

*Measure to Restrain Tobacco Use*

statistics one should know how they were gathered, how many samples were taken, and so on.

What concerns me a great deal, Mr. Speaker, is that in the compilation of the report of that standing committee I have the impression that the writers followed a very selective procedure in bringing out evidence which seemed to favour a preconceived conclusion. In substantiation of this assertion I should like to quote from an important medical authority who gave evidence before the committee and whose reputation is beyond question. I refer to Dr. William B. Ober, director of laboratories at the Knickerbocker Hospital in New York and associate professor of pathology at the New York Medical College. His evidence was entirely omitted. This is what he said, and this is why we are so annoyed that people continue to cite tobacco as the number one health hazard:

I have noticed a reluctance by the people who claim cigarette smoking causes lung cancer to present statistics which fail to support or which even negate their preconceived ideas. This is not acceptable in scientific argument. It is what is known as *suppressio veri*. They are perfectly willing to tell you in great detail about all the carcinogenic substances they have extracted from tobacco smoke, but they never bother to tell you that they have repeatedly failed to induce epidermoid carcinoma of the lung in any experimental animal by exposing it to these substances or by having batches of experimental animals inhale cigarette smoke for hours on end. The most they have been able to accomplish is to apply the tar extracted from smoke condensate to the skin of mice and produce small skin tumours, most of them not malignant, some of them, yes, malignant but the same sort of skin tumour one can produce in mouse-skin by applying a variety of harmless substances; that is, harmless to humans. In spite of the several million dollars expended on mouse, rat and dog experiments, it has all come to nothing, no proof whatsoever.

• (1640)

In other words, there is simply no cause and effect proof that cigarette smoking is the number one health hazard it is claimed to be. This is why we become uptight and tend to look askance at legislation of this type. Again I say that a ban on advertising is not the answer. I could quote statistics to show the proof of that statement. I have already mentioned the fact that in the United States cigarette consumption has continued to increase. It should also be noted that figures for Italy, where a total ban exists, or for the United Kingdom, Denmark, Iceland, The Netherlands and New Zealand, where partial bans exist, show that during the five years after the establishment of such bans cigarette smoking has continued to increase. So I say a ban is simply not the answer.

I think this is our biggest quarrel with the whole program. Tobacco producers are sick and tired of having tobacco singled out as the number one enemy, while, as I have said many times, some of the other major health hazards in this land are ignored. I point to alcohol, which I think is the number one health hazard. When one considers the detrimental effect that overconsumption of alcohol has on the individual, not to mention the slaughter on our highways caused by accidents involving drunken drivers, or broken homes, welfare costs, and so on, if the people who continually harp against the tobacco industry went to the same trouble, using the same skill and assiduity, to collect statistics for consumption of alcohol they would be surprised at the result of their investigations. The smoking of tobacco would pale into insignificance compared with alcohol consumption.

[Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Halifax)]

If I may quote a medical authority in California, Dr. Marshall Orloff, who spoke at the Toronto Academy of Medicine, as reported in the *London Free Press* for January, 1970, he said alcohol causes 90 to 95 per cent of cases of cirrhosis of the liver and can harm even the weekend drinker. He said cirrhosis of the liver is the ninth highest cause of death on the North American continent. In an interview he went on to say that scientists have proven conclusively that alcohol is directly poisonous to liver cells.

Then, too, we are annoyed that no effort is made to ascertain the effects of pollution on cancer and other bodily ailments. I should like to quote the *Delhi News Record* for December 8, 1971, an article headed, "Pollution consultant takes swipe at MDs on smoking question":

Medical associations have wrongfully blamed the tobacco industry for rising lung cancer rates. This assertion was made by R. W. Johns, a Calgary air pollution consultant, at a convention in that city on November 29.

He told a meeting of the Engineering Institute of Canada that doctors are "woefully" ignorant of the role of air pollution.

Certainly anybody who has been to the Toronto international airport and suffered the pollution from contained automobile exhausts knows something about which we are talking. Then too, no attention is paid to the many other chemical substances that are ingested into our bodies. As reported in the *Globe and Mail* for December 4, 1971, 30 cancer experts from leading research centres of the United States and Europe met under the auspices of the World Health Organization to evaluate the cancer risk to man of various chemicals. With the international agency for research on cancer they will work on a program to evaluate the human cancer risk of hundreds of compounds which have been shown to cause cancer in animals.

I think the key to this whole question, whether we are talking of tobacco, alcohol, pollution, chemicals or what have you, is excess in any one of these elements of human activity. Anything done in excess can be harmful to human health. No one is suggesting that we want people to smoke themselves into the grave, if you like, by over-smoking; of course that would cause damage. But so would overeating, overdrinking and many other things.

I have spoken rather strongly about this matter because that is the way we feel. We feel, as I said in my opening remarks, that the tobacco industry is the heart and soul of the economy in the area I represent. Eight hundred million dollars of the money earned from tobacco products went into the tax revenues of various governments. Taxes from the sale of cigarettes account for 7 per cent of Ottawa's total tax revenues.

What would happen to Canada's thriving export market for tobacco in some 28 countries, the United Kingdom being by far the biggest buyer? From the 1970 crop, 78 million pounds of cigarette tobacco worth \$65 million was exported. Tobacco is Canada's second most important agricultural export, wheat being the first. It ranks sixth in value of all Canadian exports to the United Kingdom. And remember that exports are the life blood of the Canadian economy.

I have taken longer than perhaps I should have taken, but I wanted to get across to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the