

The Address—Mr. Bradette

necessary to have a sound national income as it is to have a sound personal one.

I come to the province of Ontario, in which an election was held last year. Boasts were made, and rightly so, that the government of that province had a surplus of \$25 million. Do you think that we Liberals criticized the Conservative administration at Queen's Park for such an accomplishment? Certainly not, because it was a real accomplishment. But there is more to it than that. What did they do with that fine surplus? Instead of doing as the national treasury did—reduce taxation—they increased it. For instance, at the present time we pay a tax of eleven cents per gallon on gasoline. When the federal government took off the gasoline tax and left the matter in the hands of the provinces, the Ontario treasury put it on. They did the same thing with the amusement tax. At that time, when the provincial government had a surplus, we were proud of it. Why should not every Canadian be proud of the present economic situation? I will go this far: I would not be in favour of having a great surplus from year to year. There is a time and a place for everything. Our present hope is that taxation will be greatly reduced in the present budget. But why will that be possible? Purely and simply because the present administration has been courageous and capable, presenting policies which were not always absolutely popular with the Canadian people. But the Canadian people are practical, and they are much happier today with a large surplus than they would have been with a large deficit, and I believe that they like courage.

One must be practical in all these things. I repeat, you may have the pendulum going too far one way or the other. I would not like to see a large surplus from year to year. But we must ask ourselves this question. If the national debt kept piling up by billions and billions of dollars every year, would we be happy then? Is it not true that when we were in danger of inflation, the national government was courageous enough to tell the Canadian people that they must fear inflation, which is just as dangerous, and more so in certain circumstances, than deflation? In warning the people the government was alert, and for its action I, representing my constituency, praise the government. Again I repeat that if we are in a position at this present session to decrease taxation, that is due largely to the fact that our economic and financial position is as fine as that of any other country in the world.

I want to say a few words about election promises. We in northern Ontario, in spite

of Dr. Chisholm, still believe in old man Santa Claus. We believe that he is a fine old man and that he is performing a useful service. At the general provincial election we had a new type of Santa Claus, a rather young, handsome and glamorous young man. He made promises that dipped deeply into the Ontario provincial treasury. For what purpose? For the purpose of winning the provincial election. It is not an absolutely bad purpose, I must admit, because all parties always try to win elections. Why a person would be highly scandalized because that might have been done, I do not know. It might have to be done by this party. I do not know why the leader of the opposition thought it was scandalous when it happened so glaringly during the last provincial election. If I know anything about the constitution of the provinces, and of the country, it is this. When a legislature or the central government is dissolved, the government is then practically in the hands of the people, and I believe it is absolutely in order for the leaders of the parties or for the ex-premier of the province to make certain promises; but how it is permissible to dip into the provincial treasury in order to fulfil those promises, and for the money to be handed out immediately, without legislative sanction, is past my comprehension. If all the promises that were made during the last provincial election had been implemented, we in northern Ontario would be sitting pretty. For instance, promise was made of a fine university in Fort William or Port Arthur. Then a day or two later another university was promised for North Bay. Promise was made to a fine rural community in my own riding—and I am not scandalized about it; I merely make mention of the fact. This place was located fourteen miles east of the industrial town of Kapuskasing. The promise of an agricultural college was made to that fine rural community. I am going to see that they get it, because the promise was made. The people of that area are entitled to what they were promised; they should have it. Then, promise was made of a water system, funds for which were to be provided, to the extent of \$120,000, out of the provincial treasury.

The other sixty-four rural communities in that section are watching developments. When these promises are fulfilled, the citizens will be proud of what they have. But each of those municipalities will go to Queen's Park and make similar requests; and if they do, they will be entitled to what they ask, because I say election promises must be fulfilled—there can be no getting away from that. Otherwise it would be deceiving the population, and not keeping faith with the voters of Canada or of a province.