



**Please
I want some more**

FORCE OF NATURE

THE WHOLE TRUTH FROM AN INDEPENDENT PERSPECTIVE from
National Organization Responding Against HUJE that seek to harm the Green Space Industry (NORAHG)

EnviroPROFIT



Pesticide Ban Position Questioned

February 16th, 2012

The Western Producer

[Province of Manitoba]

Selected and adapted excerpts



Canadian
Cancer
Society

cancer-lunatic MONEY



**Canadian Cancer Society has spent thousands
and possibly millions of donor dollars on
anti-pesticide information and advocacy**

If there is not a scientific connection, why would one of Canada's largest charities **USE DONOR DOLLARS TO PROMOTE ANTI-PESTICIDE PROHIBITION** across the country ?

When the Government of Manitoba announced plans for a cosmetic pesticide ban in early February 2012, it cited research done by several so-called health organizations to justify its new policy on pest control products.

One of them was the Canadian Cancer Society, which is **NOT** a health, science, or research organization, but rather a **FUND-RAISING** and **LOBBYING** organization.

Canadian Cancer Society has **SPENT THOUSANDS AND POSSIBLY MILLIONS OF DONOR DOLLARS ON ANTI-PESTICIDE INFORMATION AND ADVOCACY.**

Yet, on its web-site, the society states **THERE IS NO PROVEN LINK BETWEEN PEST CONTROL PRODUCTS AND CANCER.**

If there is **NO** scientific connection, why would one of Canada's largest charities use donor dollars to promote Anti-Pesticide **PROHIBITION** across the country ?

Greg Thomson thinks he knows why.

enviro

PROFIT



If there is NO scientific connection, why would one of Canada's largest charities use donor dollars to promote Anti-Pesticide PROHIBITION ?

Thomson is Director of Research at Charity Intelligence, which conducts research on Canadian charities to help donors make informed giving decisions.

Thomson said Canadian Cancer Society's advocacy for Anti-Pesticide PROHIBITION is NOT entirely motivated by its desire to protect Canadians from the dangers of pesticides.

Its stance is also about RAISING MONEY.

According to Thomson, who studies Canadian Cancer Society for Charity Intelligence —

<< *There's a lot of statements that come out of large charities that have to be tempered by the fact that they are MARKETING STATEMENTS.* >>

The so-called « *cosmetic pesticide ban* » became an agricultural issue in Manitoba immediately after its announcement, provoking a forceful reaction from farm leaders.

cancer-lunatic **MONEY**



Canadian Cancer Society has spent thousands
and possibly millions of donor dollars on
anti-pesticide information and advocacy

*There is the concern that Anti-Pesticide
PROHIBITION will HARDEN PUBLIC SENTIMENT
AGAINST ALL PEST CONTROL PRODUCTS*

While Anti-Pesticide PROHIBITION in the Urban Landscape does not restrict the agricultural use of herbicides and insecticides, GROWERS ARE WORRIED THAT WEEDS WILL SPREAD FROM MUNICIPAL PROPERTY TO FARMLAND.

Moreover, there is the concern that Anti-Pesticide PROHIBITION will HARDEN PUBLIC SENTIMENT AGAINST **ALL** PEST CONTROL PRODUCTS, said Doug Chorney, President of Keystone Agricultural Producers.

In other words, consumers will begin to ask why growers are allowed to spray chemicals on food if spraying pest control products on lawns is dangerous.

enviro

PROFIT



If there is NO scientific connection, why would one of Canada's largest charities use donor dollars to promote Anti-Pesticide PROHIBITION ?

Canadian Cancer Society's web-site states that scientific research does NOT provide a conclusive link between pesticides and human cancer

Canadian Cancer Society's recommendation for Anti-Pesticide PROHIBITION tops the list of reasons the Government of Manitoba has given for introducing the legislation.

However, Thomson of Charity Intelligence said Canadian Cancer Society's support of Anti-Pesticide PROHIBITION is puzzling because a page on its web-site states that scientific research does NOT « *provide a conclusive link between pesticides and human cancer* »

Greg Thomson said donors should ask why Canadian Cancer Society is spending money on an anti-pesticide campaign if there isn't an established connection.

cancer-lunatic MONEY



Canadian Cancer Society has spent thousands
and possibly millions of donor dollars on
anti-pesticide information and advocacy

*Charity Intelligence recommends that donors
should ask why Canadian Cancer Society is
spending money on an anti-pesticide campaign
if THERE IS NO PROVEN LINK BETWEEN
PEST CONTROL PRODUCTS AND CANCER*

According to Thomson at Charity Intelligence —

<< *If there is really no proof, at this point, that pesticides
cause cancer, I would prefer that my dollar to the Canadian
Cancer Society not go towards that.*

enviro

PROFIT



If there is NO scientific connection, why would one of Canada's largest charities use donor dollars to promote Anti-Pesticide PROHIBITION ?

In 2010 – 2011, Canadian Cancer Society spent 41 million dollars on activities related to cancer prevention, information and advocacy, and spent 49 million dollars on cancer research

Thomson said part of his job is to inform the public about what Canadian Cancer Society is advocating, the validity of the science backing the advocacy and how much money the society spends on those activities.

In 2010 – 2011, Canadian Cancer Society spent 41 million dollars on activities related to cancer prevention, information and advocacy, while spending 49 million dollars on cancer research.

cancer-lunatic MONEY



Canadian Cancer Society has spent thousands
and possibly millions of donor dollars on
anti-pesticide information and advocacy

In spite of his concerns, Thomson said Canadian Cancer Society is taking a safe position on pest control products because the public has little love for chemicals and more consumers are allegedly embracing organic food.

According to Thomson at Charity Intelligence —

<< On this issue, it (their position) makes sense to me.

There's not much of a downside to saying we think this should be restricted. >>

Thomson said it's not unusual for charities to take a position to appease or motivate a certain group of donors because they are in the business of both helping people and raising funds.

<< They have the knowledge that what they state may or may not attract future dollars. >>

enviro

PROFIT



If there is NO scientific connection, why would one of Canada's largest charities use donor dollars to promote Anti-Pesticide PROHIBITION ?

Charity Intelligence suggests that Canadian Cancer Society figure out that there is a link before demanding Anti-Pesticide PROHIBITION

However, Thomson is still concerned that the society is calling for a Anti-Pesticide PROHIBITION when the science linking pesticides to cancer is so tenuous.

<< I'd rather them figure out there is a link before they make that statement.

I would say please show me the proof. >>

cancer-lunatic MONEY



Canadian Cancer Society has spent thousands
and possibly millions of donor dollars on
anti-pesticide information and advocacy

Canadian Health Association's policies on pest control products —

- The Canadian Medical Association DOES NOT RECOMMEND A BAN ON THE USE OF COSMETIC PESTICIDES, but it does call for more research on the health impact of chemical substances and recommends that pesticide use be minimized and managed wisely.
- The Canadian Paediatric Society (CPS) DOES NOT HAVE A POSITION ON THE HEALTH RISK OF PESTICIDES. The organization doesn't have a position because volunteer committees, which raise policy issues, have not brought concerns about pesticides to the CPS board. However, the CPS does have policies on banning children from tanning salons and preventing snowboarding injuries.
- The Ontario College of Family Physicians published a review of pesticides and human health in 2004. It concluded that exposure is linked to cancer, reproductive problems, and neurological diseases, and that children are particularly vulnerable to pesticides. Environmental groups and health advocates often cite the report to highlight the dangers of pesticides but HEALTH CANADA HAS DISCREDITED THE OCFP REPORT. It said the report relied on a small group of epidemiological studies to connect pesticides and disease.

*Anti-Pesticide-Basterds
DO NOT DESERVE ANY
Tax Exempt Money*

