

Could we have any idea as to what this might cost? I feel that if the veteran of World War II thought it worth his while now to take out insurance—and he has only got another three years to do it—I do not see why we should take any benefit away from him if he re-enlists to go to Europe, to train here in Canada, or to go as a reinforcement to Korea. I think he should be encouraged to do so.

Personally, my thinking at the moment is that this whole section 6 should be dropped.

Mr. GEORGE: Could Mr. Black tell us how many there are, or if we are still getting applicants for this insurance?

Mr. BLACK: At the present time, Mr. George, we get about 150 to 200 a month. We have had very few whom we have been able to identify as people who are joining the forces. We have had only one or two who are members of the special or Korean force.

The CHAIRMAN: The catch in this thing, in my view, is that these two wars come too close together. The situation has not arisen before. We have not adopted the practice in this country of insuring in any government scheme those who enlist in the forces of the country. That has not been done in either of the two previous wars we are familiar with. However, it has been done in other places. Now, it has occurred to somebody, and I think to everybody in this committee, that this is an extension of the benefits of this insurance Act. There is nothing to prevent, or practically nothing to prevent, anyone who is a veteran of World War II and otherwise entitled to this insurance and who desires to enlist again, from taking out, in multiples of \$500, insurance up to \$10,000. He can then enlist and thereby get a benefit through this government insurance which is not available to him in any insurance company.

In other words, the government, if it does not make some restrictions with respect to this, leaves the taxpayers of this country—and all of the other insurance companies are taxpayers—open to a drain which could be as large as the number of veterans who re-enlist. With respect to that, I might point out that some 42 per cent of the special force were veterans of World War II. Unintentionally this rehabilitation benefit has been created—if you do not do something about it. For that reason, I assume, an attempt has been made to see that this insurance shall do the thing which it was intended to do, and not guarantee the future of somebody who is going off to war. Its purpose was to assist the man who has been to war and to ensure security for his old age and his dependents.

The question we have got to ask ourselves is: are we at the moment sold on the idea of using something which was not intended to create a new service benefit for that purpose. It is, I think, as simple as that.

Mr. HERRIDGE: I would like to ask one or two questions. Has the superintendent of insurance had this matter brought to his attention by the insurance companies?

Mr. BLACK: No, sir, not from the insurance companies.

Mr. HERRIDGE: But with the large numbers who enlist and serve in Canada and with the normal percentage of casualties under conditions which we can reasonably assume, does covering these veterans in this way place an extremely heavy load on the fund which could not be covered by a slight increase in premium?

Mr. BLACK: When you take in the cost to the fund all these casualties during the war, you probably get the result somewhat as if payments were made under section 10 in the Act in very nearly all cases, which would restrict the benefits to some extent in any event.

Mr. BROOKS: What is the condition of the fund at the present time?