

1919, and is from the Board of Pension Commissioners. The second paragraph is as follows:

It is pointed out that had you lost the entire index finger and thumb you would only have received pension at the rate of 30 per cent—this being the official estimate for this loss. Having only lost two-thirds of each of these members, however, 20 per cent is the maximum pension which it has been possible to award you.

That is merely a sample of some of the matters with which these amputation cases have to contend. In this particular case, according to this man's letter, his stumps are of no value to him at all, but because of the fact that he has a small stump left of his index finger and also of his thumb, he is deprived of 10 per cent by way of pension that he otherwise would have if the finger and thumb had been amputated entirely. I hope the committee will go into this question and deal with these matters very thoroughly; I feel quite sure that that will be done.

Another matter which is very important at present to the soldier settlers is the question of the repayment of their loans. This matter has been before the house on various occasions in previous sessions, and in some ways the men have been dealt with very generously, but we find that a very large proportion of the soldier settlers who bought land through the Soldier Settlement Board are not in a very good position to make the payments necessary finally to liquidate their liability, and at the same time make a living. I think if we were to make a thorough examination of many of the cases of these soldier settlers who are finding it very hard indeed to meet their payments, we would find that many of them are suffering from physical deterioration because of their having passed through the war conditions, and under the circumstances it seems almost impossible, because of that physical condition, for them finally to liquidate their liability. The farmer organizations in western Canada have these matters thrust upon them from time to time, and we are very glad indeed to be able to consider the requests of these returned men. At the last convention of the United Farmers of Alberta, all these factors being taken into consideration, a resolution was unanimously adopted that so far as further payments to the Soldier Settlement Board were concerned this house should in future remit all interest charges and ask the men simply to pay the principal, primarily because of the fact that most of them were in poor health and consequently did not have a fair opportunity of meeting all their obligations in full. I hope the committee when it meets will give this matter their atten-

tion, because it is very important. We feel that those men who served Canada so well should be given every consideration. As I stated before, parliament has given them many valuable considerations, first of all by the remission of interest charges for two or three years, then by a remission of part of their stock accounts, subsequently by revaluation and so forth; but in spite of all that has already been done by parliament we find that most of the settlers under the soldier settlement scheme are still fighting hard in order to retain the properties which they bought. We believe that if interest was remitted in full and the men merely asked to pay the principal amount of their liability, the sum of money which was advanced to them to purchase land and equipment, their position would be much improved and they would at least have the opportunity of finally discharging their liability. More particularly do we urge that because we know the condition of these men and have some knowledge of the circumstances under which they are labouring.

In the speech from the throne, Mr. Speaker, we have a reference to the reorganization of the Board of Grain Commissioners of Canada. I have had the opportunity of discussing with farmers in my particular constituency what parliament did during the last session, and I had the privilege and pleasure of telling them that so far as the Board of Grain Commissioners was concerned, and particularly as respects the amendments to the Canada Grain Act adopted last year, this question was made a non-partisan question in the House of Commons, and that political parties of all degrees of thought combined their best efforts in producing such amendments to the Canada Grain Act as would be satisfactory to the producers and would therefore make them feel a little happier. I think I am quite justified in expressing to this house the pleasure that the farmers feel in realizing that this matter was treated as a non-party question. It is also stated in the speech from the throne that there is to be a new consolidation of the grain act. I presume that this question will be referred to the agriculture committee. I hope the consolidation will be such as to bring the Canada Grain Act in conformity with present day conditions and consequently give to the farmer that protection which is very much needed.

The question of the marketing of grain is one which I believe should occupy the attention of the agriculture committee. The farmers of western Canada who are growing the bulk of the export grain in the form of wheat are beginning to feel very dubious about marginal