

vate the Canada Safety Council to take such irresponsible positions. Canadians need to know more about this organization, but its Web site gives no clues as to how Therien decides on the positions he takes, whether he is counselled by colleagues and, if so, what their competence is to judge scientific issues. A request for such information yielded a large packet of press releases and — the coup de grâce — comic books featuring Elmer the Safety Elephant (another unproven safety measure).

I. Barry Pless

Editor, *Injury Prevention*
Montreal Children's Hospital
Montreal, Que.

References

1. Therien EJ. The accidental cell phone user [letter]. *CMAJ* 2001;165(4):397.
2. Redelmeier DA, Tibshirani RJ. Association between cellular-telephone calls and motor vehicle collisions. *N Engl J Med* 1997;336(7):453-8.
3. Driven to distraction: cellular phones and traffic accidents [editorial]. *CMAJ* 2001;164(11):1557.
4. Laberge-Nadeau C. *Le risque d'accidents de la route en relation avec l'utilisation d'un téléphone mobile*. Montreal: Laboratoire sur la sécurité des transports, Université de Montréal; 2001.
5. University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center. *The role of driver distraction in traffic crashes*. Washington (DC): AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety; 2001.

[The author responds:]

Barry Pless has criticized the Canada Safety Council on several fronts, apparently unaware of the strong body of evidence supporting our stance in each case. I encourage readers to visit our Web site (www.safety-council.org) to see the breadth of safety issues that we address.

It is true that cell phones can be a dangerous distraction. However, the 1997 study¹ had serious shortcomings. New research is available from organizations with recognized expertise in traffic safety; the methodology used in this research includes large, representative samples and control groups studied over significant periods of time.² Current findings should not be dismissed if we truly wish to improve safety on our roads.

The Canada Safety Council fully recognizes that laws and regulations

and their enforcement are critical to the prevention of deaths and injuries. The Hazardous Products Act, labour legislation, laws against impaired driving, laws making seat-belt use mandatory and many other regulations have played a major role in improving safety. Perhaps because of the success of these laws, more and stricter rules are demanded in the name of safety. However, it is counterproductive to have too many laws on the books if they cannot be enforced.

Before calling for new laws, it is important to consider the following questions. First, can the problem be addressed through existing laws? In the case of driver distractions and impaired driving, laws are already in place. Second, can the proposed legislation realistically be enforced? Resources for the enforcement of traffic laws, including those concerning impaired driving, are generally inadequate. Third, can non-regulatory approaches such as public education be used to address the issue?

I wrote my original letter to *CMAJ* not as an attack, but because I feel that it is vital that the members of the medical community and the safety movement work together to make Canada a safer place.³

Emile-J. Therien

President
Canada Safety Council
Ottawa, Ont.

References

1. Redelmeier DA, Tibshirani RJ. Association between cellular-telephone calls and motor vehicle collisions. *N Engl J Med* 1997;336(7):453-8.
2. University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center. *The role of driver distraction in traffic crashes*. Washington (DC): AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety; 2001.
3. Therien EJ. The accidental cell phone user [letter]. *CMAJ* 2001;165(4):397.

Neck pain

I enjoyed Ian Tsang's concise and useful lesson on neck pain.¹ I was especially interested in Tsang's comment that consultation with a specialist may be necessary for patients with disabling or progressive neurologic problems.

With or without neurologic deficits, patients often consider their neck condition to be disabling and progressive, so they and their family physicians are understandably anxious for a specialist's opinion. As a result, neurosurgeons are inundated with referrals for patients with neck (and back) problems, most of which do not involve the cervical nerve roots or the spinal cord and would not be appropriately treated by surgery.

Compounding this situation in Alberta is that many patients with chronic spinal pain turn to private MRI clinics, not uncommonly with their family physician's encouragement. A positive scan might fast-track a patient to a surgeon. However, few cervical spine MRI scans in middle-aged or older people are actually normal, and the reports often contain disturbing descriptions of degenerative changes, including bulging disks, osteophytes and "foraminal stenosis." It is difficult to convince patients without neurological involvement that these changes are of quite uncertain significance.

If I can take the liberty of speaking for my specialty, our plea to family physicians would be to investigate and refer patients to surgeons judiciously. For example, cervical radiculopathies may be associated with a knot of pain in the parascapular region but are always associated with more pain in the limb than in the neck; upon careful investigation they are usually found to be associated with a neurologic deficit in the form of weakness, a depressed stretch reflex, dermatomal numbness or some combination of these. When these symptoms and signs persist for over a month without significant improvement, further investigations are appropriate. An almost identical strategy can be recommended for sciatica.² If imaging demonstrates pathology that correlates with the clinical picture, referral to a surgeon should follow. One should also be on the lookout for red flags that should prompt more urgent investigation: fever, severe pain at rest, a history of cancer or risk factors for bacteremia, and signs of spinal cord compression. Overinvestigation and overreferral of patients with neck (and back) pain im-