

But on behalf of this company I wish to say that it welcomes both these words. The company has never made and never will make extravagant or misleading claims, such as have been made on behalf of certain other manufacturers. The company looks upon the matter in this way. First of all, it feels that these devices, these trusses, belts and so on, are articles that the public apparently require. Secondly, if they are to be made available to the public they must be advertised. The company's relations with departmental officials administering the Act are excellent, and of course it is hoped that the officials in future also will maintain a reasonable point of view, so long as no exaggerated or misleading claims are made for the company's products.

The reason why the company particularly welcomes the proposed legislation is that in some periodicals, and indeed in some of our own newspapers, misleading articles and advertisements appear at various times. This material does not always come from Canadian manufacturers, but often from producers and manufacturers outside the country. These people urge readers to write in for a booklet, and point out that no money is required to be sent along. But of course once a person's name gets on the list of firms like that, certain pressure is gradually applied, and before long one is told that he needs a brace or belt or truss to cure a rupture. And sometimes the definite claim is made that one of these devices will cure a rupture within a certain time. That is the kind of extravagant claim to which objection is taken by the company I represent. I have an advertisement of that kind before me. Control can be exercised over such an advertisement when it originates in Canada, for penalties provided by the Act can be applied against the manufacturer. I suppose, too, that once a manufacturer is caught doing that kind of thing his advertisements can be kept out of Canadian publications quite effectively. But, as we all know, a great many American publications come into this country, and many of them contain advertisements which make extravagant claims for trusses and other devices of the kind. And while the Canadian manufacturer is required to comply with the Act, these outside people go scot-free. Of course, quite properly, the Act does not set forth what the department can do by way of preventing the public from exposure to that kind of advertising. An Act of this kind is not one in which provisions of that kind should be included. No doubt the department has at present some means of dealing with matters like these.

Mr. Chairman, these are the only representations that the Ottawa Truss Company wishes to make to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further representations to be made? Would the representatives of the department care to discuss now the suggestions made by Mr. Laverty?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Mr. Chairman, instead of having a statement by the department I think we should now take up the bill clause by clause; and as we go along, the departmental officials can give us their views.

The CHAIRMAN: I was wondering, Senator Haig, whether we would not do well to have a statement from Dr. Morrell now.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Some of the people here have come from out of town and no doubt are desirous of getting home as soon as possible. I think we would make more progress if we took up the bill clause by clause.

The CHAIRMAN: I am, of course, quite willing to do whatever the committee desires. We all have in mind what Mr. Laverty said a few minutes ago, and it occurred to me that this might be an opportune time for Dr. Morrell to reply to his suggestions.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Mr. Chairman, I move that we take up the bill clause by clause.