

Tobacco Products

We heard from Dr. John Read who has much experience in this, both personally in his own family as well as through his interests with the Canadian Ski Association. We heard from those who were concerned about sponsorships the fact that sponsorships are often used not simply as a humanitarian, philanthropic gesture, but also as a means of indirectly promoting and advertising. Obviously, if we are to be cutting off promotion and advertising, we should also be moving to cut out sponsorships. I believe Motions Nos. 3 and 4 accelerate the process without eliminating it completely. This heightens the recognition that sponsorships should phase out funding from the tobacco industry.

Motion No. 5 seems, upon reflection and review, to be a housekeeping motion. In fact, the wording of the original clause was unclear and rather wordy. Therefore, that motion should be supported.

[Translation]

Mrs. Tardif (Charlesbourg): Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the allegations made by the Hon. Member with respect to Motion no. 1.

The amendments to paragraphs 4(1) and 4(2) are simply technical changes that reflect the government's intention to prohibit only advertisements for tobacco products sold in Canada.

Furthermore, amending paragraph 4(3) and creating a new paragraph 4(4) cannot be construed as major changes. The amendments only specify that publishers, broadcasters and billboard advertising businesses may be held responsible for accepting money in return for tobacco advertising, while magazine distributors and operators of cable TV networks cannot be accused of violating these provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is quite reasonable. We are talking about broadcasting, not publishing. As I see it, the Government is strictly specifying what it has said throughout the debate in committee.

As for paragraphs 4(5)(c) and 4(6), they are intended to clarify and simplify the wording of the Bill. Mr. Speaker, regarding motions 2, 3 and 4, these were extensively discussed in committee, and I believe that the position that was finally accepted was itself the subject of a lengthy debate. The purpose of these motions was to avoid undue penalties, and I think they are reasonable.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The question is on Motion No. 1 standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Motion No. 1 is carried on division.

Motion No. 1 (Mr. Epp (Provencher)) agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The next question is on Motion No. 3 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The motion is negated on division.

Motion No. 3 (Ms. Mitchell) negated.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The next question is on Motion No. 4 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The motion is negated on division.

Motion No. 4 (Ms. Mitchell) negated.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The next question is on Motion No. 5 standing in the name of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The motion is carried on division.

Motion No. 5 (Mr. Epp (Provencher)) agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The next question is on Motion No. 6 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The motion is negated on division.

Motion No. 6 (Ms. McDonald) negated.

Mr. David Orlikow (for Ms. McDonald) moved: