

well be thought of in terms of money well spent on advancing the French language. Many students use the French edition of *Reader's Digest* to further their command of the language.

If the Canadian edition of *Time* were discontinued, Canadian subscribers would be deprived of much Canadian news which we get in no all-Canadian magazine, and—let's face it—*Time* magazine has a style all its own which no all-Canadian publication can begin to emulate. *Time* also gives us information on the workings of our own government, which we do not get in *Maclean's*.

● (1610)

With reference to *Maclean's*, I would suggest that the government institute a thorough investigation into the Maclean-Hunter racket—the way they train their agents to go out and exploit people, especially the elderly. I have experienced their high-pressured salesmanship tactics. I wrote a letter of protest re this to Maclean-Hunter about three years ago, but to date have received no acknowledgment.

If we must have Canadian content in our magazines, what value is there in such drivel as "Lives of Girls and Women" in the February, 1975, issue of *Maclean's*? Compare this with "The Women of Saskatoon" or "Women of Edmonton—Pattern Breakers" in the February and April issues of *Chatelaine*. *Chatelaine* is a worth-while magazine, but some of the contributors on the staff of *Maclean's* leave much to be desired. The *Reader's Digest* has them both beaten for interesting, informative content, and should the Canadian editions of *Time* and *Reader's Digest* be withdrawn, I, for one, will drop my subscription to *Maclean's*, at least, and subscribe to the American editions of the others, whatever the cost—and I know many other subscribers who would do likewise.

Yours sincerely,

Helen M. Newnham.

Here is a letter from a couple who have dedicated their services to Canada for many years. All they want in the later years of their lives is some good reading material. The thoughts expressed in this letter have been expressed by many thousands of Canadians across the country. As I said at the beginning, this bill in no way constitutes a periodicals' policy in Canada. It is a negative step instead of a positive one, and it is my hope that most members of this House will agree it is not the type of legislation we wish to pass.

[Translation]

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, it is with utmost pleasure that I take part in this debate on Bill C-58. Needless to say, this legislation attacking magazines such as *Sélection du Reader's Digest* and *Time* magazine will have disastrous repercussions.

These publications are basically for the average person and adequately meet the requirements of the Canadian people. This is clear from the numerous letters received from my constituents after the announcement, by the Secretary of State, of the impending amendment to section 19(2) of the Income Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to air in this House my constituents' views on the subject, especially since they asked me to do so. To that end, I would quote from certain of the letters received.

I therefore enter into the record some excerpts from a letter from a lady in Sayabec:

As I have been a faithful reader of *Sélection du Reader's Digest* for about fifteen years, I want this magazine to continue to be available in our homes and schools. It is an interesting magazine since everyone wants to read it.

This same lady went on to say:

This magazine has international interest and can draw articles both from Canada and other countries and knows how to interest its readers

Non-Canadian Publications

in the fields of science, history, family and even recreation. There is nothing vulgar or distorting about this magazine and it could take the place of many others. Its publication certainly does not affect Canadian magazines and its loss would leave a great void for its French-speaking and English-speaking readers.

Another letter that I received from a lady in Mont-Joli said, and I quote:

I believe that most of us would be proud to own a magazine such as *Sélection du Reader's Digest*.

Every member of the family likes to leaf through this magazine which contains a great variety of articles. This pocket-book type of periodical is very useful to me for school work, and I can also use it as a bedside book.

I am very satisfied about this publication in its present form, and moreover, *Sélection du Reader's Digest* tries to meet our needs.

We can therefore conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that all the letters that I have received expressed the same opinion. It is easy to see that these people are concerned about the fact that the Canadian government is trying through this legislation to eliminate a publication like *Sélection du Reader's Digest*, which contains excellent articles that anyone can read.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, in general, all the letters that I have received from my constituents certainly favour maintaining *Sélection du Reader's Digest* and are completely opposed to the passing of this bill. I can very well understand this, Mr. Speaker.

Indeed, *Sélection du Reader's Digest* is very interesting and enables all classes of society to read marvellous articles. This magazine provides an opportunity to a great number of people to travel round the world at very low cost.

As for the contribution of the magazine to the Canadian economy, *Sélection du Reader's Digest* has an annual turnover of some \$30 million, 90 per cent of which is spent on Canadian soil. In addition, almost 500 Canadian employees take part in its publication.

As for its contribution to the Canadian culture, it is easily realized that the contents of each English or French issue is entirely written in Canada and that in addition some 80 editors, graphic artists and artists work to publish the magazines and the various books offered by *Sélection du Reader's Digest*. Moreover, it is easily noted that many Canadians have had the opportunity of becoming acquainted through that magazine.

Mr. Speaker, considering the very high standard of those magazines, I am compelled to object to that bill, because I feel that it is essential to let the Canadian people continue to read those fine magazines which have already proven themselves.

Mr. Béchard: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member allow me a question?

The hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Allard) seems to want us to believe that the government, through this bill, wants to eliminate *Reader's Digest*, and that Canadians, including the people from Rimouski and Gaspesia will no longer receive this magazine. Does he really believe this, because there is no question that *Reader's Digest* will disappear, is there?

Mr. Allard: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to answer the question asked by the hon. member for Bonaventure-Îles-