

or some other place. The hon. gentleman intimated, although he did not definitely say so, that this man, in his opinion, should pay income tax. That is what I gathered from his remarks. I would, however, point out to the committee that even if that man never goes overseas he has given up his profession and, when the war is over, he will have no practice to go back to, whereas other lawyers who are not in the armed forces are carrying on as usual. True, they may not be making much money; nevertheless they have their practice and, after the war is over, they have a job, while this lawyer who is sitting behind the desk has no job to which he can return.

I would also point out that all officers except those who are in a low category are liable for service overseas. They have no option if they are fit. They cannot volunteer only for home service. If they are needed they will be sent overseas. I believe that every officer in the armed forces, in the army, navy or air force, who had a job before the war and gave up that job, is making a sacrifice and that some consideration should be given to them in the payment of income tax.

I am fully aware of the difficulties with which the Minister of Finance is faced, and I know he is trying to find a solution. When I spoke in this house several weeks ago I stated that I thought the Minister of Finance was one of the greatest finance ministers this country has ever had, and since he has brought down his budget I have had no reason to change that opinion. I want to say to my hon. friends opposite or in any other part of this house that if I think any member of this government or any member of this house is doing a great service to his country, I shall not hesitate to tell the house of the great service which is being rendered. It is all right to say nice things about members after they have passed out of this house or gone to their great reward, but so far as I am concerned I am going to say good things about them while they are here.

It was stated this afternoon that if officers are relieved entirely of the payment of income tax, the coffers of this country will be depleted to the extent of probably \$15,000,000. The hon. member for Vancouver South suggested to the Minister of Finance that officers should be granted an exemption equal to the pay which a warrant officer would receive.

Mr. GREEN: And allowances.

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): The pay and allowances which a warrant officer would receive. I joined with my hon. friend this afternoon in that suggestion, and I am still in accord with him. I trust the Minister

of Finance will be able to grant such an exemption. However, if he should feel that that is going too far, I have a further suggestion to make. I suggest that all non-commissioned officers should continue to be exempt from payment of tax and that all officers in Canada pay income tax to the extent only of 50 per cent of what a civilian earning the same amount would pay. That would deplete the coffers of this country by only \$7,500,000.

While this country is spending billions of dollars, is it not fair to give some consideration to these officers? I know as well as other hon. members that some officers have better jobs to-day than they had in peace time, but I also know that if these officers were not in the armed forces they would, with conditions as they are to-day, be making just as much money outside as they are now. I also know there are many officers in the army, navy and air force who will never go outside Canada but who have made great sacrifices. I think of auditors and, in particular, of doctors, who have given up great practices, and of dentists, and if I were not a lawyer myself I would add lawyers. There are many, many men who are making a financial sacrifice in addition to leaving their home and family, and surely we can give them some consideration. It would not cost us much, if my suggestion were adopted, just 50 per cent of what they would normally pay. That would be welcomed by all of them; it would raise their morale, and be a great thing for the armed forces of this country.

Mr. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to make a speech but to ask a question which comes under subsection 2 of resolution 1. First I should like to quote from a letter I have received, and then ask my question. I quote:

Have a problem in request to tax exemptions for our two girls, Joan, age 12 years, and Joyce, age 9 years, who have been with us as our sole charge since they were about two years old.

The girls have no other home, no one else is getting exemptions for them, and we cannot see why we should be penalized for taking care of them. The Edmonton office admitted we should be entitled to exemption but as the act reads they could not allow it, but advised us to take it up with the tax commissioner, Ottawa. We could furnish you with a sworn affidavit to the effect that if we had not taken care of them, they and their mother would have been on relief all these years. In fact their father was on relief quite a few years.

We are advised that the only way we can claim exemption is to legally adopt them. This we hesitate to do on account of their mother's state of health, as she is in rather a nervous condition.

Is a case of this kind covered by subsection 2 of resolution 1?