

and that government revenue suffers accordingly. But in times of economic dislocation it behooves the government to stimulate the economy to some extent, always bearing in mind that those who call for massive tax cuts are inviting massive deficits. Regard must be paid to what we can afford. Surely, no members would wish to go through another period of high inflation such as led to the establishment of the Anti-Inflation Board in the first place. I know that Bill C-11 provides for certain benefits to corporations and shareholders and that an effort is made to introduce investment incentives. It is not my intention, though, to attempt to deal with all the various parts of the measure at this time; other hon. members have already referred to them.

We in Canada have a great deal to be proud of and a great deal to be thankful for. I suppose it depends on whether you are an optimist or a pessimist. A pessimist, I suppose, would say we have 7 per cent or 8 per cent unemployment; an optimist would say we have 92 per cent employment. Coming from British Columbia, and being a Liberal, it is easy for me to be an optimist because I believe we have a great future before our province. Indeed, I believe Canada generally has a great future. Canada has one of the highest promises of any nation in the world.

**An hon. Member:** Who made it?

**Mr. Anderson:** This does not mean we will not be affected by dislocations which take place in the world economy. We are not an island with a wall around us. If the price of steel goes up on world markets, we will have to pay higher prices in Canada. If the price of oil continues to rise, it would be unrealistic to imagine that Canada would not be affected.

I do say, though, that we have a discretionary power. Even in the field of energy we have a discretionary power. Remember that a large proportion of the oil we produce or purchase is used for private travel, to drive people back and forth to work, and so on. We have all seen rows of cars, each of them carrying only a single occupant to work. We all knew that the supply of fossil fuels would run out at some point. Alternative sources of energy must be found. It is unrealistic to expect that the low fuel prices which have existed for so many years will continue. But there does remain an area for discretion, and I wonder if that discretion will be exercised if the price of a barrel of oil is \$3 or thereabouts, as was once the case.

What reason would we give the Canadian people for asking them to conserve energy? What reason would we give them for saying that car pooling is a better idea than using larger numbers of cars to drive separate individuals to work? Should we not be encouraging the development of mass transportation systems? Should we not be encouraging the development of automobiles which will secure better mileage? To my mind, the encouragement of conservation is one of the most important parts of government policy. It is surely an important role of government to encourage the conservation of resources.

I hope that with the introduction of new technology we can cut down our dependence on oil. I thank the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand) for his statement that funding

### *Income Tax*

will be available for research into the development of methanol which can be combined with gasoline to reduce the amount of gasoline used in Canada. If I can paraphrase him, his department has given the green light to this development. This is a step in the right direction, I hope we will go on giving this green light to ensure the possibility of 40,000 new jobs in Canada just by the introduction of methanol. I believe the minister said we could save \$800 million on this single item—the combining of methanol with gasoline.

This is the sort of thing which gives an optimist grounds for hope. People are looking toward the future and saying, "Isn't everything terrible?" Sure, we have problems. But our people have proved time and time again that they are equal to meeting changes. One of the problems we have now, and I include Quebec, is that for many years we have had very few problems to look at and people have lost their challenge or feeling of adventure in this country because things have been very good and there has not been anything to challenge them. I am not suggesting that there are not people below the poverty line in Canada, but generally speaking we have had years of growth and years of good times—and when these good times are taken away or are a little less good, instead of moaning and groaning, surely we should meet that challenge. I have always been of the opinion that we should test the mettle of a person or of a country with challenges. We can either rise to meet them or you sink in hopelessness and despair and say "My goodness, poor me".

● (1712)

I do not think Canadians are like that. We do have challenges which we will have to solve, and I am confident in the ability of Canadians to solve them. Perhaps it is time we had some good ones to solve. Indeed, the situation in Quebec may lead to a greater feeling on the part of Canadians for their country; they may have a greater appreciation of what it is to be a Canadian. I think that many times in the past we have not had the sense of pride that we are Canadians, and I think the present situation may lead us to greater heights. Indeed, I hope so, and I think that economically we shall also rise to the occasion.

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with some care and attention to the hon. member who has just spoken, my good friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson). He was critical of the opposition, berating us for what he termed "doom and gloom talk". On a number of occasions in this House, commencing last March when the previous minister of finance presented his budget, one of the results of which is this bill, Bill C-11, and since as I listened to other members of the government and to the financial critics of the official opposition, it kept going through my mind that I had heard all this before. When I considered that there were upward of one million people in Canada out of work and looking for work, and when I considered the general state of our economy, I said to myself, "My God, it's Herbert Hoover, R. B. Bennett, Mackenzie King and 1930 all over again".