

REGION OF OTTAWA-CARLETON
RÉGION D'OTTAWA-CARLETON

REPORT
RAPPORT

Our File/N/Réf.
 Your File/V/Réf. RC

DATE 07 January 2000

TO/DEST. Co-ordinator, Community Services Committee

FROM/EXP. Medical Officer of Health and Regional Solicitor

SUBJECT/OBJET **TOBACCO ADVERTISING - RESPONSE TO
 CSC INQUIRY 15 (98)**

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION

That the Community Services Committee recommend Council implement a policy to prohibit tobacco advertising as well as tobacco sponsorship advertising by tobacco companies and/or their “shell” companies on Regional property.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to outline the relationship between tobacco advertising, as well as tobacco sponsorship advertising and youth smoking. Solutions proposed will decrease the amount of tobacco and sponsorship advertising youth are exposed to in Ottawa-Carleton. Results of public consultation, as well as implications of this policy that prohibits tobacco and sponsorship advertising are presented.

BACKGROUND

Under the federal *Tobacco Act*, direct advertising is permitted to continue in a number of “adult” venues, and tobacco sponsorship advertising remains legal until 2003. The relationship between tobacco product and sponsorship promotions and both smoking initiation and continuing smoking has been well-documented. History has demonstrated the tobacco industry’s ability to circumvent attempts by the federal government to restrict their marketing practices. The importance of controls on tobacco advertising and promotion to a comprehensive tobacco reduction program argues for concerted action at all levels of government. There are numerous precedents in Canada and throughout the United States that show that communities can successfully limit tobacco industry promotional activities. Health groups in the region are highly supportive of the proposed policy that would eliminate direct tobacco advertising and sponsorship advertising on the Region’s property. Arts and cultural groups expressed only mild concern, with most believing they could adjust to the restrictions.

It is therefore recommended that Regional Council adopt a policy to prohibit tobacco advertising including sponsorship advertising on Regional property.

Tobacco Advertising and Sponsorship Promotion in Ottawa-Carleton

Due to the provisions in the *Tobacco Act* controlling traditional tobacco product advertising, the form of tobacco promotion most apparent in Canadian communities including Ottawa-Carleton is tobacco sponsorship advertising—primarily point-of-purchase posters and clocks, outdoor billboards, and print ads in popular magazines. These promotions are highly visible throughout the region, with billboards featuring Export A Extreme Sports and Players Racing and countless retail signs advertising events as diverse as du Maurier Jazz, Craven A Just for Laughs Festival, Matinée Fashion, Players Racing, and Export A Extreme Sports, to name a few.

A study of tobacco sponsorship advertising in Ottawa-Hull conducted in late 1993 by the Canadian Council on Smoking and Health found that approximately three-quarters of retail outlets carried tobacco sponsorship advertising (660 stores of a total of 880 tobacco retailers), averaging almost three advertisements per store (1600 total). Point-of-sale signs for just two sponsorships, Players Racing and Matinée Fashion, generated some 280 million advertising exposures a year, worth an estimated \$100,000. A seventeen-week billboard campaign by Players Ltd. Racing in the Ottawa-Hull region cost an estimated \$2.5 million and generated approximately 4 million advertising exposures.ⁱ Of course, these advertisements are not just seen by adults or by smokers but also are absorbed by youth of all ages.

A policy to prohibit tobacco advertising and sponsorship advertising on regional property has been under consideration by regional government several times since 1994. Related policies have been enacted by the OC Transpo Commission. For a complete chronology of relevant events, consult Annex A.

DISCUSSION

75% of Ottawa-Carleton daily smokers report that they began smoking between the ages of 12 and 19. 50% of children have experimented with tobacco by age 12ⁱⁱ. Thus children and adolescents constitute the principal targets of tobacco industry marketing efforts.

There is a considerable body of scientific evidence demonstrating the important relationship between tobacco product and lifestyle advertising, including sponsorship advertising, and tobacco use, particularly among youth. Refer to Annex B for a complete review of the impact of tobacco and sponsorship advertising has on youth.

Why a Regional Tobacco Advertising Policy?

As early as 1971, the Liberal government of Pierre Trudeau had approved a total advertising ban for Canada to be in full effect by January 1, 1972:

“The Cabinet agreed that ... the legislation should prohibit the promotion by any means whatsoever of the sale of any cigarette product....”ⁱⁱⁱ

At the time, Cabinet considered a world-wide ban on tobacco advertising to be inevitable. Nonetheless almost thirty years later, Canadian communities, including Ottawa-Carleton, continue to be papered with tobacco company promotions, primarily in the form of sponsorship advertising.

For the past three decades, federal governments have consistently shown a reluctance to respond aggressively to tobacco industry efforts to undermine advertising restrictions. The 1989 *Tobacco Products Control Act* was intended to ban traditional tobacco product advertising and the promotion of tobacco company sponsorships of sporting and arts events. Tobacco companies, however, exploited a loophole in the legislation by setting up “shell” companies named after cigarette brands to sponsor the events. The government’s failure to close the loophole had several negative consequences: a proliferation of tobacco-sponsored events, an exponential growth in the promotion of these events, and a vast network of indebtedness to tobacco company largesse among Canadian sports and cultural organizations of all sizes.

Likewise the federal government’s response to the Supreme Court’s striking down of the *Tobacco Products Control Act* has been both slower and weaker than desired. The replacement *Tobacco Act* was to severely limit sponsorship promotions by the year 2000. However, in the face of intense industry lobbying, the federal government agreed to phase-in the restrictions on sponsorship advertising and promotion over a five-year period—until 2003. Given the history of “cave-ins” to tobacco industry pressure, it would be unwise to assume that tobacco promotion will finally be eradicated.

Tobacco companies are among the most profitable in the world. The money they can devote to pushing their products will always vastly overshadow the limited resources available to provide the public with a realistic view of the consequences of tobacco use.^{iv} To lessen this imbalance, all levels of government need to enact policies within their power to limit tobacco company advertising and other promotional activities.

Precedents In Other Jurisdictions

There are two Canadian cities, Edmonton and Sudbury, and various U.S. municipalities that have adopted policies to restrict tobacco advertising on government-owned property. Refer to Annex C for details of these policies.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

In September 1999, a letter was sent from the Regional Medical Officer of Health to twenty-five organizations within Ottawa-Carleton that have a vested interest in the region’s adoption of a policy banning tobacco advertising on regional property. The organizations consulted represent fourteen health groups, six arts and cultural groups, and five organizations concerned with the economic health of the region, including the City of Ottawa and the National Capital Commission. (For a complete list of organizations that were invited to submit comments, see Annex D.)

The number of responses to the request for feedback on the proposed policy was low (9/25 or 36%), particularly from the arts and business organizations, and therefore follow up calls were made to these groups.

As we had concluded, the groups had decided not to respond because they anticipated that the impact of the proposed policy on their business would be minimal. As the Director of Development with Opera Lyra explained, although the Opera does receive sponsorship funding from du Maurier Arts Ltd. which entitles the tobacco manufacturer to have its logo printed on promotional materials including posters that are posted around the City, the funding from du Maurier has been dwindling over the past few years and therefore the proposed prohibition on sponsorship advertising on regional property “is probably not an issue.”^v

The Great Canadian Theatre Company (GCTC) also receives funding from du Maurier. Because GCTC limits its promotional efforts to posters within their building and in retail stores, as well as newspaper advertisements, the General Manager does not feel that the policy would likely affect the Theatre. The fact that the prohibition would apply to events held on Festival Plaza is likewise not a concern: “If we were to do an event on Festival Plaza, we know our limitations.”

Several of the organizations, including GCTC and the Council for the Arts did express some concern about how the forecast change to a one-tier regional government structure would affect the definition of “regional property” and whether the policy would have a much greater impact than originally anticipated as a result.

The Council for the Arts also questioned whether the Health Department had discussed with du Maurier what their reaction might be to the policy and whether any consideration had been given to replacement funding for the arts groups in the region that stand to lose some \$200,000 in funding from du Maurier if the policy is approved. Speaking as a representative of the Ottawa Festival Network, Michel Gauthier, Executive Director of the Canadian Tulip Festival, mentioned the need for a regional policy on festival funding, particularly since another funding source would be “locked out” by the tobacco policy. On the other hand, M. Gauthier pointed out that alternative sponsorship opportunities do exist, citing the Montreal Jazz Festival’s securing of a new million-dollar sponsor to replace du Maurier. The Ottawa Jazz Festival likewise is concerned about the potential loss of du Maurier as a sponsor of one of the five concert series presented at its annual festival.

The spokespeople for the Council for the Arts and the Tulip Festival both indicated that they supported the proposed policy in principle.

None of the business groups has taken a position on the proposed policy, as they believe it does not represent a significant issue for their membership.

The National Capital Commission has a long-standing policy that NCC events and programs are free of tobacco advertising, sponsorship and promotion. This policy applies to events whether they are staged on NCC property or on the property of collaborating partners. Given its consistency with existing NCC policy, the Commission is supportive of the region’s proposed tobacco advertising ban.

The City of Ottawa likewise has a policy (since October 1998) which prohibits tobacco sponsorships “in direct City initiated activities.” However, the policy is not as inclusive as that of the NCC, applying only to arrangements where ownership and responsibility for City facilities, services, and activities remain with the City. The City of Ottawa offered no direct comment on the Region’s proposed ban on tobacco promotion.

Health groups were highly supportive of the proposed policy. Letters of support were received from the Canadian Cancer Society, Ontario Division, Heart and Stroke Foundation of Ontario, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, and three local community health centres: Centretown, Sandy Hill, and Somerset West.

The Canadian Cancer Society and Centre for Addiction and Mental Health both congratulated the Health Department for their leadership on this issue.^{vi} The Centre for Addiction favours public policy that increasingly restricts “the availability and visibility of hazardous and addictive products such as tobacco” and recommends that cigarettes be subject to the same regulations that apply to pharmaceutical nicotine and other drugs.^{vii}

The Centretown Community Health Centre commented on the value of the region’s proposed ban given the federal government’s delay in implementing the sponsorship restrictions in the *Tobacco Act*. The Centre sees the policy “as an important step towards continuing to promote and maintain a healthy community.”^{viii}

The Somerset West Community Health Centre, which has been a leader across the region and the province in developing strategies to prevent tobacco addiction and support cessation, sees the proposed regional ban on tobacco advertising as a first step in “what could be a more powerful effort locally.” Other suggested activities include establishing of a local fund for prevention and promotion efforts and advocating for provincial government action related to the Ontario Tobacco Strategy.

In summary, reaction to the proposed policy prohibiting tobacco advertising and promotion on regional property was largely positive or neutral. Although a few of the arts organizations expressed concern about the potential loss of du Maurier as a sponsor, their opposition to the policy was mild, with most of the groups predicting little if any negative repercussion from it. Organizations concerned with the health and well-being of the citizens of Ottawa-Carleton believe that the policy would be a positive step toward creating a climate that protects young people from inducements to start smoking and supports the cessation efforts of smokers.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications as a result of this policy.

Approved by
Robert Cushman,

Approved by
Eric A. Johnston,

CHRONOLOGY OF RELEVANT EVENTS

Early 1990's

OC Transpo Commission policy adopted that "tobacco advertisements are not acceptable. Any displays depicting the use of tobacco or consumption of tobacco shall be refused."

8 September 1994

Following presentation by Ottawa-Carleton Council on Smoking and Health on sponsorship advertising, Health Committee passed motion that Legal Department staff prepare policy report on

- banning tobacco sponsorship advertising on municipally-owned and licensed properties;
- allowing tobacco companies to sponsor events but remove the visual connection;
- restricting sponsorship advertising to event promotion; and
- developing a strategy to consult with and obtain support from local arts, cultural, and sports organizations who have received or may seek tobacco company sponsorships.

Fall 1994

Staff from Legal and Health Departments met with representatives of the three major Canadian tobacco companies.

Staff consulted with representatives of a number of local arts and cultural groups.

25 October 1995

Regional Council received report from Community Services Committee concerning Supreme Court's decision striking down the *Tobacco Products Control Act*. Regional Council approved several related motions:

- a) staff prepare policy to prohibit all tobacco advertising and lifestyle ads by tobacco companies or their "shell" companies on regional property;
- b) Council ask OC Transit Commission to prepare and adopt similar policy.

30 October 1995

Letter from Regional Clerk to OC Transit Commission requesting that Commission adopt consistent tobacco advertising policy.

28 November 1995

Follow-up letter from Acting Medical Officer of Health to OC Transit Commission General Manager.

November-December 1995

Consultations conducted with over sixty stakeholder groups (via meeting or correspondence) re policy to prohibit tobacco advertising on regional property.

11 December 1995

Federal government's response to Supreme Court decision and proposal for new tobacco control legislation announced in policy paper entitled *Tobacco Control: A Blueprint to Protect the Health of Canadians*.

2 January 1996

Community Services Committee received report from Health Department recommending:

- a) Community Services Committee and Regional Council support the federal government's proposed tobacco control legislation as outlined in its *Tobacco Control Blueprint*.
- b) Regional Council deferred the implementation of the policy to prohibit all tobacco advertising and lifestyle ads by tobacco companies or their "shell" companies on regional property in deference to the proposed new federal legislation.

February 1998

OC Transpo Commission approved policy not to accept sponsorship advertising on buses and bus shelters.

IMPACT OF TOBACCO AND SPONSORSHIP ADVERTISING ON YOUTH**Advertising plays a major role in expanding the aggregate market for cigarettes.**

A University of California study found that trends in smoking initiation among female adolescents 10-20 years old in the U.S. reflected the targeting of tobacco advertising to women. From 1967-1973, the initiation rate in girls younger than seventeen increased rapidly, with the upward trend beginning the same year that the tobacco industry introduced women's brands of cigarettes and began advertising them heavily.^{ix} In 1984 Virginia Slims launched a major advertising effort in Hong Kong aimed at women. As only 1% of women under forty then smoked, the number who could brand-switch was negligible; the advertising campaign was clearly an attempt to create a market.^x

Advertising is a key vehicle used by the tobacco industry to recruit new smokers.

Confidential tobacco industry documents reveal that the industry recruits new smokers from the teenage population to replace those who have quit or have died. As Supreme Court Justice La Forest concluded,

“The tobacco companies are concerned about a shrinking tobacco market and recognize that an ‘advocacy thrust’ is necessary to maintain the size of the overall market; the companies understand that, in order to maintain the overall numbers of smokers, they must reassure current smokers and make their product attractive to the young and to non-smokers; they also recognize that advertising is critical to maintaining the size of the market because it serves to reinforce the social acceptability of smoking by identifying it with glamour, affluence, youthfulness and vitality.”^{xi}

Exposure to tobacco advertising increases the risk of youth smoking initiation.

Exposure to cigarette advertising is an important predictor of current smoking and intention to smoke in the future. Adolescents are twice as likely to be influenced to smoke by advertising and promotion of cigarettes than they are by smoking among their peers or family members, demographic characteristics, or school performance.^{xii} One study found that adolescents with a high level of exposure to tobacco advertising were significantly more likely (1.4-2 times) to be smokers than those with low exposure.^{xiii} Another study found that receptivity to tobacco advertisements (having a favourite advertisement) was a strong predictor of progression from non-smoking to smoking status.^{xiv} The study concluded that 34% of experimentation with tobacco is attributable to tobacco advertising and promotion.

Sponsorship promotion is just another form of advertising.

In order to circumvent growing controls on traditional forms of advertising, tobacco companies have turned increasingly to sponsorship of sporting, arts, and cultural events and the promotion of these sponsorships to market their products. In the mid 1980's, Imperial Tobacco Ltd. advertised in seven

different media. Several years after the passage of the *Tobacco Products Control Act* which banned tobacco advertising, Imperial Tobacco was once again advertising in seven different media, although the media mix had changed somewhat.^{xv}

Sponsorships are not philanthropy; sponsorships serve as effective (often highly cost-effective) forms of image and lifestyle advertising:

“Sponsorship provides opportunities for embedded advertising, a fail-safe delivery system where messages are incorporated right into the action.”^{xvi}

Sponsorships associate cigarette brands—and hence tobacco use—with sporting prowess, courage and independence, artistic excellence, and other desirable lifestyle images and character traits in ways that are forbidden under various forms of advertising restrictions in many countries, including under industry voluntary codes.

Recent British research provides strong evidence of the link between sponsorship and tobacco use. A study of more than 1000 boys aged 12 and 13 found that those who watch Formula One racing are almost twice as likely to start smoking as boys who do not (13% vs. 7%).^{xvii}

Young people regard sponsorship promotions as a form of tobacco advertising.

The 1994 *Youth Smoking Survey* found that a strong majority of adolescents (85% of smokers and 83% of non-smokers) consider sponsorship billboards and signs to be “a way of advertising particular brands of cigarettes.” A majority of non-smoking youth (58%) and a significant proportion of youth who smoke (43%) believe that these promotional signs are “a way of encouraging people to smoke.”^{xviii}

Tobacco advertising and sponsorships enhance the social acceptability of smoking.

Tobacco advertising has been found to help reduce the resistance to smoking based on awareness of the health risks. “Tobacco sponsorship of sport in particular may cultivate these positive attitudes by associating tobacco with characteristics which young people admire.”^{xix} The pervasiveness of tobacco advertising creates a familiarity with tobacco products and an environment in which smoking is seen as glamorous, social, and normal.^{xx}

CANADIAN AND U.S. POLICIES RESTRICTING TOBACCO ADVERTISING AND SPONSORSHIP

Edmonton

In August 1994 a motion was passed by Edmonton City Council to ban all forms of tobacco advertising and sponsorship promotions on city property, including sports and recreational facilities. In response to intense lobbying by the Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers Council, who solicited support from local arts and cultural groups, the motion was amended several weeks later. Under the revised policy, the City refused “to enter into any new contracts for advertising on Edmonton Transit buses, trains or transit property which involve any form of tobacco company or tobacco brand promotions including sponsorship and advertising.”

Sudbury

The City of Sudbury was more successful in their recent effort to ban tobacco advertising on city property. City Council passed a resolution in September 1998 that does not permit any billboard, sign, poster, placard, etc. that “advertises or promotes the use of any tobacco product or sponsored event” on or in property or facilities owned by the City, including its tenants and licensees. The resolution covers outdoor billboards and sides of buildings on city property, hockey rink/baseball boards, bus shelters, buses and other modes of transport. All events promoted by the City, as well as facility rental agreements, must contain the prohibition against any tobacco-related promotion. The resolution did not give rise to any negative publicity from retailers, tobacco interests, or billboard companies (despite their initial opposition on the grounds that the policy infringes “freedom of expression”).

United States

A number of U.S. jurisdictions have enacted similar policies. In June 1992, the City of San Francisco passed an ordinance that bans advertisements of tobacco products on property owned or controlled by the city and prohibits the name of a tobacco company or tobacco product to be used in any promotion of any event or product. The following year, the State of California passed a law prohibiting tobacco product advertising in state-owned and state-occupied buildings, except advertising contained in programs, newspapers, magazines, etc. Also in 1993, an ordinance was passed in King County, Washington, that prohibits tobacco product advertising on any structure, facility, or fixture owned by or leased to King County.

U.S. municipalities have been slow to adopt local ordinances restricting tobacco advertising for two reasons: concern that the ordinances might violate *First Amendment* protection of commercial free speech; and the preemption clause in the federal *Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act*. The preemption does not permit state or local governments to impose restrictions on advertising and promotion “based on smoking and health”; however, it does not apply to laws which regulate tobacco

advertising based on an issue other than the relationship between smoking and health. Despite these concerns, more than 70 U.S. communities have passed ordinances restricting tobacco advertising.^{xxi}

In general U.S. ordinances to control tobacco advertising do so in one of three ways:

- by restricting advertising on government-owned property (discussed above);
- by restricting outdoor tobacco advertising; or
- by restricting advertising near schools.

In addition to enacting laws at the local level, many U.S. communities have participated in extensive social marketing campaigns organized by their state government to control tobacco company promotional activities. During the past few years, the State of California has developed and managed two major state-wide campaigns intended to reduce tobacco advertising and sponsorships—Operation Storefront and Project SMART Money. In both cases, the campaigns were based on the efforts of local coalitions who researched tobacco industry practices and public attitudes in their jurisdiction and then developed community-specific solutions to the problem.

San Francisco

For example, the City of San Francisco in January 1998 passed an ordinance that prohibits tobacco advertising and promotional displays in “publicly visible locations.” The ordinance covers signs, billboards, posters on the ground, a sidewalk, pole, building, and in the windows and doors of commercial establishment if they are visible from the exterior. The policy also includes tobacco advertising and promotion that is part of any event on city streets. Outdoor locations within 660 feet of highways are exempt. Given that the preemption does not permit local governments to regulate advertising for health reasons, the rationale for the policy is to reduce the illegal sales and supply of tobacco to minors and the commercial exploitation of potential underage smokers.

Ordinances Restricting Advertising Near Schools

Many U.S. communities have passed ordinances banning tobacco advertising in publicly visible locations near schools and other facilities frequented by children. The specific prohibitions vary, as do the permissible distances from the schools. Some of these ordinances also include various restrictions intended to prevent tobacco sales to minors, such as retailer licensing, ID requirements, mandatory vendor-assisted sales, and bans on the sale and distribution of promotional items to minors. The city of San Diego, for example, passed an ordinance in 1998 that prohibits tobacco advertising in publicly visible locations within 1000 feet (measured in a straight line) of any school, playground, recreation center or facility, child care center, arcade, or library. The policy covers signs, billboards, and posters on sidewalks, poles, buildings, or displayed in the windows and doors of commercial establishments if they are visible from the exterior. The prohibition also extends to signs at public facilities within the City’s jurisdiction.

The ordinance also restricts the placement of tobacco advertising *inside* stores that sell tobacco products and are located within 1000 feet of the premises listed above. Tobacco advertising cannot be

placed below four feet from the floor; within two feet of candy, snack, or non-alcoholic beverage displays; or posted on windows and doors if visible from the exterior.

The ordinance requires retailers to ask for identification of anyone under 27 years of age and to post legal age of sale signs; it bans self-service displays and bans the free distribution of tobacco products or promotional items. As with the San Francisco ordinance described earlier, the rationale given is to reduce illegal sales and supply of tobacco to minors by restricting advertising that encourages minors to buy or steal and use tobacco in violation of state and local laws.

Operation Storefront: Youth Against Tobacco Advertising and Promotion

The Operation Storefront campaign was undertaken from 1995-1997 by approximately forty health agencies in communities throughout California to stem the proliferation of tobacco advertising and promotion at the local level.^{xxii} Involving youth throughout the campaign was a high priority. The campaign involved three phases of activity: surveying point-of-purchase advertising at tobacco retailers in 52 counties; surveying community attitudes and beliefs and educating the public about the influence of tobacco advertising; and mobilizing the community to limit exposure to tobacco advertising and promotion.

Communities chose from a range of policy options to control tobacco product promotion:

- voluntary: using public influence to convince organizations and businesses to change their policies regarding tobacco product promotion.
- enforcement: motivating enforcement of existing federal, state or local laws, regulations, or voluntary codes.
- regulatory: enacting or strengthening public policies, regulations, or laws.

In 1998, the Operation Storefront campaign was adopted by Oregon Health Division Tobacco Prevention and Education Program. A key element of the state-wide tobacco reduction plan is the funding of tobacco-free coalitions to work on 2-4 defined issues, depending on the size of the county. One of the four mandatory issues for large counties is to decrease tobacco advertising.^{xxiii}

Project SMART (Sponsorship Mission: Avoid Reliance on Tobacco) Money

The goal of Project SMART Money is to decrease and eventually eliminate tobacco sponsorship, philanthropy and signage from community events and civic organizations in the state of California. The project was initiated in 1997 by the Tobacco Control Section of the California Department of Health. The two-year campaign involves two phases of activity—community assessment and intervention. The key intervention strategies to be used are:

- organizational policy development (encouraging organizations to adopt policies against acceptance of tobacco industry advertising, sponsorship funding, and sponsorship promotion);
- alternative sponsorship funding (helping groups identify and seek alternative funding sources); and
- lease agreement contract language (for example, implementing a policy that bans tobacco advertisements in municipal athletic facilities).

ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED**Health Groups**

Canadian Cancer Society, Carleton Unit, Ontario East Region
Carlington Community and Health Services
Centre for Addiction and Mental Health
Centretown Community Health Centre
Heart and Stroke Foundation of Ontario, Gloucester/Cumberland Chapter
Heart and Stroke Foundation of Ontario, Nepean/Kanata Chapter
Heart and Stroke Foundation of Ontario, Ontario East Region
Heart Check, The University of Ottawa Heart Institute
Lung Association of Ottawa-Carleton
Ottawa-Carleton Council on Smoking and Health
Pinecrest-Queensway Health & Community Services
Sandy Hill Community Health Centre
Somerset West Community Health Centre
South-East Ottawa Centre for a Healthier Community

Arts and Cultural Organizations

Canadian Tulip Festival
Council for the Arts in Ottawa
Franco-Ontarian Festival
Opera Lyra Ottawa
Ottawa International Jazz Festival
The Great Canadian Theatre Company

Other Municipalities

City of Ottawa

Other Organizations

National Capital Commission
Ottawa Economic Development Corporation
Ottawa Tourism and Convention Authority
The Ottawa Board of Trade

REFERENCES

-
- ⁱ Canadian Council on Smoking and Health, *Tobacco Sponsorship Advertising in the Ottawa-Hull Region*, written by Randy Woods, December 1993.
- ⁱⁱ Data for the Region of Ottawa-Carleton as sampled by the 1996 National Population Health Survey
- ⁱⁱⁱ Cabinet document, No. 18-71, May 6, 1971.
- ^{iv} World Health Organization, *Pushing Smoke: Tobacco advertising and promotion, Smoke-free Europe 8*, 1988.
- ^v Private communication with Mark Trask, Director of Development, Opera Lyra, 22 September 1999.
- ^{vi} Letter from Diane Finkle, Senior Advisor—Public Issues, Canadian Cancer Society, Ontario Division, 4 October 1999.
- ^{vii} Letter from Susan Harrison, Regional Director, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, 29 September 1999.
- ^{viii} Letter from Stella Andriopoulos, Executive Director, Centretown Community Health Centre, 4 October 1999.
- ^{ix} John Pierce et al, “Smoking Initiation by Adolescent Girls, 1944 Through 1988: An Association With Targeted Advertising,” *JAMA*, February 23, 1994, Vol. 271(8): 608-611.
- ^x Judith Mackay, “The Role of Canada in the Global Tobacco Epidemic,” Speech to the Tobacco-Free Canada Conference, 20 October 1993.
- ^{xi} *RJR-MacDonald Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, September 21, 1995, S.C.C., file nos. 23460 and 23490, per Mr. Justice La Forest.
- ^{xii} Nicola Evans et al, “Influence of Tobacco Marketing and Exposure to Smokers on Adolescent Susceptibility to Smoking,” *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, 87(20), October 18, 1995.
- ^{xiii} G. Botvin et al, “Smoking Behavior of Adolescents Exposed to Cigarette Advertising,” *Public Health Reports*, 108(2), March-April 1993, pp. 217-224.
- ^{xiv} John Pierce et al, “Tobacco Industry Promotion of Cigarettes and Adolescent Smoking,” *JAMA*, 1998; 279: 511-515.
- ^{xv} Canadian Council on Smoking and Health, *Tobacco Sponsorship Advertising in the Ottawa-Hull Region*, written by Randy Woods, December 1993.
- ^{xvi} IEG Inc., *IEG’s Complete Guide to Sponsorship: Everything you need to know about sports, arts, event, entertainment and cause marketing*, 1995.
- ^{xvii} Chris Mihill, “Racing ‘hooks’ boy smokers,” *The Guardian*, 14 November 1997. Research results also published in a Letter to the Editor in 14 November 1997 edition of *The Lancet*.
- ^{xviii} Health Canada, *1994 Youth Smoking Survey*, 1996.
- ^{xix} Economics and Operational Research Division, U.K. Department of Health, *Effect of Tobacco Advertising on Tobacco Consumption: A Discussion Document Reviewing the Evidence*, 1992.
- ^{xx} Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Best Practices for Comprehensive Tobacco Control Programs*, “Chapter 6: Counter Marketing,” August 1999. Taken from: <http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/osh/bestprac.htm>.
- ^{xxi} Technical Assistance Legal Center, Public Health Institute, Oakland, California, private communication with Leslie Zellers, TALC Legal Director, 9 November 1999.
- ^{xxii} Elaine Tencati et al, *Operation Storefront: Youth Against Tobacco Advertising and Promotion, Five Case Studies of Phase III Projects*, December 1996.
- ^{xxiii} Oregon Health Division, *Tobacco Prevention and Education Program Report, 1999*, February 1999.