

throughout his life that he is a real fighter, and I hope that he will say with it.

I also want to underline the matter that we have raised several times lately in questions, motions under Standing Order 43, late shows and in the debate on March 7 on the motion of my hon. friend. That is, what has happened to the rate of the 100 per cent disability pension? We set it in 1972 in relation to the average wage of five groups of federal civil servants. Although the committee which recommended it asked that the relationship hold, the government chose, instead, to fall back on the cost of living index. The result is that the rate for a 100 per cent disability pensioner today is \$500 a year behind the composite rate of those groups of public servants that we accepted in 1971 or 1972. I insist that the tripartite committee which recommended that set-up was on the right track and it should have been accepted then. Since it was not accepted then, I call on the minister to do it now.

I am doing my best to abbreviate my remarks. I will end on the same point with which my friend concluded his remarks; that is, the case of the widows of veterans where the veteran's pension was below 48 per cent. I say, again, that we feel very strongly about it. We are not alone. Mr. Justice Mervyn Woods recommended this. Dr. J. D. Hermann recommended it in his report. The Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs voted that way two, three or four times. It is something that has been discussed over the years, pro rata pensions for all widows of disabled veterans.

We now have the support of the modern idea—it ought not to be modern, but it is—the idea of equal rights. Apart from the fact there is the question of women having equal rights with men, women should at least have equal rights with women. The fact that one widow gets a full pension and the next widow gets none at all because the veteran's pension was just on the margin above or below 48 per cent is quite unfair. There is a little more money involved in this than in the case of prisoners of war of World War I, but justice and fair play demand its consideration just as strongly and just as seriously.

I welcome this opportunity to indicate our support of the work of the Pension Review Board, which means that we shall be voting for this bill with pleasure. I also welcome this opportunity to remind the minister of the items of unfinished business to which I have referred. I hope he will act in such a way that in a few months from now we will not have to continue to make these requests on behalf of the veterans of Canada and on behalf of their survivors, but so long as it is necessary he knows that we shall do so.

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about veterans. I commend the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. MacDonald). It is the typical type of legislation one would expect from a minister who comes from the Maritime provinces. I echo the remarks of previous speakers, including the minister. I have no hesitation in supporting the bill and getting it through this House. I hope this will be some encouragement to the minister and the cabinet to bring forth the other necessary and proper legislation concerning our veterans.

Advance Payments for Crops

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Some hon. Members: One o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock later this day.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

ADVANCE PAYMENTS FOR CROPS ACT

MEASURE TO FACILITATE MAKING ADVANCE PAYMENTS FOR CROPS

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 16, consideration of Bill C-2, to facilitate the making of advance payment for crops, as reported (without amendment), from the Standing Committee on Agriculture; and the amendment thereto of Mr. Schellenberger.

Mr. Speaker: Order. When the House last considered the report stage of this bill a point of order was raised to the effect that motion No. 2, in the name of the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger) went beyond the scope of the bill and was therefore out of order. Hon. members will recall that after hearing argument on the matter I reserved decision. I have now had an opportunity to consider the matter at some length and examine the provisions of the bill as they relate to the propriety of the motion.

Hon. members are aware that one of the most frequently raised rules and precedents concerning amendments is whether an amendment introduces a new proposition into the legislation and thereby goes beyond the scope of the original bill. The intent of the amendment in this situation is that since the bill provides for the making of advance payments through banks and through producer organizations, then in circumstances where no suitable producer organization is in place the intent of the bill could be carried out by eliminating the role of the producer organization and placing the producer, the government and the bank into the position to give effect to the advance payments arrangement without the intervention of a producer organization.

The question then becomes: is the role in the legislation of the producer organization simply a means whereby the intent