

were no major assistance projects to keep us on our farms and many of our parents and grandparents had to leave them. That experience is burned into our memory. We do not ever want to face such a situation again, and we regard our oil resources as being insurance against such disaster. We see Ontario's plan that our oil should continue to be sold at less than world market price to be a rape of our constitutional ownership and the virtual theft of our money.

Hon. members need to understand that Alberta's heritage trust fund should really be \$20 billion rather than the \$5 billion it is. Albertans have generously, and without complaint, contributed \$15 billion toward the domestic price of oil, primarily to the benefit of Ontario. We do not accept the proposition that we are either greedy or selfish.

With respect to our philosophy of government my thesis is short and simple. The Canadian people must now decide where and how power is exercised in this country. By power I mean political and economic power. On one matter there should be no doubt. Power is always exercised by some group or person in every society. Decisions must be made and they are made; the question is, by whom? History shows that political power was exercised in the past by a very few male citizens with land. This has now changed to the point at which provision has been made for universal adult suffrage for both males and females. The process has been to spread out political power among people individually. I believe this to be good and wise.

With regard to economic power, however, the issue has not been settled. On the one hand there are the Liberal and New Democratic parties which believe that the means of production, and, by extension, power, should be nationalized, that is, owned by government with decisions being made by the cabinet. We in the Conservative party, on the other hand, are committed to returning economic power to individual citizens. We believe that millions of individual decisions by individual property owners, by individual shareholders, by individual business operators are much superior to decisions by one government, one cabinet, or one prime minister. In the past ownership of land was power. Today, ownership of shares is power.

The Canadian people are at a continental divide, a watershed; we can flow to the side of government ownership in which we all become employees, or we can flow to the side of individual ownership and control. We are not without modern-day examples of the way other countries have gone on this issue and how their citizens have been affected. Witness Russia, for example. In that country one sees the extreme of nationalization since all means of production are owned by the state. But decisions do get made—and by whom? By a small party of ultra socialists. But what of individual citizens? Would anyone in Canada want to trade places with them?

Take the example of Great Britain. Since the Second World War socialist governments have nationalized coal, gas, steel, electricity, railways, docks, waterways, and communications. They have taken over huge companies such as Leyland and Rolls Royce. In short, they have done exactly what the Liberals and the New Democrats want to do here in Canada. I ask

The Address—Mr. M. Dionne

you, Mr. Speaker, are the individual citizens of Britain better off for all this nationalization? Is there freedom and opportunity there for an ambitious person to build a better life for himself or herself? The answer is clear. It is no, and they are emigrating by the thousands.

Mr. Speaker, over the last ten years during the Liberal-NDP love affair, Canada endured a greater growth of centralized government bureaucracy and power than in any other period. The growth of Crown corporations, over 200 of them since 1970—in short, government in the business and personal lives of people—has been enormous. Government regulations and red tape are totally stifling the creative, innovative part of our society. We are seeing in Canada the breakdown of control mechanisms which worked when economic decision-making was spread among millions of people.

● (2100)

Government is now an active participant in the market place rather than a regulator for the public good. Why do the Liberals and the NDP so fear Canadians that they want government ownership? What happens when government owns a business or controls a Crown corporation? Simply this: political expediency overrides the clear, correct and sound decisions which must be made about investment in new plant, market development and labour relations. What does government do when the business is failing? It pours in people's tax money. It gives preferential treatment and privilege in direct competition with private people who are trying to do the same job. This is a truth which applies whether the government is PC, NDP or Liberal. This is precisely what happened with Petro-Canada and with many Crown corporations.

The Progressive Conservative Party and the government have really adopted the position of the "classical liberals". Thank heaven we have. I am proud to carry the banner offering individuals a chance to work hard and to build a better future for themselves and their descendants.

If I may be permitted another personal comment, my grandfather did not crawl out of a mine in England at age 24, having spent ten long years working underground and then giving the rest of his life and my grandmother's to pioneering in Alberta, followed by my father and mother, only to find those gains wiped out by a socialist government with confiscatory tax policies.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thacker: I will not let their dreams fail, and I call on other hon. members to join the Prime Minister (Mr. Clark) and this government in returning Canada to a place of opportunity, spirit, growth and good will.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Dionne (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for having invited me to speak during the debate on the throne speech. As the new member for the constituency of Chicouti-