

vitaly concerned with the preparation of this report in the House, and it is interesting to note that if you examine the report carefully you find not one single economic fact presented to justify this conclusion. There is not one single piece of evidence in the report to indicate that cheaper power and better service to the consumer would be possible under public as opposed to private development. Indeed, there is not one scintilla of evidence that the public interest would be better served by an organization such as NCPD as opposed to investor participation.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Reference is made in the report to pragmatic rather than ideological reasons being the justification for government ownership; and the suggestion is that the trend is toward government ownership. Nothing could be further from the truth. In support of that statement, I again refer members of the House to the evidence adduced in the committee contained in an appendix to the brief presented by the Yukon Electrical Company Limited. I refer to research into the ownership and regulatory structure of the electrical utility industry in the United States done by one Mr. Schantz. Some very interesting conclusions are reached in that study, among which are that the trend is not toward government-owned utilities, but quite the contrary; and that there should be interlocking co-operation between the private and public sector.

It is interesting also to note that the job of the NCPD is to supply power to northern communities where private investment capital is either unwilling or unable to go. Yet we have power installation and distribution systems—I am confining myself to the Northwest Territories—in the communities of Arctic Bay, Broughton, Cape Dorset, Clyde River, Grise Liard, Hall Beach, Igloodik, Lake Harbour, Padloping, Pengnertung, Pond Inlet, Coral Harbour, Eskimo Point, Rankin Inlet, Repulse Bay, Whale Cove. All of these are owned by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and there are others.

If it is the job of NCPD to supply power to those communities where private investment capital is unable or unwilling to go, then why is it not doing the job of generating and supplying power to the communities that appear in the appendix to the thirteenth report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development for March 13, 1969? There is no doubt about the ability of the private sector to supply the necessary capital, and in view of the statistics I have put on the record by way of example, further of which is to be found in the reports of the committee in 1969. There can be very little remaining doubt in the minds of hon. members, I suggest, that private investment capital is not gouging the user in power rates. Indeed, the rates of NCPD where it supplies power on a retail basis are generally higher than those of the private generators and distributors.

This is not as innocuous a piece of legislation as it appears. There is every reasonable justification for the members of this House inquiring into the whole, broad aspect of the operations of NCPD and for the committee

#### Division

that will be examining the bill to make some useful recommendations to the government, having heard evidence throughout the north and from all interested power generators and suppliers, including NCPD. These recommendations may convince the government that it is going the wrong way as far as this legislation is concerned.

However, this kind of broad inquiry is impossible unless the amendment which is now before the House is adopted. Certainly, backbench members on the government side cannot be inhibited in their support for the resolution, because all they are supporting is the broadest possible inquiry in committee instead of the confined inquiry that would result if the resolution standing in the name of the government were accepted in preference to the amendment now before the House.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The question is on the amendment to the main motion. All those in favour on the amendment will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Baldwin) which was negated on the following division:

• (4:30 p.m.)

#### YEAS

#### Messrs:

Alexander	MacInnis (Cape
Baldwin	Breton-East Richmond)
Bell	MacLean
Bigg	Macquarrie
Cadieu	MacRae
Coates	McCleave
Comeau	McIntosh
Crouse	Marshall
Danforth	Mazankowski
Dinsdale	Nesbitt
Dionne	Nielsen
Fairweather	Peddle
Forrestall	Ricard
Fortin	Ritchie
Gauthier	Rodrigue
Godin	Rondeau
Hales	Ryan
Howe	Rynard
Korchinski	Schumacher
Lambert	Scott
(Edmonton West)	Simpson
Laprise	Southam
Latulippe	Stewart (Marquette)—45.
Lundrigan	