

ought to do. The grant is given under the supervision of the advisory council; it is not a subsidy to assist the university; it is a grant for a specific purpose. The separation of tar from the tar sand is another very important matter. If that problem could be solved, immense benefit would result to the western country. A grant of a small amount, about \$1,500, is to be given to that university under the supervision of the proper professor—who is conversant with the question and who is carrying out an investigation at present—to enable him to carry his work to a conclusion. That is the very principle upon which we are proceeding; and that, I think, answers the objection that my hon. friend made in one part of his remarks.

Mr. OLIVER: What the minister has said in regard to grants to universities exactly bears out what I say: the practical result to be expected will be reached by the making of small grants to the universities. I am not suggesting that the minister should make grants to universities in respect of these particular questions, but if he feels the impulse to do something, let him make the grants to the universities directly for these purposes; let him not launch upon this country at this time an expensive organization which will cost \$91,000 to start—no one knows how much it will cost to carry it on—when all that he proposes actually to spend in regard to the tar sand is \$1,500. I presume a similar amount will be expended for research work in regard to the tar extract from the gas from burning straw, and possibly a similar amount as to the extract from coal gas. Those are moderate amounts, and I suppose nobody will object to their expenditure for such purposes. Let the minister make those expenditures if he pleases, and the country will support him, but let him not burden this country with an expenditure of \$100,000 for the purpose of giving four or five thousand dollars for actual research work.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The expenditure of \$100,000 for scientific research in Canada is not objectionable, if we have the proper organization. It is quite possible, if real practical work is done by the commission, for an expenditure of \$100,000 to yield a return of \$1,000,000. I suppose one of the best instances of the value to a country of scientific work was that performed by the late Mr. Saunders in the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Saunders developed a seed wheat for Canada which matured some

weeks earlier than any other wheat that had been known prior to this time in Canada.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: What wheat is that?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know what the name of the wheat is, but the fact which I have seen stated in government publications is that, through Mr. Saunders' effort, a special wheat was developed which matured very much earlier in Canada than any wheat previously known. I did not know that this fact was ever in question. I could easily put my hand upon written authority in which it is stated by very prominent persons that the result of this was the widening of the wheat belt in western Canada by many miles.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I think the wheat to which the hon. member refers is Marquis wheat. The experience of practical farmers has been that it matures eight or ten days earlier than other kinds.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman may be correct, but I am simply stating to the committee a fact which I have seen stated a score of times. I am giving it to the committee just as I have gained it from my reading, and I have no doubt I am correct in this.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I only wish the statement were true.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is well known that the work done by Mr. Saunders in this respect resulted in securing for Canada a seed wheat which enables us to harvest wheat very much earlier than we were able to do before, and that was a very important matter in a country in which the summer season is short. If what I have stated is correct, Mr. Saunders' work was worth millions of dollars to Canada.

When the Bill establishing this commission was before the committee, I objected to the personnel of the commission, and I want to repeat my objection. It is not satisfactory to the people of Canada; it is not satisfactory to some of the members of the commission. The men constituting that commission should be much younger men with some practical experience. I do not believe in establishing a commission composed of men who are able to give attention to this work for only a few days in a year. The appointment of such a commission is fraught with great possibilities for this country. The idea is absolutely sound. This is the time above all others in our history when we should be doing work of this kind. The very fact that we have a