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OPINION
Choice embraces more than tuition payments and community control.
William Raspberry

Justice squanders public's faith

If you take a broad view, the reported travel and telephone expenses of some members of the state Supreme Court bear this out. For instance, some of them like to drive big, expensive government cars that cost more to pay for than their sister's normal reimbursement rate, and are unable to argue with such a little piece of government reimbursed at a higher rate. So what? Same to say in fancy hotels and they shouldn't pay for that. But the total amount of money involved isn't that much of a notable dollar bill. For sure, they seem 'forget' the rule about reimbursing the cost for personal phones made on the state phone - which is another ticket of some. But again, we're talking at the most a few dollars a year.

It's right there. Once again, the arrogance of a few tarnishes the image of all the justices and their colleagues on the state appellate and circuit courts. And once again, the arrow of a few sets us back for thousands and leaves employees and undermines state efforts to cut costs. If we're talking about a few cents double on the Supreme Court's ability to police itself, then the entire state judicial system is compromised.

Pesticide bans too costly to take lightly

The American Farm Bureau last week released a poll that showed that one in five Americans would like to ban pesticides. So what would the world be like if we knew it?

Banger, for starters. The world's ability to food-producing capacity would drop, and so would the cost of food. Many experts sure as much for years have been involved in conservation of the natural capital, which is not the same as our natural capital.

Necessary are some who most champions switch crops to grow something else, where they belong.

The development world also would be a more pesticide-free place to eat. Without pesticides, food costs would rise sharply because farmers would lose a much higher percentage of their crops to pests and disease. And some types of fruits and vegetables would be harder to come by at any price.

If most telling for the Fearful One-Fifth of the planet, pesticides wouldn't make our food supply measurably safer.

Yes, pesticides are potent, but the protection pesticides in miracles of agronomics and agronomy. The recent reductions in food are set by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the reductions in health are necessary to protect health. The Federal Food and Drug Administration inspects foods to make sure these "tolerance levels" are respected. Even if pesticides were banned in an attempt to make our food supply completely free of chemicals, the federal government's magazine explained that if the 99.9 percent of the pesticides we eat are not measured, there's no way to measure our food supply.

According to the magazine, foods contain natural pesticides that cause cancer in mice, asparagus, green beans, caper berries, canola, etc. - well, you don't need the magazine to tell you that is not food.

Public nerves about pesticides were frayed a year ago when a recent survey showed that 47 percent of the people believed studies suggested could cause cancer in humans. Of those two surveys, one would need to drink 280 gallons of apple juice per day for 70 years to get the same rate of chemical exposure as one person once consumed by laboratory mice.

All pesticides are chemicals such as weed killers and fertilizers close chemical, and there may be some value in the reduction of chemicals consumed by laboratory mice.
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