

drawn by experts who appeared before it. I should like to quote from a magazine called *Advertising Age* in which Oscar Meyer, an advertising executive, observed in the July, 1965, issue:

When you sell a woman on a product and she goes into the store and finds your brand isn't in stock, she'll probably forget about it. But when you sell a kid on your product, if he can't get it, he will throw himself on the floor, stamp his feet and cry. You can't get a reaction like that out of an adult.

I think it is worth reflecting on that, Mr. Speaker. A survey of the industry, reported in *Playthings* magazine of March, 1970, found as follows:

Repeatedly, both retailers and wholesalers returned surveys with harsh words for the TV-advertised toys; these items were most often labeled as overpriced and below standard—a contributing problem to the after Christmas clean-up because TV toys come back in droves ... they just don't work properly.

In the March, 1971, issue of the same American magazine a toy retailer observed:

The toy industry probably has the worst public image of any business in America today, and most of its black eye comes from those of us who have worked within the business and have come away soiled by the contact with the "let the public be damned" greed philosophy that pervades much of the industry. The toys we are forced to offer the public are insultingly touted by slick TV commercials ...

I should also like to put on record, for the benefit of the mandarins in the CRTC, a comment by Dr. Richard Feinbloom of the Harvard family health care program who says that children normally distort reality in accordance with their own immature views of the world. This view is quite different from the adult perspective of reality, and changes rapidly as a child matures. Thus, the same advertising is interpreted differently by children and by adults. I could go on and on with observations from psychologists and admissions from people within the industry that television advertising directed at children under 13 years of age is unacceptable to them. Dr. Feinbloom puts it this way:

To children, normally impulsive, advertisements for appealing things demand immediate gratification. An advertisement to a child has the quality of an order, not a suggestion. The child lacks the ability to set priorities, to determine relative importance and to reject some directives as inappropriate ... The child responds as much to the setting as to the object advertised, unlike an adult, and is unable to separate the two. Thus, the real toy is very often found by the child to be disappointing ... The child cannot judge the monetary value of advertised merchandise, an intrinsic and crucial part of the adult's evaluation and consideration.

I quote these observations because they are important in putting some of the committee's findings in perspective and showing why we think this is an area that demands action by the CRTC. I should like to point out that I do not think we can rely upon the industry to supervise itself. By its code, the advertising industry writes its own rules; in fact, it becomes almost judge and jury. I have researched the 1973 and 1974 "Broadcast Code for Advertising to Children" produced by the Canadian Association of Broadcasters. I recommend that hon. members read both issues very carefully and note changes in the wording.

As long as we allow the industry itself to write its rules, it will do so to its own advantage. One section in particular brings this out. Section 8 of the code covers social values. I should like to read section 8 of the 1973 edition and compare it with the current one. It reads as follows:

### Broadcasting Act

Although many influences affect a child's habit development it remains the prime responsibility of parents "to instruct a child in the way that he should go". Advertisers should ensure that they do not make the task more difficult.

(a) Messages must not reflect disregard for parental authority or parental judgment or portray undesirable family living habits.

(b) Advertising must not imply that possession or use of a product makes the owner superior, or that without it the child will be open to ridicule or contempt. This prohibition does not apply to true statements regarding educational or health benefits.

(c) Any material benefits enjoyed should be inherent in the use of the product itself.

Compare that with section 8 of the 1974 code which reads as follows:

(a) Advertising must not encourage a range of values that are inconsistent with the moral, ethical or legal standards of contemporary Canadian society.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that there is no reference, as there was in the 1973 edition, to disregard for parental authority.

(b) Advertising must not imply that possession or use of a product makes the owner superior, or that without it the child will be open to ridicule or contempt. This prohibition does not apply to true statements regarding educational or health benefits.

That clause is unchanged. Absent from the most recent edition is the reference in the 1973 one that "any material benefits enjoyed should be inherent in the use of the product itself." I quote that merely to illustrate what happens when an industry sets its own code and changes it as it goes along. The new code also provides:

● (1740)

No station or network will carry more than eight minutes of commercial messages in any one clock hour of children's programming

If you look at the guidelines relating to the new code, what do you find? The regulations allow the industry to get around that eight minutes per hour limitation. On the face of it, the network is not to broadcast more than eight minutes of commercial messages per hour, or four minutes per half hour. However, it is clear that the regulations refer to a half hour period, not to a half hour program. Thus, it is quite permissible to broadcast up to six minutes of commercial messages within a half hour so long as two of the commercial messages are classified as adult-directed commercials. Of course, the definition of an adult-directed commercial is for the industry to determine.

Another loophole is this: only those members of the network who decide to become signatories to the code are bound by it. The CRTC has forgotten this point. They say that if anyone wants to be regulated, they must be participants in the code. Certain types of legally produced commercials are excluded. For example, the code provides:

... any commercials scheduled for viewing during the school-day morning hours must be directed to the family, parent, or an adult, rather than to children.

Note the word "school-day" in the code. It says nothing about Saturday mornings, when most children are looking at certain programs. I could refer to other loopholes in this code. For example, there is no penalty for an infraction of the code; all that is required is that the offending commercial be withdrawn. The code is weak, and the CRTC is relying on it to protect children from too much commercial advertising.