

political status before the Northwest Territories. The Yukon will have a progressive political, provincial status before the Northwest Territories.

Because of the British North America Act, in terms of power, we have a concept in Canada whereby the equalization principle shall apply within provincial boundaries and not overlap into other provinces. I appreciate and endorse that concept. That is a very minor part of the Conservative campaign with respect to this legislation. It is a superficial type of argument. The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) made this abundantly clear in the speeches he made on this bill and the amendments. The Conservatives feel that the fundamental question is private power versus public power; there is no question about that. The Conservative party is attempting to preserve the last vestige of exploitive private power whose purpose is to distribute and supply electrical energy in order to make a profit. We have gone through this argument in every province of Canada at one time or another, and every political party at one time or another has come out in favour of the concept of public ownership—only one of them out of conscience and principle and others out of political expediency.

● (8:30 p.m.)

It may be that the Northern Canada Power Commission is not the most sensitive to the needs of the people in the area; it may be that the commission is not the most efficient; it may be that it is bureaucrat-ridden; it may be that it is more concerned with its own paperwork than it is with the purpose for which it was set up; it may even be that some of the members of the commission are not even friendly toward the concept of public power. But I do not think this is reason enough, in a moral or philosophical sense, to defeat the concept we want to establish, namely, that public administration in this field is preferable to private enterprise. Every political party, every province in Canada has endorsed the idea that public power is more valuable to the people than private ownership, exploitation and development for the purpose of private profit.

It would seem to me that the contention on behalf of the Conservative party that the Northern Canada Power Commission is not responsive to the interests of the people of these territories somehow runs counter to their hope that they will be called upon to form a government after the next election. If hon. members to my right think it is likely they will form a government next time, surely it is a companion concept that they will be in a position to straighten out the NCPC and see that it is headed in the right direction.

The primary point to be considered in relation not only to the amendment before us but in relation to the earlier motion is that its purpose is not to have a task force study this issue in committee of the whole or elsewhere; the purpose of the Conservative party is to destroy the concept of the bill and establish over this last frontier the discreditable values of private exploitive power in the field of energy, despite the fact that it has been accepted for many years by every political party in Canada that public power is the most desirable, the most ethical and

Northern Canada Power Commission Act

the most moral way of proceeding. We cannot agree with this attempt to destroy the principle behind the bill. I do not really think the Liberal party is any better disposed toward it than is the party to my right. It is simply that, sitting where they are, they have seen an opportunity to make political gain by taking something which is socially desirable and putting a political complexion upon it.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words about the bill before us. You can only call it socialism. No matter how you slice it, that is what it is. Look at what has happened to Britain. It has been destroyed by too much socialism in the last 50 years. Who would think that a dynamic, young country like Canada—I almost said “republic” because that is what we are rapidly heading to under the dictatorship of an arrogant government—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Bigg: Wait for it. I know you are ahead of me, but you are wrong. It is not a question of personalities but of principles. We are carrying on our back an old man of the sea—socialism. If you like, you can call it democratic socialism. It can only work under the strong fist of a top-heavy bureaucracy.

It is only a week or two ago since Air Canada, which has a good deal of merit—we all know it is one of the finest airlines in the world, and so it ought to be; we are spending enough money on it—was a little worried because it was losing a certain amount of business. What did they do? Did they improve their service? No. They cut into the private part of the economy. They took away the routes of small outfits such as Wardair in Edmonton, my home city. I hope they are not simply picking on Edmonton, but they are picking on private enterprise.

There is something more important at stake here than balancing the books of Air Canada. Canada is big enough for us all, as the leader of the *Créditistes* (Mr. Caouette) has said. I would think the airways are big enough for both Air Canada and private enterprise. Who built Canada's air fleet? It was the bush pilots, every one a free enterpriser. Air Canada itself looks to these bush pilots when they need men among the brass to help run their enterprise. They learned the business the hard way. I am sick and tired of seeing well-meaning bureaucrats nibble away at free enterprise in every facet of the economic life of this country.

I could spend all my time discussing agriculture, but of course this is not a debate on agriculture, though it comes close to it. We are now invading the last frontier. Agriculture used to be a frontier. At one time you could say to the hungry people of Canada, or of the earth: Go west and take a fresh piece of land and carve yourself out a career. You cannot do that any more because the socialists have taken over agriculture. That is gone. What has happened to those who want to run farms? They have been told: Go into the cities and live in high-rise apartments. If you cannot beat us, you will have to join us. They have taken over the fishing industry, both freshwater and deep sea, instead of encouraging free enterprise to become more efficient through thrift and hard