ENVIRONMENTAL CARCINOGENS
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The Canadian Cancer Society BC/Y Division

Since the 1930s, the Canadian Cancer Society has been present in communities across British Columbia and the Yukon enhancing the quality of life of people living with cancer and working towards the eradication of cancer.

Today, over 20,000 volunteers and 22,000 event participants are working with the Society to raise funds for outstanding cancer research, quality support programs and trusted cancer information. Each year volunteers also assist with the delivery of services to thousands of people in BC and the Yukon living with cancer.

The Canadian Cancer Society is leading community action and health promotion initiatives to reduce the number of preventable cancers in a growing and aging population. By educating the public and encouraging all levels of government to adopt healthy public policies, the Society is helping to create communities where healthy choices are easier choices.
Section 1

Cancer in BC
CANCER STATISTICS IN BC

Cancer has and will continue to have a tremendous impact on British Columbian communities. Although British Columbians have some of the lowest overall incidence and mortality rates in Canada, there were an estimated 20,600 new cases of cancer and 9,000 deaths from cancer in 2007. These numbers are predicted to increase. Four cancers, lung, breast, colorectal and prostate cancer account for more than half of all cancers in British Columbia, the Yukon and across Canada. The increasing number of cases is due primarily to our growing and aging population: approximately one third of the province’s population is aged 50 and over.

Healthy public policies can support the most vulnerable members of our communities to take control of their health and reduce their risk of cancer. Supportive environments are critical to improve the health of a population. Current environments are not always health promoting, so there is a need for more policies, programs and structures to make the healthy choice the easier choice.

The Premier’s vision is that BC be the healthiest and greenest jurisdiction to ever host an Olympic Games. As a result, the Canadian Cancer Society is taking this opportunity to make policy recommendations to broaden the scope of cancer prevention dialogue around environmental carcinogens.

Lung cancer in particular was estimated to kill more than 2,300 residents of British Columbia in 2007. More than 85% of the cases of lung cancer are caused by smoking, making tobacco consumption the largest single cause of preventable disease.

According to the 2007 Canadian Cancer Society statistics, two in every five Canadians will develop cancer during their lifetime. One in four with cancer will die from their disease. Without prevention initiatives, the numbers of new cases and deaths will rise steadily as the Canadian population grows and ages.

Most common cancers in BC: (Canadian Cancer Statistics, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Deaths</th>
<th>Diagnoses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorectal</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostate</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>2700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram showing the number of deaths and diagnoses for lung, colorectal, prostate, and breast cancer in British Columbia.
Prevention is the Key
We know that up to 50% of cancers can be prevented through a combination of healthy living and healthy public policies that create supportive environments.

TOBACCO
We can prevent up to 30% of cancer deaths and 85% of lung cancers by eliminating the use of and exposure to tobacco.

► 15% of British Columbians are currently smokers (Canadian Tobacco Use Monitoring Survey, 2007H), which is the lowest provincial smoking rate in Canada. 10.5% of non-smoking British Columbians are regularly exposed to second-hand smoke in public places (Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS), 2005).

DIET, PHYSICAL INACTIVITY AND OBESITY
Up to 30% of cancers can be prevented by eating well, being active, and maintaining a healthy body weight.

► More than half of all British Columbians eat less than 5 daily servings of fruits/vegetables, and 40% of the population is physically inactive (CCHS, 2005).

► 45.2% of British Columbians are overweight/obese (CCHS, 2005).

ULTRAVIOLET RADIATION
90% of skin cancers can be prevented. This encompasses almost all of the 420 cases of melanoma and the 13,000 cases of non-melanoma skin cancer estimated to be diagnosed in BC in 2007.

► The 2007 National Survey on Sun Exposure and Protective Behaviours found that most Canadians are not aware of the ways to protect themselves adequately from the sun, and do not take precautions.

OCCUPATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CARCINOGENS
The proportion of cancer deaths related to environmental carcinogens (excluding environmental tobacco smoke) is estimated to be in the range of 7–11%*. Many scientists believe that with further research the proportion will be much higher.

► Among households in BC with a lawn or garden, 29% responded that they used pesticides in the last 12 months. This is much higher than the household pesticide use in Quebec (15%), which has a provincial pesticide ban (Statistics Canada: Households and the Environment Survey, 2006)

*This number does not account for the increased risk of cancer in certain populations of occupational or industrial groups exposed to higher concentrations of environmental exposures.
Section 2

BC Government’s Commitment to Health: Environmental Carcinogens
**REDUCE EXPOSURE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CARCINOGENS**

**Environmental Carcinogens**

The BC government has shown leadership on environmental issues and a commitment to environmental sustainability. The government’s goal to become carbon neutral by 2010 and reduce greenhouse gas emissions by \( \frac{1}{3} \) by 2020 will improve the health of British Columbians, and protect our environment. The government’s investment in the BC Lung Association’s public education campaign around the Air Quality Health Index will better inform British Columbians about air pollution levels, and advance health promotion in BC.

The BC government now needs to expand its focus from climate change to broader environmental issues. The Select Standing Committee on Finance and Government Services reported in November 2007:

...the Finance Committee strongly endorses the government’s goal of reducing greenhouse gases. However, we remind the government that environmental protection goes beyond the reduction of greenhouse gases: it must include provisions for safe drinking water, clean air, conservation officers, healthy lands, fish and wildlife, and recreational opportunities for all British Columbians...

(Available at [http://www.leg.bc.ca/cmt/38thparl/session-3/fgs/index.htm](http://www.leg.bc.ca/cmt/38thparl/session-3/fgs/index.htm)).

**RECOMMENDATION**

The BC government can continue to build on its leadership on environmental issues by introducing legislation to:

- **Label consumer products** so that British Columbians will know if they are being exposed to products that contain cancer-causing substances at point of sale and use.

- **Reduce the environmental and health impact of pesticides** by implementing province-wide pesticide legislation banning the sale, retail display, and use of pesticides for cosmetic purposes.

- **Further reduce exposure to second-hand smoke**, by banning smoking in a variety of outdoor public places, including restaurant and bar patios, seating areas of sports arenas, stadiums, sports fields, parks, playgrounds and beaches.

The Canadian Cancer Society is committed to the environment by reducing the rates of preventable cancers. Environmental carcinogens are substances in the environment that are known to increase the risk of cancer. The Canadian Cancer Society is calling on all levels of government to make changes to reduce or eliminate the exposure of citizens to environmental carcinogens. The proportion of cancer deaths related to environmental carcinogens is in the range of 7–11%.

*Many scientists believe that with further research, that proportion will be much higher in some groups.*

*This number does not account for the increased risk of cancer in certain populations of occupational or industrial groups exposed to higher concentrations of environmental exposures.*
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BC Government’s Commitment to Health: Right to Know (Product Labelling) Legislation
RIGHT TO KNOW (PRODUCT LABELLING) LEGISLATION

The Canadian Cancer Society is concerned about British Columbians’ potential exposure to cancer-causing substances (carcinogens) that may be in commonly used consumer products. We believe that people have the right to know if they are being exposed to substances that contain carcinogens at the point of purchase or use. Citizens also need more information about the ingredients in consumer products so assessments about potential exposure can be undertaken. Knowing this information can help British Columbians make informed decisions to protect their health.

Why should this legislation be implemented:
Currently, federal legislation about labelling of ingredients only exists for cosmetics, but not for other consumer products, such as household cleaners. Current federal legislation that does exist on some consumer products does not inform the consumer whether the ingredient is a cancer-causing substance nor does the legislation require the product to carry a warning if it contains a carcinogen.

Product labelling legislation would:
- Empower citizens to act as informed consumers and enable consumers to choose less toxic products.
- Encourage proactive improvement by businesses and organizations by:
  - encouraging manufacturers to substitute safer materials
  - persuading industry to reduce the use of hazardous substances.

What other jurisdictions are doing
- In Ontario, Bill 164, a Right to Know (Product Labelling) Bill, has been ordered for Third Reading.
- Environment Canada developed the Environmental Choice (Eco-label) program, primarily to provide information to large consumer groups (for example, businesses) about which products are more environmentally friendly. Environment Canada is discussing how to expand this program to provide information to all Canadians.
For more information visit: www.environmentalchoice.com
- In California, a regulation called Proposition 65 requires a clear warning label on products that contain cancer-causing substances.

SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM
- Currently, most consumer products are not labeled with the ingredients they contain.
- Some of these products may contain cancer causing substances.
- In addition, there are no labels or symbols on consumer products warning if they contain a cancer-causing substance.
Public Opinion

Virtually all British Columbians agree that consumers have the right to know the ingredients that are contained in the products they purchase (Canadian Cancer Society Advocacy Public Opinion Research Survey, 2008).

Further, the vast majority of British Columbians would support the provincial government passing legislation that would require companies and manufacturers to clearly label all of their products that contain cancer-causing substances.

RECOMMENDATION

The BC Government should enact legislation to ensure:

- That all consumer products be clearly labeled with a list of ingredients they contain, and that all products should inform consumers if they contain cancer-causing substances.
Section 4

BC Government’s Commitment to Health: Cosmetic Pesticides
BANNING THE SALE, DISPLAY AND USE OF COSMETIC PESTICIDES

Pesticides are substances intended to kill or otherwise control weeds, insects, fungi or pests. They can be over-the-counter products, or special chemicals not easily available to the public. Examples include products that are intended to kill:

- weeds and unwanted plants (herbicides)
- insects (insecticides)
- products that kill mold (fungicides)

The Canadian Cancer Society is very concerned about the use of pesticides, which can contain carcinogens, for the purposes of enhancing the appearance of lawns, gardens, parks, recreation facilities and golf courses.

The term, cosmetic use of pesticides, refers to pesticides used to enhance the appearance of lawns, gardens, parks, and golf courses to control unwanted weeds, pests, and plants, or to prevent blemishes and other imperfections.

SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

There is a growing body of evidence linking pesticide exposure to both adult and childhood cancers.

- The International Agency for Research on Cancer (which conducts research into the causes of cancer), and others, have concluded that some substances in pesticides are known, probable, or possible carcinogens.

- In 2004, the Ontario College of Family Physicians conducted a scientific literature review on the evidence linking pesticides to cancer, and concluded that there is a statistically significant association between pesticide exposure and certain types of cancer (www.ocfp.on.ca).


- The U.S. National Toxicology Program 11th Report on Carcinogens, 2005 has classified a number of active ingredients in pesticides as ‘reasonably anticipated to be a human carcinogen’ (http://ntp-server.niehs.nih.gov/index.cfm?objectid=03C98512-ACF8-C1F3-ADBA53CAE848F635).

- The Canadian Medical Association also has a position against the cosmetic use of pesticides. The Canadian Medical Association “urges all levels of government to show leadership by refraining from the cosmetic use of pesticides and aggressively employing safer alternatives to the use of chemicals” (http://www.cma.ca/index.cfm/ci_id/53670/la_id/1.htm).
**Why Pesticide Restrictions Make Sense**

The Canadian Cancer Society’s position on cosmetic pesticides is based on the precautionary principle. The precautionary principle states that whenever there is reliable scientific evidence that a substance may have an adverse impact on human health and the environment but there is still scientific uncertainty about the precise nature or the magnitude of the potential damage, decision-making must be based on precaution in order to prevent damage to human health and the environment.

- Pesticide restrictions have been very successful in reducing the use of pesticides, particularly if coupled with public education. The City of Toronto began to phase out pesticides in 2003. By 2005, Toronto City Staff reported that 35% fewer households were using these products. In Quebec, between 1994 and 2005 pesticide use dropped by 50% (Statistics Canada, 2007).

- Education and outreach programs alone, without legislation restricting use and sales, have been shown to achieve only a 10-24% reduction in pesticide use, whereas education coupled with a restriction such as a bylaw, has been shown to achieve a 51-90% reduction in pesticide use (Canadian Centre for Pollution Prevention, 2004).

- The public’s concern over environmental exposures, such as pesticides, is growing. For instance, approximately three-quarters of all British Columbians believe that pesticides have a negative impact on their health, and similar numbers are concerned about the environmental impacts of pesticides (Canadian Cancer Society Advocacy Public Opinion Research Survey, 2008).

- Typically, the public supports pesticide bylaws. Reputable public opinion polls conducted across Canada regarding pesticide use, consistently report that more than 70% of the respondents support banning the cosmetic use of pesticides. In BC, some three quarters of the population supports their local or provincial government passing legislation that would phase-out the use of cosmetic pesticides on private and public properties (Canadian Cancer Society Advocacy Public Opinion Research Survey, 2008).

- Babies and young children are at greater risk from the effects of pesticides, due to their underdeveloped immune systems and common behaviour such as playing on grass, and putting plants or hands in their mouths. Pregnant women are particularly vulnerable because of the impact of pesticides on the developing fetus.

**The Economics of Pesticide Restrictions**

An argument against pesticide bans comes from businesses in the gardening and landscaping sectors, and pesticide producers. Many of these businesses believe that a ban on non-essential pesticides would damage their revenue with the most impact on small or mid-size commercial ventures. This fear has not been realized.

When pesticide restrictions are combined with education, the public responds and begins to demand non-toxic alternatives. Many alternatives to pesticides for lawns and gardens are readily available to the average homeowner. Research reveals that, in regions across Canada that have pesticide bylaws, businesses have shifted successfully to non-toxic alternatives, and the sales and offerings of non-toxic alternatives are growing.

“We have reduced the number of Non-Eco Chemicals and Fertilizers by 8% from 2005–2006. More importantly, we have increased our Eco Chemicals and Fertilizers by 29% and next spring, we will increase [these options] by another 27%. As part of our Eco Options strategy, we will also continue to invest more space in Eco friendly products, both in Halifax and across the country.”

(Nick Colwing, former Senior Manager, Communications and External Affairs, Home Depot Canada).
**Integrated Pest Management (IPM) is not the answer**

Integrated Pest Management (IPM) is a term that originally referred to the use of pesticides as a last resort to deal with weeds and insect problems. However, the landscape industry has begun to use the term to defend the right to use pesticides as a part of normal lawn and garden care. The **BC Integrated Pest Management Act** does not require that alternatives to pesticides be given priority.

There are sustainable, non-toxic alternatives for healthy lawns and gardens. IPM should not be integrated into pesticide legislation. The Minister of Environment rightly launched Environment Week 2006 with 10 tips to help protect the environment, including the “[use of] natural methods to fertilize and protect plants from pests and conserve water by covering plant beds with composted leaves or grass to help retain moisture.”

**Banning the sale, display and use of cosmetic pesticides**

The BC government has an important and distinct role in restricting pesticide use by mandating sales and display restrictions across the province.

Over 130 municipalities across Canada have implemented bylaws restricting pesticide use, including 12 in British Columbia. Another 13 municipalities in BC have drafted pesticide bylaws, or are considering such bylaws. While this is good news, it does result in a patchwork of bylaws and an uneven playing field, when a province-wide restriction would be more effective.

Further, the BC Government has jurisdiction to ban the sale of pesticides across the province, while municipalities can only ban the use and application of pesticides within its boundaries. Municipalities that have taken steps to protect their citizens by enacting pesticide bylaws have often said that their ability to stop people from buying the banned chemicals has diluted the effectiveness of the bylaw.

The BC Government needs to take to heart the recommendations from the Federal Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development and “give absolute priority to the protection of human health and the environment.”

**What other provinces are doing**

In Quebec, municipal bylaws have led to province-wide restrictions. A new Pesticide Management Code came into effect in 2006, specifically prohibiting the sale of 20 pesticide ingredients, and some 210 pesticide brands, including the popular herbicide 2, 4-D.

The Ontario Liberal government has committed to banning the cosmetic use of pesticides province-wide.

In PEI, the government has introduced a Standing Committee, which will consider province-wide cosmetic pesticide legislation.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Since the cosmetic use of pesticides has no countervailing health benefit and has the potential to cause harm, the Canadian Cancer Society is calling for a ban on the cosmetic use of pesticides on private and public lands.

**The BC Government should enact legislation to:**

- Restrict the sale and retail display of cosmetic pesticides.
- Ban the cosmetic use of pesticides on public and private lands.

---
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Communities with Pesticide Bylaws or with Drafted Bylaws or are Considering Bylaws

- Municipalities with bylaws in place
- Municipalities with draft bylaws in place or considering bylaws
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BC Government’s Commitment to Health:
Tobacco Control in BC
**TOBACCO CONTROL IN BC**

In 2004, the Canadian Cancer Society introduced a cancer prevention strategy at its first MLA Breakfast and asked the BC Government to allocate 5% of the health care budget to chronic disease prevention.

At our second MLA Breakfast in 2006, the Canadian Cancer Society recommended that the BC Government undertake six tobacco control measures. The Government has responded by demonstrating a firm commitment to improve the health outcomes of British Columbians by implementing various chronic disease prevention initiatives.

**These initiatives include:**

- The establishment of ACT NOW BC.
- The allocation of 4% of the health budget to cancer prevention.
- Funding of $4 million for the establishment of a Research Chair in the Primary Prevention of Cancer at UBC.
- An investment of $26 million in the BC Healthy Living Alliance.
- Enacting the **Tobacco Control Act** to ban smoking on school grounds and ban smoking at entrances to public places and inside all public facilities and ban tobacco promotion at point of purchase in locations accessible to minors.
- An announcement that the BC Government will pass new legislation banning smoking in vehicles where children are present.

The Canadian Cancer Society congratulates the BC government for these initiatives and continues to encourage the government to implement further tobacco control measures to regain the leadership the province once held in tobacco control across Canada.

**Exposure to Second-hand Smoke**

The Canadian Cancer Society advocates for public spaces to be smoke-free in order to reduce exposure to second-hand smoke, help smokers quit, and protect children and youth from the use of tobacco products in their neighbourhoods.

**SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM**

- Tobacco-related illness kills more than 6,000 British Columbians each year.
- Cigarette smoking causes 30% of cancer deaths in Canada and 85% of lung cancer deaths. Cancer is the leading cause of premature death in Canada.
- The Ministry of Health reports that disease from second-hand smoke kills up to 140 British Columbians each year.
- According to the 2006 US Surgeon General’s report, there is no safe level of exposure to second-hand smoke.
- The vast majority of British Columbians, 85%, do not smoke.
- Tobacco related illness and death are entirely preventable.
- Recent estimates (2005) indicate approximately 44% of non-smoking youth aged 12 to 19 in Canada are exposed to second-hand smoke in public places.
- The rate of progress we make in reducing smoking rates still further will be directly related to the strength and speed of implementing additional tobacco control measures in BC.
Smoke-free outdoor public places make sense

- This ensures that tobacco smoke concentrations do not pose a health risk to staff and patrons outdoors, and tobacco smoke does not drift indoors.
- The evidence shows that there is a real risk of exposure to second-hand smoke from people smoking in outdoor public places. In fact, a person can be exposed to the same level of second-hand smoke on an outdoor patio as sitting in an indoor establishment where smoking is allowed.
- A strong message is sent that not smoking is the community norm. This would have an impact on smoking rates by discouraging youth from starting to smoke, allowing more ex-smokers to successfully stay quit, motivating more smokers to quit, and reducing the level of use.
- There are high levels of support for banning smoking at various outdoor venues in BC including stadiums (84%), sports fields (76%) and parks and playgrounds (75%) (Canadian Cancer Society Advocacy Public Opinion Research, 2008).

What other jurisdictions are doing

Legislation prohibiting smoking on outdoor patios of restaurants and bars has been adopted in the provinces of Nova Scotia, Newfoundland & Labrador, and Alberta, and at least 19 Canadian municipalities, including the Capital Regional District of BC, and soon Vancouver, BC. White Rock has agreed in principle to ban smoking on patios by 2009.

Although municipalities can create bylaws, it would be better to avoid a patchwork of legislation and create an even playing field across the province. Provincial legislation would constitute a stand against second-hand smoke equally and fairly in all regions.

The BC Government should enact legislation to ban smoking in restaurant and bar patios, the seating areas of sports arenas, stadiums and other entertainment venues, bus shelters, sports fields, parks, playgrounds and beaches.

RECOMMENDATION

To decrease exposure to environmental carcinogens, the BC Government should enact province wide legislation to:

- Prohibit smoking on outdoor patios of restaurants and bars.
- Prohibit smoking within 7 metres of entrances and windows of public places.
- Extend the ban to include sports arenas, stadiums, sports fields, parks, playgrounds and beaches.

In addition, the BC Government should enact province-wide legislation to:

- Prohibit the sale of tobacco products in all pharmacies, premises that contain a pharmacy and kiosks associated with a pharmacy.
- Increase tobacco taxes and close the ‘roll-your-own’ tobacco tax loophole.
- Subsidise Nicotine Replacement Therapies and physician counselling for British Columbians.
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Canadian Cancer Society Advocacy
Public Opinion Research Survey 2008
The Canadian Cancer Society commissioned Ipsos Reid to conduct a survey to better understand British Columbians’ views on smoking bans, cosmetic pesticides, and right to know product labelling.

Specifically, the main objectives of the research were to:

- Determine attitudes towards right to know product labelling legislation;
- Measure the level of public support for legislation requiring clear labelling of products that contain substances linked to an increased risk of cancer;
- Assess pesticide usage;
- Determine the likelihood of using alternatives to chemicals and pesticides;
- Gauge the perceived threat of cosmetic pesticides to the environment, children, pets, and respondents’ own personal health;
- Measure the level of public support for legislation that would restrict the use and sale of cosmetic pesticides;
- Measure awareness of the link between exposure to pesticides and an increased risk of cancer, and determine what impact, if any, this information has on support for legislation phasing-out the use of cosmetic pesticides;
- Measure the level of public support for regulations that would prohibit smoking at various venues;
- Measure the level of public support for regulations that would prohibit the sale of tobacco products in pharmacies and in stores that contain a pharmacy.

In total, 3,200 telephone interviews were conducted with randomly selected adult (18 years or older) British Columbians. Of this, 600 interviews were conducted with a representative BC-wide sample. The remaining 2,600 interviews were distributed evenly across the 13 oversample communities. The final data were weighted to ensure the age/gender/regional distribution reflects that of the actual population in each target area according to the 2006 Census data. All interviews were conducted between the dates of February 5 and 17, 2008. Overall results based on the BC-wide survey (n=600) are accurate to within ±4.0 percentage points, 19 times out of 20. Results for each oversample (n=200) are accurate to within ±6.9 percentage points, 19 times out of 20.
**PRODUCT LABELLING**

**Agreement with Right to Know (Product Labelling) Legislation**

Please tell me the extent to which you personally agree or disagree with the following statement: “Consumers have the right to know the ingredients that are contained in the products they purchase.”

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All of BC</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithers</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualicum Beach/Parksville</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whistler</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Westminster</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Rock</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamloops</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelowna</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kootenay</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Support for Right to Know (Product Labelling) Legislation**

Would you support or oppose your provincial government passing legislation that would require companies and manufacturers to clearly label all of their products that contain substances that have been linked to an increased risk of some cancers?

- Strongly support
- Somewhat support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Strongly Support (%)</th>
<th>Somewhat Support (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All of BC</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithers</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualicum Beach/Parksville</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whistler</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Westminster</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Rock</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamloops</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelowna</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kootenay</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of all British Columbians agree that cosmetic pesticides pose a threat to the environment, children, pets, and their own personal health.
COSMETIC PESTICIDES

Likelihood of Trying Alternative Practices
If you were provided with information and tips on how to have a weed-free and insect-free lawn or garden without using chemicals or pesticides, how likely would you be to try these alternative practices instead of chemicals or pesticides? Would you say …?

- Very likely
- Somewhat likely

Support for Legislation Phasing-Out the Use of Cosmetic Pesticides on Private and Public Properties
Would you support or oppose your local or provincial government passing legislation that would phase-out the use of cosmetic pesticides on private and public properties? Under this legislation, no cosmetic pesticides could be used on private and public lawns or gardens, including parks and recreation facilities, after a phase-out period is over.

- Strongly support
- Somewhat support

Aided Awareness of Pesticide Use and Increased Cancer Risk
Prior to today, were you aware there may be a link between exposure to some components of pesticides and an increased risk of some types of cancer?

- % Yes
TOBACCO CONTROL

Support for Regulations Prohibiting Smoking On Outdoor Patios

Would you support or oppose the provincial government or your local municipal government establishing regulations that would prohibit smoking on outdoor patios of restaurants and bars?

- Strongly support
- Somewhat support

Support for Regulations Prohibiting Smoking Within Seven Metres of Entrances and Windows of Public Places

Would you support or oppose the provincial government or your local municipal government establishing regulations that would prohibit smoking within seven metres of entrances and windows of public places such as malls, workplaces, and restaurants?

- Strongly support
- Somewhat support

Support for Regulations Prohibiting Smoking At Parks and Playgrounds

Would you support or oppose the provincial government or your local municipal government establishing regulations that would prohibit smoking at parks and playgrounds?

- Strongly support
- Somewhat support

BASE: All respondents (N=3,200)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DOCKET</th>
<th>CLIENT</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>COLOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAR 20, 2008</td>
<td>021-2986</td>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>2986_CCS_MLA KIT</td>
<td>11&quot; X 8.5&quot;</td>
<td>PMS 300 + 369 + 109 + K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTACT INFORMATION

In our regional offices, ask for our Community Action or Health Promotions Coordinators:

BC AND YUKON DIVISION
565 West 10th Ave
Vancouver, BC V5Z 4J4
Toll-free: 1.800.663.2524
Telephone: (604) 872.4400
Fax: (604) 675.7336
www.cancer.ca
CONTACT:
The Strategic Initiatives Department

YUKON TERRITORY
#2 – 211 Wood Street
Whitehorse, YT Y1A 2E4
Toll-free: 1.867.668.6440
Telephone: (867) 668.6442
Fax: (867) 668.6442
Email: yukon@bc.cancer.ca

VANCOUVER ISLAND REGION
750 Hillside Ave
Victoria, BC V8T 1Z4
Toll-free: 1.800.663.7892
Telephone: (250) 592.2244
Fax: (250) 382.8130
Email: vanisland@bc.cancer.ca

GREATER VANCOUVER REGION
Suite 230 – 3689 East 1st Ave
Vancouver, BC V5M 1C2
Toll-free: 1.888.229.8288
Telephone: (604) 253.8470
Fax: (604) 253.8403
Email: greatervan@bc.cancer.ca

INTERIOR REGION
1633 Pandosy Street
Kelowna, BC V1Y 1P6
Toll-free: 1.800.403.8222
Telephone: (250) 762.6381
Fax: (250) 762.8855
Email: interior@bc.cancer.ca

FRASER VALLEY REGION
Suite 202 – 20434 64th Ave
Langley, BC V2Y 1N4
Toll-free: 1.888.222.2240
Telephone: (604) 533.1668
Fax: (604) 533.8511
Email: fraservalley@bc.cancer.ca

KOOTENAY REGION
19 – 9th Avenue South
Cranbrook, BC V1C 2L9
Toll-free: 1.800.656.6426
Telephone: (250) 426.8916
Fax: (250) 426.3947
Email: kootenay@bc.cancer.ca

NORTHERN REGION
Suite 300 – 500 Victoria St
Prince George, BC V2L 2J9
Toll-free: 1.800.811.5666
Telephone: (250) 564.0885
Fax: (250) 563.0385
Email: north@bc.cancer.ca