

Questions for Peter Goodhand, CEO, Canadian Cancer Society

1. **Other collaborations?** CCS has developed partnerships with other health organizations over the past year or two to focus more on primary prevention, such as the *Take Charge on Toxics* campaign in Ontario, and your national collaboration with the Canadian Lung Association and the Heart & Stroke Foundation for *right to know* legislation and action on air quality. These are excellent initiatives. Are there others in the works on a national level that focus on ‘environmental’ connections to cancer?

2. **Plan for primary prevention?** The Canadian Cancer Society has developed several new policies and positions based on primary prevention of cancer over the past 10 years, beyond the ‘lifestyle’ messages that focus on tobacco, diet, alcohol and physical exercise. There are hundreds of known and possible carcinogens to which Canadians are involuntarily exposed in numerous environments – in homes, schools, workplaces, in proximity to traffic – as well as in personal products, conventional foods and in pharmaceuticals, etc. Does CCS have a strategic plan for primary prevention that integrates these factors, and educates the general public about their risks, their possible synergistic effects and health consequences, and how to eliminate or minimize them? Why do the words ‘carcinogen’ and ‘environment’ rarely appear together in CCS public literature about cancer?

3. **Budget for primary prevention?** What percentage of the CCS annual budget is devoted to primary prevention; how much of this budget is devoted to environmental and occupational links to cancer. Are there plans to increase funding for primary prevention, especially environmental/occupational carcinogen issues?

4. **In utero exposures?** A growing body of evidence now links cancer in children, adolescents and adulthood with *in utero* exposure to carcinogens and hormone disruptors. Does CCS have plans to incorporate this knowledge into messages to the general public and others, and to develop recommended policy for governments and regulators to eliminate or minimize these hazards?

5. **Healthier prizes?** At times it appears that CCS and other cancer agencies seem unaware of the contradictory messages they give Canadians. In Ontario, for example, the annual ‘Driven to Quit’ campaign that encourage smokers to quit offers cars as the grand prize. While these vehicles are now *hybrids* – a better option! - they still use fossil fuels that contain or create (through fossil fuel combustion) numerous carcinogens known to endanger public health. Would CCS consider healthier types of prizes that more suitably reflect its mission?

6. **Personal care products?** Does CCS endorse or participate in the *Look Good, Feel Better* program as the American Cancer Society does? As CCS knows, there have been many concerns raised over the past several years about harmful and sometimes carcinogenic ingredients in personal care products and cosmetics. If not directly involved in *Look Good, Feel Better*, would CCS consider using its considerable influence and moral suasion to encourage the *Look Good, Feel Better* program to use only the safest (preferably organic) cosmetics that do not contain phthalates, formaldehyde, parabens, 1,4 dioxane and other toxic substances?

7. Precautionary Principle? We are delighted that the Canadian Cancer Society officially adopted the Precautionary Principle several years ago. Can you explain how CCS applies this principle in developing its policies and practices? Could you cite some examples of decisions CCS has made based on the Precautionary Principle? We understand that the CCS ornamental pesticide policy was based to some degree on the precautionary principle; if this is true, why does this not extend to agricultural pesticides?

8. Policy on corporate donations? CCS has several corporate partners/sponsors marketing products that contain known or possible carcinogens, such as Carpet One (vinyl, various petrochemicals), Bialetti cookware (Teflon), Energizer (heavy metals such as cadmium, mercury, lead), Procter & Gamble (dioxin in rayon products, parabens and phthalates in cosmetics), and others such as General Motors and Petro Canada. What is the CCS policy on accepting donations from corporations in this regard? Would you consider establishing a 'green screen' to ensure that future donors are companies producing products carrying the EcoLogo, or similar third-party 'green' stamp of approval?

9. Chemicals Management Plan – submissions and press releases. The federal government is currently reviewing approximately 200 toxic industrial substances under the *Challenge Program of the Chemicals Management Plan*. For these substances, the government has focused on health outcomes such as carcinogenicity (or having the potential to be carcinogenic), neuro-developmental toxins, and endocrine disruptors. Considering these health endpoints, is CCS planning to submit written comments to the federal government on the risk assessment and risk management of these toxic substances? Also, will CCS comment on the assessment and management of these toxic chemicals through press releases?

