

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No, we would have to look up the individual files for that.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Green.

Mr. GREEN: Would that figure given by Colonel Garneau include widows?

Mr. GARNEAU: No, just the veterans.

The CHAIRMAN: I suppose, Colonel Garneau, you have made a study—and I think the committee would be interested in having it if you are able to give it—based upon the average amount of war veterans' allowance which is paid to people in the same age group, what this would likely cost if this were extended to all veterans who saw service only in England.

Mr. G. L. LALONDE (Acting Deputy Minister): We have taken the number of veterans who served in England only during World War I, and we have applied to that figure the percentage of those who are receiving war veterans allowance, and who were in a theatre of actual war. By transposing that figure to the number of those who served in England only, we estimate that about 11,500 of those would probably become recipients under the Act.

If you take that figure as a basis and you multiply it by the average payment made to present recipients, that gives us the estimated cost of adding to the number of recipients those who served in England in World War I.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the figure?

Mr. LALONDE: It amounts to \$9,650,000 per year, and that is based on the rates of allowance included in the bill.

Mr. PEARKES: Would it be possible to get those figures by years of arrival in England? I think there is a lot of difference between the men who went through all the hardships of Salisbury Plains in 1915 and the men who arrived in England at the end of 1918.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The only way those figures could be obtained would be by an examination of each individual file. As the deputy minister has explained, our estimates are based on the average of our experience with regard to these actual recipients. So we would have to look up each individual file to ascertain the date of arrival in England.

Mr. PHILPOTT: We have been using that figure of \$50 a month. I think it is unfortunate, but we keep on using it. When I was congratulating the Legion on the brief before on the point about the minor children, I wonder if they noticed what seems to me to be a small error at the end of page 6 in which they say:

In some cases the veteran in this category is at present trying to support a wife and several small children on \$90 per month.

And under the terms of Bill 164 he would receive \$108. In addition to that, if they have small children they would also be drawing family allowance and I think we should be clear on this if we are trying to get this past the treasury.

Mr. HARKNESS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Legion officers, or its president, could tell us why they have made a recommendation on permissible income of \$1,200 and \$2,000 for single and married rather than on the income tax level of \$1,000 and \$2,000?

Dean J. O. ANDERSON: I presume, sir, the reason for the figure of \$1,200 would be that it is \$100 a month. This subject has been discussed by us, as indeed by you gentlemen, for some years now and I believe the origin of some of these things happened before I came into the picture.

Mr. THOMPSON: We arrived at those figures as a result of a committee of council which studied a number of reports on living costs across the country combined a number of resolutions from Legion branches. They arrived at