

Mr. ROGERS: I shall be very glad to secure the information, but it does not come to me as a matter of course.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Before the house rose at one o'clock, dealing with the plan under which men on the farms were to be taken care of until the end of March, the minister informed the committee that there has been an extension to cover the month of April, \$5 per month being paid to the employee but nothing to the farmer. I was asking the minister what would now be done for these young men and he replied that every effort was being made to have them absorbed by the farmers now employing them. I was pointing out that most farmers, particularly those in the drought area of Saskatchewan, would not be in a position to employ them. It seemed to me the minister was delightfully vague about just what was going to happen. Here we have several thousand young men employed on farms in Saskatchewan. What is going to happen to them? When seeding operations are completed where are they to go? Men are needed on the farm more in the summer than in the winter. Has the government in mind some plan to look after these men during the summer months? Is this vote only to pay for the scheme that has been in operation during the winter months?

Mr. ROGERS: As circumstances may warrant, amounts will be available for single unemployed men, either under the schemes now in operation or under some other arrangement as may be made. As my hon. friend will observe, the item reads:—

To provide for federal contribution to farm employment and supplementary plans.

I can assure my hon. friend that we are keeping closely in touch with the situation in the prairie provinces. We have had it in mind from the beginning that every effort should be made to see that these men on the farms are kept in employment wherever possible. I hold in my hand a letter dated March 17 from Mr. Molloy, commissioner of public welfare in the province of Saskatchewan. He states that they always have a large number of unfilled farm jobs during the months of March, April and May and that they undoubtedly will be in a position to offer farm employment to any person applying for relief. Our information is that owing to the expectation of good crops in western Canada there is likely to be a greater demand this year for farm labour than there has been in several years. We have it on definite information that a large number of those employed under this scheme will be retained by the farmers with whom they are

now living, at least for the seeding season. I can assure my hon. friend that we shall continue to watch the situation carefully in order that it may be dealt with adequately.

Item agreed to.

To provide for federal contribution towards the greater Winnipeg sewage disposal scheme, \$362,200.

Mr. CHURCH: How is it the city of Winnipeg can get a direct federal grant? I do not object to that city getting some help from this government, but if assistance is given to one municipality for the construction of trunk sewers or other works of the kind, the same thing should be done for other municipalities. There are many other municipalities greatly in need of increased sewage facilities. I do not see why this city should be singled out for treatment outside of the general legislation. Toronto is carrying out a \$30,000,000 trunk sewer scheme at the present time and has not asked the provincial and dominion governments to contribute one-third each of the cost. The principle of confederation, each for all and all for each, should apply.

Mr. BENNETT: I think I should say that the minister is not responsible for this. The former government made this arrangement with the city of Winnipeg in consequence of the Red river having shrunk in volume to such an extent that the health of the whole community was threatened. The province made representations and the arrangement was made that we would pay one-third of the cost of this scheme to protect the health, and shall I say the lives of the people of Winnipeg. The Red river was one over which we exercised some jurisdiction, and the minister merely inherited this matter.

Mr. ROGERS: Perhaps I should say that the arrangement was made through the provincial government.

Mr. MASSEY: There is a business project of which I am about to speak, but which has been rejected by business men as not being one likely to pay, but which if the initial cost could be met might be made into a most extraordinarily efficient and productive proposition. I was very much impressed this last autumn with the spectacular and dramatic waste of heat occurring in the Turner Valley of Alberta. There I saw scores of fires burning the waste gases from the various wells, heating the whole outdoors to no purpose whatsoever. It is a well known fact that such gas has been advantageously utilized in many places for heating purposes. There is little or no doubt that there are sufficient b.t.u.'s being dissipated