

always been particularly interested in the control of disease of farm crops and farm stock. At the present time the fruit growers are seriously concerned over the spread of what is generally known as little cherry disease. I think hon. members who represent ridings in which fruit growing is of considerable interest would be wise to listen to this. I am going to deal with it for a few minutes for the information of hon. members. Not only is it, on present indications, a threat to the orchardists of West Kootenay and British Columbia, it is a threat to all the fruit growing sections on the North American continent.

It was around 1936 or 1937 that we began to notice small cherries at a certain point in West Kootenay but we did not think of them as being diseased at the time. I might say that this small cherry is a cherry which ripens with the usual colour; it is much smaller in size than the normal cherry, but it lacks sugar content. The theory generally accepted was that the heavy freeze which we had in that district in 1935 had affected the trees but that there would be a recovery. When there was no sign of recovery in the following years the growers began to look for other causes and suspected a nutritional deficiency, but this theory was soon discounted after investigation by various representatives of the science service.

Further investigation revealed the fact that this disease had been present as far back as 1932, but apparently it was confined to one orchard. The disease appeared to remain static until about 1938 or 1939 and then an unfavourable market reaction, so far as the sale of cherries was concerned, caused further investigation. It was found that nearly all the orchards of the west arm of Kootenay lake were affected. Since that time we can say that the spread of the disease has been fairly rapid to other sections of the Kootenay district.

I am not sure of the year, but I think it was in 1940 that further investigations were carried on. The first hint of the virus nature of the disease was obtained in 1941 when Doctor Foster got what appeared to be a genuine transfer of little cherry by placing buds from affected trees in the Kootenay district on three healthy trees on Vancouver island. Unfortunately, since the disease had not been found on Vancouver island, the science service officials could not assume the

[Mr. Herridge.]

responsibility of introducing it there. Therefore the material had to be destroyed before a full evaluation of its significance could be obtained.

However, following this lead, a conference of provincial and science service officials was held and a programme of further research outlined. Science department officials realize that this is a great threat to the fruit industry and say that it will require a team of entomologists and pathologists working together, which will mean a lot of slow, painstaking and costly work. I am informed that the problem in general is not one of appropriations, but of man-power; that the problem can be solved only by adequately trained investigators. I am informed also that there is a great shortage of trained personnel, which is one of the obstacles facing the government in developing a full-scale attack on this and similar disease problems.

Before concluding, I should like to deal briefly with the question of trained personnel. Why are we at this time short of trained personnel in Canada? Everyone recognizes the fact that we are short of trained personnel in the agriculture industry in Canada. I say it is because the dominion and provincial governments of this country have a scale of salaries too low to retain the services of many of our best men in this field. I wish to pay a tribute to the many men who do stay in the service of the dominion and provincial governments, at a financial loss to themselves, because of their devotion to this country.

In my opinion, considering comparative academic qualifications and the cost of obtaining them, agriculture graduates in most positions in the public service should be just as well paid as engineers and foresters, and, I should say, considerably higher than lawyers. Most agricultural positions in research now require at least a master's degree, with preference for a doctorate. As an illustration I should like to give the range of salaries paid to agriculture science workers in Canada and the United States. Assistant professors in the United States average \$2,900 to \$3,800, whereas the average Canadian salary is \$2,500 to \$3,200. Instructors in the United States average \$2,000 to \$3,800, and in Canada the average is \$1,500 to \$2,100.

The salary advantage in the United States universities is larger for the lower paid teach-