

No one needs to stress in this Chamber the importance of measures that have been taken to conserve our natural resources. We all know that there is a great field for increased employment in the extension of such measures. I am, of course, quite aware of the fact that much has been talked of along these lines, and some things have been done; but what has been done has usually been of a comparatively minor nature to meet some special need, and not as part of a planned national economy with the objective of providing employment. No one, for instance, will dispute the important effect conservation measures can have in preserving and regulating our water power, which is closely interlocked with our forest problems and forest wealth. Of the four greatest sources of wealth in Canada, namely, our farms, forests, mines, and electrical power, three are vitally affected by what we do, or fail to do, in conservation, and there is room for great extension of employment in this field.

The extension of recreational services would embrace a wide variety of items ranging all the way from the creation of more great National Parks and the granting of more large-scale support for cultural subjects to more playgrounds for children.

The third field for extension of services which I mentioned is the field of health and medical services and here, of course, the possibilities are almost unlimited, for medical services would include education and sanitation as well as the services of doctors and nurses; also the providing of hospitals and sanatoriums. This has been for years one of our most pressing national needs, and yet year after year we have seen the National Health Bill pigeon-holed on one pretext or another, while family allowances, not nearly so urgent a need, was made law almost over night. Of course, I freely acknowledge that the latter was much more spectacular and a much better vote getter.

Opposition to substantial nationally planned extension of services such as I have outlined is based on the belief that the cost would be a heavy burden on the taxpayer. I do not think that would be so. Increased activity in mining and lumbering would be a source of new wealth, and the services I have mentioned would from a national viewpoint, soon become almost, if not entirely, self-sustaining because of the additional employment given in other parts of our national life to meet these requirements.

By way of illustration, I may remind honourable senators that recently the Govern-

Hon. Mrs. FALLIS.

ment and citizens of Ontario subscribed a sum sufficient to erect a new Sick Children's Hospital in Toronto. If the need for such accommodation throughout the Dominion were to be adequately met, that building should be duplicated in the other provinces. From the employment angle it is obvious that the building, equipping and staffing of these hospitals would require not only the services of doctors and nurses and maintenance staffs, but as well would provide employment in the building trades and in the factories which turn out the equipment required.

Speaking of cost, if we do not provide employment for our people, we shall find that this becomes expensive too. Honourable members will appreciate what it costs, not only in money but also in lessened physical efficiency and in the lowered morale of our people, when thousands of families are on relief.

So in closing I come back to my original theme, that to me it seems a mistake to place so much of the onus of prevention of unemployment on our industrial plants alone, and that a great and useful service could be performed by the Government planning now for intensive development of our natural resources and extension of useful services to the people as part of a long-range source of permanent employment. I believe that if this policy were carried out in so far as it is practical and feasible, it would pay us valuable national dividends in the form of much needed permanent employment, with its resultant higher average standard of living, more healthy minds in healthy bodies, and a better all-round citizenship.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. A. C. HARDY: I did not wish to interrupt the honourable lady senator during her speech. Now that she has resumed her seat, will she tell us who made a promise that jobs would be found for everyone at present wages, and when and where such promise was made?

Hon. Mrs. FALLIS: I think the honourable senator has misunderstood me. I did not say that that was a promise. I said the Minister of Labour had stated over and over again that there were jobs for all and to spare, and that the workers naturally concluded that he meant they were to be kept in their present jobs at their present wages. That is the conclusion they drew from the Minister's statement; it was not a statement by me.

Hon. Mr. HARDY: It was the idea of labour itself.