

Nova Scotia—that advertising does in fact have an influence on very young people and that it does contribute toward their adoption of this dangerous habit. I am convinced now beyond any doubt—five years ago I was not—that the use of tobacco is a dangerous health hazard and does, in fact, lead to a much greater increase in the incidence of disease and death in respect not only to cancer but to certain heart diseases, respiratory ailments and so on.

So, having regard to all these arguments and to the danger of the product whose advertising we are banning, I propose to support the legislation. I suspect that it will be tested in the courts and it will be interesting to see what the courts decide. It may be that we or our successors here in the not-too-distant future will be faced with the question of whether we should make the use of tobacco illegal. I must say that I think I would start off being pretty well opposed to that idea. It did not work with prohibition. In a recent edition of *Time* magazine there was even rather intelligent speculation as to whether we might be able to control the use of drugs better if some were made legally available. In any event, this is all beyond the arguments that go with this legislation. As I say, with the reservations I have referred to, I have decided, with some reluctance, I may say—I have never smoked at all during my life, so I have no personal involvement whatsoever—to support Bill C-51 and also Bill C-204 when it comes before us.

Hon. L. Norbert Thériault: Honourable senators, I have a question for Senator Spivak with regard to the proposed Free Trade Agreement. By the way, I support the bill. I am a non-smoker now, because I had to stop, and, thank God, I was able to. I, too, like Senator Hicks, have some reservations about the legality of this legislation and about what will happen when we pull out all these restraints. We in New Brunswick have forbidden the advertisement of liquor, but we are nevertheless flooded with advertising from Quebec, the State of Maine and other areas through television and magazines advertising beers, wines and liquors of all kinds. I would like to ask Senator Spivak: Will there not be a tendency by the tobacco companies to increase the amount of advertising they do in foreign magazines and on foreign television and radio stations?

Senator Spivak: Honourable senators, this point—

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Senator Spivak, perhaps you should wait until honourable senators have discussed the principles of the bill, after which you will have all the time you want to answer questions.

Senator Hicks: Surely the honourable senator can answer the question that was put to her directly by Senator Thériault.

Senator Thériault: Your Honour, I asked permission to ask a question. Are you now ruling that I cannot—

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: If it is not considered that the honourable senator is closing the debate in answering your question, then she may so answer.

Senator Spivak: Honourable senators, this question was discussed quite thoroughly in the House committee meetings.

Apparently 65 per cent of advertising of tobacco and tobacco products is now done in American magazines. However, the point is that these magazines cannot advertise Canadian cigarettes. They can advertise only American cigarettes. A very small percentage of American cigarettes is accepted by the Canadian public. I think it is something like 1 or 2 per cent.

Senator Thériault: Under what law are companies prevented from advertising Canadian cigarettes in American magazines?

Senator Spivak: It is my understanding that this legislation prevents Canadian companies from advertising Canadian cigarettes, but I can check on that.

Senator Thériault: In other countries?

Senator Spivak: No Canadian company can advertise Canadian cigarettes in such publications, though those publications can advertise American cigarettes. I would point out that this applies only to magazines. You must remember that there is a voluntary ban by the broadcasting industry in the United States on cigarettes, as there is in Canada. We do not know what the Americans are likely to do as a result of this bill. I hope they will be as convinced by the arguments as are some other countries which were consulted with regard to this legislation, countries such as Australia and New Zealand. We hope that the Americans will look at this very good example in Canada and perhaps introduce similar legislation, or at least continue the voluntary ban. No one can remain immune forever to the disastrous effects of a product like this and take no action, particularly when the advertising is targeted toward, as I said, women and young children. That is my understanding as to the provisions with regard to American advertisements.

Senator Thériault: Will this legislation interfere in any way with the proposed Free Trade Agreement?

Senator Spivak: I asked this question of officials and apparently the Free Trade Agreement is not an issue here.

Senator Thériault: Perhaps it is not an issue now, but could it become an issue?

Senator Spivak: My understanding is that it is not the issue. On motion of Senator Flynn, debate adjourned.

NON-SMOKERS' HEALTH BILL

SECOND READING—POINT OF ORDER—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Stanley Haidasz moved the second reading of Bill C-204, to regulate smoking in the federal workplace and on common carriers and to amend the Hazardous Products Act in relation to cigarette advertising.

Hon. Orville H. Phillips: Honourable senators, I rise on a point of order. I should point out, first of all, honourable senators, that Senator Haidasz now has two bills in his name amending the Hazardous Products Act, S-4 and C-204. *Beauchesne's* paragraph 701(3) says:

... if a decision of the House has already been taken on one such bill, for example, if the bill has been given or