

though she were someone engaged in a business he was running. The same is true of small shopkeepers, just as it is true of farmers. But when it comes to children there is no reason why the farmer could not put his children on the payroll, if he wanted to, and claim the amounts paid to them as a deduction, as part of the expense of running the farm, as long as they were actually paid.

Mr. PERLEY: I think there should be some way of making some allowance for the wife, because last fall I saw many farmers' wives in overalls, pitching sheaves, driving trucks, drawing grain to the elevators, and so on. Then they would go home and prepare the meals. Right on my own place I know there were three women working in the harvest fields on the tenant's farm, and at times his wife drove the truck. I think there should be some consideration for the work these women do, because that practice was prevalent all over the west last year.\*

While I am on my feet there is another matter in regard to the allowance for board for hired help. A farmer is allowed to charge fifty cents a day as board for a day labourer, but last fall he was permitted to charge \$1 a day for board for the harvesters who went to the west from universities and so on in the east. I think there is discrimination in that regard. Last year the farmers were permitted to charge \$1 a day for boarding harvest help, but now for seasonal help they are permitted to charge only fifty cents a day. Some adjustment should be made there.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Suppose the farmer's wife has an income as a result of her own work keeping chickens, milking cows, making butter, and so on. Does the farmer have to show that as part of his income?

Mr. GIBSON: No; that is usually allowed to the wife, where she is running an independent side-line on her own account and due to her own activities. That is regarded as the income of the wife.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: What would you call an independent activity? Suppose she is using grain grown on the farm; that would not be completely independent.

Mr. GIBSON: Well, it is hard to define, but I refer to cases where the wife is perhaps looking after chickens and selling the eggs herself, taking the entire responsibility for that activity.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: She would be granted that income?

Mr. GIBSON: Yes, she gets that now.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The other evening I raised the question of the man selling perhaps

[Mr. Ilsey.]

a herd of pure bred cattle, and I endeavoured to point out that this should be classified not as income but as investment return. Just the other day I received a letter which puts the case much more clearly than I could put it. This letter does not come from my own constituency, but the writer says:

You no doubt wonder why I am writing you, but it appears to me you, Mr. Perley and Mr. Leader are about the only ones in the house who take the farmers' grievances seriously.\*

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I think he is rather flattering in that, but I will pass over the personal part and get to the meat of the letter:

I am writing you this letter to let you know what a lot of farmers in this western country are up against when we are asked to produce more food for Britain.

We had a splendid crop of everything in 1942, but can only realize on fourteen bushels to the acre; and have eighteen bushels to the acre in the granary and no market for it. After the year's operations and after paying all expenses my son and I have \$530 for our year's work. We keep quite a number of cattle, hogs and sheep since 1939, and have sold no females except in the hogs. And now when we have come to the point where we have to dispose of about \$4,000 worth of live stock the inspector of taxation, Mr. Loury tells me everything over and above our profits in 1942 we have to pay 40 per cent excess profits tax; and my son would have to take 15 per cent compulsory savings; or in other words \$2,200, if we sold \$4,000 worth of live stock.

I was talking with Mr. Loury in Winnipeg a few days ago and I know this is absolutely correct, and he gave me the above figures. Now, Mr. Ross, I am not trying to get out of paying income tax, as I think it is up to the farmers of this country to do their share absolutely. What I think is wrong and you know as well as I do that we have passed through some of the worst years in Canadian history, and machinery was worn out before the war started. And now none can be purchased. As for ourselves we have to spend \$2,000 for new equipment as soon as this war is over. And where are we going to get the money if the government takes it in income tax? If we keep our present number of live stock and get some efficient help we could produce from 45,000 to 50,000 pounds of meat, besides poultry and dairy products.

He goes on to point out that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) and the "Irish preacher from Fort William" will vouch for his statements.

Then, I have another statement from another gentleman who contemplates having to sell most of his live stock, to the value of \$8,000. He must have a different set-up in respect of grain production, because he points out that the government is taking only forty per cent, or \$3,200 in income tax on the sale. He points out further that the live stock he