

Oral Questions

work, more unemployed; no orders, no work, more unemployed; etc., etc. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm):

That this House asks the minister to be sensible and withdraw this provision from the budget and get farmers and businessmen buying new equipment, which will put Canadians back to work, which will increase pay rolls, which will give the government more revenue. Only good can result from the cancellation of this ill-thought-out scheme.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

NUCLEAR ENERGY

EXPORT OF TECHNOLOGY AND FUEL TO ARGENTINA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Mark Rose (Mission-Port Moody): Madam Speaker, yesterday the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, a Washington-based human rights research group, condemned the Canadian government decision to continue supplying Argentina with nuclear fuel, characterizing the decision as "cynical economic opportunism", and as being "irresponsible and, indeed, reckless." The Council also reiterated a point already made by many Canadian nuclear experts, that any non-proliferation agreements which Argentina has signed are unenforceable and that Argentina has refused to sign the 1968 United Nations Nuclear Non-Proliferation Agreement or the 1967 agreement signed in Mexico intended to make Latin America a nuclear free zone. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Young):

That this House instruct the government to stop promoting its economic bailout of Canada's nuclear industry at the expense of non-proliferation, and further, that the government stop supplying nuclear technology and fuel to the military junta in Argentina until such time as we can be sure that our uranium products are not being used to build an Argentinian bomb.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

• (1415)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

THE PRESS

POLICIES GOVERNING CONCENTRATION OF OWNERSHIP

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Multiculturalism. Yesterday the minister left the House to make an

announcement of the government's policies to regulate the daily newspaper industry in Canada. What is there in the minister's recommendations that would have led to the *Ottawa Journal* or the *Winnipeg Tribune* not being closed? What are the recommendations made by the minister to prevent future closings of newspapers throughout the country?

Hon. Jim Fleming (Minister of State (Multiculturalism)): Madam Speaker, I believe that the recommendations of cabinet that I announced yesterday respond to the major findings of the Kent Royal Commission, that is, the problem of increasing concentration, conglomerate ownership, cross-media dominance in a particular marketplace, and the right of Canadians, especially when so many Canadian cities have only one newspaper, to have recourse other than to the courts or the benevolence of a publisher or an editor if they believe they have a grievance.

As far as the question about what it has done to reverse the tragic demise of the *Tribune* or *Journal*, I do not believe the government is in a position to do that unless the hon. member is suggesting that we directly support newspapers with public funds in their entirety. I do not think that would be appropriate.

Mr. Beatty: The minister concedes that nothing in his recommendations will stop the closing of newspapers in Canada in the future.

ROLE OF RESTRICTIVE TRADE PRACTICES COMMISSION

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question concerns one of the specific recommendations. In the minister's recommendations he proposes that in future non-media companies intending to buy a daily newspaper would be required to justify that action to the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission. In view of the fact that in the minister's own document, a cabinet document dated March 31, 1982, he raised serious doubts as to the legality of such a measure, why does the minister propose that Parliament should pass such legislation which he, himself, feels could be illegal?

Hon. Jim Fleming (Minister of State (Multiculturalism)): Madam Speaker, under the proposal, the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission would review a company that had interests beyond media interests and greater than those media interests to see that the ownership and running of the newspaper entity being purchased would be undertaken in a manner satisfactory to the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission independent of editorial influence or intimidation from other properties owned by the same company.

We are acting quite within the law. If the hon. member is suggesting that we are in fact acting outside the law, he is not understanding our proposal. He should also note the dating on documents, real or otherwise, which he has, that may or may not be changed by the cabinet process.