

publicity, paid most often by toy companies, but also by candy and cereal manufacturers.

For fiscal year 1969-70 alone, the year of radio broadcasters, the revenues spent for children's programs and obtained from the companies which pay for publicity was evaluated at \$12.5 million. This amount represents approximately 10 per cent of the total cost of television programs.

I shall add that it seems to me that—as I said earlier, which made the hon. member opposite smile—we are over-protective about children. I sincerely believe that today's children, those of what we call the television generation, decode much more quickly than we do televised messages, that they often become aware much more rapidly than us of the tricks behind these publicity messages, and you only have to listen to them when they are among themselves to see if they do not care and that if they are smart they will make little songs of it that they will repeat between themselves. So one can realize then that children have a capacity of judgment that is perhaps more developed than ours for a medium that is truly theirs and not ours.

I would add that there is one thing on which I can quite sincerely congratulate the hon. member, and that is arousing, as many others, the public opinion to the nonsense of advertising, the handling of children by mass media, quite specifically television, and the moral aspect that has not yet been mentioned in this House but that is of much greater concern to me than advertising itself, to the point that one can say in a sense that a toy is shown as capable of much greater velocity than it can actually deliver and people are misled on the cost of toys, or any other object for that matter, displayed for children. I think this is very serious because that is what transmits the concepts of social classes from one generation to another. That has never been discussed. In fact, it is a very complex and useful thing because it affects culture and the whole civilization.

But, besides that, I want to congratulate the hon. member because he contributed to arousing parents. I think they have a vital role in an area in which I do not personally believe altogether in legislation but a little in regulation provided, of course, we can include in regulations subtle things of a psychological and sociological nature. The resignation of parents is perhaps lesser now in Canada because they were brought to read frequently in the papers, not so much this year but in previous years, very strong reactions both here in committee hearings and in the public at large on the question of overprodding children and even a certain manipulation by an excessive quantity of television commercials aimed at them.

● (1750)

[English]

**Mr. Marke Raines (Burnaby-Seymour):** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-211 provides that no advertising shall be permitted during the broadcast of a program devoted to children under the age of 13 years, these programs being defined by the commission by regulation. I am glad to hear this concern expressed by my colleagues and members of the opposition. We all share this concern; we differ only in the remedy. Television enters all our homes, rich or poor. It has a tremendous impact, especially on children, who are

### Broadcasting Act

most vulnerable. On the surface, Bill C-211 may appear to be a good idea. It may appear to be enough simply to ban commercials from children's programs. However, like the housekeeper who sweeps dirt under the carpet, this bill is not coming to grips with the entire question of television advertising in so far as children are concerned.

Children watch television at all hours of the day. If you banned television advertisers on Saturday morning, they might move their ads to Saturday night. This leads to the question of whether we should ban ads on Saturday night. Carried to its illogical conclusion, perhaps in time we should ban all commercials.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Why not?

**Mr. Raines:** Because then the taxpayers would have to shoulder the full burden, and I do not think they are prepared to do that at this time.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** They pay for them now in the price of the goods they buy.

**Mr. Raines:** Let us come to the reality, crass and commercial as it may be, that the advertisers pay the heavy cost of producing the programs. Without them we would be more heavily taxed than we may want. Also, many things that are wrong with children's advertising can also be said to be wrong with all advertising. For example, one of the objections to beaming commercials at children is that children of poor families are encouraged to hope for and ask for things their parents cannot afford. Should this not also be an objection to beaming commercials at the parents of poor families who cannot afford the tantalizing things that are demonstrated to them and are hopelessly beyond their reach? Should not our task be to help these families with their problems so they can get the education and jobs required to earn enough money to buy these desirable things, or help people to understand that an excess of material things does not necessarily constitute happiness.

Another point is that in all advertising—and children do watch television at all hours—there are undesirable elements. The game shows are geared to the hope of getting a windfall of prizes—something for nothing. The soap commercials perpetuate the picture of the wife in the laundry room crying over “ring around the collar” or because her neighbour's wash is whiter than hers. These advertisements, which are seen by children, show the wife fussing over the shine on the kitchen floor, or breathing heavily, “I'm so glad I'm a woman”. To many thinking people these are very undesirable commercials; they perpetuate myths which make life miserable for women who are led to believe that if their kitchen floor does not shine, they are failures.

● (1800)

The Canadian Association of Broadcasters and the Canadian Advertising Advisory Board have developed a voluntary code for children's advertising on radio and television. It was developed with an end to controlling advertising directed at children aged 12 and under, who have not yet developed a sense of discrimination and who are therefore susceptible to distortion of the real world, through their imagination. I shall not go through the