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This booklet will assist community organizations and individuals in participating in the development of regulations under the federal Tobacco Act (1977).

The information is presented in three sections:

Section 1: provides an overview of the marketing of cigarettes and profiles the British Columbia cigarette market. A brief outline of the Tobacco Act is also provided.

Section 2: focuses on the promotion of cigarettes through advertising, sponsorship and retail promotion. Relevant research on specific regulatory approaches is also provided.

Section 3: reviews ways to regulate information provided on and in cigarette packages.

While the production of this booklet was supported by the British Columbia Ministry of Health and Ministry Responsible for Seniors, the opinions, errors and omissions are the responsibility of the authors.

Further information on how to comment on draft regulations, or otherwise participate in their development can be obtained through the Office of Tobacco Control, Health Canada, (613) 941 2423. Many of the reports referenced in this booklet can be found on Health Canada’s web-site at www.hc-sc.gc.ca/datahpb/data/end/english/tobacco/tobacco.htm

With other questions or comments, please call Physicians for a Smoke-Free Canada, (613) 233-4878.
CIGARETTE SALES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

The Tobacco Products Control Act (TPCA, 1988) required all Canadian tobacco manufacturers to provide data to the government on wholesale shipments for each brand to each Canadian province. This section of the TPCA was upheld by the Supreme Court, and was in force until the TPCA was replaced by the Tobacco Act in April 1997. The new Act has similar provisions, and the industry has continued to provide market data to Health Canada.

This data provides a reliable basis for estimates on:
- Market share of each brand
- Per capita consumption of cigarettes

Only the data from Canada’s three major tobacco companies (Imperial Tobacco, Rothmans, Benson & Hedges and RJR-Macdonald) are made public. Market information from the smaller companies which together account for a tiny percentage of the cigarette market is not released.

Data provided to Health Canada under the provisions of the TPCA let us know the following about the cigarette market in British Columbia in 1996:

- Of the 166 types of cigarette sold in Canada, 117 are available in British Columbia. [Players Medium King Size Filter and Players Medium Regular Filter would be two examples of cigarettes types, even though both belong to the Players brand family].
- A majority of the cigarettes sold in British Columbia (57%) are labelled “light,” “extra-light,” “mild”, “ultra-mild,” or with similar descriptors.
- 4.3% of the cigarettes sold in British Columbia are menthol.
- The most popular selling cigarette in British Columbia is Players Light Regular Filter (13.7% market share). The second and third most popular are du Maurier King Size Filter and Players Regular Filter (6% each)
- The most popular brand family of manufactured cigarettes is Players. One in three cigarettes sold in B.C. is a Player’s Cigarette.
## Market Share of Cigarette Brands

### British Columbia - 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Market Share – Manufactured Cigarettes</th>
<th>Market Share – Fine Cut Tobacco</th>
<th>Total Market (000s of Cigarettes and fine cut equivalents)</th>
<th>Total Market Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperial Tobacco</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>58,760</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duMaurier</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>822,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Players</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>1671,930</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matinee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>296,040</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>54,860</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35.06</td>
<td>2,904,086</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RJR MacDonald

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Market Share – Manufactured Cigarettes</th>
<th>Market Share – Fine Cut Tobacco</th>
<th>Total Market (000s of Cigarettes and fine cut equivalents)</th>
<th>Total Market Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.22</td>
<td>676,990</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vantage</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macdonald</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>15,700</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.22</td>
<td>702,685</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rothmans, Benson & Hedges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Market Share – Manufactured Cigarettes</th>
<th>Market Share – Fine Cut Tobacco</th>
<th>Total Market (000s of Cigarettes and fine cut equivalents)</th>
<th>Total Market Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benson &amp; Hedges</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>199,860</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Classic</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>29,840</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothmans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>216,610</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craven A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>311,260</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsman</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>18,980</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39.19</td>
<td>414,360</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>64.180</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>287,350</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47.72</td>
<td>1,322,441</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Market Share – Manufactured Cigarettes</th>
<th>Market Share – Fine Cut Tobacco</th>
<th>Total Market (000s of Cigarettes and fine cut equivalents)</th>
<th>Total Market Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperial Tobacco</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>58,760</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duMaurier</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>822,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Players</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>1671,930</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matinee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>296,040</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>54,860</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35.06</td>
<td>2,904,086</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Market Share (%)- Canada

- Imperial Tobacco: 30.0
- RJR MacDonald: 28.2
- Rothmans, Benson & Hedges: 34.4

### Market Share (%)- British Columbia

- Imperial Tobacco: 33.4
- RJR MacDonald: 47.7
- Rothmans, Benson & Hedges: 22.9

---
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• The most commonly sold brand of fine-cut tobacco is Number 7, which is often sold in easily assembled tobacco-sticks (manufactured by Rothmans, Benson & Hedges).

• Imperial Tobacco sells almost three times as many manufactured cigarettes as its nearest competitor (Rothmans Benson & Hedges).

• Approximately 15% of the cigarettes smoked in British Columbia are not manufactured, but are assembled by smokers from “roll-your-own” tobacco. This is about 5% higher than the Canadian average of around 10%.

• Per capita consumption of cigarettes continues to decline in British Columbia, although it remains relatively stable in the rest of Canada.

These per capita figures are based on legal sales of cigarettes. Including the consumption of smuggled cigarettes would raise per capita consumption. Reliable data on smuggled cigarettes is not available at this time.
THE **TOBACCO ACT (1997)**

The **Tobacco Act** (C-71) was introduced in Parliament in December 1996, fifteen months after the Supreme Court of Canada struck down many provisions of the **Tobacco Products Control Act** (TPCA, 1988). The tobacco industry had challenged the total ban on cigarette advertising enacted through the TPCA, claiming it was an infringement of their Charter-protected freedoms of expression. The Court agreed that the freedoms of the cigarette companies had been affected, and ruled that the government had not provided enough evidence to demonstrate that a total ban was necessary (and that a partial ban would not be sufficient).

In drafting the new **Tobacco Act**, Health Canada chose to move away from a total ban on advertising, and to restrict cigarette advertising in other ways. The new act blends a few explicit prohibitions, some explicit permissions and a large number of regulatory constraints. The main powers of the **Act** are found both in what is required through the legislation, and in the regulations the **Act** authorizes the government to pass.

**The Purpose of the Tobacco Act:**

The four main goals of the **Tobacco Act**, as defined in the law, are:

- To restrict young persons’ access to cigarettes
- To protect young persons and others from inducements to smoke;
- To protect the health of Canadians from diseases caused by tobacco; and
- To enhance public awareness of the health hazards associated with cigarettes and other tobacco products.

**The Provisions of the Tobacco Act:**

The **Tobacco Act** gives the federal government extensive authority over the manufacture, the promotion, the packaging and the retailing of cigarettes. The law specifies some prohibited activities (i.e. cigarette sales people under 18). It specifies some permitted activities (i.e. advertisements that aren’t lifestyle or youth-oriented advertisements in periodicals with a readership of at least 85% adult). But most of its authority lies in the power it gives to government to pass regulations.
Cigarette and Tobacco Promotion

♦ Tobacco advertising is limited to print ads in publications with mainly adult readership, ads in adult-only venues and ads sent through direct mailings. No lifestyle or youth-oriented ads are permitted.
♦ Celebrity endorsements are banned.
♦ The use of cigarette logos in the sale of services and non-tobacco goods (like knapsacks or clothing) is restricted, and in some cases banned.
♦ Free distribution of cigarettes is banned.
♦ Some sales promotions (i.e. coupons and gifts) are banned.
♦ Sponsorship promotion is limited (as of October 1, 1998).
♦ Regulations are authorized over:
  - Form, manner and conditions of tobacco promotion and advertising.
  - Form, manner and conditions of promotion of services and non-tobacco products which have tobacco logos and names on them.
  - Use of a tobacco name or logo on buildings and permanent facilities.
  - Use of a tobacco name or logo on lighters and matches.
  - Display of tobacco products and accessories at retail.
  - Information that manufacturers must provide to the government concerning tobacco promotion.

Cigarette manufacture

♦ The Tobacco Act requires that the manufacture of cigarettes conform with standards established by regulation.
♦ Regulations are authorized over:
  - Standards for tobacco products generally.
  - Amounts of substances in cigarettes or cigarette smoke.
  - Substances that may not be added to tobacco products.
  - Test methods, including methods to assess conformity with standards.
  - Information that manufacturers must provide to the Minister about tobacco products.

Packaging and Labelling

♦ The Tobacco Act prohibits “false” or “misleading” claims on tobacco packages
♦ Regulations are authorized over:
  - Information that must appear on packages.
  - Information that must appear in leaflets.
Sale and Distribution

♦ Sale of cigarettes to young persons under 18 is banned.
♦ ‘Kiddy packs’ (packages under 20) are banned.
♦ Vending machines may only be in a bar or a place to which the public does not reasonably have access.
♦ Mail order sales are forbidden.
♦ Self-service displays are banned.
♦ Regulations are authorized:
  ▪ To require warning and other signs at retail
  ▪ Defining minimum package size of cigars, chewing tobacco, etc.
  ▪ Regulating display of tobacco products and accessories
  ▪ Regulating size, content, number and placement of price signs

Reporting Requirements

The Tobacco Act allows the government to require cigarette companies to report on:

¬ The contents of cigarettes and other tobacco products, and the emissions in smoke.
¬ Any promotional activities
¬ Sales data.
¬ Hazardous properties of tobacco products.

The Tobacco Act and Parliament: Requirement to consult

The House of Commons has special responsibilities and powers to review any regulation drafted under the provisions of the Tobacco Act. All proposed regulations must be tabled in the House, which then has 30 days to review and amend them. [Tobacco Act, s. 42].

References and resources:


Regulatory power over advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tobacco Act Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The Governor in Council may make regulations...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Requiring manufacturers to reveal how they promote, where they promote and how much they spend.

- Constraining any advertising permitted by the legislation (such as a requirement for health warnings on the advertising)

- Limiting how big cigarette names can be on sponsored buildings

- Limiting how brand names are used in promotional material for sponsored events

- Defining a ‘site’ where sponsorship promotion can be displayed

- Regulating use of brand elements on matches, lighters and other accessories

---

### Regulatory Powers over manufacture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishing levels for cigarette &amp; smoke ingredients</td>
<td>s. 7(a)(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibiting additives</td>
<td>s. 7(a)(ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing test methods to determine nicotine, tar and other levels</td>
<td>s. 7(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Powers over packaging and labelling</td>
<td>Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requiring certain information to be printed on packages or leaflets, i.e.</td>
<td>s. 17(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Toxic constituent labelling</td>
<td>s. 17(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Warning labels</td>
<td>s. 17(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Informational leaflets</td>
<td>s. 17(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Packaging (including plain packaging)</td>
<td>s. 23, 33(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Powers over sale and distribution</th>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Requiring warning and other signs in retail stores.</td>
<td>s. 14( c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Defining minimum package size of cigars, chewing tobacco, etc.</td>
<td>s. 14(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regulating retail display of tobacco products and accessories</td>
<td>s. 33(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regulating size, content, number and placement of price signs at retail</td>
<td>s. 33(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Powers to require reporting</td>
<td>Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The contents of cigarettes and other tobacco products</td>
<td>“The Governor in Council may make regulations…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sales data</td>
<td>s. 7 (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hazardous properties of cigarettes and tobacco products</td>
<td>s. 7 (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotional activities</td>
<td>s. 33 (h)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Authority**

Prescribing information that manufacturers must provide to the Minister about tobacco products and their emissions, including sales data and information on product composition, ingredients, hazardous properties and brand elements;

Prescribing information that manufacturers must provide to the Minister about tobacco products and their emissions, including sales data and information on product composition, ingredients, hazardous properties and brand elements;

Requiring manufacturers to disclose the particulars of their tobacco product-related brand elements and promotional activities;
Direct and Sponsorship Advertising

Direct advertising is the most commonly understood marketing tool. For historic reasons, however, sponsorship advertising has become the most common form of cigarette advertising in Canada. Because tobacco companies use sponsorship advertising to replace direct advertising, and because sponsorship advertising is often perceived by children as advertising for cigarettes [1], it is appropriate to consider regulations for these two forms of marketing at the same time.

The Tobacco Act restricts direct and sponsorship advertising of cigarette in the following ways:

A. Restrictions on Location

Under the Tobacco Act, direct advertisements for cigarettes and other tobacco products are restricted to:

- Publications with at least 85% adult readership
- Direct mail to adults
- Places where only adults are allowed by law (i.e. bars in some provinces)

Sponsorship advertisements using tobacco brand names (for sponsorships with lifestyle or youth appeal∗) are restricted after October 1, 1998 to:

- Publications with at least 85% adult readership
- Direct mail to adults
- Places where only adults are allowed by law
- On signs or programmes available on the site of the sponsored event, activity or facility. [The Tobacco Act defines neither ‘sign’ nor ‘site’, although such definitions can be established by regulation].

The Act does not allow the government to make restrictions on the ‘sight-lines’ of television cameras, although the Canadian Radio Television and Communications Commission has the powers to make such restrictions.

There are no legislative restrictions on the location of sponsorship advertising for events without lifestyle or youth appeal.

∗ Sponsored events with lifestyle or youth appeal are considered to be those “associated with young persons or could be construed on reasonable grounds to be appealing to young persons or if young persons are its primary beneficiaries; or is associated with a way of life such as one that includes glamour, recreation, excitement, vitality, risk or daring.
See section 22, 24(3), (4) and 66 of the Tobacco Act.

B. Restrictions on Content

Direct tobacco advertisements may be:

- **Information advertising**
  (defined as “advertising that provides factual information to the consumer about (a) a product and its characteristics; or (b) the availability or price of a product or brand of product, (s. 22(4)).

- **Brand-preference advertising**
  (defined as "advertising that promotes a tobacco product by means of its brand characteristics." (s 22(4)).

Direct tobacco advertisements may not be:

- **Life-style advertising**
  (defined as “advertising that associates a product with, or evokes a positive or negative emotion about or image of, a way of life such as one that includes glamour, recreation, excitement, vitality, risk or daring. (ss 22(4)).

- **Appealing to young persons**
  See section 22 of the Tobacco Act.

Sponsorship advertising (for events with lifestyle or youth appeal)

- **May only display tobacco product brand elements within the bottom ten percent of the display surface of any promotional material.**

  See sections 24(2) of the Tobacco Act.

Health Canada provides this example of sponsorship advertisement allowed under the Tobacco Act before regulations are implemented.

It demonstrates:
- Restrictions of brand name to bottom 10%
- Allowable use of lifestyle imagery on sponsorship ads
- Absence of health warnings
- Appearance of people in sponsorship ads.
C. Other restrictions

Health Canada has the power to regulate additional conditions for direct tobacco advertisements. Such regulations could:

- Require text warnings
- Require graphic warnings
- Restrict colour, type-face, style.

See sections 22(2) and 33 of the Tobacco Act.

Health Canada also has the power to regulate sponsorship advertisements. Such regulations could:

- Require text warnings
- Require graphic warnings
- Restrict colour, type-face, style
- Restrict the use of human figures
- Define allowable ‘signs’ for on-site advertising
- Define allowable ‘sites’ for promotional signs

See sections 24(1) and (4) and 33(c),(i)and (j) of the Tobacco Act.

An illustrated history of recent cigarette advertising

Over the past decade, there have been four legal treatments of cigarette advertising. A review of marketing promotions for Export A cigarettes during this period shows that lifestyle promotion has continued under each legal regime.

Prior to January 1, 1989

- There were no legal restrictions on cigarette advertisements.
- Tobacco companies refrained from direct advertising on television or radio
- Models and other images were allowed to convey lifestyle associations.
- Health warnings were placed voluntarily by tobacco companies (in small print).
1988 – 1995:
• The Tobacco Products Control Act banned all direct advertisements.
• Shell companies (such as Players Racing Inc.) were able to place sponsorship advertisements.
• There were no restrictions on where these ads could appear, and ads appeared on television.
• Health warnings were not included.

September 1995 – April 1997:
• The decision of the Supreme Court to strike down the Tobacco Products Control Act created a legal void for tobacco advertisements.
• The industry voluntarily refrained from portraying human figures in direct advertising, although other images were used to convey lifestyle associations.
• Health warnings were placed voluntarily.

April 1997 –
• The Tobacco Act restricts tobacco advertising (tobacco industry refrains from placing any direct ads)
• Sponsorship advertisements continue to convey human figures in lifestyle association
• No health warning is required on either direct or sponsorship advertising, and tobacco companies do not place one voluntarily.
These examples show that without additional regulatory restrictions, the sponsorship advertisements allowed under the *Tobacco Act* could be equally dangerous inducements to smoke as those produced in a total absence of law or regulation in 1996.

## Research on advertising and promotion

### A. Environics Research, 1996 and 1997

In 1997, Health Canada commissioned Environics Research [2] to study tobacco advertising warning labels and to:

- assess whether health warning labels on the bottom 10% of cigarette print ads were effective
- explore alternatives for making the warning labels more effective
- test public reaction to the use of symbols or icons used with warnings

Environics found:

- Health warnings at the bottom of the page were found to be “completely ineffective” by focus group participants of all ages.
- Warning labels could be improved by:
  - Using contrasting colours
  - Making the font size of the lettering bigger
  - Increasing the amount of space devoted to the message
  - Changing the position of the message
- Virtually all participants agreed that the use of icons made the warnings more eye-catching and therefore more effective than the current bottom-of-the-page format.
- Among those icons presented, lungs and skull and cross bones elicited the most positive response, followed by the tombstone and coffin. The use of a death certificate and toe-tags were widely rejected.

### B. Health Canada Policy Analysis

During the development of the *Tobacco Act*, Health Canada advisors were acutely aware of the irony of banning lifestyle images in direct cigarette advertising while allowing it to continue on sponsorship advertising.

In a long and thoughtful analysis [3], Health Canada’s advisors stressed the importance of diminishing the impact of event marketing by requiring warning labels and other restrictions.

> “Viewed from the perspective of the Supreme Court’s guidance, *tobacco event marketing as currently practiced is clearly lifestyle marketing* of tobacco product brand names and brand-
identifiable insignia, or visual reminders of cigarette brand identity. If it is to be treated for reasons of policy symmetry in exactly the same way as product advertising... then tobacco sponsorship advertising would be banned completely, since 'lifestyle' elements would be completely eliminated.

Alternatively, sponsorship advertising could be required to display only certain limited brand-identifiable elements, or an omnibus health message similar to that required on advertisements that depict the product or package. Such a requirement might be justified by appeal to consistency with the policy principle that marketing impact considerations take precedence over considerations of marketing intentions.” [p. 93, emphasis added.]

C. Youth Smoking Survey

The impact of the event-marketing of cigarette brands was measured by Health Canada during its 1994 Youth Smoking Survey, which asked a number of questions of children 10 – 19 years of age about their knowledge and impressions of tobacco promotion. This survey [1] quoted by Health Canada [3, p. 44] showed:

- “About one half of all youth aged 10-14 and slightly over half of those aged 15-19 report seeing advertisements for events sponsored by tobacco brand-name corporations.

- Nearly two-third (63%) of youth who noticed and could recall these promotions saw them on television, where tobacco product advertising has been non-existent since 1972.

- Over 80 per cent of teens agreed that sponsorship promotions are a way of advertising the sponsoring brands of cigarettes.”
Regulatory Issues

A. Defining ‘sites’ and ‘signs’ for permitted on-site promotion

Jazz festivals, fireworks displays, tennis matches, equestrian events and other sponsored events allow Canadian cigarette companies to market an image and brand name to:

- Those who go to the event site
- Those who watch the event on television or listen on radio.
- Those who watch news reports of the event.

Many cigarette-sponsored events take place in sites which are not well or easily defined. For example:

- Benson & Hedges fireworks festival takes place on water fronts in Vancouver, Montreal and Toronto.
- Du Maurier Jazz festivals take place in privates clubs and city streets in Vancouver, Montreal and Toronto
- Molson Indy race takes place on city streets in Vancouver and Toronto.
- Players’ Grand Prix includes dances and other events held in private clubs and city streets in Montreal.
- Canadian Classics white water rafting takes place on public rivers in British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec.
- Craven A Country music takes place on radio stations.

These 1997 photos illustrate some of the questions facing Health Canada regulators:

- What is the ‘site’ of an event?
  What regulations are needed to avoid the permanent display of promotional material on city streets?
  Are the public airwaves the ‘site’ of a televised concert? If so, what regulations are needed to protect against a return to television advertising of cigarette brands?

- What is a ‘sign’?
  What regulations are needed to minimize the use of signs to get cigarette brand names on television?
B. Regulating Advertising in Bars and Taverns

The Tobacco Act allows cigarette promotion and sponsorship promotions to continue in bars and other places where “young persons are not permitted by law.”

Increased tobacco advertising in bars could result in increased rates of smoking relapse. For the smoker trying to quit, drinking in bars is a seductive blend of alcohol-induced relaxation and socializing in smoking-friendly circumstances. Recent published research has shown that “drinking appears to prompt smoking in real-life situations… data consistently demonstrate that alcohol consumption may precipitate smoking relapse.”

There is good reason to believe that cigarette marketing in bars and taverns will also lead to increased smoking rates among adolescents and young adults. There is a strong association between drinking and smoking among youth: a recent Nova Scotia survey showed that over half of all high school students who drank also smoked cigarettes; and that only one in ten high school students who smoked didn’t report drinking. [6]

Restricting tobacco ads to bars will not prevent young persons from seeing them. Children may not be permitted in bars – but they enter and are served drinks nonetheless. These precocious youths may be the most vulnerable to tobacco promotion. There are many areas where children are not permitted, but which are clearly visible to children from the outside. Tobacco promotion which appears on the windows of bars and taverns, or on sidewalk taverns, would be in this category.

Tobacco companies already advertise in bars and taverns. Associating smoking and drinking ads to the ‘adult’ allure of cigarettes to young persons. Allowing these ads to increase or to remain unregulated increases the risk of drinking places providing one-stop shopping to children who wish to become instant adults through drinking and smoking.
Regulatory Options

Health Canada can adopt the following regulatory measures to diminish the impact of tobacco advertising (both direct and sponsorship):

**For print advertising and sponsorship advertising**

- Require health warnings on all print promotions.

- Increase the effectiveness of health warnings on print advertisements as suggested by Health Canada research:
  - Prominent display (i.e. not along bottom).
  - Use of new warning messages.
  - Use of icons (scull, tombstone and coffin) to frame warning messages
  - Adequate proportions of advertising space (i.e. 33%-50%).
  - Use of pictures on health warnings (i.e. diseased lung).

- Direct ads and “corporate” ads for sponsorship (i.e. Matinee Fashion Foundation) should be in text only, in a prescribed font.

**For On-Site Promotions:**

- Strict limits on the size and definition of ‘sign’ (i.e. printed on paper no larger than 3 square metres).

- Clear limits on the allowable time for the posting of any sign (i.e. no earlier than 24 hours before the beginning of an event, and no later than 24 hours after the end of the event.)

- Prohibition on the use of brand identifiable colours in the upper part of allowed signs (i.e. the signs for du Maurier Tennis could not be predominantly red).
• Requirement that on-site promotional signage not be visible from off-site.

• Strict definition on ‘site’ of sponsored event, i.e.
  • No broadcasts (i.e. Craven A country music concerts)
  • No public property (i.e. public streets for Jazz festivals, or harbourfronts for fireworks displays)

For promotion in bars and other adult-only venues

• Strict limits on the size and definition of allowed promotions (i.e. printed on paper no larger than 2 square feet).

• Requirements for health warnings on all forms of promotion.

• Requirement that no promotional material for cigarettes can be seen by anyone outside the premises (i.e. no window signs, nothing on outside tables).

• Prohibition on specialty programming sponsored by tobacco companies (such as trivia games or racing programmes currently in bars).

For reporting requirements

• Requirements that tobacco companies provide details on all forms of promotional activities. Included in these can be:
  • location of promotion.
  • brand being promotion.
  • market research in association with promotion
  • cash transfers and in-kind support to sponsored activities.
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Retailers generate earnings from cigarette sales in two ways: they make a profit on each package or carton of cigarettes sold, and they receive payments for renting space in their store for cigarette promotions.

Promotional displays commonly found in British Columbia stores include:

- **Counter-top displays**
  
  *Few children could miss this display of Matinee cigarettes. It is placed at children’s eye level beside the cash register and surrounded by candies.*

- **Display Shelving**
  
  *Not all these cigarettes are for sale: the ones on the top shelf are for display purposes only.*

- **Interior Signs**
  
  *This poster for Rothman hero Jacques Villeneuve is placed just above a rack of comic adventure books.*
Signs directed to passers-by

This advertisement for Craven A cigarettes is placed four feet above the ground – just at the eye level of young children.

Retailer Profit from Promoting Cigarettes

Canadian cigarette firms voluntarily reported to Health Canada that in 1996-96 they spent approximately $60 million in retail promotions. In addition to cash payments to retailers, they also provide discounts on cigarettes, free shelving and other incentives.

If B.C. retailers receive payments proportional to their sales, then roughly $5 million is spent by tobacco companies to promote cigarettes at retail level in B.C. This is slightly more than 5% the money earned by B.C. retailers from cigarette sales.

There are no published studies on point of purchase promotions of cigarettes in Canada. U.S. studies [1] report that:

- Point of purchase advertising is the fastest growing category of advertising for tobacco companies since 1971.
- Tobacco companies spend more than any other industry on point of purchase advertising.
- Tobacco purchases increase by as much as 28% with point of purchase advertising.

A survey by Washington state health volunteers [2] of local retailers found that:

- Stores near schools had more tobacco ads – both inside and outside – than stores further away from schools.
- Stores near schools were more likely to place tobacco ads near candy sections.
- Stores near schools were more likely to place ads at a child’s eye level.
New retail initiatives

Many retailers refuse to sell cigarettes (i.e. Eaton’s and Walmart). Other stores which do sell cigarettes refrain from promoting. For example, many grocery stores no longer display cigarettes near their check-out areas.

Some B.C. branches of the international chain Macs Milk have gone further, and have removed virtually all forms of cigarette promotion. Cigarettes in some of the “design 2000” stores are kept under the counter and out of sight of children.

Restrictions under the Tobacco Act

The Tobacco Act bans self-serve displays as a means of limiting youth access. Section 11 of the Act says:

11. No person, unless exempted by the regulations, shall sell a tobacco product by means of a display that permits a person to handle the tobacco product before paying for it.

In 1995, the federal government proposed in its “Blueprint on Tobacco Control” to restrict the display of cigarette packages to one package per brand. The current Act does not include any such legislative requirement, although such measures could be required by regulation.

Section 33 of the Act authorizes regulations:

(f) respecting the display of tobacco products and accessories at retail.

The Tobacco Act bans the display of any direct cigarette advertisement at retail level. Some sponsorship promotions will be banned after October 1, 1998. Even after that date, retail promotions for sponsored events or services which are not directed at youth will be permitted. [See sections 24(4) and 28].
Under the Act, the government could also require health warnings on any retail promotions, and require the posting of health warning signs in all retail outlets.

9. Every retailer shall post, at retail, in the prescribed place an manner, signs in the prescribed form and with the prescribed content, that inform the public that the sale or giving of a tobacco product to a young person is prohibited by law, or that contain a prescribed health message, unless that retailer is exempted by the regulations from the requirement to post the signs.

The Act also gives the government the authority to require tobacco companies to file a full report on all forms of retail promotion. Section 33 of the Act gives the government the power to pass regulations:

(h) requiring manufacturers to disclose the particulars of their tobacco product-related brand elements and promotional activities.

Regulatory Options

The federal government can take the following steps to protect children from cigarette promotions at retail levels:

- Restrict the number of cigarettes on display
- Ban counter-top displays
- Ban all retail level promotions for any events or services permitted after October 1, 1998.
- Require reports on all promotional activities at retail level.
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MATCHES, LIGHTERS AND OTHER ACCESSORIES

Tobacco companies know that matches and lighters are ideal ways to promote their cigarette brands. They are inexpensive, they are used in highly visible ways and in smoking-friendly circumstances. Even when they are thrown away and litter the streets, they continue to promote cigarettes to passers-by.

Many children are also highly attracted to matches and lighters. Like cigarettes, these are the forbidden fruit of adulthood. "If you think lighting matches is naughty and fun," says the cigarette logo on the match-pack to the youngster, "wait till you try smoking."

The Tobacco Act allows cigarette brand names to be used on matches, lighters and other smoking accessories, but imposes some restrictions.

- Cigarette-brand accessories may only be advertised under the same rules as cigarettes (i.e. in bars, through direct mail and in magazines, but not on billboards or directly in stores).
- Cigarette-brand accessories may not be given away as free promotion.
- The government has the right to regulate the use of cigarette brand names on accessories.
- The government has the right to regulate how cigarette-brand accessories are displayed for sale.
- The government has the right to demand details of how cigarette-brand accessories are sold.

(See sections 26, 29 and 33(e), (f) and (h) of the Tobacco Act for precise wording.)
Example: Match covers used to market cigarettes

Rothmans, Benson & Hedges uses the match box to advertise that Canadian Classics are:

- “Pure”
- “100% Canadian”
- “Additive-Free”
- Part of a wilderness life
- As Canadian as hockey and the great outdoors
- A good brand for fun-loving outdoors types.
Regulatory Options

The federal government can take the following steps to reduce the advertising impact of these promotional items. It can:

- Require health warnings on all cigarette-brand matches and lighters, and on any advertisements for them.
- Forbid brand-identifiable colours, and require that all cigarette-brand accessories are in black-and-white or generic colours.
- Require generic-style font for cigarette-brand names on all matches and cigarettes.
- Limit how cigarette-brand matches and lighters are displayed at retail (i.e. not in prominent displays near the cash-register where children are most likely to see them).
SPONSORED BUILDINGS

Over the past decade, a number of permanent sports and cultural facilities have been named after cigarette brands. Some of these are rooms within larger centres (such as the duMaurier studio at Place des Arts in Montreal, the Stade du Maruier tennis facility in Montreal, or the du Maurier Theatre at Harbourfront.)

The Tobacco Act permits buildings to carry tobacco-brand names. Section 25 of the act provides that:

*If a tobacco product-related brand element is part of the name of a permanent facility, the tobacco product-related brand element may appear on the facility in accordance with the regulations.*

Section 33(d) gives the government the authority to pass regulations

*Prescribing the manner in which a tobacco product-related brand element may appear on permanent facility.*

The Act does not define a permanent facility, nor does it limit which permanent facilities can be named after cigarettes. In the absence of regulations, cigarette brand names could return to cornerstores (where they were common until 1989).

Regulations under this section of the Act can reduce the promotional impact of current facilities and curb the establishment of further permanent promotional facilities.

*Is this kiosk a permanent facility within the meaning of the Tobacco Act? Without regulations, it could be.*
Tobacco companies use both the inside and outside of cigarette packages to reach smokers. Governments can too.

The Tobacco Act, like its predecessor the Tobacco Products Control Act, contemplates package inserts. It allows the government to require information leaflets, including those in cigarette packages. Manufacturers who fail to comply face a fine up to $300,000 and/or two years’ imprisonment. [Exact wording of the requirement can be found in sections 15(2), (3) and 17(a) of the Tobacco Act].

Tobacco control agencies within Health Canada have proposed package leaflets as a way of increasing smokers’ knowledge of health effects for almost ten years. Almost a decade ago, leaflets were designed; regulations drafted and public opinion tested. Deputy Minister approval was obtained. [1]

Imperial Tobacco recently used package inserts to promote its new Player’s Premiere brand.

Claims for ‘reduced irritation’ continue a tradition of providing supposedly more palatable – although equally deadly – cigarettes to smokers who might be thinking of quitting because of sore throats and other smoking symptoms.

This leaflet is shown at 70% actual size
Sadly, these proposals have not yet been implemented. In the meantime, tobacco companies have continued to include package inserts to diminish smokers concerns, or to lead smokers to believe that new cigarette designs are less harmful.

Health Canada development of package inserts, 1989-1990


♦ On November 7, 1988, Health Canada sent an information letter (no. 754) to tobacco companies suggesting “a leaflet to be placed inside packages of tobacco products.”

♦ On May 12, 1989, senior health consultant to the Environmental Health Directorate (G.E. MacDonald) recommended “Effective June 1, 1990, leaflets carrying information relative to the health effects of tobacco products be placed inside the packages of cigarettes. The information on the leaflet inserts be modified and updated every four months.”

♦ On November 10, 1989, the Director General of the Environmental Health Director (J.R. Hickman) sought the approval of the Assistant Deputy Minister of Health Protection Branch (A.J. Liston) to develop package inserts “somewhat longer health message than would fit on the exterior label … printed at a specified size and prominence as a package insert.”

♦ On December 6, 1989, A/Head of Tobacco Products Section (Byron Rogers) wrote a briefing note on the Current Status of Tobacco Control Policy. He noted that the second round of regulations under the TPCA, expected to begin in early 1990 would provide for “the first package insert [which] will display a longer health message, as per sub-section 9(1)/(b/) of the Act, at the Minister’s discretion.”

♦ On December 6, 1990, the Director General of the Environmental Health Director (J.R. Hickman) provided the Assistant Deputy Minister of Health Protection Branch (A.J. Liston) with draft regulations covering new health warnings, toxic constituent labelling and package leaflets. The government has not explained why it dropped package leaflets when the other regulations were subsequently Gazetted.
These regulations to require package inserts were finalized by Health Canada's Health Protection Branch in December 1990, and made public for the first time through Access to Information in October 1997.

It is not known who overturned this advice, or on what basis. A sample of the required leaflets is shown beneath. The seven other leaflets are shown at the end of this section.
Public opinion research

In 1992, three health agencies commissioned a poll from Insight Canada Research on a variety of tobacco-related issues. 83% of the 3,200 Canadians surveyed supported requiring manufacturers to place more detailed warnings about the risks of tobacco use inside cigarette packages. [2].

Regulatory options

The federal government can take the following steps to improve smokers' knowledge of the risks of smoking and ways to quit by:

- Requiring that each cigarette package contain supplementary health information printed on an enclosed leaflet (possibly but not necessarily linking the message inserted with that on the package).

- Requiring that these leaflets follow the same design and format as those currently enclosed by cigarette manufacturers to accommodate any technical or packaging problems manufacturers may claim.

- Requiring frequent “refreshment” of the content and style of package leaflets, i.e. new messages every six months.

- Allowing the attribution of the information on these leaflets to refer to other specified agencies and individuals, as appropriate and effective.
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The Package Leaflets Smokers Never Saw

In 1990, Health Canada prepared eight package leaflets designed to accompany the eight new health warnings for the exterior of cigarette packages.

Had these leaflets been implemented in 1992 as planned, roughly 10 billion health messages would have been delivered to smokers by the end of 1997. The cost to government would have been negligible.
Is smoking the only way to get lung cancer?
Cigarettes cause 85% of lung cancer in Canada. This disease is almost always linked to smoking.
Tobacco use can cause other cancers too—cancer of the bladder, pancreas, and kidney.
To reduce your risk of cancer, quit smoking. If you need help quitting, you can talk to your doctor, your local health unit, or the cancer, heart or lung association in your area.

Can cigarette smoke harm non-smokers?
Exposure over several years to the smoke that comes off the tip of a cigarette can cause lung cancer in other family members.
Exposure is likely to cause harm in non-smokers. Children born to parents who smoke are more likely to develop middle ear infections than children of non-smokers.
For help quitting smoking, contact your local health unit or the cancer, heart or lung association office in your area.

How can cigarettes cause strokes?
Cigarettes cause hardening of the arteries, which leads to poor blood circulation to the brain.
Strokes are 3 times more likely to occur in non-smokers. Smokers are also 2 to 3 times more likely to develop other arterial diseases that reduce blood flow to the hands and feet.
You can get help quitting by calling your doctor, your local health unit, or the cancer, heart or lung association office in your area.

What effect does smoking have on my lungs?
About 10,000 Canadians die each year from tobacco-related lung cancer. Smoking blackens and destroys lung tissue, causing chronic lung disease that makes it more and more difficult to breathe. Tens of thousands of Canadians suffer from these diseases and over 4,000 Canadians die each year from them.
You can get help quitting by calling your doctor, your local health unit, or cancer, lung or heart association office in your area.
TOXIC CONSTITUENT LABELLING

Most companies making products which are eaten or otherwise ingested provide a list of ingredients on the package. Whether on a tube of toothpaste or a candy bar, you’ll almost certainly find an ordered list of ingredients.

Tobacco companies are currently not required to provide this information, and they don’t provide it voluntarily. Cigarette packages do not fully disclose what is in the tobacco or filters, what chemicals are added to the tobacco or wrappers, nor the contents of the cigarette smoke. (When tobacco is burned, new chemicals are created. Since it’s the smoke that is inhaled and not the unburned cigarette, it is more important to list the smoke ingredients than the ingredients in unburned tobacco).

Under the federal Tobacco Act, tobacco companies can be made to provide this information. The act requires all tobacco product packages to carry the labels required by regulation. (The exact wording is found in section 15(1) and 17(a)). The government has broad powers to set regulations

“respecting the information that must appear on packages and in leaflets about tobacco products and their emissions and the health hazards and health effects arising from the use of the products and from their emissions.”
Health risks associated with current labelling requirements

Cigarette packages do list tar, nicotine and carbon monoxide levels. Yet numerous studies have shown that smokers are misled by these labels. The levels of tar, nicotine and carbon monoxide that the smoker inhales are very different than the levels on the cigarette packages.

Many smokers believe that lower tar cigarettes are not as dangerous as high tar cigarettes, a belief reinforced over the past few decades by the marketing strategies of cigarette manufacturers, and the use of descriptors like "light," "ultralight," "mild," etc. When so-called low tar cigarettes were introduced, even governments and health promoters believed they were healthier, and encouraged smokers to switch to lower tar brands.

What smokers inhale depends more on how they smoke than on which type of cigarette they smoke. Smokers subconsciously learn to puff harder or to block the filter holes intended to dilute the smoke. As a result, they are likely to inhale as much nicotine (and other dangerous compounds) as they would in a regular cigarette.

The current tar and nicotine labels contribute to mistaken beliefs about low-tar cigarettes being 'healthier.' Smokers will reasonably believe that smoking cigarettes with a lower tar figure will mean they inhale less tar.

American researchers have shown that low-yield cigarettes have "kept many smokers smoking who otherwise might have quit. The net effect of the introduction and mass marketing of these brands, then, may have been and may continue to be an increased number of smoking-attributable deaths." [5]
Light Cigarettes? Massachusetts tests say no different than regular cigarettes.

Massachusetts Department of Public Health developed a testing method which better simulates the smoking behavior of the average smoker under normal smoking conditions by increasing the amount of smoke inhaled with each puff by the smoking machine, reducing the amount of time taken between puffs, and requiring 50% of the cigarette filter to be covered. [6]

The Massachusetts testing method showed that:
- Nicotine yields were about twice those found by the standard tests set by the Federal Trade Commission and used in Canada.
- Despite ‘light’ and ‘mild’ descriptors, 85% of the cigarettes tested fell into the highest nicotine range.
- There are no significant differences in the total nicotine content of full flavour, ‘light’ or ‘ultra-light’ cigarettes.
- Smokers who switch to light cigarettes do not get less nicotine.

Cigarette Additives

There are no legal restrictions on what products can be added to tobacco during the manufacture of cigarettes, and no requirements that these additives be disclosed to the public.

Many cigarette packages sold in Canada boast of being ‘additive-free.’ Yet these same cigarettes include papers which are chemically treated to ensure even burning, and filters which contain a number of unspecified fibers and chemicals.

Massachusetts has show that it is possible to provide smokers with information on the ingredients of cigarettes. Most tobacco companies are challenging Massachusetts regulations to require disclosure, but one manufacture already lists ingredients on carton wrappings.

Public awareness of toxicity of cigarette smoke

There are thousands of chemical compounds in cigarettes, many of which are proven or suspected carcinogens. Lumping these together as ‘tar’ does not give the smoker full information on what they are inhaling. Health Canada commissioned research which revealed that few smokers were aware of any other toxic constituents in cigarettes, and ‘when presented with a list of 15 toxins, most participants reacted with surprise.’ [3]

Fewer than one in ten Canadians appear to know that cigarettes contain toxins that aren't listed on the cigarette package.
Environics Canada tested Canadians' knowledge of the compounds found in cigarettes. They found that, even when prompted, fewer than half of Canadians are aware that cigarettes contain toxins other than nicotine and tar [2].

When those participating in the toxic constituent sessions were asked to name those ingredients in cigarettes that are dangerous, virtually all participants could recall the three ingredients currently listed on the package (i.e. tar, nicotine and carbon monoxide). When asked if they could name anything else, only a small number could offer any other answers.

Envirornics Research [1, p. 7]
Development of improved toxic constituent labelling by Health Canada

The government has completed the research necessary to improve the way tar and nicotine levels are reported and to list other toxic ingredients. Health Canada has:

- developed testing methods to determine toxic levels in tobacco and in mainstream and sidestream smoke;
- developed prototype labels to require this information on the cigarette package;
- tested these prototypes in focus groups across Canada;
- surveyed Canadian public attitudes towards new labels.

This research was conducted following the commitment to improve toxic constituent labelling made by former health minister, David Dingwall, in December 1996.

Health Canada research supports:

- Mandatory inclusion of a full list of toxins on cigarette packages.
- Inclusion of a full list of toxins as a package insert in other countries have developed more informative labelling requirements.

warning:

The smoke from each cigarette contains, on average:
- 16 milligrams or less of tar - condensed smoke containing many chemicals, including some that cause cancer;
- 1.2 milligrams or less of nicotine - a poisonous and addictive drug;
- 1.5 milligrams or less of carbon monoxide - a deadly gas which reduces the ability of blood to carry oxygen.
Public support for new toxic constituent labelling

Environics research showed that [2]:

- Canadians express almost unanimous support (89%) for requiring cigarette companies to display a list of toxic constituents on cigarette packages.

- Most Canadians (88%) also support the idea of requiring cigarette companies to display an informational statement about the effects of chemical constituents along with a list of constituents.

- Almost three quarters of Canadians (73% of adults and 83% of young people, aged 12 to 17) feel there should be more information available about the contents of cigarettes.

- 70% of Canadians believe that “people who are taking up smoking today don’t understand the true health risks associated with smoking.”
Information statements supported by Health Canada research

Nitrosamines cause cancer. They are the most active cancer causing agent in tobacco smoke.

Nicotine is the active drug in tobacco smoke and is addictive.

Exposure to hydrogen cyanide can lead to headaches, dizziness, nausea, vomiting and death.

4-Aminobiphenyl causes bladder cancer, and is banned from commercial use.

Cancer causing tar is a sticky, black residue that contains hundreds of chemicals.

Arsenic poisoning can cause stomach and intestinal problems.

Cadmium is a heavy metal which collects in the liver and kidneys. Cigarettes are a major source of cadmium.

Carbon monoxide is a colourless, odourless, poisonous gas.

Formaldehyde is a colourless gas with a pungent odour. It may cause health problems and discomfort when present in high concentrations in indoor air.

Cadmium is a heavy metal which collects in the liver and kidneys. Cigarettes are a major source of cadmium.

Toxic Constituent Label developed by Health Canada as it could appear on a package of cigarettes.
Regulatory options

The federal government can take the following steps to provide more detailed and accurate information on the toxic constituents of cigarettes and cigarette smoke by:

- Implementing the toxic constituent labelling developed by Health Canada and tested by Environics Canada.
- Including an information statement about the effects of chemical constituents along with a list of constituents.
- Requiring additional toxic information to be provided in package or carton inserts and displayed at point of purchase.
- Banning the use of descriptors like ‘light,’ ‘mild,’ ‘ultralight,’ ‘smooth’ even where they are part of a registered or trademarked name.
- Using Massachusetts-style test methods, and requiring more accurate disclosure of nicotine, tar and other toxic components.
- Requiring package disclosure of all additives and flavourings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toxic Substance</th>
<th>Mainstream Smoke</th>
<th>Sidestream Smoke</th>
<th>Cigarette Tobacco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicotine</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>1.2 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>15 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tar</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>15 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>60 micrograms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.01 micrograms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadmium</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 micrograms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenic</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.04 micrograms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Cyanide</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>180 micrograms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>10 micrograms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formaldehyde</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>1 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrosamines</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>1 microgram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenols</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>24 micrograms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzo[a]pyrene</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.2 micrograms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.01 micrograms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.01 micrograms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrylonitrile</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.1 mg</td>
<td>0.01 micrograms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested signs for posting where cigarettes are sold, or inserted in cigarette packages based on Health Canada research. (Values are for illustrative purposes only).
Alternative suggestions for signs for posting where cigarettes are sold, or inserted in cigarette packages, or printed on cartons of cigarettes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acetylene</td>
<td>An asphyxiating gas used in welding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia</td>
<td>A gas that irritates eyes and lungs that is used to clean, bleach and deodorize and to etch aluminum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenic</td>
<td>A crystalline solid used in rat poison, causes skin irritations, lung cancer, lymphatic cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>A gas that causes leukemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta-Naphthalamine</td>
<td>Suspected of causing bladder cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadmium</td>
<td>A metal that causes lung cancer and prostate cancer and damages the kidneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>A gas that robs the body of oxygen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creosol</td>
<td>A caustic poison toxic to the skin, the kidneys, the liver and the pancreas, used as a disinfectant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formaldehyde</td>
<td>A suffocating carcinogen with a pungent odour, used as a disinfectant and as a preservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrazine</td>
<td>A corrosive fuming liquid that is hazardous to skin, blood and the liver, used as rocket fuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Cyanide</td>
<td>The gas used in execution chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxides of Nitrogen</td>
<td>The same lung-searing smog that motor vehicles emit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naphtylamine</td>
<td>A cause of bladder cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicotine</td>
<td>An addictive alkaloid toxic to the heart, used as an insecticide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrosamines</td>
<td>A variety of carcinogenic compounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenol</td>
<td>Hazardous for skin, the eyes, the liver, the kidneys and the nervous system, used as a disinfectant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polonium</td>
<td>A radioactive metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propane</td>
<td>A malodorous gas used as fuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>A solvent that depresses the central nervous system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urethane</td>
<td>A fungicide and pesticide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinyl Chloride</td>
<td>A gas that causes liver cancer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PACKAGE WARNING LABELS

The cigarette package is an effective advertising vehicle for both pro-smoking and anti-smoking messages.

The cigarette package is the most visible marketing tool for tobacco companies. Every year, more than 2 billion cigarette packages are displayed behind retail cashiers (the most visible and valuable retail promotion spot). Every day, cigarette packages are pulled out of pockets and purses 140 million times as Canada’s smokers reach for another cigarette. Smokers and non-smokers alike are exposed on a daily, even hourly basis to the package, the brand name and logo, the brand colour and other components of the brand ‘look’.

The cigarette package can also be an excellent advertising outlet for government health messages. There is little that can compare with the over 50 billion exposures a year of package warning labels.

Warnings on cigarette packages are probably the most cost-effective health promotion measure. They cost the government virtually nothing, as it is the tobacco companies which pays for printing and distribution.

Canada has been a world leader on package warnings. It was the first country to insist on black-and-white warnings at the top of the pack. Canada pioneered the use of strong, unequivocal messages like “Cigarettes cause cancer.”

Since the appearance of the current package warnings in 1994, research has found ways to improve these warnings. New regulations under the Tobacco Act can make these warnings more effective at helping smokers quit and at discouraging youth from beginning to smoke.

Powers of the Tobacco Act

The Act gives the federal government the power to require cigarette companies to put health warnings on the packages of cigarettes they sell. [Section 15(1) of the law requires companies to include any labels required by regulation; section 17(a) gives the government powers to set these regulations.]

The government’s powers over health warnings are restricted in two ways.

1. The Supreme Court has ruled that tobacco companies must be permitted to include an attribution on warnings (e.g. – ‘Health Canada’).
2. The Tobacco Act limits information on packages to those about “the product and its emissions, and about the health hazards and health effects arising from the use of the product or from its emissions.” (s. 15(1)). The wording of any required label must satisfy this condition.

The "attribution" of package warnings

In recent years, cigarette packages carried warnings that did not give the origin of the warning. For example, the warning “Cigarettes are addictive” did not indicate who was issuing the warning of addiction – the government, the tobacco companies or some other agent. This made it an ‘unattributed’ warning.

Many other labelling laws require unattributed warnings. The Hazardous Products Act, for example, requires that bleach bottles carry unattributed verbal and symbolic warnings of the corrosive potential of bleach.

Nonetheless, the tobacco companies successfully argued before the Supreme Court that unattributed warnings breached their charter-guaranteed freedom of expression. The court said the government could not force the companies to appear to say something they may not have wished to say. As a result, future requirements for warnings must allow for an attribution, although the court did not say how the warning must be attributed.

The Supreme Court ruled that health warnings must be attributed.

The Vantage pack displays the current preference of the tobacco industry to attribute the warning to Health Canada.
The Matinee and Camel packages show different ways of attributing warnings.

The quote attributed to Imperial Tobacco came from documents tabled during their challenge of the federal law.

The warning on the Camel package dispels any false impression that the tobacco company might be the author of the statement.

These examples were provided by the Non Smokers' Rights Association.
Research on package warnings

Since Canada’s new health warnings came into place in 1994, Health Canada has commissioned several scientific reviews and surveys whose findings support further improvements to health warnings on cigarette packages. Independent researchers and other governments have also conducted rigorous reviews of health warning messages.

This body of research supports:

- Adding graphic images as part of health warnings.
- Rewording current warnings, as some are not remembered or have little perceived effect.
- Considering health warnings which do not focus on risk.
- Targetting messages to specific populations.
- Requiring a variety of message types.

Expert Panel on Plain Packaging, 1995

Health warnings were a major component of the analysis of plain packaging completed by an expert panel on behalf of Health Canada in 1994-95 [2].

Finding: The impact of warnings is enhanced by graphic images.

The potential health impact of a variety of package designs were tested on Canadian teenagers. The Expert Panel found the placement of a graphic representation of cigarettes and a lung be very effective.

- When asked which of five plain package designs would “most discourage” them from smoking, 86% of teenagers chose the only one with a symbol of cigarettes and lungs.
- “Plain and generic packaging, and especially plain and generic packaging with the lungs symbol, can serve to minimize the unique brand images that have been constructed over time and the perception of actual packages of cigarettes,” the panel concluded.

Source: Research Conducted for Health Canada by the expert panel on plain packaging.
Tandemar Research, 1996

Tandemar Research [5] was commissioned in 1996 by Health Canada to evaluate the effectiveness of current health warnings, and to explore potential attributions. This study concluded:

♦ Health warnings provide information to smokers

Health warnings on cigarette packages:
- were cited by four in ten smokers as a source of information
- were second only to television as a source of information about the health hazards of tobacco.
- Were most effective on teenagers, who were more likely to cite package warnings as a source of information.

♦ Smokers support health warnings

- Health warnings on cigarette package were considered to be “important information for smokers” by three-quarters of Canadian smokers.

♦ Health warnings help reduce smoking

- Health warnings on cigarette packages influenced almost one in five smokers either a little or a lot in making a recent quit attempt (that's 1.3 million smokers).

♦ Health warnings are read and remembered

- Virtually all smokers have seen the messages, and they are read an average 1.7 times per day per smoker.
- Nine in ten smokers can recall at least one warning, and over half can recall at least three. (Recall levels are higher among teenagers).

Environics Research, 1996 and 1997

In 1997, Health Canada commissioned Environics [1, 3 and 4] to further explore what makes an effective health warning label, and to develop new health warnings. Environics concluded:

♦ Not all health warnings are equally memorable to young persons.

- Only half of the current health messages were frequently recalled by young persons.
New messages are supported.

Envirionics tested public reaction and recommended the following messages.

- Smoking makes your breath smell and your teeth yellow
- Light up for a slow and painful death
- 40,000 Canadians will die this year from smoking
- Smoking is a weakness, not a strength
- Smoking shortens your breath and decreases your energy level

Envirionics found no clear consensus about which labels were the best or worst. The following reflections were made:

- Many like messages that are ‘short and sweet’ (like You smoke, you stink). This group tended to be older.
- Some prefer labels that are factual, and less like slogans. This group, which tended to be younger, preferred labels that presented ‘just the facts.’
- Humourous labels (like ‘light up for a slow and painful death’) were favoured by many who felt that smokers don’t respond well to scare-tactics. Younger people and heavy smokers were in this group.
• Labels which focused on personal image (i.e. ‘Smoking makes your breath smell and your teeth yellow’) were favoured particularly by older teens and adults.

• A diverse group favour warnings which shock (i.e. ‘40,000 Canadians will die this year from smoking’). Many in this group suggest that gruesome images, such as diseased lungs, appear on the warning labels.

The following French language warnings were tested:

Goûte a la vie sans fumer
365 paquets par an = 2 semaines de vacances
Pense à ton avenir et à ta tirelire
Pourquoi commencer si tu sais que tu vas arrêter
Sois “cool”. Arrête!

Tests on these French-language warnings showed:

• Several adults were not favourable to humorous messages, and disapproved of the “tu.”

• Adolescents were more likely to favour a lighter approach.

• Adolescents preferred the message “Pens àton avenir et à ta tirelire”

• Many adolescents and adults favoured “365 paquetspar an = 2 semaines de vacances” and “Goûte a la vie sans fumer.”

• Many adults felt that “365 paquets par an = 2 semaines de vacances” would make them reconsider smoking more than the current messages.

♦ Some current health warnings may be counter-productive.

Do the current health warnings reach the young Canadians who are most vulnerable to smoking? Do they deliver the messages most likely to encourage smokers to quit, or to discourage potential smokers from experimenting with cigarettes?

Environics [1] made several startling conclusions from their socio-cultural profile of smokers and young smokers.

• “Because young people are not willing to make much effort to improve their health, anti-tobacco advertising should not focus primarily on health concerns. In fact, dire warnings about the impact of tobacco on one’s
health will likely be tuned out by smokers, who already feel a loss of control”

- “Because young people are risk-takers, do not focus on the risks associated with tobacco use or the principles of risk-avoidance.”

- “Because of young people’s preoccupation with appearances, focus on portraying the ugly aspects of smoking (e.g. nicotine stains, bad breath, weathered-looking skin, etc.)”

- “Because young people tend to be more emotional than rational, consider emotional, not informational, advertising.”

[ emphasis added]
University of Toronto and collaborators, 1994-95.

A joint research project compared health warnings on current American, current Canadian and currently proposed plain packages. Through qualitative and quantitative analysis of the attitudes and knowledge of teenagers in Chicago and Ontario, researchers concluded:

♦ **Canadian warnings have been effective at getting the attention of young smokers, while American ones have not.**
  - 83% of Ontario students volunteered the health warning when asked to list everything they could about the cigarette package. Only 6% of Chicago students did.

♦ **Warnings have more impact when they are on ‘plain’ packages.**
  - When comparing plain packages with regular brand name packages, twice as many students reported that it was easier to see the health warning on the plain package (51% vs. 29%).
  - Believability of the health warning is enhanced by plain packaging. 53% of Ontario students said plain packaging makes the health warning look more serious, but only 19% said that of the regular package.

New Zealand Government Research

Researchers [7] tested the position of health warnings on cigarette packages among smokers and non-smokers in New Zealand and found:

♦ **The best location for a health warning is on the front panel**

♦ **Warnings on the inside of package lids are well received.**
  - “A pack that combined a health warning on the front with one inside the lid would probably be the strongest combination.”
**U.S. Researchers**

Paul Fischer and his colleagues from Atlanta, Georgia, used standard research methods to test new health warnings [8] against existing U.S. warnings (which are much less prominent than those currently on Canadian packages). They concluded that warnings must be more prominent to be effective, but also suggested that more imagination be applied by regulators in developing package warnings. They concluded:

“To be effective, warnings must be managed using the same strategies that are employed to develop the cigarette ads with which they must compete.”

---

**Comparison of communication strategies used in mandated warnings and cigarette advertisements**

(adapted for Canadian context from Fischer et al, [8])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Cigarette Ads</th>
<th>Health Warnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>66% of space</td>
<td>33% of space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Primarily graphic</td>
<td>Solely textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeting</td>
<td>Targeted to specific populations</td>
<td>Not targeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novelty</td>
<td>Continuously updated</td>
<td>Eight rotating messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Image based</td>
<td>Knowledge based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Based on marketing research</td>
<td>Based on government regulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paul Fisher et al. tested warnings like these and found them more effective than the current U.S. health warnings.
Non-Smokers’ Rights Association (Canada), 1996

The time has come, NSRA [9] concludes, to move health warnings to a next stage. After 30 years of ‘traditional’ health warnings, it is time to move beyond merely warning the consumer to delivering more effective messages at deterring smoking.

NSRA proposes:

♦ Changing “health message” to “package message.” Health information is only one type of information that can be conveyed on package messages.

♦ Targeting messages to the demographic groups, or regions most likely to buy a specific brand.

♦ Amplifying health warnings to provide more meaningful assessments of risks.

♦ Using package messages to increase public awareness of the role of:
  • Tobacco Companies
  • Family members

More children smoke Player’s than any other Canadian brand
-Health Canada

Matinée’s give you facial wrinkles
-Canadian Society of Plastic Surgeons

Cigarettes kill one half of all long-term smokers
-Health Canada

Like Being Addicted?
Call Imperial Tobacco 1-800-267-1877
-Canadian Medical Association

Half of all parents killed by smoking die in middle age.
Isn’t that too soon to lose yours?
-Ecumenical Council of Canada

The example provided here are based on NSRA’s recommendations. Direct examples of NSRA’s proposed innovative health warnings are provided elsewhere in this section.
Regulatory options

The federal government can take the following steps to increase public health knowledge, to encourage quitting and to discourage the promotional appeal of cigarette packages:

- Add new health warnings to current set of rotated warnings, and removing those which are shown to have less effect. The five warnings already by Health Canada are immediately available.
- Develop messages to respond to Health Canada research showing that warnings focused on health risks may not be the most effective in reaching youth.
- Implement the recommendations of the Expert Panel on Plain Packaging.
- Target messages to specific populations.
- Refresh messages frequently.
- Complement new package warning messages with requirements for new toxic constituent labelling and package inserts.
- Broadly interpret “health” to allow for messages that are shown to be effective at motivating smokers to quit.
- Increase the proportion of the package taken by warning labels, allowing for the use of images and other graphic material.

References and resources:

Current package warnings (Canadian cigarettes)

These eight health warnings have appeared on the top of cigarette packages in Canada since 1994.
Options for package warnings
Based on independent research

These unpolished examples show how warnings can:

- **Be targeted at specific populations, i.e.:**
  - Women smokers
  - British Columbians

- **Be used to counter tobacco promotion, i.e.**
  - Rothmans sponsorship of racing

- **Be directed at those who surround the smoker, i.e.**
  - Their children

- **Be used to correct misbeliefs about smoking, i.e.**
  - Low-tar smokers

- **Be complemented with graphic images**

- **Provide smokers with information on where to turn for help, i.e. smoking cessation programs**

---

**Be like Jacques Villeneuve:**

**DON'T SMOKE**

Professional Drivers of Canada

**Light cigarettes are just as deadly as regular cigarettes**

Government Warning

**Smokers who switch to light cigarettes do not reduce their risk of lung cancer or heart disease.**

**Smoking gives you wrinkles**

Canadian Society of Plastic Surgeons Warns

**Tobacco will kill 5800 British Columbians this year**

B.C. Ministry of Health

**Tell MOM to QUIT**

Health Canada

---

**Government Warning**

Tobacco smoke causes fatal lung disease in non-smokers

**Government Warning**

Smokers who switch to light cigarettes do not reduce their risk of lung cancer or heart disease.

**Matinée**

You can cope without cigarettes

Call the YWCA: 1-800-555-1111

**Government Warning**

Smokers who switch to light cigarettes do not reduce their risk of lung cancer or heart disease.
Options for package warnings
As researched and developed by Health Canada

Five new warnings, developed and researched by Environics for Health Canada, as they would appear on a current package of du Maurier.

- **Light up for a slow and painful death**
  - Health Canada

- **Smoking shortens your breath and decreases your energy level**
  - Health Canada

- **Smoking makes your breath smell and your teeth yellow**
  - Health Canada

- **40,000 Canadians will die this year from smoking**
  - Health Canada

- **Smoking is a Weakness, Not a Strength**
  - Health Canada
The same new package warnings as they would appear if combined with recommendations of Expert Panel on Plain Packaging for generic packages.

Example used by Expert Panel

- **Light up for a slow and painful death**
  - [Image of warnings label]
  - Du Maurier
  - 25 King Size

- **Smoking is a Weakness, Not a Strength**
  - [Image of warnings label]
  - Vantage
  - 25 Filter

- **Smoking shortens your breath and decreases your energy level**
  - [Image of warnings label]
  - Export ‘A’
  - 25 Plain

- **40,000 Canadians will die this year from smoking**
  - [Image of warnings label]
  - Cameo
  - 25 Regular

- **Smoking makes your breath smell and your teeth yellow**
  - [Image of warnings label]
  - Matinée
  - 25 King Size