

indirectly to the wife, under the law as it stands now, and much consideration has been given some method by which the law might be changed. However, I am not in a position at the moment to say whether or not an amendment to meet the situation will be proposed. The matter is still under consideration.

Mr. GREEN: What is the law in Great Britain and the United States?

Mr. ILSLEY: In Great Britain the law is that if the payment to the ex-wife is made under an order of the court, it is allowed as a deduction from the husband's income for the purposes of income tax, and it is taxed as income to the wife. In the United States I believe the law is the same as ours.

Mr. GREEN: Have they not changed it this year?

Mr. ILSLEY: They are trying to, but I do not know how they will get along. I should have completed my remarks about Great Britain. If the payment is under a separation agreement instead of an order of the court, then the husband is taxed on the full income, and the wife not at all.

Mr. GREEN: Why has Canada followed the United States law rather than the British law in this case?

Mr. ILSLEY: There has never been any other law in Canada. Perhaps they are following us; I do not know. We just do the same; that is all.

Mr. GREEN: I really think it is an impossible situation, with the tax so greatly increased as it has been this year. After all, our law recognizes divorce, and once the parties are divorced they are entitled to marry again. In some cases that have been brought to my attention the husband has remarried and had children by the second wife, but is forced to pay income tax on the alimony that he pays the first wife, and I suggest that the position is absolutely unfair.

Mr. ILSLEY: I agree that it is, in a great many cases.

Mr. ROSS (Calgary East): Where a widower has young children, and requires the services of a housekeeper, is any allowance made for that housekeeper?

Mr. ILSLEY: No, there is none.

Mr. GRAYDON: I do not rise to pose as an expert on the question of alimony, like those of my colleagues who apparently have made a close personal study of the matter; but when the hon. member for Vancouver South suggested that we in this country had

followed the policy of the United States I was reminded of the minister's very mild boast during the course of his budget speech as to the way the United States had followed his price-ceiling policy, and I was wondering if this was another evidence of that reciprocity about which through all the years this government has been so proud to boast.

I should like to point out to the minister that according to the answer to a question tabled yesterday, some 7,920 children have been brought here from Great Britain since the outbreak of war. Of these I believe all but 189 came prior to or during 1941, and therefore the stream of immigrants of tender age from that quarter has apparently pretty well dried up, I presume because of transportation and other difficulties. It does seem to me that in connection with the income tax, even though the minister has refused similar requests in previous years, in view of the acuteness of the financial stringency of some of our people in the very low income brackets who are looking after these British guest children, this year he might well give further consideration to this matter. If the arguments used in former years in support of exemptions in respect of these children had any strength at all, the minister might well take into consideration the tremendous increase that has been brought about in the income tax and do something with respect to these evacuated children who have been brought to Canada. There are less than 8,000 of them, and I think it would be an extremely nice gesture on the part of this government, and would not cause any great drain upon the treasury, if some consideration could be shown the people who, often at great personal sacrifice, are looking after these guest children.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I should like to ask a question in connection with officers in the armed forces, and I do not see any other clause under which I may do so. I remember a discussion which took place about a year ago in regard to the different treatment given the air force and the army in this country, and I believe at that time it was pointed out by the minister that those who were undergoing flying training certainly were exposed to greater danger than those in the army. Since then I have been told that any administrative officer of the air force who has done 100 hours of flying during the year is exempt from payment of income tax. Is that correct?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Then I think that is most discriminatory. I believe the army