

proposals are listed in Table 1. The President's initiative, to be carried out initially on an administrative basis without legislation (and already challenged in the courts), bears a striking resemblance to the more restrictive anti-smoking policy of the Canadian federal government, as incorporated in the Tobacco Products Control Act of 1988 and subsequent legislation. As one early news story put it, Canada "already has field-tested virtually all of the Administration's proposals" (Symonds, 1995). This similarity has not been lost on the Canadian government. In Tobacco Control: A Blueprint to Protect the Health of Canadians, issued in December, 1995 in the wake of a Canadian Supreme Court decision invalidating the Tobacco Products Control Act, 1988, Health Canada comments on the (then) proposed new FDA rules: "Many components of the U.S. initiative mirrored the Canadian experience" (p. 13). A quick comparison of the 1988 Canadian legislation with the 1996 FDA regulations and Bill C-71 , as shown in Tables 1, 2, and 3 indicates that this claim has considerable face validity.

(Tables 1, 2, and 3 about here.)

Both President Clinton's 1993-94 attempted comprehensive health care reform and, more recently, his initiative to have the Food and Drug Administration regulate smoking through controls on advertising and distribution of tobacco products are potential