

*Tobacco Products*

phase-in of billboards to a date six months later than the second reading of Bill C-51. Bill C-51 was better in its original version in this respect. It was watered down to allow for this three year phase-in. I am suggesting that we go back to the original spirit of the law and bring it in much more quickly. When we consider that 35,000 Canadians are dying every year from tobacco related diseases and that the death toll from involuntary smoking is certainly in the hundreds, we should not be gingerly phasing in this ban on tobacco advertising but we should be working promptly to see that this encouragement of taking up a habit that kills people is ended as soon as possible.

With respect to Motion No. 3, if we must have a phase-in of billboard advertisements, this would reduce the amount of money that could be spent on advertising from two-thirds to one-half in the second year. That is relevant to current levels. This is a practical amendment. I would rather get rid of it completely and do so promptly. However, if we are going to have a phase-in let us at least reduce the amount, put limits on it so that it is clearly a phasing out and not an opportunity for advertising to continue at current levels.

Motion No. 4 is similar to Motion No. 3. It allows in the third year of the phase-in period a quarter of current billboard spending. Again, it is in the spirit of let us get rid of it and let us have clear caps on the amount of spending that would be permitted.

• (1150)

Motion No. 5 comes from the Government. It is a good amendment. It would tighten the loophole that is given to merchants to advertise tobacco names in their shop names, for example, "Lynn's Tobacco Shop". This type of advertising would not be permitted in radio and television ads, although it would be permitted in signs. The second part of the motion is merely housekeeping, and we would support that.

Finally, in the first set of amendments is Motion No. 6. This is one of my amendments and it would restore to the Bill the original date in the second reading version for the removal of in-store advertisements. Here again the original Bill was better. As a result of a lot of pressure put on by this very profitable industry that is killing people in the process of making money, unfortunately one result was that amendments were brought in at committee stage which weakened the provisions of this Bill.

The health community is looking at this Bill. It does not wish to see further amendments. That was said very clearly at committee stage. The health community considers this a minimal measure. At the municipal level there is legislation for the workplace, and here the Government has brought in no workplace legislation whatsoever. This is a very minimal action for advertising and for sponsorship. It is not complete. It is not thorough. It will go a long way, but we do not want it to be watered down any further.

The whole purpose of the amendments that I have brought in is to deal with some of these matters where there was too much watering down at committee, and get the Bill back on track to where it should be. The health community is saying: "Don't water it down any more. Let us take Bill C-51 as it is and let us get it into operation". Let us restore the spirit of the amendments that we agreed on earlier at second reading and get on with adopting this important piece of legislation.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is the House ready for the question? On debate, the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps)

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, first I wish to express my absolute disbelief that the Minister is not present to speak to the legislation. I thought the reason we went through that ridiculous—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The Hon. Member does not need to mention whether the Minister is in attendance. The Hon. Member has been here for quite a while, so I would hope that she would just get on with the motion.

**Ms. Copps:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We played political leap-frog yesterday because the Government in its wisdom saw fit to ignore a chance to finally put Bill C-204 into law. In that regard, I wish to congratulate the efforts of the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald), who has shown an incredible intestinal fortitude in pursuing her Bill in the face of constant thwarting, confusion, and disinformation on the part of the Government. The reason I am shocked that we played this political leap-frog yesterday was that I expected, of course, that the Government was going to move with the Minister today to expedite Bill C-51. Although I cannot comment on the presence or absence of Members, I am shocked. Parliamentary secretaries can be hard working and well-intentioned, but I would have liked to hear from the Minister.

If one reads Motion No. 1, Subclause (3) I believe that this amendment has been moved specifically because of the free trade agreement. That amendment reads:

(3) For greater certainty, subsection (2) does not apply in respect of the distribution for sale of publications imported into Canada or the retransmission of radio or television broadcasts originating outside Canada.

What has changed between the original wording in Bill C-51 and this particular motion, which we cannot support, is the fact that the Government, in its wisdom, in the final wording on the free trade agreement decided that it would offer preferential tax treatment to American advertisers, in the same manner as is currently available to Canadian advertisers in magazines. One might say that that is totally unrelated to the Bill that is before us. What is being set up here by way of Bill C-51 is a limitation and a prohibition on advertising in Canadian magazines of Canadian tobacco products beyond a certain date.