

In fact, there is nothing at all objectionable to it. I know of no reason for trying to stop it except that the proprietors sell a magazine which Canadians who want to advertise think is as good as or better than any other medium, and they spend their money on it because they believe they will get their money's worth. The minute you restrict the magazine the money is diverted somewhere else and the paper is cut out. There is no use in saying that this is not the intention of the amendment; it is to stop the magazine coming into this country.

**Hon. Mr. Kinley:** You cannot stop it coming into this country.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** It cannot be printed here.

**Hon. Mr. Kinley:** *Time* or any other magazine can be sent into this country; but the publishers print a section in which they tell Canadians what they think of them, a section which Americans cannot read because it does not appear in the United States.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** The only objection I have to *Time* magazine is its enthusiasm over the great things it thinks the Liberal party has done for Canada. I understand such language quite well. When I am in a mood very hostile to the Government I pass up that part of the magazine, but sometimes I read it to get an idea of what a fellow who does not know what is going on in Canada says about us. But it has something else which is what I want: it comes in a form which any man or woman can read, and from it one can obtain in a concise fashion news of political and public affairs in United States. That sort of information I can get from this magazine better than from any other. I have the *Reader's Digest*; and I used to take *Newsweek*, but I dropped it. While I am here in Ottawa, if *Time* does not come to me from Winnipeg I buy it at the news-stand, and when I go home the old issues are in a pile waiting for me.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** May I ask my honourable friend a question? He values *Time*. I, too, read it. But does he not think that it expresses opinions more than it gives facts?

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** It prints the opinions of the American publisher.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** To that extent it is not a newspaper.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Quite so. The publisher is a prominent American; his wife is the United States Ambassador to Italy. I understand all that. I see a great many Americans reading it, and since these attacks began I made a practice of asking them what kind of a magazine it is. I never heard one person criticize

it. I read what it has to say about the Republicans and about the Democrats; and if I were an American, to whichever party I belonged I would regard its descriptions as very fair: one can gather what the two parties stand for, what they are trying to do, what kind of men their leaders are. All these things are what I want to know. I want to know, too, the views of people in the southern and western states, the farmers, and those who reside in the eastern and manufacturing areas. I want to know the views of both sides on the Negro question. I may not get a right representation of the facts, but I believe I do, because it is confirmed by what I read elsewhere. For instance, I read also quite often the *New York Times*, and the *Christian Science Monitor*, which is published in Boston, is it not?

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** Yes. It is all right.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** But I always come back to *Time*, for it gives me something I cannot get any place else.

I think a tax like this is one that we do not need to impose. I am a Canadian, I like the Canadian people, I think we have a great country and I am very proud of it; I stand for Canadian ways; but I feel that we Canadians have tremendous responsibilities, and that the greatest of them is to know the American people. When citizens of other countries meet us, either here or on our visits overseas, they are very keen to learn what the Canadian opinion of the American is. That is one of the things most frequently asked of us. The only time I was at the United Nations Assembly several people asked me for my opinion of the Americans. I say that as we have a responsibility we can never get away from, we should have information on which to base our opinions. So I regret exceedingly that our Government has seen fit to put a tax on this magazine which can, it seems to me, drive it out of this country.

**Hon. Norman P. Lambert:** Honourable senators, I am grateful to the sponsor of this bill for having made the remarks he did about Part II, relative to the subject which has just been referred to by my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig). I am rising now to express my opposition to that part of the bill, because I could not comfortably sit in my seat and give even tacit acquiescence to this bill with that part in it.

I am opposed to it because I think it is entirely unnecessary. I think it is a complete perversion of the traditional liberal principles which have characterized most of the legislation which I have been privileged to