placing on the record of a man's business connection constitutes a smear, then I suggest that is a very grave reflection upon the businessmen of this country. I say this because all the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar did was to outline the business connections of these two gentlemen in order to indicate their difficulties in exercising impartial judgment.

Now I mentioned a moment ago the reference made by the minister in respect to my own province in connection with pipe lines and I asked the minister whether it was not a fact apart from Trans-Canada Pipe Lines of course which is interprovincial, the construction of all pipe lines in the province of Saskatchewan—outside of the main trunk line—is under the auspices of the Saskatchewan power corporation and that we in Saskatchewan are doing precisely what we want the government of Canada to do.

In Saskatchewan we are developing our gas pipe lines as a public utility in order that natural gas may be brought to the hon. member's home city of Saskatoon. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has natural gas in his home in Saskatoon but I know there are thousands of people in that city, as there are thousands of people in my own city, who are now benefiting as a result of the development of our resources and through the transmission of natural gas by the Saskatchewan power corporation into the cities, towns and villages of the province of Saskatchewan.

The hon. gentleman said something about risk capital. I think he ought to bear in mind that there is a distinct difference between capital invested in oil exploration and the building of a pipe line. Where, might I ask, is there any risk involved in the building of a pipe line? There has not been a pipe line built in North America which has not produced sizeable profits for its owners and there has not been a pipe line built in North America which has failed. Therefore, for the hon. gentleman to suggest there is any similarity between the risk capital involved in exploration for oil and the building of a pipe line to transport the gas resources in being from the producer to the consumer is, of course, to beg the question. I suggest that we in the C.C.F. have been thoroughly consistent in that over the years we have stated in this house that we believe the Canadian people will enjoy the greatest benefit from the natural resources of this country through the building of pipe lines by the government.

We have proven this to be the case in the province of Saskatchewan. We used to hear all sorts of references to gas prices; we do not hear them any more. As a matter of fact the right hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner), last year or two years ago, had a great deal to say about gas prices and prospective gas prices in Regina. We do not hear those comments any more because, as my hon. colleagues from Winnipeg will confirm, there has been a tremendous struggle going on in the city of Winnipeg over this matter and it has been proven that after making allowances for the extra distance involved in the pipe line between Regina and the city of Winnipeg, the people of Winnipeg, who are not getting the benefits of a publicly owned pipe line, are going to pay I believe 25 or 26 cents more per thousand cubic feet for gas than are the consumers in my own city of Regina. That, I think, illustrates the benefits which accrue to the gas consumers in this country through a policy of public ownership of pipe lines.

Hence the suggestions which we have made during the course of this and previous debates have been substantiated through actual performance in my own province. I suggest that what is being done there can be done with equal benefit to the people of this country through the adoption by this government of public construction and ownership of pipe lines.

Now some reference was also made by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Green) to socialism. Well, it was rather strange that in 1956—read reports from the province of Ontario of speeches made by the then leader of the opposition—Mr. Drew suggested public ownership. Did that make Mr. Drew a socialist? Were the Tories who suggested that also socialists and are the supporters of the Ontario hydro socialists? The minister spoke also with respect to free enterprise and the fact that this country had been built by free enterprise. Might I ask whether the amendments to the National Housing Act were not brought about because of the failure of private enterprise to come up with some solution of our housing problem?

Time after time this parliament has had to bail out private enterprise and make use of public funds to cover up the failure of private enterprise through its failure to solve many of our major problems. Here is an instance with regard to which the Conservative party made a strong case in 1956, even going so far as to suggest public ownership, where the government is under a moral obligation to the people of this country who expected that as the result of the election there would be a reversal of the policy adopted by the previous government. The people of Canada have the right to expect that the government should take hold of the situation now, not refer it to a royal commission, and that it