

Ottawa crowded into any place they can get. Many moving appeals have been made because these girls are being asked to pay \$20, \$30, \$40 or something like that.

Mr. HOMUTH: It is a crying shame.

Mr. ILSLEY: Unless we tax these lower paid people we cannot get the amount that we require. Does it worry anyone that these girls in uniform should be relieved completely from paying a tax? I find it hard to understand the great lightness with which hon. members talk about throwing off fifteen, twenty or twenty-five millions; they talk of doing away with all discriminations, and there are some, eliminating them at the expense of the rest of the overburdened taxpayers. While I must admit that I look at the matter the other way I do find it hard to understand this attitude.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The minister asks if we are worried. While I may not have received as many representations as the minister, I have received a good many and have given a great deal of consideration to this matter. I had intended to say something in the address which I made on the budget. Almost immediately after we got into the discussion on this resolution the point was raised by the hon. member for Calgary East. I thought he was jumping into it just a little too soon, but I knew we were bound to reach the question sooner or later. There is a wider picture to be considered. My information is that everybody in the United States pays, whether they are in or out of the country, provided, of course, that they come within the taxable brackets. The same thing is true in the United Kingdom.

Mr. ILSLEY: They get a little more pay when they are outside the country.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But the principle of their taxation is that they all pay. I want to discuss this matter in the light of all the circumstances and as judicially as possible. I think the minister wants a frank expression of opinion from the members of the house who are not looking particularly for votes. I am not dealing with it from that angle. It is quite popular to espouse the cause of cutting taxation; I have done a lot of it in days gone by, but I never found that it got me many votes in the final result. We have departed from the principle in a particular instance, and the operation of that departure has caused hardship. There has been a terrific increase in the rates of taxation imposed upon some of these men. There is a discriminatory effect upon the junior officers, up to and including majors, I believe, as opposed to warrant officers.

[Mr. Ilesley.]

Mr. ILSLEY: I think it just includes captains.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is probably correct, but I was told that it included majors. These junior officers up to and including captains are now taxed at such a rate that they actually receive less than warrant officers. That is an invidious discrimination. There are men who enlisted for active service and who have been sent back to Canada. I believe all officers are subject to direction to go anywhere, there is no such thing as a home army officer. Those men who have been overseas and have been brought home are subject to a tremendous impost because of a move they have made against their wish and desire. They want to stay overseas, but they have been ordered to come back to do service here. Those men are entitled to some consideration.

But there is another large array of men who are now in the armed services who hold relatively high ranks and who have never dreamed of going overseas. Many of them got into the army because they could improve their positions. Why should they escape? The minister tells us that \$20,000,000 is the aggregate amount of money to be collected from all, including the class of soldier who never thought of fighting. I have no sympathy for men like that, men who probably bothered everybody they knew to get transferred from a peace-time department into the Department of National Defence and be able to occupy an office in that department and wear a uniform. I have no sympathy for that type of man at all. If he does not like his job, let him resign and go back to his peace-time occupation.

Mr. MacNICOL: There is not a chance in a million of his doing that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not think there will be. I suppose it would be almost impossible to lay down a general rule, but I understand the departmental experts have tried to establish a general principle so that this particular class shall not escape. This particular class of army officer, made up of men who are not soldiers, who are simply bookkeepers or paymasters in uniform—we have seen some of them around—will escape if we make an alteration. If it is humanly possible to differentiate between these men and those who are actually in the fighting services, it should be done. Consideration should be given to the man who is sent back from overseas for instructional purposes, and to the man sent out to the coast to help defend the coast.

Mr. GREEN: And the man who is there now.