

should not be so directed by legislation which dictates that he will receive reimbursement only if he spends it on a mailing or travel costs, on newspaper advertising or some other method of campaigning. The decision should be left to the candidate and the party to make up their own minds. Be the decision good or bad, it should be left to them.

Further, the maximum amount allowed to each candidate should be stated not only in terms of so many cents per registered voter, providing of course he achieves 20 per cent of the vote, but I feel there should also be included a maximum amount allowed related to the total that he actually spends. The bill is totally silent on this subject. I suggest that the formula be that the candidate be reimbursed the lesser of the formula set out in the bill, or one-third or the amount spent by him in the election. Such a requirement would ensure a sincere effort on behalf of all candidates and parties to raise funds on their own behalf and thus reduce the reliance on the state.

For instance, if a candidate received 20 per cent of the vote in the riding and he were to receive \$7,000, he would receive that \$7,000 only if he had expended a total of \$21,000; that is, there is a requirement on him to raise the balance of \$14,000. If for some reason he did not raise the additional amount, he could receive from the public treasury no more than one-third of his total expenses. There would be a real onus on him to get out and demonstrate that there is public support for him and his party by raising the funds on his own behalf.

I do not think we should get away from the principle that freely given private donations should still be the rock upon which we finance our candidate and our party. I feel that the temptation to rely on the funds provided by the government will be great and that there is merit in requiring candidates and parties to show that they have public support by raising for themselves at least two-thirds of the funds they will be spending during the election. The expenditure limitations are the other side of the coin of assistance to candidates and parties. On the one hand, we have a proposal for public financing at the bottom, and on the other we have the squeeze of limitations from the top, both designed to eliminate or at least to reduce the traditional advantages of wealthy candidates over less wealthy opponents.

In the area of disclosure of private donors, I feel we must not move away from the concept that private financing of parties and candidates is still the most desirable method of funding our system. The emphasis of this legislation should be directed toward more voluntary individual financial involvement in our system. The object should be to create a system which would encourage more individuals and groups of individuals to support a man or party while at the same time eliminating public suspicion by means of a system of disclosure sufficient to achieve this end. That is, the system should encourage each person to exercise his choice, by means of a private donation, and it should not tend to relieve him of this choice, by means of overemphasis on public funding, which of course involves all the people of Canada supporting all political parties. Such a system, that is, a system of public funding, takes the freedom of choice of support away from the individual and requires him to support all parties includ-

Election Expenses

ing those with whose philosophy he may strongly disagree.

The requirement for the disclosure of donors and their amounts is long overdue. The disclosure requirements, together with tax incentives to small donors, should achieve the fundamental objective of broadening the base of political support. Disclosure will engender confidence in the public that parties and candidates are not controlled or bought by a few large donors but are in fact supported by many thousands of small and medium sized donors.

However, I would point out that clause 4 in the present bill, dealing with section 13.4(2)(b) of the act, is so poorly worded that it will not achieve the purpose of disclosure which I am sure was intended by the President of the Privy Council. It contains wording similar to section 63(1)(e) of the Canada Elections Act which similarly, and surprising to most of the general public I think, requires disclosure of the names of persons making disclosure. These disclosure provisions were easily circumvented by virtually every candidate in the last election, and virtually every member in this House, by the use of a third party fund collector who, after completing his collections, made one gift of the total amount to the official agent who in turn reported the full sum as originating from one source. It seems to me that the equivalent section of the bill before us permits the same practice. As a member of the committee before which this bill will be considered, let me say that I think considerable tightening of this section will be in order.

● (1640)

These are a few of the areas which cause me considerable concern and which will require close attention and redrafting, if necessary, by the committee on privileges and elections. Other members have mentioned other areas of concern. I agree with much of what they have said, particularly with those parts having to do with the allocation of television and radio time. The bill before us is devoid of any formula for guiding the CRTC in the allocation of such time. I think it is unfair and unnecessary to expect the CRTC to make such politically sensitive decisions. I submit that the bill itself should contain some kind of formula or direction which the CRTC could follow in allocating time to candidates and parties.

This bill covers an area that is of vital concern to all Canadians. We as politicians in this House, and our parties, have suffered vicariously from the tremendous lack of confidence and distrust inspired by the Watergate case in the American system. Let me say a word about recently revealed efforts on the part of government supporters to collect funds from the head offices of American parents which have subsidiaries operating in Canada. Without trying to characterize that type of activity, which I personally think is odious, as illegal or wrong, let me say that regardless of whether it is right or wrong that is the kind of activity which instils lack of confidence and distrust in the public. That is the kind of action we must get away from in our system if we are to create the confidence and trust that we are attempting to create with this bill. It is incumbent upon us to take strong steps immediately to prevent any further erosion of such confidence in Canada.