

*Pension Act Amendment*

made the statement that many pensioners' widows did not have a pension. All widows are pensionable when the death of the husband is attributable to his pensionable disability.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I should like to leave the case there for the present and carry it forward to the veterans affairs committee.

Mr. GREEN: May I ask the minister a question? In his earlier remarks he questioned the figures I gave on Monday with regard to men who have been ruled out in their applications for pension on the ground that they had pre-enlistment disability. I could not hear distinctly what he said, but I believe it was to the effect that not all these men had been discharged from the forces on medical grounds. I should like to know whether that was the statement. If it was, could the minister tell us how many of these men were discharged because they were medically unfit? In that connection, I would point out to him that in each one of these cases—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The minister has closed the debate.

Mr. GREEN: But I must clarify the question, Mr. Speaker. In each one of these cases there is admittedly a disability, and it is not a post-war disability, but the disability which the commission says existed is based on a pre-enlistment condition.

Mr. GREGG: In my earlier remarks I did not question the quotation of the figures but rather the implication in the hon. member's statement on Monday, that all these veterans came out because they were unfit, whereas the great number of them came out under general demobilization. I will undertake to get a breakdown of those figures.

Mr. GREEN: But it is a fact, is it not, that the rulings against these veterans in each case were based on the fact that they were suffering from a pre-enlistment condition?

Mr. GREGG: I think I may be right in saying no, but I will check that.

Mr. GREEN: The minister will find he is absolutely wrong if he checks up the statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. We are not in committee. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the special committee on veterans affairs.

[Mr. Gregg.]

## CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

## PROVISION FOR EMPLOYEES' PENSIONS, MINIMUM PRICE OF WHEAT DELIVERIES, ETC.

The house resumed, from Friday, February 27, consideration of the motion of Mr. Howe:

That it is expedient to present a bill to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, to authorize the board to provide pensions for members, officers and employees and to make provision for the increase of the fixed minimum price on wheat deliveries; to extend the control of interprovincial movements of wheat products and to empower the governor in council to extend the present system to oats or barley.

And the amendment thereto of Mr. Ross (Souris).

Mr. SPEAKER: There is before the house an amendment moved by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross), on which I desire to give a ruling. The amendment deals exclusively with procedure; it does not challenge the crown's recommendation for amending the Canadian Wheat Board Act. It is, however, lacking in a very important requirement. It proposes in the first paragraph to strike out certain words, but it does not say that these words are part of the resolution. Moreover, paragraph 6 of the amendment reads as follows:

That the words "Canadian Wheat" be substituted immediately before the word "board" in the third line of the resolution.

The word "substituted" is not the legal expression here, because a substitution cannot take place unless a certain thing is put in the place of another. On these two grounds alone, the amendment could be ruled out, but I shall not do so since I think the house is able to understand what the hon. member really had in mind. The amendment should not be turned down on mere technicalities. It purports to suggest that the governor general's recommendation, if accepted, be embodied in three bills instead of one.

The division of a bill into two or more bills may be permitted under our procedure, as may be seen in Bourinot, page 298 and May, page 530. It seems, however, that there are serious objections to doing this by amending a money resolution on the motion that the Speaker leave the chair for committee of the whole on the resolution. The house decided on February 16 to resolve itself into committee of the whole at a future date to consider the resolution which it is now proposed to amend. This decision precludes amendments to the resolution at the stage it is now in, because it must be considered by committee of the whole in the very words in