

*Motions*

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

Mr. Speaker: The division will be deferred. We shall now consider motion No. 1, standing in the name of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) which is as follows:

That Bill C-203, an act to amend the Canada Elections Act, the Broadcasting Act and the Income Tax Act in respect of election expenses, be amended by deleting the words "Election Expenses Act" in clause 1 and substituting therefor the words:

"Election Expenses and Subsidies to Political Parties Act."

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, as the mover of this motion may I say that it gives us an opportunity to put some thoughts on the record. Let me say that I, for one, the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) and others are opposed to the concept of providing subsidies out of the public treasury to political parties and candidates. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni, particularly, would like to say a few words and I am sure the House will not be seriously offended if he talks until 4.15.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I had not expected such generosity from my colleague from Skeena (Mr. Howard). As the bill is to pass third reading stage without debate, perhaps I might make one or two comments. Although I recognize that this bill is a step in the right direction in the limiting of expenses and the reporting of the sources of campaign contributions, I feel that if we carry through the idea of subsidizing political parties and candidates from the public purse, in the long run we shall be acting against the best interests of the political parties themselves. Once the people of Canada become aware of this, I think they will express their opposition to this concept with increasing vigour. For that reason, having weighed everything in the balance, we have brought forward this amendment. It deals with a basic concept which I, for one, cannot agree to support which is included in the bill.

I am agreeable to providing services for candidates, such as franking privileges which would be useful for the mailing of information to voters in one's constituency. But once we adopt the concept of providing reimbursement directly from the public treasury to candidates of parties we shall be encouraging candidates to spend more money so that they can get more money back. By so doing we should be introducing a retrograde element in our electoral system. It is an element which I think is wrong and which I intend to oppose with my vote on third reading, if I have the opportunity.

● (1610)

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: Those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost on division.

Motion No. 1 (Mr. Howard) negatived.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### HOUSE OF COMMONS

#### CHRISTMAS ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Speaker: We shall turn now to the motion which stands in the name of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen).

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, may I make a suggestion? The principals involved on both sides of the House are negotiating very hard. There is a good mood, so perhaps we could hold over any decision until after the private members' hour.

Mr. MacEachen: Could we agree to put the motion at five o'clock?

Mr. Speaker: The President of the Privy Council will remember that there is royal assent at 4.45 p.m.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Don't let him in.

Mr. Roche: I should like to know whether there is to be any opportunity for debate on the third reading of the election expenses bill. I urge the government House leader to provide for at least one day's debate on third reading.

Mr. Speaker: I believe there is a reference to that in the order. Is it the wish of the House that I read the motion? Some hon. Members suggested I should dispense with reading it. The motion has been put and will, I gather, be reconsidered at 4.45 p.m. after the private members' hour.

\* \* \*

#### THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication:

Government House,  
Ottawa 21 December, 1973

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Roland A. Ritchie, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, December 21, at 4.45 p.m. for the purpose of giving the royal assent to certain bills.