

much greater burden on the people of the province. I can see no reason why, if from time to time valuable discoveries are made by research council scientists in fields hitherto unknown in Canada, the results of their investigations should not be used for and by the people. It is true that the national research council has not had experience in this field, but there is no fundamental reason why an organization which made such an excellent contribution during the war should not extend its activities and produce additional revenue in further justification of its existence.

One would not expect that we would go along with the Progressive Conservatives in their protests against section 9, which gives authority to incorporate or take over crown companies already in existence. It was demonstrated during the war that we could not depend upon private industry to do all the research work that was required, and the council having done research work in so many fields there is no reason why the people generally should not enjoy the benefits of that work.

When the resolution was before the committee the minister said, at page 1891 of *Hansard*:

There should be a considerable turnover of research men. In other words, people should move from universities into the government service, and after they have made their contribution there they should move back to the universities. In government there should be a good deal of moving from one department of research to another department, from one type of research to another. There should be moving from public research into private research, and from private research into public research.

At the time I questioned the wisdom of that policy in an organization such as the research council. I can understand the younger personnel might like to spend some years in western Canada, or in the maritimes, or on the frontier, studying various problems. But many research problems require for their solution the work of a lifetime, and I think that a policy such as the minister outlined should be applied very cautiously. My point the other day was that these men should not leave the research council because of more attractive salaries outside the service. When the agriculture estimates were before the committee I had something to say on a comparison between the salaries of the scientific personnel in the Department of Agriculture in Canada and the salaries for similar work in the United States and Great Britain. The information I gave at that time indicated that in practically every classification the agriculture scientist in Canada received much less attractive remuneration than his fellow scientist in Great Britain or in the United States.

I have here the report of the royal commission on technical and professional services, published in 1930, better known as the Beatty report. The commission consisted of the late Sir Edward Beatty, then president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, J. George Garneau, and Walter C. Murray, of the university of Saskatchewan. In its report the commission pointed out:

It is only within the last three generations that even the most advanced of modern democracies have felt sufficient confidence in their mechanism of public administration, to launch boldly upon their new tasks. The change in the attitude of government to national problems and its willingness to satisfy demands for legislative action, to meet new and complex economic and social conditions, were preceded by the creation of a body of trained experts and administrators, in the service of the state, who could safely be entrusted with the important responsibilities of efficient government administration . . .

The problems of government are becoming ever more complex; the effectiveness of government action must be limited, to a substantial extent, by the quality of the civil service, which is called upon to investigate many subjects of national importance demanding consideration by the government, as well as to make governmental policies effective and governmental decisions operative; and we believe that no more important task confronts those in charge of the country's affairs, than that of improving, and continuing to improve, by every means at their disposal, the quality of the Civil Service of Canada.

They were disturbed in 1930 at the tendency of civil servants, particularly scientific men, to leave the government service for private industry. They say in their report:

In certain respects, it is true, the civil servant is at no disadvantage, or even at a positive advantage, when compared with other workers of his own kind in private employment.

They observed that those who continue in the service find in a very few years that those who have left it for private industry have much more remunerative positions. In appendix C is given a table showing the average earned income of McGill graduates in engineering at certain intervals after graduation, from which I find that after twenty years those who are with the government service average an annual salary of \$3,560; teachers, \$4,250; all classes, \$9,300; which would indicate that the graduates in engineering who select government employment for a career are sorry after they have been in it for a year or two, because the government employees after twenty years receive an average salary only about one-third of the average remuneration of all other classes.

The report has a special section dealing with the national research council, in which it is pointed out that: