



6th June 2025

Non-Toxic vs. Non-Hazardous

A Labelling Deception?

Charlotte Christopher
Marketing Manager

Executive Summary

Food labelling in the UK has undergone significant improvement in recent years, offering consumers clearer insights into product contents and health impacts. Conversely, chemical labelling, though tightly regulated, still suffers from inconsistent and misleading terminology.

This paper explores the distinction between the terms non-toxic and non-hazardous in chemical labelling, highlighting the regulatory implications and the potential risks of miscommunication. It aims to inform both chemical producers and consumers, advocating for clarity, accuracy, and adherence to HSE guidelines.

Introduction

Food labelling in the UK is strictly regulated and has evolved to promote transparency. Initiatives such as the Food Standards Agency's "traffic light system," the Red Tractor scheme, and dietary-specific labels like Vegan, Vegetarian, and Gluten-Free, have empowered consumers to make informed decisions.

Chemical labelling, however, has not kept pace in clarity or consumer understanding. Despite being regulated by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) under the Great Britain Classification, Labelling and Packaging (GB CLP) regulation, ambiguous or incorrect terminology, particularly the misuse of "non-toxic", continues to be a concern. This paper outlines the dangers of such mislabelling and calls for improved industry standards and consumer awareness.

The Role of Chemical Labelling

Chemical labelling is a legal requirement and critical to user safety. Whether in industrial settings or in household products like oven cleaners and drain un-blockers, labels must clearly communicate potential risks and safe usage guidelines.

Under GB CLP, manufacturers, importers, and distributors are legally obligated to classify, label, and package chemicals correctly. Failure to do so not only undermine safety but also violates regulatory compliance.



Key Label Elements Include:



Hazard Identification:

Clear labelling of any classified hazards, including pictograms, risk information, and protective instructions.



Hazard Statements:

Specific descriptions of chemical risks (e.g., "Causes severe skin burns").



Precautionary Statements:

Guidance for minimising exposure (e.g., "Wear protective gloves").

Signal Words:

Terms such as 'Danger' or 'Warning' to denote severity.

Understanding the Terminology

While "toxic" and "hazardous" are often used interchangeably in everyday language, they have distinct meanings in regulatory contexts:



Toxic:

Indicates substances that can cause significant harm to health, through ingestion, inhalation, or skin contact. The term suggests acute or chronic effects and is associated with specific thresholds in toxicological data.

In casual language:

Implies high, direct harm to health.



Hazardous:

A broader term covering physical, health, and environmental dangers. A substance may be hazardous due to flammability, corrosivity, or reactivity, even if it is not classified as toxic.

In casual language:

Implies a general need for caution and protective measures.

The Problem with “Non-Toxic”

In chemical regulation, these distinctions are critical. The HSE advises against using the term “non-toxic” on chemical labels because it can falsely imply the absence of harm. A substance may not meet the strict classification of toxicity but could still pose significant hazards (e.g., skin irritation, respiratory effects).

Some UK chemical producers continue to use “non-toxic” as a marketing term, despite regulatory guidance advising otherwise. This is misleading and potentially dangerous, as it may cause users to underestimate the risks associated with the product.

Using “non-hazardous” is more appropriate only if the product has undergone a proper hazard assessment and is confirmed to pose no significant risk under normal conditions of use.

Case Studies

R v Lee (2009) – Mislabelled Medication

In 2009, pharmacist Elizabeth Lee was prosecuted under the Medicines Act 1968 after dispensing propranolol (a beta-blocker) instead of the prescribed prednisolone (a steroid).

The mislabelled medication contributed to the deterioration of a patient’s health, leading to her death. Lee pleaded guilty to two offences: supplying a medicinal product not of the nature or quality specified in the prescription and supplying a label likely to mislead as to the product’s uses or effects.

She received a suspended sentence, highlighting the legal consequences of mislabelling in the pharmaceutical sector.

(Pharmaceutical Journal, 2009).

Case Studies

Real-World Implications: Mislabelled Chemicals

A UC Berkeley researcher mistakenly mixed isopropanol with nitric acid due to a mislabelled container. The resulting reaction caused the container to rupture, spraying corrosive acid and causing chemical burns.

The incident resulted in physical injury and highlighted serious safety risks tied to improper chemical labelling. This demonstrates the potential for personal injury, equipment damage, and operational disruption when hazardous materials are not clearly and accurately labelled.

(UC Berkeley, 2004)

Industrial Safety Breach: Distillex Factory Fire

The Distillex chemical plant in North Shields experienced a significant fire due to the ignition of flammable solvents.

Investigations revealed breaches of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, leading to fines totalling £39,000. While not directly linked to labelling, the incident underscores the broader consequences of inadequate chemical safety practices.

(BBC News, 2022)

Critical Safety Failure: Floor Sealant Mistaken for Milk

Twelve children and two adults at a summer program drank floor sealant, mistaken for milk, because both were stored and transported in identical bags from the same warehouse pallets.

Several experienced throat and mouth burns, with one child hospitalised. The incident highlights the severe risks posed by mislabelled or improperly stored chemicals, especially when they are indistinguishable from consumables.

(The Independent, 2022)

These cases illustrate the serious legal and health ramifications of misleading chemical labelling in the UK.

Ensuring accurate and compliant labelling is not only a legal obligation but also a critical component of public and occupational safety.



Regulatory Framework and Enforcement

The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) enforces the UK Classification, Labelling and Packaging (CLP) Regulation.

Under this regulation, it is an offence to provide false or misleading information on chemical labels. Penalties can include unlimited fines and imprisonment for up to two years, depending on the severity and nature of the offence.

Call to Action

This paper serves two key purposes:



To manufacturers:

Ensure all chemical labelling complies with GB CLP regulations.

Avoid misleading or prohibited terms like “non-toxic,” which can create a false sense of safety and result in regulatory action or harm.



To consumers:

Understand that terms like “non-toxic” are not officially recognised or regulated and may not reflect actual safety.

Look for proper hazard communication on labels and treat ambiguous claims with caution.



Conclusion

Chemical labelling is not merely a legal requirement but a vital aspect of public health and safety. Ambiguous terms undermine the trust and clarity that labels are meant to provide.

By aligning industry practices with HSE guidance and educating consumers on correct terminology, we can promote safer chemical use across both professional and domestic environments.

References

BBC.co.uk. (2025). BBC News | ENGLAND | Tyneside chemical alert over. [online] Available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/1790942.stm>.

European Chemicals Agency (2021). Guidance on labelling and packaging in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008. [online] Available at: https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/2324906/clp_labelling_en.pdf/89628d94-573a-4024-86cc-0b4052a74d65.

The Independent (2022). Alaska kids served sealant instead of milk at school program. [online] The Independent. Available at: <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/alaska-ap-anchorage-two-b2102101.html>.

The Pharmaceutical Journal. (2021). Former locum handed suspended jail term for dispensing error. [online] Available at: <https://pharmaceutical-journal.com/article/news/former-locum-handed-suspended-jail-term-for-dispensing-error>.

UC Berkley (2004). Improper Labelling Causes Injury from Acid Spray | Office of Environment, Health & Safety. [online] Available at: <https://ehs.berkeley.edu/news/improper-labeling-causes-injury-acid-spray>.

HSE (n.d.). HSE: Information about health and safety at work. [online]. Available at: <https://www.hse.gov.uk>.



Contact Us

Our Office

Blended Products
Elsham Wolds Industrial Estate
Brigg
DN20 0SP

Opening Hours:
Monday - Friday 8:30am to 5:00pm

Call Us

+44 (0)1652 680 555

Email Us

enquires@blendedproducts.com



Non-Toxic vs. Non-Hazardous

A Labelling Deception?

