

*Election Expenses*

**Mr. Peters:** They are autonomous at the bottom level. To my Bible-quoting friend I suggest this is not true of the multinational corporations. If members want clarification, I am prepared to move as follows:

That the word "sources" at the end of the three amendments be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"citizens, persons with landed immigrant status, corporations which have no less than 50 per cent of their voting stock owned by Canadian citizens and no more than 10 per cent of their voting stock owned by any foreign group or person, trade unions which are located in Canada, and associations or organizations which are established pursuant to a statute of the Parliament of Canada or of a province"

This motion will be seconded by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Knight).

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member would have someone else move his motion, since he seconded the three motions that are now before us. This would clearly be out of order.

**Mr. Peters:** It will be seconded by the hon. member for Mississauga (Mr. Blenkarn).

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is the moving of the subamendment that is giving the Chair difficulty, not the seconding. I understand that is being done by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Knight). The motion that is being put before the Chair will have to be moved by someone other than the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) because he has already moved or seconded the three motions now before us at the report stage. Perhaps this could be done by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett).

**Mr. Barnett:** Then I would so move, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Comox-Alberni, seconded by the hon. member for Assiniboia, moves the proposed amendment to the motion which was read by the hon. member for Timiskaming. Possibly the Chair could look at the motion for a moment, since we are dealing with three amendments. I presume it is the intention to amend each of the three motions before us. The Chair has examined the proposed amendment that has been presented to it. I find no difficulty in putting it to the House, but if there are points of order arising therefrom I will reserve decision for a few moments. It covers motions Nos. 7, 17 and 31 and reads as follows:

• (1630)

That the word "sources" at the end of the three amendments be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"citizens, persons with landed immigrant status, corporations which have no less than 50 per cent of their voting stock owned by Canadian citizens and not more than 10 per cent of their voting stock owned by any foreign group or person, trade unions which are located in Canada, and associations or organizations which are established pursuant to a statute of the Parliament of Canada or of a province".

I believe the proposed amendment is in order though it comes to us in an irregular way inasmuch as it was presented in the speech of one member and moved by another member. The Chair will recognize the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), and since the point

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

of order has probably taken up four minutes he will be allowed his full 20 minutes.

**Mr. Horner (Crowfoot):** He has just spoiled a good amendment by that subamendment. The bookkeeping necessary to keep track of it will be impossible.

**Mr. Peters:** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I need 20 minutes to justify the amendment. I do know there are sincere differences of opinion as to the kinds of contribution which should be allowed. I believe there is a growing body of opinion that Canadians should pay for their own elections. This has been my view for a long time. It is obvious that money is needed to run for federal election, though I must say that I myself have never had to spend large amounts in my constituency. The people there did not supply me with very much money but instead they supplied me over the years with a great deal of assistance in other ways. They have provided me with a lot of help and have done a great deal of work to see that I was elected; and I can always be sure that the assistance I am receiving is assistance from Canadian citizens who are interested in the progress of legislation which is enacted with their interests in mind.

I am sure most Canadians will be aware, unless they live with their radios turned off, that huge sums are spent in the United States in the course of election campaigns and that the very size of these funds may lead to wrong decisions being taken. When Mr. John Dean was asked during the early, electrifying days of the Watergate hearings to tell the Senators what had gone wrong, how he as a lawyer who had taken an oath to uphold the law could have got himself into the circumstances which led to his appearance, his answer was that the Republican Party had too much money at its disposal. As I say, there has to be some money but it need not be a very large amount. I would be the first to oppose the idea of the New Democratic Party receiving large sums of money either from Canadian or foreign sources. I recall an occasion when in the province of Ontario we were offered a sum which was, for us, a very large one. I suppose it was \$5,000 or \$6,000—

**Mr. Horner (Crowfoot):** All that much?

**Mr. Peters:** Well, in those days the party had between \$15,000 and \$20,000 at its disposal to run a provincial election. I was on the provincial executive, and \$5,000 probably amounted to 15 per cent or 20 per cent of the total amount of money the provincial office had available to run an election. We turned this offer down. We turned it down for two reasons: first, we were dominated at that time by the teetotal element in Ontario; second, we were not sure what we would have to do in return for this donation. This was a period during which the temperance group in Ontario had the largest influence in the Ontario New Democratic Party, rather than the trade unions by which, according to most people, we have always been dominated. I believe the position has changed now with changing social attitudes.

As I say, I would be opposed to large sums of money coming into the party, simply because I do not believe large amounts of money are needed. What happened in the United States was this: the Republican Party had \$3 million or \$4 million left over and no place to spend it, so they