

sedition and treason—I do think a special case can be made for an organization like the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, which is supported by the taxpayers of this country through the Parliament of Canada. When such a large proportion of its revenues comes from the taxpayers, it seems to me that we ought to be able to expect a higher standard of reporting and interviewing of our prominent public figures from that body. Moreover, we ought to be able to expect at least this agency to attempt to promote the unity of Canada rather than to underline all the divisive elements which are bound to crop up in such a diverse society as we have in Canada today.

It seems to me that to some extent the one who pays the piper should be entitled to call the tune. Therefore, while the largest measure of freedom to speak in a disruptive manner about our country and our nation, even to denigrate our flag and our national anthem and Canadian life generally, ought to be allowed to private agencies, I do not think that the people of Canada, through their national Parliament, should support an agency which places a disproportionate emphasis on disruptive reporting as often as, I regret to say, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation does.

I also wish that the quality of their reporting and interviewing was better. To give two examples: only a few nights ago after the opening of Parliament a group of reporters or interviewers on that great national network interviewed the Leader of the New Democratic Party. It seemed a shame to me that the leader of any political party in Canada should have to go through an interview by such people, not because they were hard on him, but because they knew so little about the issues on which they were challenging him. Perhaps it is a matter of some satisfaction that the politician came out on top, showing himself to be so much more able in the area of discussion than were any of those who were interviewing him. Nevertheless, at the same time it seemed that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation ought to have been able to put together a better team than that to deal with such an able and intelligent person as David Lewis, the Leader of the New Democratic Party of Canada.

Some time within the last year or two I saw an interview of the present Prime Minister of Canada in which the interviewer was trying to make some point vis-à-vis Mr. Trudeau, which depended upon a system of government such as obtains in the United States. Mr. Trudeau tried to explain to the interviewer the difference between the congressional system of government in the United States and the system of representative parliamentary democracy which we have in Canada. The interviewer had no idea of the distinction between the two systems, and perhaps he did not want to learn, because if he had appreciated the distinction he would have realized that the point he was trying to make against the Prime Minister had no validity whatsoever.

In my opinion, when the Prime Minister of Canada goes on a national network, particularly the national network of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, he is entitled to have people who are well informed to discuss the issues of the day with him. If he has been criticized for giving lectures on constitutional law to reporters and radio interviewers, then all I can say is that there is ample evidence

that it was necessary for someone to give them those lessons, though the lessons ought to have been given to them previously by someone other than the Prime Minister of Canada.

Admittedly, it is a long time since I saw that program and I could be wrong in saying it was on the CBC. It might have been carried by the Canadian Television network, the CTV, and not the CBC. If that is the case, I would say that there is not as much blame to be attached to the CTV, because I do not think that this Parliament has the right to require the same kind of standards from the CTV as it does from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

The media do not like to be criticized. Indeed, it was suggested to me that I should be careful in referring to them at all. Someone even used the expression, "They will crucify you." Well, in the first instance I do not see that there is much point in trying to crucify a member of this august chamber, and, in the second place, I want to make it very clear that, when members of the press accuse leading political figures of arrogance and other attributes of that nature, they should realize that no one can be more arrogant than a member of the press who holds himself beyond criticism. I hope that these comments which I have made will be regarded as a constructive rather than destructive accusation.

I come now to the section of the Address which has to do with economic policy in Canada. Indeed, the economic policy and social policy aspects are closely linked, but, if I may deal with one or two of those having to do with economic policy, the Speech goes on to say:

In the area of economic policy, the Government has four main objectives.

It then lists those objectives and I shall not read them to you.

Among the remedies that are proposed are further amendments to the Income Tax Act. These, I think, are of the greatest importance. Indeed, I am concerned about the present Income Tax Act and its operation. We all know that the Royal Commission on Taxation, chaired by Kenneth Carter, was appointed in September, 1962, a long time ago now, by the Diefenbaker government. The Honourable Edgar Benson, under Prime Minister Trudeau, tabled his White Paper on Tax Reform on November 7, 1969, not so long ago, but almost three years after the Carter Commission had reported. The present act is, I believe, a direct result of that white paper.

I find the act most difficult to understand, and, what worries me even more, a good many of my chartered accountant friends tell me that the act is difficult to understand.

Much has been written on the act during the past year, but it seems to me that it will be many months, if not years, before a clear understanding is possible concerning the many diverse interpretations being placed on the various complex sections of this act.

In addition to being burdened—be he an individual, a small businessman or a large businessman—with the multiplicity of forms, the taxpayer now finds himself in the position that because the act is so complicated, he can no longer understand it and will have to seek professional