

I think the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman) mentioned this yesterday and I believe the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) will agree: it is amazing how many women think that the way to be attractive is by buying cosmetics. Nobody in advertising suggests you can become more attractive if you become smarter, if you write poetry, if you become a sculptor or win the Nobel prize. Our women are told they can become more attractive if they buy pretty purple lipsticks, wrinkle cream which allegedly takes the years off, or wear attractive sets of fish across their fronts. What nonsense!

An hon. Member: Careful.

Mr. Leggatt: I hope the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway will not take offence. My point is that women, probably more than any other group, are being manipulated by the media.

Mrs. Holt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I feel the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) is singling out women in this House, one woman especially—

An hon. Member: Shame!

Mrs. Holt:—and referring to her personal attire. I think that is totally inappropriate. I did not hear the hon. member singling out men in the House and drawing attention to their attire.

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, I assure you I intended to compliment the hon. lady. There are many attractive members in this House, but she just happened to catch my eye.

An hon. Member: There are many more. You need glasses.

Mr. Alexander: Withdraw.

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, I cannot possibly withdraw; I merely suggest that females are being corrupted and manipulated by advertising. But we are all manipulated and corrupted by advertising and I should not single out a special group.

Let me now speak specifically about the amendment. We say that advertised qualities must be definable and that you must not say something is new when it is not. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) suggested that we should consider a new name for our party—we have been around for some time—and instead of calling ourselves the New Democratic Party we ought to call ourselves the Democratic Party, a name which I feel is better because we are probably the most democratic party in the House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Leggatt: Why should hon. members object to an amendment which says that no company shall:

(e) make a representation to the public containing exaggerated price claims of a general nature, unless such claims are fully supported by evidence of a substantial nature.

Why should companies be allowed to lie? Why let them get away with something they could not get away with in court? For years and years you could adduce pretty well

Combines Investigation Act

any evidence in court. Then the hearsay rule was introduced. But in the area of the public's manipulation by advertising we refuse to impose on companies standards of truthfulness which any court would enforce if the company were in court, or which we expect our children to abide by. We expect our children to tell the truth, but somehow people engaged in commerce are exempt from the normal rules of morality.

The next paragraph of the hon. member's proposed amendment reads:

(f) make a representation to the public that, either explicitly or implicitly, arouses or tends to arouse unwarranted expectations of product effectiveness.

Some ridiculous claims are made for products. I am thinking of claims made for wrinkle creams. The advertisers say that these creams will take the years off. What about claims made for toothpastes which are made of little more than artificial fat?

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): What toothpaste do you use?

Mr. Leggatt: Colgate's.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): No commercials, please.

● (1530)

Mr. Leggatt: The next item refers to making a representation to the public, and I quote:

(h) make a representation to the public containing suggestions, either implicit or explicit, of product effectiveness in areas other than those in which the product is intended primarily to have effect.

That is a very simple request. Why not tell the truth about the product? There is no law requiring a commercial enterprise to say that its product is bad. We only say, "Don't lie." That is a very simple proposition; one that I think should appeal to all sections of the House. The last paragraph of the amendment the hon. member has proposed perhaps gets to the subject matter better than the others. I quote:

(l) and in all cases, products shall be sold on the basis of definable qualities and grades, where that is possible.

What we are trying to accomplish here is a way for the consumer to get a break in what he is buying. He has been manipulated. His needs have been artificially stimulated. What we are saying is that if the quality or grade of a product is defined, an objective judgment can be made in the marketplace. At the moment this cannot be done. Advertising has become so sophisticated that we are no longer capable of resisting many of the ploys or status approaches used by advertisers.

I do not think there is any industry more typical of the insidious nature of the advertising we have been faced with than the automobile industry. Over a ten-year period they have clearly been attempting to manipulate the public in order to sell high-profit, large, expensive gas-guzzlers. The public has been able to resist slightly but not entirely. People began to ask whether they really needed these large cars, and slowly the small cars started to grow in popularity. The resistance continued and Detroit would bring out a small car. However, the compact car of one year would suddenly become a medium-sized car the fol-