under way. Could he explain how, by giving a special tax break to lawyers, he feels the economy or the recovery will be assisted and how the fact that the Government has increased average personal income taxes by $200 to $300 per family will help?

Mr. Cullen: I believe the April Budget indicated where that money would be spent and what kinds of things it would be used for. It was to be used for the benefit of ordinary, average Canadians, by putting into place nets which have to be there to help people when the economy runs into a snag, such as the recession we have experienced over the last three or four years. The people who are hurt most by that are those in the income category about which the Hon. Member talks.

In so far as providing benefits to lawyers, etcetera, perhaps it is appropriate at long last and has not come too soon. We do not have any problem recognizing that a hockey player with talent and brilliant skills can make between $300,000 and $500,000 over the years and that there should be some tax break for him, whether he incorporates himself or whatever he does. I say that is appropriate; I am not knocking it. However, lawyers and accountants are usually not in that particular position, so we made a concession to them.

It seems significant when we talk about the salaries to which the Hon. Member referred that I have a letter on my desk today which indicates that the average lawyer in downtown Regina makes $35,000 a year. It is not as though they are all making vast sums of money, but it does give them an opportunity. The Hon. Member uses the example of a lawyer who makes $200,000 or $300,000. I never made anything like that in the small community in which I live.

Mr. Riis: How does it help the economy?

Mr. Cullen: We have to recognize that just as athletes train and put a lot of time into developing their skills so that they can become professionals, doctors and lawyers require post-secondary education and beyond. Not only that, they are constantly in a position where they are required to upgrade their skills. There should be some recognition of this. Quite often doctors do not graduate until they are 30 years of age. Often they work their way through school. From the time they are 18 years or 19 years of age until they are 30 years to 32 years of age, they are not making money. In fact, they are paying out money. We have to recognize that professionals in this country should also be rewarded for that kind of sacrifice.

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I will call it one o'clock in just a moment, but before I do so I want to indicate briefly that I will be responding to some of the statements made earlier today by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin). One thing she said in dealing with the subject of pension reform was that there were a number of elephants which had held back any progress in this field in the last four years. She cited among other things the business community. I say to her that the major elephant which blocked progress in this vital field of pension reform in the past four years, and once again in this Budget, is the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde).

Also I say to the Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen), who has just spoke so eloquently about the need for something to be done for single women over the age of 55 that while he and his Government condone various tax breaks to people in higher income brackets, they had the choice to set the priority as to whether it should be that group who have been so well served by this Budget, people between the ages of 55 years and 65 years, or, as the task force on pension reform recommended, single elderly persons between the ages of 60 years and 65 years who should have had something done for them in this Budget but were completely ignored. That is the tragedy of this Budget.

May I call it one o'clock?

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order.

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

NATIONAL REVENUE

DEPARTMENT'S TREATMENT OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT

Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, Revenue Canada has just published a nice glossy booklet at taxpayers' expense entitled "Inside Taxation" emphasizing, as it would, the integrity and fairness of that Department. It is still a nickel and dime outfit. Aside from the general harassment of waitresses who are caught in the gratuity squeeze, a Niagara College student took advantage of the inquiry service of that Department and tells this story.

For two years he had tried to earn a living as a commission salesman. The market was slow. He used his own car. He paid for the coffee. He was in effect selling all the time, but finally his money ran out and so he started back to school on student loans and grants. After his first full year as a student, he had questions about his return, so he called the taxation office. You guessed it. He ended up being reassessed for the years 1981 and 1982. They need vouchers, who, where, and what. They want a daily mileage record, and what geographical area he covered.