

Adjournment Debate

Saskatchewan, a jurisdiction whose sources are found at the very roots of our Constitution. If we accept, as I think we all do, that the administration of justice is a subject of exclusive provincial jurisdiction, then we must accept that only the responsible provincial authorities are empowered to produce material relating to this particular case, and indeed all such cases.

As I indicated when this motion was tabled on February 23, 1977, and I quote from page 3345 of *Hansard*:

—the transcript of the preliminary hearing will be made available to the hon. member, upon request, by the office of the deputy attorney general, Regina, Saskatchewan.

The hon. member has a copy of the transcript because he referred to it.

To request that papers under the control and direction of the attorney general of the province of Saskatchewan be produced in this House would, I submit, sorely test, and be highly detrimental to the conduct of relations with the province of Saskatchewan and, because of the unprecedented character of such an action within the area of administration of justice, with all the other provinces that contract for the services of the RCMP.

Federal-provincial respect of jurisdictional boundaries is vital to an effective policing system in Canada. The police battle against crime grows daily more complex and demanding. Its successful prosecution depends upon a wide variety of factors, not the least of which is a clear division of responsibilities and jurisdictions. Accordingly, if we were to accede to the hon. member for Red Deer's motion, I submit we would disrupt the clear lines of jurisdiction. Certainly this is not what we need in this nation. If we are to be successful in combatting crime—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have to cut in to—

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, may I just interrupt to ask a very important and brief question. Did the hon. member through his department ask the attorney general to produce these documents so that he can supply them to us?

Mr. Towers: Yes or no.

Mr. Lee: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that; I would have to check into that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Hon. members are aware that we have gone beyond the hour provided for the consideration of private members' business, and if we are to pursue questions or speeches we would need unanimous consent. Therefore, I think the House had better proceed now with the adjournment motion.

● (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

HEALTH—POSSIBILITY OF CONTROLLING USE OF TOBACCO

Mr. W. Kenneth Robinson (Toronto-Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I asked a question of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) on May 26, 1977, which appears in *Hansard* at page 5964 as follows:

In view of the known dangers of smoking to health, is the minister considering the possibility of controlling tobacco under the Food and Drugs Act?

The minister's answer was: "Not at this time". This answer is most unfortunate when the matter is so serious. I should point out to the members of the House that this same matter was presented before the United States Senate on the same date as I presented it here in the House of Commons.

Over the past 70 years people have become increasingly concerned with the quality of their environment. Technological developments have given scientists the means to protect society from once dreaded diseases, and in many cases these maladies are now almost unheard of. One of the reasons for this vast improvement in public health is the discovery and availability of drugs to prevent and cure. However, there is also another component which is often forgotten, and that is the regulation of the purity of food and water.

Perhaps one of the most common defences used to protect our health is the strict standards which our drinking water must measure up to. This same type of protection is also provided to ensure that the food we eat, and the drugs we must take from time to time, will benefit rather than harm us. Similarly, we are exceedingly cautious in the types of chemicals available for general use.

The success of those who administer the statutes and regulations concerning water, food, and chemicals is recognized by everyone. We are constantly made aware by the various media of the concerns of the scientists who are continually examining and evaluating the many new substances which may affect some aspect of our lives. Often we do not fully understand the technicalities involved, but because of the track record of our authorities we accept and respect their warnings.

I would like to turn to a particular warning that has been expressed by health authorities around the world. I refer to the specified danger of inhaling the smoke of tobacco. This danger is, according to those who know, one that is avoidable. However, unlike our water and food, which we also take into our bodies, with a few exceptions the air we breathe is not protected by similar health standards.

It is generally recognized that the use of tobacco products has a long history of social acceptance. Moreover, smoking has become a type of status symbol. We also use smoking to