

to farmers in such a way as to promote an increase in the production of milk, butter, poultry, eggs and livestock.

Respectfully submitted,

W. D. Lightbody, president,
F. C. Matheson, secretary,
Yorkton and district Board of Trade.

Similar resolutions asking for the reduction of the farm income tax have come from many of the rural municipalities in my constituency. They protest against the discriminatory features of farm income tax collections and urge that the exemptions be raised to at least \$1,200 for single men and \$2,400 for married men.

There is a further injustice that should be removed, in that no allowance is made for the unpaid labour on the farm. When that allowance is not made, surely the products that are consumed on the farm should not be considered as farm income. Another rank injustice exists in this field. We find employees of the federal taxation branches in the provincial centres charging farmers as much as \$1,000 for their living expenses on the farm, and in other cases raising this to \$1,200 or \$1,500. Apparently the amount depends upon what they wish to try to collect from the different farmers. Such discrimination brings the deepest of resentment.

In closing, I should like to reassert our contention that the success of an economic system is measured by the extent to which it can take care of the welfare of human beings within the nation. The welfare of the people within the country is more important than the right of any particular group to extract excessive profits from those who toil. If the Canadian people are ever denied the right to obtain a living in return for their toil, and an opportunity for toil in this land of abundance, then our system will stand doomed, and it has failed once already. The real importance to the people of the present situation is not just a matter of the trade of tomorrow, or even a depression. I hope we appreciate the fact that our democratic system is on trial today as it never was before. We must prove that this land of abundance is able to provide for all. We must produce the greatest security with the highest degree of freedom. If we provide that, then no kind of totalitarianism will ever replace our Canadian democracy.

(Translation):

Mr. Marcel Boivin (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 26, when the fifth

The Address—Mr. Boivin

session of the 20th parliament was officially opened, I went to the Senate with the object of paying close attention to the speech of His Excellency the Governor General. Let me tell you in all sincerity that for the fifth time I was greatly disappointed in the acoustics in the upper house, especially when solemn ceremonies take place. This is probably due to the noise and special formalities. Despite their good will, most members did not hear anything and they had to wait until the next day to find out what the speech was about, by reading it in *Hansard*.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, through the medium of newspapers and radio, the whole population of Canada heard about the contents of the speech from the throne at the same time as their representatives, if not before them. That event has again shown the importance of putting in a system of loud-speakers in another place and I believe it also demonstrates the importance of a system of microphones with loud-speakers in this house. If after due investigation, your consulting engineers should report that this is not possible, as they will probably do, I am almost sure that after serious consideration they will suggest the adoption of a system of microphones with receiving sets, such as found in the United Nations assembly halls at Lake Success. This system has been entirely satisfactory to the representatives of various countries who are presently in session and particularly to the public who attend those proceedings. I may add that I am conversant with the matter since I have had, like many others, the privilege of attending one of these meetings and of seeing for myself the advantages of such a system.

We must admit that during the war we accomplished things which the public considered impossible. We were able to accomplish them and to that end, these achievements being indispensable, the price was never a consideration. Well, I feel that for many years now such a system has been necessary and essential. It would allow the members from this part of the house to hear those sitting at the other end and who turn their backs to us when addressing you, Mr. Speaker. We could dispense then with reading the reports and still be informed on matters dealt with on the orders of the day. We would also be able to hear a member's speech even if the latter's voice is rather faint. We could thus keep really up to date.