

mentions paragraph 6 of the Agreement negotiated by the Government with the United States. Further down on the page, he said that he wanted to say with reference to the issue of sovereignty that the same agreement contains the following words, and he goes on. This is the Memorandum of Understanding the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon) could not find. However, it was sitting there on the front-bench seat of the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Langdon: I said nothing about that.

Mr. Lewis: He said: "My goodness, I'm prejudiced. I can't find it. Oh, I see, it's over there on the seat of the Hon. Member for Oshawa".

On page 2385 of *Hansard*—

Mr. de Corneille: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Does the Speaker believe that the present debate is at all related to the Bill?

Mr. Lewis: I will save you the embarrassment of answering that, Madam Speaker, because I do not wish to embarrass the Hon. Member any further. The point is that the Memorandum of Understanding was in the hands of the Opposition, in their offices, and they did not take the time to read it. To spend the time of this House suggesting that they did not have it in their offices is nonsense and all Hon. Members know that. The fact is that the Memorandum of Understanding was quoted by both Leaders of the Opposition.

I submit to you, Madam Speaker, that since it is four o'clock, we should end the debate on this delightful and informative note and proceed with Private Members' Business. By the way, I was shocked to see members of the Liberal Party try to deny a private Member her right—

Mr. Gauthier: On a point of order, Madam Speaker. That's a lot of nonsense and he knows it too.

• (1600)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—PUBLIC BILLS

[Translation]

NON-SMOKERS' HEALTH ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from November 20, 1986, consideration of the motion of Ms. McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood) that Bill C-204, an Act to regulate smoking in the federal workplace and on common carriers and to amend the Hazardous Products Act in relation to cigarette advertising, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Hull—Aylmer): Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take part in the debate on the Bill presented by the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald), Bill C-204, an Act to regulate smoking in the federal workplace and on common carriers and to amend

the Hazardous Products Act in relation to cigarette advertising.

Madam Speaker, I think this is an extremely important matter, especially now that we have had clear evidence for a number of years that smoking is indeed harmful to the health of Canadians.

The House will recall that not long ago, I think it was December 11, 1986, *The Ottawa Citizen* published the results of a survey in the Ottawa-Hull region that asked people if they would be agreeable to a complete ban on smoking in offices. Much to the surprise of the firm that conducted the survey, 79 per cent supported a ban on smoking at their place of work.

Of course I know that for a long time, the medical profession in particular has always been in favour of a ban on smoking in public places. Since 1938 some very important studies have been made, and in fact I think that in France, in 1859, more than a century ago, reports made on patients who died of cancers of the lip indicated that of sixty-eight cases, sixty-six were pipe or cigar smokers. As I recall, it was in 1938 that John Hopkins University Professor Pearl proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that the mortality rate among smokers was much higher than it was among non-smokers.

A number of other studies made in Canada, Great Britain and the United States also indicated quite clearly that the death rate among male smokers was 70 per cent higher than among male non-smokers.

In 1968-69 I had the pleasure of chairing the committee which studied the whole question of tobacco and cigarette use, and I can tell you that our report had a worldwide impact because we were the first country to make an in-depth study on the harmful effects of smoking.

We made a number of recommendations and some of them have since been implemented, such as a ban on radio and television advertising, as well as warnings on cigarette packages and cartons, including certain precautions to be taken by people who did not give up smoking.

If no action is taken in this respect, I am afraid there may very well be a 50 per cent increase in the number of lung cancer cases by the turn of the next century. Lung cancer is now the main cause of death among all cancer patients. It has a direct bearing on coronary arteries, which happens to be one of leading causes of death in Canada.

I commend my colleague from Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald) for introducing this Bill because I think it is imperative that we do something about this disease. I use the word "disease" advisedly for the simple reason that, if we fail to take appropriate action, air pollution in offices, public places and public transit systems will boost the lung cancer rate by 50 per cent, as I said earlier.

It is rather strange that, in our report to the House in 1968-69, we recommended that the members of the Canadian