

Election Expenses

Mr. Howard: Right on, Mr. Speaker; thank you very much. It is the hon. member for Mississauga who made those interjections. He is not nearly as competent as was the hon. member for Peel South, when there was a member for Peel South here. The hon. member for Mississauga had an opportunity a moment ago to stand up and be counted like a man with respect to the type of union contributions to which he referred, but he ducked the issue. Why? Because he wanted to continue to protect their source of funds. He was not concerned about cutting off anybody else's source of funds, but he wanted to continue to protect his party's source of funds from south of the border and make sure that no one knew about it and that they could come in by the back door, that it was folded money, unidentifiable money.

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order. First I would like to ask the hon. member whether he is rising on a point of order or a question of privilege.

Mr. Blenkarn: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member knows full-well that it is only his party that is relying on international union contributions, that these contributions do not come to the PC party, that this party does not rely—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order. The hon. member knows very well that this is a point of debate or opinion. I think the Chair must tell him right away that the hon. member who has the floor is the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard).

Mr. Howard: I would have thought the hon. member for Mississauga would have got that message before. I do not want to go any further in that direction. All this information was set down on the record earlier today in great detail, with great clarity and precision, with complete disclosure while the hon. member for Mississauga was not here to listen to it. If he would like to find the truth about that matter, let him read *Hansard*. It is there.

I would get back to the amendment before us. As I said, all political parties have this tendency to produce the most slick brochure possible, thinking that that will have the greatest impact and that it will attract people to vote for us because we are able to present whatever it is we have to present. We have a manner of presenting it that would appear attractive, that would appear as if careful thought had gone into it, that would look appealing to the eye. Our television programs tend to do the same thing. We run newspaper advertisements that are designed not to impart information to the general public about anything, and not to indicate that one party or another has a particular philosophy or a particular policy or a particular program, but designed to leave the impression, in the mind of a voter, of a particular name. We have posters. A classic one is that of a minister of national defence cuddling up to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and whispering. This was on a billboard in Winnipeg. It was not designed for any other purpose except to say that the then minister of national defence and the Prime Minister were pretty close buddy-buddies, so much so that they whisper confidentialities to each other in full public view on the billboard.

Mr. Blenkarn: He is in bed half the time when there is an emergency. I guess that is what happens to the Prime Minister also.

Mr. Howard: I have no commentary to make about things of that nature. Those are interruptions from the hon. member for Mississauga. I want to deal with the items that are before us and I hope he will not try to drag the conversation in that direction. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you have warned him a sufficient number of times that he should stay in order. Now we come to the matter of how much these national elections are to cost.

Mr. Blenkarn: It will not cost you that much while David and Pierre are together.

Mr. Howard: We want them to cost more. One thing I have noticed about these chatterboxes in the Conservative Party is that they make their most sensible comments from the position in which they are now. It may well be that this is because it is that part of their anatomy that is resting at that particular time.

Mr. Stackhouse: Will you be reading from the telephone directory now? You have not done that yet.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): I wonder whether the hon. member has terminated his speech, or is some interruption keeping him from expressing his ideas? I would point out to hon. members that we are getting closer to the adjournment hour tonight, but still order must be maintained. The hon. member for Mississauga (Mr. Blenkarn) had been asking questions. I would plead with him not to interrupt any more as the Chair is having a hard time following the speaker who has the floor.

• (2140)

Mr. Brewin: May I ask the hon. member a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Does the hon. member for Skeena agree?

Mr. Howard: I would be more than delighted, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Brewin: This amending motion No. 12 seeks to take the word "not" out of proposed section 13.2(1.1) of sub-clause 4(1). Would the hon. member who is moving this motion tell us the effect of that? I haven't the vagues idea.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member for Greenwood is kind of embarrassed and is trying to get us back on the track again. Probably if I could put it in one sentence it may help to clarify the whole matter. Most times when you seek to take the knots out of something, you unravel it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Howard: That is what we are seeking to do here, to remove one of the knots and unravel, or ravel—I am not sure which is correct not being a person who has done much knitting lately. However, we are attempting to unravel a very involved and complicated bit of political declaration.

An hon. Member: Why don't you try a zipper?