

with only approximately \$4 billion in economic revenue from the tobacco industry.

It seems to me that most people would welcome this law banning smoking in the workplace except in designated areas. It has been enthusiastically supported by groups such as the Canadian Lung Association, the Non-Smokers' Rights Association, the Canadian Cancer Society, Physicians for a Smoke Free Canada, the Canadian Council on Smoking and Health and the Public Service Alliance of Canada.

Finally, I must point out that this Government does not have a good record when it comes to implementing legislation regulating smoking and tobacco. As noted in *The Globe and Mail* today, this Government allowed the tobacco industry to succeed in its lobby to remove two fundamental recommendations from the Tobacco Products Control Regulations, regulations which were to provide a serious warning system for tobacco.

First, this Government removed the requirement that every tobacco package should display messages identifying tobacco as addictive.

Second, the Government also removed the requirement that packages have an arrow circle display symbol which would draw attention to the risks of smoking.

This has seriously weakened the Tobacco Products Control Regulations and shows us that this Government cannot be trusted and that we must be careful to ensure that the Government takes its responsibilities to the citizens of Canada more seriously. It is obvious that the Non-smokers' Health Act is one that is necessary to help protect the good health of Canadians and to alleviate some of the negative and economic aspects of smoking.

With this new Act, hopefully the Government can redeem itself and show the people that truly the safety of Canadians is paramount and never can be subservient to the interests of the tobacco industry.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues and say it is a pleasure to participate in this debate. What becomes very clear is that this Bill is indeed a victory of parliamentary reform.

### *Non-smokers' Health Act*

The Non-smokers' Health Act, known as Bill C-204 in the last Parliament, was a victory for the role of Private Members. It was the first controversial Private Members' Bill selected as a votable item to succeed its passage through the House of Commons. Its eventual passage was certainly a testament to the determination of its mover, Lynn McDonald from the constituency of Broadwood—Greenwood. It was her incredible work that focused on the need to change the attitude of Canadians toward smoking, to show parliamentary leadership in terms of what could be done to clean up the Non-smokers' Health Act.

What we are debating today is a reflection of the success of that Private Members' Bill and indicates the diligence of the health community, particularly the Non-Smokers' Rights Association, the Canadian Medical Association, the Canadian Cancer Society and the Canadian Lung Association. There are other groups and hundreds of thousands of individuals who became involved in attempting to move parliamentarians to take action on this very, very critical issue.

I must say the willingness of back-benchers from all sides of the House, members of the New Democratic Party, Liberal and Conservative Parties, set aside partisan differences in moving that Private Members' Bill through. They voted for a cleaner environment and voted against the work of the tobacco lobby which if it had had its way would have us all smoking and smoking as much as we possibly could. That is a testament to how successful this place can be. All Members of Parliament deserve to be commended, those who voted in favour I might add, because there were still some who bowed to the pressure of the tobacco lobby and voted against a smoke-free workplace, if you can imagine, Mr. Speaker.

In the intervening months we have seen unanimous support for this initiative and now it seems incredibly Draconian to think that Members wanted to encourage people to smoke and encourage young people to begin the practice.

Unfortunately, the Bill did not emerge from the House unscathed. During very often acrimonious committee review, sections of the Bill were reworked and redrafted without the guidance of those who knew what elements were needed for the law to be enforceable. As a result, the Bill was more of a statement of principle than a framework for regulation. We all remember that