



Join our team!



Powered by Troy Media's Yugogi Ads

- [Stay Connected](#)
- / Wednesday, August 10, 2011

Search in site...



EvidenceNetwork.ca

NON-PARTISAN HEALTH POLICY EXPERTS AND EVIDENCE

Building an evidence-based dialogue on Canadian healthcare

www.evidencenetwork.ca

Powered by Troy Media's Yugogi Ads

- [Home](#)
- [A&E](#)
- [Business](#)
- [Education](#)
- [Health](#)
- [Careers](#)
- [Politics](#)
- [Science/Tech](#)
- [Travel](#)
- [Environment](#)
- [Video/Audio](#)
- [Special Reports](#)
- [Line Story](#)
- [Viewpoint](#)
- [Sports](#)
- [Drive](#)
- [Other Voices](#)
- [Crime](#)
- [Troy Media Features](#)
- [About Troy Media](#)
- [Editorial Calendar](#)
- [Commentary submissions](#)
- [Advertise](#)
- [Classified Ads](#)

# Pickles may be hazardous to your health

Like

Be the first of your friends to like this.

August 10, 2011

**By Nachum Gabler  
Economist  
and  
Joel Wood  
Senior Research Economist  
Centre for Risk and Regulation  
The Fraser Institute**

VANCOUVER, BC, Aug. 10, 2011/ Troy Media/ – The busybody tendencies of BC politicians are leading to the further regulation of what had previously been the refuge of green thumbs across the province: green lawns, colorful flower beds, and ripening vegetable gardens.

As of early July, the BC government has been reviewing the feasibility of further regulating your private garden by adopting ill-conceived laws restricting pesticide use that do not accurately reflect the current state of scientific knowledge. A hasty ban on the cosmetic use of artificial pesticides should not be implemented until the underlying science is conclusive and a comprehensive analysis of the potential side effects resulting from the ban has been undertaken.

### ***BC a follower, not a leader***

By banning pesticides for cosmetic uses, BC would be following the questionable precedent set by several other provinces. For example, Ontario has restricted the sale and use of more than 250 pesticide products and 80 pesticide ingredients. These provincial prohibitions on cosmetic use of artificial pesticides may apply to lawns, vegetable and ornamental gardens, driveways, cemeteries, public parks and school grounds. Similarly, dozens of municipalities across Canada have introduced their own restrictions on cosmetic pesticide use.

The justification for a ban on the cosmetic use of artificial pesticides is based on the ‘precautionary principle’ which concludes that any activity that might potentially constitute a “threat of harm” on humans or the ecosystem should be curtailed or abated regardless of whether a “cause-and-effect” relationship has been concretely established.

For example, the Canadian Cancer Society argues that the current evidence of a connection between cancer and artificial pesticide exposure is sufficient to justify a ban, despite readily admitting that no “cause-and-effect” relationship has been “established scientifically.”

Many of the artificial pesticides that would be banned are not proven to be carcinogenic. For example, the World Health Organization only lists the common pesticide 2,4-D in the same cancer risk category as pickled vegetables and cell phones. And, just recently, the United States Environmental Protection Agency conducted a review of the scientific literature and concluded that there was no evidence of a link between cancer and 2,4-D.

If we take the ‘precautionary principle’ to its natural conclusion, governments should also be banning household soap. Scientists at Cornell University have developed the Environmental Impact Quotient (EIQ) as a measure of the relative impact of common pesticide ingredients on humans and the environment. The EIQ is actually lower for many artificial pesticides than the EIQ for many other mundane household items and ‘natural’ pesticide alternatives. For example, the EIQ for soap is higher than the EIQ for 2,4-D.

While politicians may think they’re doing good, a ban on the use of artificial pesticides for cosmetic purposes imposes costs on many British Columbians. The existence of a market for pesticides for cosmetic use suggests that Canadians derive value from having these landscape-enhancing products available for purchase. Prohibiting the cosmetic use of artificial pesticides ignores the benefits Canadians enjoy in maintaining aesthetically pleasing green landscapes.

Furthermore, a blanket prohibition on cosmetic pesticide use lacks the careful contrasting of costs and benefits that should be undertaken before any possible regulations are adopted. A wiser approach to evaluating the merits of any regulation controlling cosmetic pesticide use would weigh the trade-offs implied by the proposed regulation.

### ***Ban could lead to higher risk solutions***

Making matters worse, a blanket ban might also encourage individuals to substitute the banned product with alternatives that can be potentially more hazardous. Consider the recent case of a Victoria couple who accidentally set their home ablaze while trying to eradicate their weed problem with a blow torch, since artificial pesticide use is banned in Victoria.

Though this case is anecdotal, it lends credibility to the assertion that using public policy to subvert market forces and regulate the availability of certain commodities that might potentially pose some kind of a risk is likely to give birth to other risks. These other risks arise from the sometimes clever, sometimes careless, ways Canadians adapt to altered incentives resulting from regulation.

BC politicians should avoid enacting poorly designed regulations to control pesticide use that may ultimately prove more damaging than the pesticides themselves.

*Nachum Gabler is an economist in the Centre for Risk and Regulation at the Fraser Institute. Joel Wood is a senior research economist in the Centre for Risk and Regulation at the Fraser Institute.*

[+ Share / Save](#)

Related posts:

1. [Health Council of Canada short-sighted on health care reform](#)
2. [Let's not turn our backs on science](#)
3. [To understand health care spending, we need to measure the right outcomes](#)
4. [Canada's health care crisis is an economics problem, not a management problem](#)
5. [Better health care or financial folly?](#)



You can follow any responses to this entry through the [RSS 2.0](#). You can leave a response or trackback to this entry

You must be logged in to post a comment [Login](#)

Save, Earn and Enter for a chance to Win up to 100,000 miles\* with Web Saver Plus

Book now and save up to 25%

DELTA HOTELS AND RESORTS

aeroplan

\*No purchase necessary

Powered by Troy Media's Yugogi Ads

- [‘Sour’ gas sweetens its reputation](#)
- [Pickles may be hazardous to your health](#)
- [Desperate economic times call for desperate measures](#)
- [The eurozone's rendezvous with destiny](#)
- [The U.S. remains a global powerhouse](#)
- [Alberta housing starts flatline](#)
- [If economic disparity is a growing problem, then let's discuss solutions](#)
- [An ethical response to poverty in Canada](#)
- [How to save \\$690 and prevent unnecessary worry](#)
- [Alberta youth job prospects dim](#)

- [A&E](#)
- [Business](#)
- [Education](#)
- [Health](#)
- [Careers](#)
- [Politics](#)
- [Science/Tech](#)
- [Travel](#)
- [Environment](#)
- [Video/Audio](#)
- [Special Reports](#)
- [Line Story](#)
- [Viewpoint](#)
- [Sports](#)
- [Drive](#)
- [Other Voices](#)
- [Crime](#)
  
- [Troy Media Features](#)
- [About Troy Media](#)

- [Editorial Calendar](#)
- [Commentary submissions](#)
- [Advertise](#)
- [Classified Ads](#)
- [RSS](#)

Share on  
Facebook

Share on  
Twitter

Share via  
email

Joel Wood

[Log in](#) | 