

compassionate allowances, but I would have considerable hesitation in doing so in connection with losses due to this particular disease, because we would then have to apply the same principle to losses from all diseases, whether contagious or not. This is not a contagious disease, and therefore we are not justified in dealing with it under the act. My hon. friend certainly has my compassion, but I do not know how I am going to exercise it in the way he suggests.

Mr. COTNAM: The circumstances were rather unusual in this case, because the vaccine was administered in good faith, and it is very unfortunate that these farmers in trying to protect their cattle against an outbreak of the disease should have incurred very heavy losses. I know some of them will not recover financially for several years. I would urge the minister to make some allowance to these farmers. Otherwise the case will drag on in the courts, and from what I know of the circumstances I am afraid those interested will not recover much, if anything; by way of damages.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Will my hon. friend send me a communication detailing the circumstances so that we may have the matter looked into?

Mr. COTNAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Minister; I shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. FRASER: Last year I put before the minister the case of an official of his department in the city of Kamloops. It was for payment for the inspection of 146 stock cars. Unfortunately I had to leave before he came to a decision. His decision was against me. I want to review the case to-night to a final conclusion.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Go to the mat, as it were.

Mr. FRASER: Yes. Must I take up the time of the house to review this case? I am quite prepared to do it, but I think he is fully advised of all the circumstances. The man earned \$146. Your officials are prepared to say that he performed those services and earned the money. Still you refuse to pay him. Am I to understand that you still persist in that attitude?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have not reviewed the case for the last few months, but I think the man was paid a full time salary, and when he was doing this car inspection he was just simply putting in part of his day's work. If we recognized the right of any officer to

[Mr. Motherwell.]

be paid two salaries, one for full time and the other for extra work, we would be running into all sorts of difficulties, because an embarrassing precedent would be set. For instance, our seed branch staff of thirty-six men perform services of five or six different kinds. This man—his name is Smith, is it not?

Mr. FRASER: Yes.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Smith was given full salary as a fruit inspector, and in addition he was inspecting stock cars. Well, that was part of his day's work. When he was doing that he was not inspecting apples.

Mr. FRASER: I want to put the minister right on the statement he has made. That man never inspected one stock car during the time he was inspecting fruit cars. He put in from twelve to fourteen hours every day during the whole time he was employed in the fruit branch inspecting fruit cars, and every single stock car was inspected after hours. Does that meet the situation?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Was he instructed to do so?

Mr. FRASER: He had an official appointment and was discharging the duties of that appointment.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The official correspondence does not indicate that the work was done after hours. The question was raised and this is the first time we have been told that it was extra work. I do not doubt my hon. friend's statement. It is generally understood that when an officer on full time pay works out of hours he is not so well qualified for his full time pay. We were under the impression that we were paying two men, both of the name Smith, and there being as a matter of fact only one man in the case this gentleman enjoyed two salaries for a period; and having received that double salary for a while he thought he was entitled to it for good. But after we discovered that the two Mr. Smiths were in reality only one Mr. Smith we reduced the salaries to one.

Mr. FRASER: Let me state the matter further. This full time job lasted only five months, at a salary of \$125 a month, making \$625. The total the man earned for the two jobs was \$825 a year, and out of that \$825 you deduct \$146. Now he earned that \$146. He inspected the cars and earned the money and you have refused to pay him. Is that a fair proposition? He was engaged for five months and that engagement as junior fruit car inspector was entered into with the full con-