

I remember that when I was very young there were advertisements on television for a certain brand which claimed to be the "coolest, cleanest, and most refreshing". You may remember that as well. My oldest sister was smoking that brand in the house at the time. I thought to myself how wonderful it would be to enjoy that coolest, cleanest, most refreshing, fun thing. Therefore, the advertising does have an impact.

A number of Canadian magazines and newspapers, including the Kingston *Whig-Standard*, the Brockville *Recorder and Times* and *The Globe and Mail*, are now refusing to accept tobacco advertising because they believe it is unethical to advertise a product which is so clearly hazardous to your health. They may consider banning political advertising for the same reason.

My colleagues in the federal Government have met with representatives of the Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers Council with a view toward taking stronger action on tobacco advertising and promotion. Of special concern are the issues of life-style advertising and promotion aimed at teenagers and adults, the effectiveness of current health warnings, and the effectiveness of current compliance procedures.

Smokers must face another reality which I, as a smoker, accept. More and more employers are establishing policies which restrict smoking in the workplace. For example, the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia and a variety of other companies have adopted as their goal a smoke-free workplace and are moving in that direction. Bata Industries Ltd. has already entirely banned smoking on the job. Municipalities such as the City of Ottawa are banning smoking at work stations and are working toward a complete ban on smoking in the workplace. In my home Province of British Columbia, the City of Vancouver passed a by-law significantly restricting tobacco smoke in most indoor public places in the city including places of employment. Workplaces in Vancouver must now automatically become non-smoking areas if no consensus can be reached among employees on smoking in the workplace. Smoking has also been banned in areas such as taxis, retail shops, service counters and queues.

In my own riding of Nanaimo—Alberni many municipalities and school boards are restricting the presence of tobacco smoke, but they insist on having an area somewhere in the building where employees can enjoy a puff, or sneak a puff, as is the case these days.

When this debate began on November 20 my colleague, the Member for Calgary South (Mrs. Sparrow), mentioned that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie) has proposed a new air regulation to ban smoking in Canadian aircraft for both domestic and transborder flights of two hours or less. Most smokers can accept that. Most of us manage to sit through a movie for two hours without feeling the urge. However, the key is "two hours or less".

Non-Smokers' Health Act

Generally smokers are courteous. Some may be surprised at that, but we are. We normally respect the rights of others, but we have rights as well. Clause 5 of the proposed Bill reads:

No person shall smoke anywhere, other than in a designated smoking room, in or on an aircraft—a ship—a railway car—(or) a motor vehicle operated pursuant to—

This puts a whole new meaning on the old political adage that as far as the NDP are concerned, if it moves, legislate it. Why should we expect any Canadian who takes a six or seven-hour flight across the country not to be able to indulge in a cigarette? This legislation may be enforceable on a boat, a train, or a bus, but I think that is asking a bit too much on the long flights which some of us often take across the country.

We are told that one-third of Canadians smoke and two-thirds do not. We know that all Parties in this House are concerned about minority rights. We would not want to unduly infringe upon the minority rights of Canadians.

This Chamber is a good example of how courteous smokers can be. There are many unwritten rules in the House of Commons. No smoking is allowed here where we stand. I understand that is also the case in Quebec, although the previous Premier slipped one day. No coffee is allowed in this part of the Chamber and male Members must wear a jacket and tie. Female Members do not have that regulation imposed on them, but I am sure equal rights will get into that as well. Yes, Madam Speaker, you do wear a jacket and tie. Madam Speaker is looking very spiffy today.

I believe it is only common courtesy to allow those of us in the minority in Canada to continue to do as we wish as long as we do not infringe, in the long haul, on the rights of other Canadians who do not smoke.

I offer those words of wisdom on behalf of my fellow Canadians who do smoke. I hope we can pass this Bill after making a couple of amendments in committee, if at all possible, which would allow those of us who must have a puff to do so on common carriers, and particularly on airplanes.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Madam Speaker, it is interesting that more and more groups are supporting this legislation. I would like to begin my remarks by listing some of the groups which have indicated their support for the legislation. I will not give a complete list, because I would not have any time left to speak on the legislation itself. Those groups which support the legislation include The Lung Association, the Medical Society of Nova Scotia, the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Health Unit, the Canadian Cancer Society, the Canadian Council on Smoking and Health, the Canadian Medical Association, the Manitoba Medical Association and the Canadian Hospital Association. As I indicated, that is only a partial list because there are more groups who support the legislation.

● (1620)

As the Hon. Member for Hull-Aylmer (Mr. Isabelle) mentioned, this is something that has been studied in the past