by the wind and can be inhaled as though they were a vapor. Because the focal groups are also exposed to other toxins, cigarettes as an example, Dow claims there are no direct studies that link 2,4-D to cancer. If it goes to court, Dow will lose this one, just as they lost breast implants.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 2:41 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

99. **s c from Canada writes:** A B from Ottawa, Canada writes: People speak of this as though some evil environmental organization is out to get them and destroy life as we know it (we are talking about green lawns and golf courses...). For some reason, I have more confidence in a group of "tree-huggers" wanting to stop the use of specific chemicals than a corporation, who's track record speaks for itself, telling me I must compensate then for not wanting to be poisoned by their product. -----  
----- I don't have confidence in either of them as they both bend facts to suit their own objectives. Personally, I hope Dow fails in any attempt to sue if they proceed as I don't think they should have a case. I also think that the government wanting to ban any chemicals that individuals want to use on their own property is also wrong. Are some chemicals bad and should they be banned - yes. Are all chemicals bad and should all chemicals be banned - no. Even Health Canada scientists say that some of the week killers cause no health concerns when used as directed (they are some of the only unbiased scientists) - not funded by tree-huggers or corporations. They have government jobs and can't be fired regardless of what they say. Politicians want to take the easy road and ban all chemicals because some are bad.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 2:34 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

100. **The Last Fenian from Upper Canada, Canada writes:** .  
s c from Canada writes:

"I don't drink motor oil either and don't see it being banned."  
-----

No one is advocating spraying motor oil around residential neighbourhoods.

If they did, that activity would be banned very quickly.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 2:54 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

101. **The Last Fenian from Upper Canada, Canada writes:** .

s c from Canada writes:

"I also think that the government wanting to ban any chemicals that individuals want to use on their own property is also wrong. "  
-----

Unfortunately the chemicals that you use on your property are inevitably going to end up on your neighbours' property, and in our air, rivers, lakes and oceans.

Such is the nature of wind, water and erosion.

And, despite owning your land, you can't poison it for generations to come. The period for which you have ownership is just a blink in the time of that property's existence.

Should you be allowed to poison it for generations because you owned it for a couple of years?

Our urban scapes are full of poisoned lands where the owners dumped oil, chemicals etc and then sold the land and disappeared, leaving behind a mess for others to clean up.

Is that all right with you?

- Posted 03/04/09 at 3:04 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
102. **Jon Q Public from Canada writes:** We wouldn't want human health concerns to get in the way of corporate profits !

Sheesh ...

- Posted 03/04/09 at 3:05 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
103. **Is there anybody out there from Saltspring Island, Canada writes:** How dare human health trump profits of Dow chemical. I mean, the gaul, to suggest interfering with the right to make profit, socialist pigs, bring in the army!
- Posted 03/04/09 at 3:12 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
104. **s c from Canada writes:** The Last Fenian from Upper Canada, Canada writes: ....

-----

You wrote a very well laid out argument for the banning of many chemicals. I thank you.

Absolutely some chemicals should be banned. My problem is that our politicians are taking the wrong road of wide-spread bans that include chemicals that our own government scientists say are safe. So yes, I should be able to use chemicals that unbiased scientists deem safe. I don't believe any report written by scientists funded by a corporation or a report written by scientists funded by an environmental group as both studies would have looked only for evidence to support a pre-determined conclusion but I do believe health canada studies.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 3:16 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
105. **Alban Leurk from Ottawax, Canada writes:** Meanwhile Petro Canada is reducing its octane content in BC: the highest octane will be only 91 down from 94... this is the best way to lose business from all high end cars users who value high octane product for better fuel efficiency and engine performance.

Yes Petro Canada can offer their cheap glasses as olympic bribes...

- Posted 03/04/09 at 3:27 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
106. **Peter Lucas from Langley, Canada writes:** Quebec's ban on the use of a chemical approved for use in Canada by the Federal Government is yet one more example of governments running amok. A provincial government forbids a property owner from using an approved chemical for no scientific reason. What next?

I hope Dow sues and wins. Governments should not be able to make capricious laws

based on emotion and not on science.

The continued erosion of individual rights by governments is, in my opinion, Canada's biggest problem.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 3:52 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
107. **Hans S from Canada writes:** Obviously a lot of paid shills from Dow here today.
- Posted 03/04/09 at 4:00 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
108. **Pierre Brassard from Down the Saint-Laurence, high above water, Canada writes:** Billy Bob says: "I wonder if I will win a prize for the nicest lawn in the city this year?"

I will never let out my secret, except to say that it is something everyone eats every day. :)"

Eats and processes prior to spreading on the lawn?

As for the elected parliament of the province of Quebec legislating to ban anything, let us not forget that this law was passed by the representatives of the people it affects. If we in Quebec chose to elect a government with a platform to ban pesticides, why should anyone outside Quebec have a say as to our sovereign right to manage ourselves? As proven by more recent treaties on international trade, such unwarranted claims as that by Dow have been banned as a recourse. If NAFTA has a flaw, profit oriented companies may well chose to sue to attempt to get their money and that is understandable as profit is their only motivation. Consumers on the other hand can "vote with their feet" and walk away, from Dow, in this instance.

Have a good weekend.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 4:26 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
109. **Nathan Weatherdon from Canada writes:** It is not American pesticides that are being targeted, it is specific kinds of pesticides regardless of where they are produced.

thus, Canadian and American producers are held to the same regulations, which is completely consistent with the trade agreement.

What would be problematic would be if American producers were held to different standards than the Canadian ones.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 4:43 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
110. **Robert Wager from Canada writes:** I find myself wondering about the role of media in the anti-pesticide campaigns. I wonder how many people read anything about the decision last week by the the European Food safety agency that 14/27 organically certified pesticides were unsafe and had to be banned. Not many I suspect.
- Posted 03/04/09 at 4:47 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
111. **Robert Wager from Canada writes:** Further, how many posters knew organic food production allows for the use of pesticides and even antibiotics in some cases? Not many I suspect.
- Posted 03/04/09 at 5:07 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

112. **bob millington from guelph, Canada writes:**

Just thought I'd mention that maybe it's the crap in the air but; I'm kinda thinken back to my youth, when I watched a movie called "Invasion of the body snatchers".

Similarities lead me to wonder if many of those giving the same old rotenone raps here are not really; welllllll-----who they started out ta be.

Still huggen those trees and lovin it I am.

Sadly; the snap back from all our "business as usual" behaviour, will be bigger than even Johnny pickup can imagine.

Time to pray folks.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 5:15 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

113. **Peter Lucas from Langley, Canada writes:** Pierre Brassard from Down the Saint-Laurence, high above water, Canada wrote:

"As for the elected parliament of the province of Quebec legislating to ban anything, let us not forget that this law was passed by the representatives of the people it affects. If we in Quebec chose to elect a government with a platform to ban pesticides, why should anyone outside Quebec have a say as to our sovereign right to manage ourselves?"

-----

1. Was the ban part of the pre-election platform? If so, was it publicly broadcasted so that a reasonable person would be aware?
2. Quebec is not sovereign; it's one of the ten provinces of Canada. So it should leave Canada, or stay and play by the rules. (And continue to enjoy the vast subsidies paid to Quebec by taxpayers in the ROC.)
3. What about Quebec residents who want to use the safe, but banned chemicals? Isn't this tyranny of the majority? What will be the next safe and legal substance to be banned?

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 5:16 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

114. **gilles monenemie from Montreal, Canada writes:** Peter lucas

how about the kid with asthma that lives beside the control freak with the perfect lawn who loves his pesticides, in your eyes that kid has no rights. You would different take on the law if you had a child with severe asthma. Lots of nasty carriers (inerts) used with pesticides that also cause health issues. Its a crazy risk having pesticides in urban areas.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 5:20 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

115. **Richard Hawrelak from Sarnia, Canada writes:** Just a note:

Pesticides are aimed at criters, like grubs et al.

Herbicides are aimed at weeds, like dandilions et al.

Wish the folks at Environment Canada and the Comments Closed G&M would get their act together and tell us who/what they are fighting.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 5:29 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

116. **Peter Lucas from Langley, Canada writes:** gilles monenemie from Montreal, Canada writes: Peter lucas

how about the kid with asthma that lives beside the control freak with the perfect lawn who loves his pesticides, in your eyes that kid has no rights  
-----

gilles, surely neighbours can find a reasonable solution. For example, the kid could stay inside for a couple days and the herbicide user could water his lawn so there's no longer a hint of herbicide in the air.

Neighbours work things out. Would you support a ban stereo systems capable of producing big sound because it might cause a migraine in a neighbour? Ban peanuts because an allergic neighbour might smell them? Loud dogs?

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 5:40 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

117. **Peter Lucas from Langley, Canada writes:** gilles monenemie from Montreal, Canada, I do have a son with asthma. I would never expect a neighbour to refrain from using a herbicide on his private property. My son's asthma is not my neighbour's problem.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 5:43 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

118. **Rain Couver from Canada writes:** I don't see Chinese companies saber rattling because the lead-laced paint on toys were a health risk to Americans.

Flush.

Wait, what was that. The sound of Dow product sales going down. You cannot tell us what we are and are not allowed to buy big conglomerate monster types, so create natural and allergenic pesticides and herbicides or just f\*\*k off.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 5:45 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

119. **Joe Btfsplk from toronto, Canada writes:** From answers.com,

" The word "pesticide" is a broad term that refers to any device, method, or chemical that kills plants or animals that compete for humanity's food supply or are otherwise undesirable. Pesticides include insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, nematocides (used to kill nematodes, elongated cylindrical worms), and rodenticides. "

As to the semantics referred to at 5:29.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 5:46 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

120. **Peter Lucas from Langley, Canada writes:** Rain Couver from Canada wrote:

"You cannot tell us what we are and are not allowed to buy big conglomerate monster types...."

But governments are allowed to tell you? Dow provides a legal and safe product. You can choose whether or not to buy it. But neither you nor the Quebec provincial government have any right to tell me I can't buy it.

I hope Dow sues and wins.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 5:57 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

121. **Susan Rogan from Canada writes:** Peter Lucas, your neighbour does not have the right to poison the air circulating on your property. Your son should not have to stay off his own lawn so that he can breathe. It is very strange that you have more sympathy for the quality of your neighbour's lawn than the quality of your son's life on his own property. Think about that.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 7:02 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

122. **R L from Canada writes:** Please Mr/Ms Government , tell us what is safe and unsafe, keep us from harming ourselves and our neighbours. If we cant read the label and use the product appropriately then put the product out of sight and mind. That might include the car, but thats another matter as we all need the car even though the deaths are quantifiable and the injuries and damage which are substantial and keep adding up. (And I think Montreal drivers are right up there in their poor driving skills)

And I keep forgetting, who is the government again?

For those that rattle on and on about "perfect" lawns. Where are there perfect lawns these days? Two, did you know that an adequately cared for lawn provides food, for birds and insects and rodents, and has an impact on carbon processing, air filtration and provides some carbon sequestration. Moreover, as one individual stated, running through a lawn in barefeet has many benefits. Gardening reduces stress, a major factor in cancer development.

Once again the government has you distracted, while they carry on in other directions. What are they really doing out there?

One of the above writers indicates they are using a "natural" fungus on their lawn. Interesting, and what is it we know about funguses that we can leap to the conclusion that they are safe? What is even more hilarious is that they are spending 60% more for this natural product? When maybe a couple yards of compost might do the same thing for far less money and do more to amend the soil.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 7:23 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

123. **Rain Couver from Canada writes:** Fair enough Peter Lucas, just don't be surprised if you and Dow end up on the tail end of your neighbours' lawsuit.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 7:32 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

124. **Peter Lucas from Langley, Canada writes:** Susan Rogan, everytime my neighbour starts and idles his diesel truck, he poisons air, some of which circulates on my property. When I apply herbicide to my yard an odour is briefly detectable in his yard. The odour is harmless according to federal government scientists. After 24 hours I water my lawn and the herbicide is gone.

Susan, you're wrong to think I value my neighbour's lawn more than my son's health. What I value is the rights and freedoms individuals have from government and religion. I submit that for most of the world's population throughout history oppression and tyranny

by, again, governments and religious organizations have been the worst problems people have had.

Through bravery and intelligence and sacrifice of good people, we had the benefits of the Magna Carta, habeous corpus, the US constitution and so on. Ordinary people were free from unwarranted attacks by church or state and seizure of their property. And day by day, bill by bill, the rights achieved by sacrifice are eroded.

And I do value the rights achieved more than my son's health, or my own life. The rights Canadians apathetically see being eroded.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 7:34 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

125. **Ralph Bishop from Hong Kong writes:** dave ross from Canada writes:

I wonder of any of the Quebec asbestos companies have gone after the US or Mexico over any restrictions on asbestos?

-----

Dave - a few years ago, there was an extensive 2 full page story in the Bangkok Post, condemning Canada's locally based export officials because they were presenting Asbestos 'safe use' seminars for Thailand's local auto industry.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 7:35 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

126. **R L from Canada writes:** Fungess... sort of like geoses... make that fungi

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 7:35 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

127. **Peter Lucas from Langley, Canada writes:** you're quick, R L

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 7:44 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

128. **R L from Canada writes:** Peter I agree with you on the rights and freedoms issues.

If one only knew what "scientific" documentation has been used to get these bans in place one would be truly surprised.

Many of the bans have been orchestrated using faulty information, and misrepresentation by certain organizations. Part fraud, part artifice and part smoke and mirrors, with a little fear thrown in to tilt the decision making. When an Phd in engineering constitutes a Doctor in a research article on herbicides, when the actual toxicologist slated in the article has never seen the information. There is some subterfuge going on.

Did the pesticide companies see that coming, nope, they thought that science would be sufficient to balance the decision making. And the thought that the PMRA reviewing the pesticides might make a difference. However we are entering an era of what I would call "boogey man" politics where everything that we cant see is a threat and big corporations are always evil. And we rely on the "government" to protect us.

I think Dow should be allowed to proceed with the lawsuit. It may just show how decisions are really made in the governing institutions.

If people are offended, why would you be offended if it brings to light exactly how decisions are being made and legislation is pushed forward. A little clarity might be of value.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 7:48 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
- 129. **Greg Atkin from Canada writes:** Obsessing over a lawn is for the effete.
  - Posted 03/04/09 at 7:49 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
- 130. **Peter Lucas from Langley, Canada writes:** R L, I like your last post. In fact, I'm going to use your words below without attribution (since Canada appears not to protect intellectual policy). Yes, I'm stealing them.

You wrote the following. "However we are entering an era of what I would call "boogey man" politics where everything that we cant see is a threat and big corporations are always evil. And we rely on the "government" to protect us"

- Posted 03/04/09 at 8:15 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
- 131. **K St-Pierre from Toronto, Canada writes:** Peter Lucas- I think your sentiments are misplaced. Corporations are not "people" under the law and a grave mistake was made in ever considering them so in any sense. If u truly care about rights you should be enraged that an unelected entity like a company (and a foreign one to boot) has the right supercede or nullify any law made by an elected assembly or to be given welfare in lieu of any law. That sounds like socialism, no? Corporations have no concern or obligation for the common good or society in general. That disqualifies them from having any influence over public policy. If u think that the law enacted is illegal or reactionist- fine. But we already have mechanisms in place to correct it- its called elections/debates/house committee's ect. Corps having the ability to do an end run around elected assemblies is undemocratic and unconstitutional.
  - Posted 03/04/09 at 8:32 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
- 132. **john doe from toronto, Canada writes:** Dow Chemical also settled with the US SEC in 2007, paying a fine of \$325,000. Why? Bribery.

DOW spent 6 years bribing a foreign government (India). Once again, DOW was illegally trying to coerce a foreign government to allow its pesticides to be sold, even though it was banned in the U.S.

Sound familiar?

Napalm, Agent Orange, Bhopal...

- Posted 03/04/09 at 8:36 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
- 133. **Peter Lucas from Langley, Canada writes:** john doe,

Dow was the exclusive provider of napalm to the US military from 1965 to 1969. It beat Dupont and another company in the competition for the contract. Napalm is just one form of essentially adding thickening agent to gasoline or similar fuels. Other companies make stuff that acts like napalm, but isn't. I guess it's a "Kleenex" vs tissue kind of thing. Dow had an accident in India, it supplied chemicals to the US government. So what?

But you're missing my point. I'm not defending Dow. I'm objecting to the Quebec government's legislation banning a legal substance based on emotion and not science. Are rights and freedoms are being lost. We are abrogating that which was so valiantly won.

BTW, I'm glad you liked my US speech. Canadians used to be like that before PET.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 8:45 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

134. **K St-Pierre from Toronto, Canada writes:** Peter Lucas- What rights have we lost? Your argument is contradictory. You want the people to lose the right to determine their own laws regardless of what a corp might think so that they can preserve their freedoms and rights? Your argument makes no sense.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 8:52 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

135. **john doe from toronto, Canada writes:** Peter Lucas writes: "BTW, I'm glad you liked my US speech. Canadians used to be like that before PET."

It was a great speech..

"Napalm is just one form of essentially adding thickening agent to gasoline or similar fuels. I guess it's a "Kleenex" vs tissue kind of thing."

But it's not a tissue, it's a firebomb. If they had dropped kleenex on little Kim Phuk, the photo of that napalm attack wouldn't be seared in our memory.

"Dow had an accident in India... So what?"

It was the worst chemical disaster ever... and they have had hundreds of smaller ones over the years.

"I'm not defending Dow. I'm objecting to the Quebec government's legislation banning a legal substance based on emotion and not science. "

But if an elected government bans something, it isn't legal. And since DOW is notorious for its government bribery, enormous PR department and aggressive lawsuits, and for falsifying or concealing its own negative test results, I have to question their safety claims as well.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 9:01 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

136. **Peter Lucas from Langley, Canada writes:** K St-Pierre from Toronto, I do think the law is not legal, and I suspect someone will challenge it in the courts. And Dow is not doing an end run around an elected body. It's simply considering its options under an agreement (NAFTA) signed by two elected governments. Canada signed the agreement, and the agreement provides a challenge. Quebec has banned the sale of a substance that is legal for no good reason. Dow will lose money due to this undefendable action. If Quebec chooses not to follow Canadian law it should get out of Canada.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 9:03 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

137. **Peter Lucas from Langley, Canada writes:** "But if an elected government bans something, it isn't legal.", writes john doe from toronto. Yes, unless the elected government did not have the legal right to pass the ban in the first place. A provincial government can't pass a law that pertains to federal government responsibility.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 9:09 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

138. **john doe from toronto, Canada writes:** Peter Lucas writes: "A provincial government can't pass a law that pertains to federal government responsibility."

But -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- provinces and states **can** ban or regulate whatever they choose to. They can't prevent other provinces from doing so, but they certainly can restrict or ban something in their own jurisdiction.

Some random examples: trans fats, lead levels in gas, car emissions, etc. Many bans, partial restrictions, and requirements differ province to province, state to state.

But the perniciously noxious chemical giant DOW is attempting to couch this in terms of the super-national Free Trade Act. And, in doing so, it is greatly overstepping its bounds, and illegally treading on provincial toes.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:21 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

139. **Peter Lucas from Langley, Canada writes:** K St-Pierre from Toronto, Canada writes:

"Peter Lucas- What rights have we lost? Your argument is contradictory. You want the people to lose the right to determine their own laws regardless of what a corp might think so that they can preserve their freedoms and rights? Your argument makes no sense. "

-----

People have the right to pass their own secular well-reasoned laws in areas that the relevant government has jurisdiction.

But the right I'm referring to is the right of a Quebec property owner to put whatever legal substance he wants on his property. The federal government, based on science says the stuff is safe. The government of Quebec has no right to limit me without objective science.

The right I'm speaking of is the right not to be shackled by whimsical laws based on anecdotes, emotion, and any kind of bias. If 99.9% of Quebec voters support the ban, it's still wrong unless it's based on science. You know, tyranny of the majority.

My ancestors and perhaps your died to obtain rights. Let's not fritter them away.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:23 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

140. **john doe from toronto, Canada writes:** Sorry, I mean supranational, not super national.

- o Posted 03/04/09 at 9:25 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

141. **john doe from toronto, Canada writes:** Peter Lucas from Langley, Canada writes: "My ancestors and perhaps your died to obtain rights. Let's not fritter them away."

As long as you remember that Quebec is Clarisse, and DOW Chemical is Hannibal Lecter. Everyone is subject to the rule of law; that's the way this nation is run. DOW/Hannibal can take it to court if it wants.

But don't take off his muzzle... or you'll be sorry.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 9:30 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
142. **Peter Lucas from Langley, Canada writes:** john doe from toronto, Canada writes:

"But -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- provinces and states can ban or regulate whatever they choose to. They can't prevent other provinces from doing so, but they certainly can restrict or ban something in their own jurisdiction."

joe, I understand your point. And I won't debate or pretend I know constitutional law in Canada.

But, I think it's dead wrong to pass a law that limits an individual's freedom without objective scientifically verifiable evidence. I gather the feds have done the work and say the stuff is safe. I also gather Quebec cannot assert it's not safe since they can't come up with evidence. And this whimsical basis for the ban is just wrong.

I don't understand the attacks against Dow. Dow is simply considering a legal challenge under NAFTA. I use the banned stuff, and the kind I buy is made in Alberta by a Canadian company. Dow is not relevant to the ban.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 9:33 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
143. **Jo Blo from Canada writes:** Angry West Coast Canuck from Canada writes: " People claiming that pesticides are 'harmless' are the ones who really have a fundamental misunderstanding of science. If you really believe it's 'harmless', I suggest you drink a glass of it."

How about you drink some Draino, or some CLR? Too deadly for your liking? Then why are these products not banned? You could spill some on your hand, or spill some on the floor and poison your cat.

I'll give you a hint: It has to do with the concentrations and following the instructions. You can't go around calling for products to be banned just because you don't trust yourself to not do something stupid. Most of society is not as irresponsible as you are.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 9:34 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
144. **Peter Lucas from Langley, Canada writes:** john doe, this is my last post. You don't like Dow, and that's your prerogative. I don't like Toronto.

But neither of us could justify legislation that served mainly to serve our bias. The ban that harms Dow also harms Dow's competitors, including a Canadian company based in Alberta.

- Posted 03/04/09 at 9:39 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)
145. **john doe from toronto, Canada writes:** Peter Lucas writes:"You don't like Dow, and that's your prerogative. I don't like Toronto. But neither of us could justify legislation that served mainly to serve our bias. The ban that harms Dow also harms Dow's competitors, including a Canadian company based in Alberta."

You're correct -- I am not especially fond of DOW (Napalm! Agent Orange! Bhopal!)

Chemical.

But, in fact I have no objections whatsoever to an Alberta company questioning -- on scientific grounds -- another province's restrictions on any products. I hope they do so, if that's what they feel (though 2,4-D is thought by many to cause non-hodgkins lymphoma and nervous-system damage -- I haven't seen the research myself.)

But when one of the worst, most poisonous, most murderous multinationals in the world (DOW was the direct cause of tens of thousands of painful deaths around the world) sues a province for lost profits, purely on free-trade grounds... well, yes, Peter, I have to say I feel considerably less sympathy.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:11 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

146. **R L from Canada writes:** Angry West coaster.." suggesting you drink a glass of it" Guess you were not around BC in the days when there were town hall meetings for the discussion and preparation of herbicide spray programs and the subsequent approvals. One of the board members was so annoyed at the trivial arguments of the protesters that he poured himself a shot glass of one of the herbicides and drank it in front of the panel and the protesters.

We suggest you do not try that at home, by the way!

As they say the dose is the toxin. All things are poison and nothing is without poison, only the dose permits something not to be poisonous.-.Paracelsus  
There are worse chemicals out there.

DiHydrogen Monoxide is killing our children. Dihydrogen monoxide is a leading cause of death among children under the age of 15 and countless others. It is colourless, odourless and tasteless. In a solid form it can cause severe tissue damage. As a vapour it will cause severe burns. And it has been found in excised tumours of cancer patients. This is the type of chemical that we need to control!

When I read the above scary stories about Dow, I would remind you that the Bhopal incident was a Union Carbide incident which occurred in 1984, Dow bought the company in 2001. Did DOW make products for the defense industries, yes. And I have a Krups coffee grinder. What did Krups do in the war Daddy, and what did Bayer do? Do we expect more out of our corporations today, you bet.

Who are those corporations made up of? You or your neighbours or your neighbours neighbours or friends. Hold them accountable, certainly. But I would ask you this, if you saw your neighbour driving erratically and dangerously, would you act? Why or why not? You have a chance of 1 in 2 of being in a serious or fatal accident!

So remember we are all in this together, there is no them! We have met the enemy and he is us!

o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:19 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

147. **Fifty cal from Austin Texas, United States writes:** YAY! About time the fascist quebecian government is smacked down for expropriating lawful products. Yugo Chabez is next.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:51 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

148. **john doe from toronto, Canada writes:** R L from Canada writes: "When I read the above scary stories about Dow, I would remind you that the Bhopal incident was a Union Carbide incident which occurred in 1984, Dow bought the company in 2001."

Actually, the two merged in 1999. So the DOW Chemical of today is comprised of both of those companies, both with a frightening, recent history.

"Did DOW make products for the defense industries, yes. And I have a Krups coffee grinder. What did Krups do in the war Daddy, and what did Bayer do?"

Actually, "Krupps" made small household products in the war; "Krupp" Steel Works was huge the munition maker that used slave labour -- two completely unrelated companies. But your point is valid. (Bayer, BASF, etc...)

"Do we expect more out of our corporations today, you bet."

I guess it's because DOW chemical's horrible war crimes, mass poisonings and terrible medical disasters were in the 1960's, 70's, 80's, and 90s, not in the 1930's and 40's. So it is a corporation of today, not one from WWII, and it is not living up to our expectations.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 10:52 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

149. **R L from Canada writes:** Beats me where we get all this stuff! 99 or 2001, the offer was made in 99 and completed in 01. must be the reliability of the internet. But as per the union carbide page: "Union Carbide became a wholly owned subsidiary of The Dow Chemical Company (TDCC) on February 6, 2001"

We expect our company's to be more responsible, and DOW is making products which do raise our standard of living, styrofoam is great, and saran wrap..well just cant live without it.

I did throw a ringer in there with Krups vs Krupp, but did not throw in the Mercedes Benz as that might offend some people who still drive them. Mind you if one flies Westjet on Boeing jets, what did Boeing do during the wars? And we still fly on them, oh well we won that one didn't we.

DOW's war crimes were? Boeings war crimes were? Incos war crimes were? GM's crimes were? Duponts war crimes were?

It was not the company it was the people. It is those we need to hold to account. If its napalm you are referring to. they were fighting a war, an unpleasant one. I also note that because they could not bomb the dykes in north Vietnam they resorted to napalm to preserve the dykes but take out the population, how thoughtful.

The Dow corporation is holding up quite well, employs a couple of folks around the

world, makes some reasonable agricultural products and building products. Are they perfect, no, so lets keep their feet to the fire (hopefully not napalm) and make it so! They certainly are not going away, therefore lets make them pay attention. And if they want to sue the Quebec govt, let them. But ensure that they dont distract us from other more serious operations where we should be paying attention.

o Posted 03/04/09 at 11:51 PM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

150. **K. Jean Cottam from Ottawa, Canada writes:** Perfumes are toxic poisons-- hardly a trivial matter. Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) rubberstamps partially tested pesticides as "safe", exhibiting a shocking lack of expertise in handling human data. PMRA re-registered the common herbicide 2,4-D without awaiting industry's evidence of potential neurological and other harms, and foregoing the search for random contaminant due to inability to identify/handle this contaminant. Only the "active" portion of the final product is industry tested, whereas the untested formulant that may amount up to 90% of the ready-to-use chemical goes untested. Combinations of herbicides are also untested, even though "synergistic" (reinforcing effects) are suspected. All this is very significant, bearing mind that Dow's is about to legally challenge the 2,4-D ban in Quebec, alleging that the chemical is "safe."

o Posted 04/04/09 at 12:12 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

151. **john doe from toronto, Canada writes:** A lot of it has to do with reputation. Some companies have good reputations, some not so good. For whatever reason, companies like Dow, United Fruit, Blackwater, Haliburton, Nestle, Monsanto, General Dynamics, and Walmart are ones many people have a really bad feeling about. Yes, Dow makes saran wrap, but people also hear Dow Corning implants, the Bhopal disaster, dioxins, etc.

"DOW's war crimes were?"

The sole supplier of napalm used in US fire bombs in Vietnam. They also were one of the main makers of Agent Orange, the notorious antifoliant sprayed all over vietnam to burn away the plants -- it led to widespread dioxin poisoning.

"Boeings war crimes were?" None that I'm aware of... they did make some missiles and helicopters.... I think they mainly transported people.

"INCO?" none I'm aware of. Planes?

"GM's crimes were?" Made their stuff for both sides of the war.

"Duponts war crimes were?" dunno. mainly nylon and parachutes I think -- although they were involved in the manhattan project -- judge that how you will.

I guess my point is that some companies "smell" good, some -- like Dow -- just don't. maybe they should put more money into PR, less into free trade, provincial pesticide fights.

o Posted 04/04/09 at 12:41 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

152. **K. Jean Cottam from Ottawa, Canada writes:** This is an additional comment responding to readers who question Quebec's and Ontario's bans on cosmetic pesticides, without a similar ban being applied to agriculture and golf courses. Surely, use of pesticides in agriculture is non-cosmetic, as doing away entirely with pesticide use in agriculture is unrealistic at this time. Besides the urban densely populated environment is especially detrimental to children, assuming that farmers are mindful of their own children's safety. In urban areas we are primarily concerned with harm done by homeowners and businesses to third parties. In rural areas it is the hired workers who are in need of special protection, often denied to them. As to pesticide residues in food, they are somewhat cleansed by the liver. Not so, if the pesticide is inhaled. When children walk beside a sprayed lawn the residues they inhale go directly to their brain by-passing the liver which is the cleansing organ. As to golf courses, their lawn care is non-cosmetic and they are unlikely to be used by children. Golf courses are not entirely off the hook under Ontario's Bill 64: they must produce annual reports demonstrating significant reductions of pesticide use.

o Posted 04/04/09 at 12:45 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

153. **Rod Smelser from Maple Ridge, BC, Canada writes:** When you hear of vexatious cases like this, one is reminded of the softwood lumber wars, most of which were launched not to protect US lumber companies, but to further the interests of Washington DC law company, Dewey Ballantyne. In fact, the offices of the Coalition for Fair Lumber Imports is in the same Washington building as Dewey's.

These law suits area growth industry for American law companies, and of increasing importance since the Bush administration was busy pandering to even larger business interests by limiting damage awards. So with domestic business facing a cap of sorts, the need for some foreign business is that much greater.

The only good news on this front is the willingness of Pres Obama to reopen NAFTA and to include environmental and labour rights.

o Posted 04/04/09 at 1:34 AM EDT | [Alert an Editor](#) | [Link to Comment](#)

### Comments are closed

Thanks for your interest in commenting on this article, however we are no longer accepting submissions. If you would like, you may send a [letter to the editor](#).

[Report an abusive comment to our editorial staff](#)

[close](#)

### Alert us about this comment

Please let us know if this reader's comment breaks the editor's rules and is obscene, abusive, threatening, unlawful, harassing, defamatory, profane or racially offensive by selecting the appropriate option to describe the problem.

**Do not** use this to complain about comments that don't break the rules, for example those comments that you disagree with or contain spelling errors or multiple postings.

- Comment is inflammatory
- Comment is offensive
- Comment is advertising/spam

Other

-  [Article](#)
-  [Comments](#) (  157 )
- 

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• News</li><li>• Stock</li><li>• Local</li><li>• People</li></ul>
--	---

Search the News

- [E-mail](#)
- [Share](#)
-   Text Size

### Top National Stories

- [Halifax fire destroys eight homes](#)
- [Last minute of play ...](#)
- [Lessons of 1976: flu, fear, wasted millions](#)
- [Go to the National section](#)

### National Page Columnists

- [John Ibbitson: Not surprisingly, Obama gives himself high marks](#)
- [Roy MacGregor: The architect of the new, big, bad Bruins](#)
- [Margaret Wentz: Not every girl can be a winner](#)

## Top Stories by Section

- [Report on Business: How Walter's dream became a nightmare](#)
- [National: Halifax fire destroys eight homes](#)
- [World: Ruthless, dedicated Tamil leader faces final assault](#)
- [Sports: Stars assume centre stage in high-profile matchup](#)
- [Arts: It's summer at the movies!](#)
- [Technology: Canada placed on copyright blacklist](#)
- [Life: Wild, but civilized](#)

## On-line:

- [Help](#)
- [Contact Us](#)
- [Staff](#)
- [RSS](#)
- [Globe Plus Subscription](#)
- [Member Centre](#)
- [Mobile](#)
- [Newspaper Ads](#)

## Newspaper:

- [Customer Care](#)
- [Contact Us](#)
- [Staff](#)
- [Press Room](#)
- [Corrections](#)
- [Subscribe](#)
- [Vacation Stops](#)
- [Change Address](#)
- [Recognition Card](#)

## Advertise:

- [Advertise With Us](#)
- [Newspaper](#)
- [Magazines](#)
- [Online](#)
- [Marketing Solutions Group](#)
- [Media Central](#)
- [Classifieds](#)
  
- [Privacy Policy](#)
- [Terms & Conditions](#)
- [Disclaimer](#)

CTVglobemedia © Copyright 2009 CTVglobemedia Publishing Inc. All Rights Reserved.

globeandmail.com and The Globe and Mail are divisions of CTVglobemedia Publishing Inc.,  
444 Front St. W., Toronto, ON Canada M5V 2S9  
Phillip Crawley, Publisher

**DELETE  
CYBER  
BULLYING**

DON'T WRITE IT, DON'T FORWARD IT.

Ad Council NATIONAL CRIME PREVENTION COUNCIL WWW.NCPC.ORG

[Back to top](#)