

what you need is a law prohibiting relations between related persons. We have never seen fit to have that. Why would we, in fact, bar marriages?

My recollection—and Senator Flynn can correct me—is that in the earlier hearings, about three or four years ago, when we did eight bills at once, one of the things that we looked for was to be certain that the people were past the age of child bearing. We had, for example, a 90-year-old man and a 70-year-old woman. It was often included in the material that was sent to us that they were beyond child-bearing years.

In any event, the most telling point of Professor Hubbard was that we have no law prohibiting relations; that would be more important than having a law prohibiting marriage.

Then, finally, this may well be a quote, but Professor Hubbard does not know it.

Senator Frith: No, your quote is fine.

Senator Nurgitz: He recommended that the scope of the present prohibitions be narrowed to exclude prohibitions against marriage. His view was that eugenic and social justifications for retaining prohibitions are no longer persuasive or appropriate by today's medical and ethical standards.

Hon. Henry D. Hicks: Honourable senators, may I ask a question along the same lines? While Professor Hubbard may have expressed this view, did he approve of the retention in the legislation of the prohibition against marriage for persons who are lineally related by adoption? It seems to me that there are no genetic reasons why marriage should be prohibited between a man and a woman who had been adopted by him. Did Professor Hubbard have a view on that?

Senator Nurgitz: I apologize to Senator Hicks. I do not recall. We have not heard from Professor Hubbard in about two years, and my recollection is that he had none.

I recall the 1978 case of two people who had been adopted shortly after birth, were raised as brother and sister, and were separated for a number of years. Each had lost their spouse through a death. Both had even moved to the U.S., and had suddenly come back, for some reason, to retire in Saskatchewan. These two people found each other. They had many things in common and wished to be married. Now, I believe that is the story of the 1978 case, the name of which I do not recall.

Senator Hicks: Well, their marriage would not be prohibited under this legislation.

Senator Nurgitz: That is correct.

Senator Hicks: But the father-adoptive daughter, or the mother-adoptive son marriage would be prohibited.

Senator Nurgitz: That is correct.

Senator Hicks: Yes. Well, I want to say something about this, but I shall wait until a later time. Thank you.

On motion of Senator Neiman, debate adjourned.

HAZARDOUS PRODUCTS ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Haidasz, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator Lapointe, P.C., for the second reading of the Bill S-4, An Act to amend the Hazardous Products Act (tobacco and tobacco products).—(*Honourable Senator Argue, P.C.*).

Hon. Hazen Argue: Honourable senators, I rise to support Bill S-4, introduced a considerable time ago by Senator Haidasz.

I think it is an important bill. The purpose of the bill is to ban the advertising of tobacco and tobacco products.

As with any other subject, when you move in one direction, you may appear to be causing hardship by such a move. Of course, there is a tobacco industry; there are tobacco farmers, and to the extent that peoples' habits are changing, the demand for tobacco smoking is going down, and that industry faces difficulty. However, while the two questions are related, both need to be addressed, namely, if farmers who have had a substantial income from the production of tobacco do, in fact, get into trouble economically, then action by the government to assist them in production of other products, and to assist them in whatever financial difficulty they may be in, might well be taken, while at the same time generally understanding the great hazard that tobacco constitutes for the health of Canadians.

Dr. Haidasz made a most comprehensive and very effective speech. Nothing that I can say can add very much to the statement he has made. However, from time to time I think it is proper and desirable to let a senator who is putting forward a bill know that there is support for that bill, and that his colleagues think it is an important initiative which should have general support, go on and be dealt with in committee, should come back to the Senate and, we hope, receive Senate approval. It should then go on to the House of Commons where, it is to be hoped, it will be dealt with in a supportive manner.

It has been pointed out that 30 per cent of cancer deaths may be caused by smoking, and that 32,000 Canadians died as a result of tobacco-related diseases in a given year. Those kinds of figures indicate the major hazard that smoking constitutes in terms of the health of the Canadian nation.

In dealing with this major question, one does realize that the position of the tobacco industry is influential and that there is definitely pressure from it to oppose any banning of the advertising of tobacco. Nonetheless, I think it should be the role of parliamentarians to proceed and to take the necessary action to sustain and protect the health of Canadians generally.

There are a lot of vested interests, of course, in the tobacco industry. It is a major industry and, as has been pointed out in an article in the *Toronto Star*, pharmacists are encouraged by tobacco companies, through the offering of free cigarettes or by the payment of actual cash, to display tobacco products in a