

that he and my deputy should endeavour, by going down to-morrow morning to the Civil Service Commission—I do not know what kind of weapons they are going to take with them—to get results.

Mr. FRASER: I claim the decision made by the Department of Justice and the Civil Service Commission was hardly fair to the man who was claiming the compensation. Am I to understand that if I am to make that point clear, the minister will pay the \$146?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I would be glad to pay that amount and get rid of the whole question, but I do not see how I can do it. We have dozens and, indeed, hundreds of such claims, and if we pay a claim without justification, we open the door to innumerable others.

Mr. COOTE: I should like to say a few words to the minister in regard to the salaries of the research men in his department. It is very hard for some of us to understand the policy of the Department of Agriculture in connection with the expenditure of money for different purposes. I think the minister is on record as saying that the research men in his department should be paid higher salaries than they are receiving at the present time. He will not deny that we have lost the services of several valuable men who have been engaged in research in connection with rust, simply because we did not pay them sufficient salaries. I thought a year ago that no doubt by this time the salaries of such men would have been readjusted, but no action has yet been taken. I was wondering whether the minister would be good enough to tell us why he is granting \$100,000 towards the grain exposition which is to be held at Regina and has not yet succeeded in getting fitting salaries for men engaged in research work. I am credibly informed that we are going to lose some more of these men this year because the government has dilly-dallied with the question for so long. The government finally got a report from the Civil Service Commission, recommending an increase of salary to these men. The Minister of Finance, who last year would not give us any encouragement in regard to the matter, because, as he said, the Civil Service Commission had not reported, now assumes the attitude that he is going to have another commission inquire into the case again. Has the minister not been able to convince the cabinet that it is really necessary that these research men should be paid a little more, and would the minister say that in his opinion the expenditure of \$100,000 for the grain exposition is more justifiable than paying these men increased

[Mr. Motherwell.]

salaries? I am anxious to know the attitude of the minister. Does he think this advertising scheme is more important than the retaining of these research men in his department, because I am satisfied—and the minister must be of the same opinion—that he is going to lose one or two valuable men if their salaries are not adjusted before another year passes by?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: As my hon. friend knows, we have had from the Civil Service Commission a report which has in turn been referred to a commission composed of Mr. Beatty, Doctor Murray and Sir George Garneau. While the matter is before that commission, I do not see how we can make any comments that would be germane to the question, except that I might say that I have never ceased endeavouring to have agriculture recognized as being on a parity with other departments in the matter of salaries. I have always taken the ground that a technical man in agriculture is worth just as much to the country as a technical man in any other department. That was not recognized even by the Civil Service Commission, until about a year ago. The question has arisen: What constitutes a technical man? And the committee has that question before it.

Mr. COOTE: Opposition is often expressed to the proposal to pay the research men in the Department of Agriculture a little more money because it is said that the department is spending too much money now. I am not saying that such is the case; but if the cabinet are willing to spend only a certain amount in connection with the Department of Agriculture, it would be much better to spend this \$100,000 in paying these research men higher salaries and to do without the grain exposition which is, after all, merely an advertising proposition.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Oh, no.

Mr. COOTE: While they are advertising we may lose a man whose services might be of just as much value to the country as those of Doctor Saunders, the man who propagated marquis wheat and placed it on the market for the benefit of the farmers of Canada. The minister is pursuing a rather unwise policy in this regard.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is no reason in the world why both these services should not be carried on and both these expenditures made. The situation would not be improved by abandoning the world exposition because, as I understand the question, it is one not of the money, but of deciding what constitutes technical men. That is what the