

the tax. Therefore the farmer who is trying to live up to the law is penalized by having his help go to the other fellow.

A board of arbitration is another suggestion which I am glad to see the minister has provided for. The payment of arrears of principal and interest on the home farm contracted prior to 1940 should be allowed as current expenses. Representation along that line has been made on many occasions, I believe, but I do not see any mention of it included in the budget. I should like to have the minister take that under consideration because I believe he realizes, as we who live on the farm do, that farming conditions and farming prices have been anything but desirable up until recently.

My last suggestion is that final clearance be given within two years of filing of tax returns. At the present time returns are still not definitely cleared back as far as 1942. In connection with the suggestions I have made, I should like to see a reduction in the levy, an increase in the exemption and the effective date made July 1, 1946, instead of January 1, 1947.

On motion of Mr. Boivin the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, July 11, 1946

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE

MR. MICHAUD—REFERENCE TO ARTICLE IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE" OF JULY 11

Mr. BENOIT MICHAUD (Restigouche-Madawaska): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. The *Montreal Gazette* of this morning carries the following heading on its front page:

M.P. scores "Empty Seat" report, accuses *Gazette* man of bad faith.

I did not accuse the reporter of the *Gazette* of bad faith. As a matter of fact I did not use the term at all, and the body of the report bears me out on this point. To the mass of readers who do not always read an editorial to the very last line, the heading is most misleading, and so I leave it to the house and the country to determine whether or not such a heading discloses lack of good faith, or just bad faith, to use the words of the *Gazette*.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman must state his question of privilege and be brief and to the point.

Mr. MICHAUD: The newspaper in question insinuates that I accused the reporter of bad faith, which I did not do, when referring to the fact that the house has now but 242 members as the result of vacancies which had occurred recently and of which the reporter did not seem to be aware. I made the following statement in this house, which is reported verbatim in the *Gazette*:

Either the reporter's sense of observation is no keener than his judgment, or else he is disclosing an unusual lack of good faith, and that requires no further comment.

Mr. GRAYDON: What is an unusual lack of good faith if it is not bad faith?

MR. BROWN—INDIAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE—
NEWSPAPER REPORTS AND HEADLINES

Mr. D. F. BROWN (Essex West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege affecting the members of a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons. As joint chairman of the committee which is examining and considering Indian affairs I raised this question of privilege at our committee meeting this morning, and the committee have directed me to raise the same question in this house at the first available opportunity.

The question arises out of newspaper headlines and reports which give an entirely misleading, unfair and untrue impression of certain of the proceedings of the joint committee on Tuesday, July 9, 1946. Newspaper reports I hope unintentionally, are unfair to both houses of parliament, mislead Canadians generally and will cause grave distress to the people most concerned—the Canadian Indians. As examples I should like to quote the *Toronto Evening Telegram* of July 9, which contains this heading: "Defeat motion to put Indians on committee." The *Cornwall Daily Standard Freeholder* of July 10 had this heading: "Defeats motion to have Indians on committee." The *Kitchener Daily Record* of July 9 has this: "Reject Indians on Ottawa body." The *Owen Sound Sun-Times* of July 9: "Refuse to name Indians to Commons body." The *Toronto Daily Star* of July 9: "Defeat move to let Indians give opinions." The *Toronto Globe and Mail* of July 10: "Oppose naming of five Indians to house group." The newspapers from western Canada, the maritimes and British Columbia are not yet on file, but it is likely that many of them will carry similar headlines unless some correction is made.