

ments with four provinces, having to do with agricultural settlement and resettlement. There was an item in the estimates last year under this heading amounting to \$1,000,000. Agreements were entered into with the provinces of New Brunswick, Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia. I may say that the purpose of these agreements was to enable those who were receiving relief as farmers to get on their feet, so to speak; and be able to look after themselves.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Does the minister mean moving them to some other parts?

Mr. ROGERS: In some provinces there was a measure of transfer. That was true in the northern districts of Saskatchewan, and to some extent in Alberta. Some of the families assisted under this particular scheme were families who had moved to the northern parts of those provinces from the drought area, but who found themselves still in a state of practical destitution. The desire was to provide them, as far as possible, with the means of establishing themselves on an independent basis. The same was true in the province of New Brunswick, where a considerable number of families were established on crown lands and given such assistance, through the provision of stock in some cases, as would enable them to dispense with relief. I may say there is no comparable item in the estimates of this year for new expenditures of this kind, and only \$242,691.51 was actually spent under the agreements with the provinces that I have indicated.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Why is the amount so much smaller this year? Is some of the money being revoted?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount of \$52,500 is being revoted to cover commitments actually made under agreements with the provinces I have indicated.

Mr. DOUGLAS: It is not the intention of the government to pursue this policy further?

Mr. ROGERS: There is an item under the Department of Agriculture in the final supplementary estimates, which is designed to carry on this work. My own feeling was that this type of work should be done by the Department of Agriculture rather than by the Department of Labour.

Mr. MASSEY: I think the minister and the department are in the main to be congratulated on the work that has been done under this item, but I understand that the province of Ontario does not cooperate in this work with the federal department. Is there any reason why Ontario does

[Mr. Rogers.]

not so cooperate? Why is it that we do not gain the benefits that might easily accrue to the province through the application of part of the sum so voted?

Mr. ROGERS: Ontario was not one of the provinces with which agreements were made for this purpose. I may say, however, that in an earlier year Ontario did have an agreement with the dominion government for relief settlement. Possibly my hon. friend has in mind the farm employment plan, which comes under the next item, which was not accepted by Ontario. I shall be glad to discuss that in a moment.

Item agreed to.

To provide for federal contribution to farm employment and supplementary plans, \$3,283,500.

Mr. ROGERS: On this item I should like to say a word before the discussion continues. The farm employment plan, as hon. members are aware, was worked out after very careful consultation, during which the national employment commission held conferences with representatives of all the provincial governments. It was designed to meet the situation created by the closing of the relief camps and, subsequently, the termination of the special maintenance work upon the railways.

I should like to say here, and I am glad of this opportunity to do so, that during the discussion of unemployment and relief a year ago the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) brought to the attention of the house the importance of enabling single unemployed men in the cities to go to the farms, particularly during the winter months, and also the advantage to the farmers of having that additional assistance during this period. The hon. member made a definite proposal, as I recall it, which has been largely carried out in the actual farm employment plan which has been in operation. I give that simply as one illustration to assure hon. members that those responsible for particular departments frequently profit, and ought to profit, from the suggestions which come to them from various quarters of the house.

The farm employment plan, I think we may say, has worked out very successfully. It has meant that the large concentration of single unemployed men, particularly in our western cities, has been dissolved, as it were, and these single men who otherwise would be receiving casual meals at soup kitchens have spent the winter in more congenial and, I submit, more wholesome surroundings. Not only that, but we have reason to believe that a very large number of these men who have been placed on the farms in the west-