

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I know it is cross-examination. That is what we are doing here to-night. The budget, I think, bore it out. The minister repudiates that press report.

Then, I hold in my hand an extract from a speech of Mr. Spinney, now president of the bank of Montreal, and chairman of the victory loan committee. There was a report in the press that Mr. Spinney had spoken to the same effect in the course of the campaign for the last loan. I saw Mr. Spinney, and he said that he had been incorrectly reported, and in one newspaper only, I think, and that he never said anything of the sort. But in an address which he made in Hamilton on October 7 last, Mr. Spinney, speaking for himself I am sure, and not for the cabinet, but occupying a very important position in relation to the government, said this:

I am not losing sight of the possibility, even the probability, that when the war is over the government may be subjected for a time to a policy of expenditures, looking to the reestablishment of our armed forces into civil life and to cushion the transfer of our war-time enterprises into enterprises of peace. Of this I am absolutely sure, that if we as a nation will exert real self-denial and save like we have never saved before, this cushioning process will largely take care of itself, because after long deprivation a demand for consumer goods will not only come actively into play but the people through their savings will have the money to pay for them. I am satisfied that the very logic which calls for high taxes—

This is the part of his statement to which I call attention:

—in war years will dictate a reversal in post-war years.

I should like to know if the minister is prepared to make any announcement like that, because that was a rather reassuring announcement. I do not suggest that it was inspired by the minister; I would not like to go that far; I have no authority for going that far; but I would think that probably the chairman of the victory loan committee, Mr. Spinney, had, shall I say, an intelligent anticipation of what was in the minister's mind—"an intelligent anticipation of the minister's wishes." I think that was a celebrated term which was used here in parliament on one occasion in connection with the customs scandal, and went down in history. Would the minister care to make any statement, if not now, then at some time, because I believe it would have a reassuring effect on the loan? I am anxious to see some such statement made.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. A few moments ago the hon. member for Portage la Prairie tried to introduce a discussion on the taxation of cooperative wheat pools. I have taken

occasion to warn the committee several times since I have occupied my present position that we should follow the procedure of the house. All hon. members know that I am bound by parliamentary procedures, and I desire now, having in mind the fine statement made this afternoon by the leader of the opposition, that we shall get on with the business of this house. The committee will readily realize that I have to follow the rules of parliament. The Minister of Finance, also, mentioned this afternoon standing order 58, section 2:

Speeches in committee of the whole house must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

I do not wish to be dogmatic. This is not a court of law; it is a committee of ways and means. At the same time I believe it is the desire of every hon. member that we should have coordination and cooperation, and in order that the discussions of the committee shall have useful and coordinated results we should absolutely stay with the item which is under discussion. I feel that the committee has that aim alone in mind.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I should like to get an explanation from the minister.

Mr. MARSHALL: Who has the floor?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): On a couple of occasions the hon. member for Battle River has stated that a married couple, both working in industry, are allowed an exemption of \$1,860. I recollect the Minister of Finance stating a year ago that there had to be some extra exemption given to married women in order to keep them working in offices, and such like. I should like to have a statement from the minister as to whether this married couple, both working in industry or in offices in cities, are allowed this joint exemption of \$1,860, and if they are why should the farmer's wife not be allowed exemption when she puts in much longer hours on the farm besides having to do her housework. We have before us a programme of food production in excess of anything in the past history of this country. I am sure that the farm woman, who works at milking cows and does all sorts of outside work on the farm, puts in quite as long hours and is contributing quite as much to the war effort as any married woman in an office or elsewhere in the cities, and if these married couples are allowed \$1,860, why should the farmer's wife not be entitled to a similar exemption?

Mr. ILSLEY: In the case of a man whose wife works in industry, or works at all and receives an income, the husband is entitled to