

*Supply—Resources and Development*

travelling through that country I saw literally hundreds of fires. Those areas will be ruined for all time unless some reforestation is carried on. As was pointed out this morning, lumbering is of infinite value to the Canadian economy.

However, there is another matter that is possibly even more important. That is the fact that forests exercise a strong measure of control over the amount of run-off and flood conditions. Possibly the best example to which I can refer is China. When Marco Polo went to China he described it as a land of forests, rich pastures and rich soil. During the course of the years the trees were cut down for one purpose or another and the land was over-grazed. No effort was made toward reforestation or reconversion of the land. The upper reaches of the rivers gave forth torrents of water causing floods up and down their courses. Silt and gravel were carried down into the lowlands. Erosion set in over huge areas of land, and many thousands of square miles were ruined. In some periods they would have floods and in other periods droughts.

To come a little closer home, there is the Mississippi river basin in the United States. It has been discovered that through the creation of tree belts in dry areas partial control at least can be exercised over the flood situation along the Mississippi river. What has taken place there could quite easily take place here. Students of civilization have found that where land goes to waste civilization declines. Many notable examples can be cited such as North Africa, the Middle East and China, to which I have already referred. They are major examples of what happens. We have in Canada a few minor examples of dried-out areas where people are living a subnormal existence. Let us get together and see that we do not have any such examples here. I strongly urge the minister to take up the matter with the government for the purpose of extending much more assistance to the provinces in the matter of reforestation.

**Mr. Fraser:** As to this item, I had a return tabled on April 19, 1950. The first question had to do with what departments of the federal government have information and publicity divisions. The second was as to how many employees there are in each of these divisions. The Department of Resources and Development answered that publicity for the administration branch cost \$4,670. I notice in the details on page 246 there is one item of \$10,000 for publicity and information under the first item of departmental administration. I should like the minister to explain that

[Mr. Thomas.]

to me, and also why he did not include in the return the travelling expenses of the other branches of his department.

**Mr. Winters:** I gather the question is why we are showing \$10,000—

**Mr. Fraser:** Why was that not shown in the administration section of the return to which I have referred?

**Mr. Winters:** The amount referred to in the return was the amount spent last year. The \$10,000 is the amount estimated for this year. That does not mean we will spend the money. It is just an appropriation to cover what may be spent.

**Mr. Fraser:** There was \$10,000 in the estimates for last year. How did you come to put that \$10,000 in there when you had nothing to go on so far as your publicity and information service is concerned?

**Mr. Winters:** That is just an estimate. I should remind my hon. friend of what he already knows, that the Department of Resources and Development is one of those that resulted from a split of two other departments. That amount was put in the estimates for publicity at that time but that does not mean of course that it will be spent. It was an estimate at that time, but it is receiving very close scrutiny at the present moment.

**Mr. Fraser:** It is hard to follow the minister because under printing and stationery the amount in the estimates for 1949-50 was \$9,700 but for 1950-51 it has jumped to \$15,000. Can you explain why that should be? The item is exactly the same. The minister has explained that it was not all spent.

**Mr. Winters:** On the split, \$9,700 was the amount taken over by this department. It was found that it was too low, and it was estimated that an amount of \$15,000 would be required for this year.

**Mr. Fraser:** The minister said that was too low. How much of that was spent last year?

**Mr. Winters:** About \$25,000 was spent by the three departments, and of that amount \$9,700 was assigned to this department on the split.

**Mr. Fraser:** The \$9,700 was all spent?

**Mr. Winters:** Yes.

**Mr. Fraser:** And still you say it is not enough and that is why you have raised the amount.

**Mr. Winters:** This year we think we will need to spend more.

**Mr. Fraser:** Does your department employ any commercial advertising agency?