

*Non-Smokers' Health Act*

population who should lead by their example in Canada be encouraged to do so. This included such people as parents, naturally, as well as teachers, doctors, nurses, and all those who had direct or indirect dealings with public. We also found some rather strange facts in our study as concerns the example which some people should give when it comes to smoking.

For instance, at the beginning, men smoked much more than women, but for some reason, during the sixties, women started to smoke more than men. However, since 1981, there has been a slight tendency for women to smoke less. Another interesting fact is that those who do smoke seem to do so more than ever because, while the number of smokers has gone down, the volume of cigarette consumption has increased, which could lead to a national disaster if we do not take action to put an end to this ill, which I find worse than acid rain, and we know what harm acid rain can cause to vegetation in this country. However, in this case, it is human beings who are being harmed.

From the submissions presented to the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare, we also found that it was essential to educate the public, and this point is closely related to the role of those who should preach by their example. However, we found, for instance, that there were cigarette machines at the door in certain school boards. Then we asked some school boards: "Why not put them in a remote spot?" And they replied: "It is our only livelihood. The money coming from the machine enables us to carry on certain activities which otherwise we could not." I think that educators entrusted with the care of our children should act consistently and intelligently. There has been no co-operation since 1968. I know that lately there has been a bit more co-operation from some professional organizations which seem to be more eager to exert pressures on the Government so that legislation is passed to eradicate totally the nefarious effects of smoking in Canada.

We should also point out that, strangely enough, youngsters under 15 years of age are smoking and drinking. Both are closely related.

Madam Speaker, I should have liked to have dealt more thoroughly with this very interesting issue but I have to close now to allow another Hon. Member to speak. I hope that when the matter comes to a vote, all political parties in the House will agree to eradicate forever the dangerous and lethal effects of smoking.

● (1610)

[English]

**Mr. Ted Schellenberg (Nanaimo—Alberni):** Madam Speaker, it is rather refreshing to finally debate something today. If this kind of nonsense continues, perhaps we should have five or six hours of debate on Private Member's business and one hour on Orders of the Day.

It is quite appropriate that this Bill is being debated so soon after "cold turkey day". I commend the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald) for her Bill and

would like to say a few words on behalf of the smokers of Canada, of whom I am one. I will first comment on the good things about Bill C-204. The Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood and I have sparred with each other in the Committee on Communications and Culture. She would not allow any smoking in that committee. I was not there the infamous day she broke all the ashtrays, but I heard a great deal about it. I believe the Hon. Member means well, although there is a clause in this Bill which does impugn minority rights.

In her remarks on the introduction of this Bill on November 20 the Hon. Member complimented the Government on the parliamentary reform which allowed her to bring in this Bill. She also said that discouraging smokers will mean more jobs in other sectors. She said:

People who stop smoking buy other products and other services. They go to the movies and to restaurants, they buy clothes, and so forth. I think rising demand in these sectors will create more employment.

That is a very good point and very reasoned debate. She also said that this Bill "would provide for designated smoking rooms for those individuals who do not smoke, who happen to be a majority in this country". I agree with that. However, she went on to say:

It would also mean that there would be no smoking in common carriers under federal jurisdiction.

I will get into that in a moment.

The portion of Bill C-204 which makes eminent good sense is that which deals with the banning of the advertising of tobacco products. Cigarette smoking is emerging as a major public health concern for many Canadians. As a result of this growing awareness of the effects of cigarette smoking, the public wants some action on several tobacco issues, including tobacco advertising. The Non-Smokers' Rights Association has documented numerous violations of the current tobacco manufacturers' voluntary tobacco advertising and promotion, including the practice of advertising tobacco products on billboards and store posters within 200 metres of school property.

Moreover, the "Tempo" cigarette ad campaign last year raised public concern and was, in my opinion, clearly directed at recruiting new smokers among Canadian youth, in contravention of the voluntary advertising code. The new 15-cigarette Export A pack has also been a worrisome tobacco marketing practice since the lower price does make the product more accessible to Canadian youth. Unfortunately, in a declining tobacco market an increasing number of these questionable advertising and promotion campaigns can be expected.

Advertising and promoting such a hazardous product has been a source of concern for some time. This is due to the fact that advertising associates tobacco products with healthy, exciting and glamorous lifestyles, that it increases the acceptability of tobacco products among young people, and that it generally legitimizes tobacco use.