

enough to give it a little more time, following their September 1984 decision. Personally, I shall sit tomorrow on the Finance Committee to complete the study of Bill C-80

I should be delighted if the economy lesson given by Senator MacEachen could be the first of a long series of conferences on the subject. This brought to my memory the many conferences of ministers of finance or first ministers which I have attended, as well as Mr. MacEachen's good years, when he was fully convinced that his proposals would get Canada going again, while promising better days economically and socially. I am looking forward to many other lessons from Senator MacEachen. They would certainly be enlightening. To improve the situation, we would be well advised to remember that those years were not so fine and rich in employment for Canadians. I suggest that if we want to prepare tomorrow, we should not imitate the former government and maintain the programs which it implemented or failed to implement. Let us try instead to build a more stable and economically acceptable Canada.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*: Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the third time?

On motion of Senator Simard, bill referred to Standing Senate Committee on National Finance.

[*English*]

NOTICE OF COMMITTEE MEETING

Hon. Orville H. Phillips: Honourable senators, may I take this opportunity to advise the chamber that the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance is scheduled to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

● (1630)

SMOKING PROHIBITION BILL

SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Leave having been given to revert to Order No. 3:

Hon. Stanley Haidasz moved the second reading of Bill S-8, to prohibit smoking in certain work areas and on board certain modes of transport.

He said: I wish to express my thanks to honourable senators for allowing me to revert to Order No. 3 so as to deliver a few remarks on Bill S-8, to prohibit smoking in certain work areas and on board certain modes of transport. In rising to launch this debate on second reading of this bill, which I introduced in the Senate on February 13, I would like to make it clear that the primary aim of this proposed legislation is to protect the rights of non-smokers, who are now in the majority in Canada. According to a Statistics Canada report of 1982, 62 per cent of Canadians do not smoke. Essentially, this bill is designed to protect non-smokers from the deleterious effects of combustible substances, especially tobacco, found harmful to health. Furthermore, I wish to make it clear that this bill is in no way

intended to deprive of their freedom those persons who wish to smoke a legal substance. I am sure we all agree that smokers have the right to smoke. But I also believe that smokers have a definite responsibility, and I would emphasize that it is a moral one, to consider the effect of their smoking on non-smokers. Martin Dewey, a Canadian journalist, in his recent book entitled, *Smoke in the Workplace*, wrote:

Where the tobacco industry or smokers claim there is a right to smoke, they are talking in code. They are not really asserting a right to smoke, for it is generally conceded that people have every right to do so, just as they have every right to drink pop or chew gum or beat themselves over the head with a board. What they are asserting is a right to smoke at will; that is, to smoke without regard for the consequences to others. They are claiming the right to pollute, and the long and short of it is that there is no such right in society.

Dr. James Repace, a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency expert on the effects of smoking, wrote that smokers have the right to enjoy the risks of smoking, just as they have the right to play Russian roulette. He maintained that when they smoke indoors, however, in the presence of others, they are playing Russian roulette with non-smokers' health. This they do not have the right to do.

A few years ago, Mr. Justice Walter Tarnopolsky of the Supreme Court of Ontario, a former professor of law and a former president of the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, himself a smoker—at least, he was when he made this statement—said:

It would be misdirected to equate the "right" to smoke with such fundamental civil liberties as the right of free speech, the right of assembly, freedom of religion, et cetera. A person's freedom to act must certainly be limited when such acts injure or tend to injure others. The claim of a person to a right to unpolluted air must take precedence over a claim to smoke in public . . . A person's "right" to smoke might more accurately be described as a limited privilege.

Furthermore, I think that all of us would agree that people must be free to choose—at least, that is what we practise in Canada—but that is provided that it is an informed choice. Dr. George Godber, former Chief Medical Officer of England, stated at the United Nations WHO meeting in Geneva four years ago:

That informed choice is hopelessly prejudiced if it has to be made against the constant pressure of sales promotion, always presenting smoking as a sociable, attractive activity of normal men and women in pleasant circumstances. By now we have come to realize that smoking is essentially a form of addiction, which is cleverly reinforced by sales promotion.

The specious argument of the tobacco industry about a right ignores the fundamental interest and responsibility of governments in protecting public health. In all countries, government has the power to intervene to preserve the quality of the