

*Supply—Veterans Affairs*

to get this insurance? If I remember correctly what happened in the veterans affairs committee, the general feeling was that there should not be much hesitation in extending the cut-off date. I would hope that the minister is giving consideration now to extending that date next year.

**Mr. Gregg:** In view of the discussion tonight, Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to give that matter careful consideration before any announcement is made as to the cut-off date.

**Mr. Green:** Can the minister tell us how long after the first war it was possible to get this insurance?

**Mr. Gregg:** I am afraid that none of us here can tell that exactly. Of my own personal knowledge I remember that it was extended several times. I think it was somewhere in the vicinity of 1935, but I am not sure.

**Mr. Green:** That is seventeen years.

**Mr. Mutch:** At least four extensions.

**Mr. Harkness:** Can the minister tell us whether this cut-off date of February 2, 1951, is a statutory provision?

**Mr. Gregg:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. It was in the amendments to the insurance act which I brought in in 1948.

**Mr. Harkness:** I would suggest to the minister that if that is the case it may be, and certainly I would think it is likely, that the house would not be meeting again in time to pass an amendment to this act before that date. If therefore anything were going to be done by us to extend the date, it would probably have to be done at this session.

**An hon. Member:** Or by order in council.

**Mr. Harkness:** Therefore it is a matter that should receive what you might call immediate consideration. There is another question I wish to ask as to the figures the minister gave of approximately 27,000 applications and approximately 23,000 policies issued. Do I understand that those are the numbers of applications and policies issued as from the inception of the act?

**Mr. Gregg:** Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Harkness:** My understanding has always been that this insurance was for the benefit of veterans who were unable to get an insurance policy from the ordinary line companies because of various disabilities they had and so forth. I was rather surprised to find that the number of applications exceeded the number of policies by some 5,000. I should like to ask the minister what the explanation of that is.

**Mr. Gregg:** Perhaps I should have explained that. The number of applications that I quoted was the grand total of applications from the beginning down to the present time. The number of policies in force were those actually in force at the present time, which did not take into consideration at all those whose policies had lapsed; for example, those who had died and whose policies had been paid.

**Mr. Harkness:** There is then no question of people having applied and having been turned down?

**Mr. Gregg:** Oh, no. There have been some turned down.

**Mr. Harkness:** There just have not been any cases of that kind?

**Mr. Gregg:** There were 58 declined out of the whole lot.

**Mr. Harkness:** What would be the reason for those 58 being turned down, just generally speaking? I do not mean to go into every case.

**Mr. Gregg:** I could not give it exactly, but to cover it generally it could be that they did not meet the requirements of the act. I suppose it probably might be lack of sufficient service or it might be for a number of reasons.

**Mr. Harkness:** There is one other question I want to ask. This is entirely the administration end of the veterans insurance. I had some question in my mind as to how this veterans insurance had worked out from the point of view of profit and loss. Has the government had a profit on this veterans insurance or has it suffered a loss up to date? If so, what is the amount of the profit or loss?

**Mr. Gregg:** I think this would answer my hon. friend. The treasury pays the cost of the administration, which is voted here.

**Mr. Harkness:** I meant apart from administration.

**Mr. Gregg:** Granted the cost of administration, then beyond that we believe it to be actuarially sound: no profit and no loss.

**Mr. Harkness:** Does that mean that up to date there has been a profit to the treasury, we will say, on the operation of this act? And if so, to what amount?

**Mr. Lennard:** The minister said "no profit and no loss".

**Mr. Harkness:** You cannot have that. That is not practically possible.

**Mr. Gregg:** To put it briefly the payments received on account of premiums on policies are paid into the fund; the amounts due on account of collections on policies are paid out