

ing a political meeting and they have paid the rent for the hall. The candidate is making a speech expounding the aims and policies of his party. He makes a remark that is not popular with the cross-section of the general public who are his listeners in the hall. Bedlam breaks loose at the back of the hall. A man stands up and says, "Shut up, Mr. Candidate. I won't let you say that here, because your candidacy is subsidized by the general public and I am a taxpaying citizen. You either shut up or get out."

• (2140)

The candidate answers the heckler, "With due respect, our party has paid the rent here tonight." The heckler then says, "So have I helped pay the rent, because my taxes help pay your election expenses." This shows how ridiculous and crazy has been the thinking of the government in the formulation of this bill.

There is another point which I wish to put forward. The chairman of the committee mentioned disclosure. Mr. Speaker, as long as there is coin of the realm in circulation, how can any candidate—especially since according to law he cannot handle money and all cash must be handled by his financial agent—disclose anonymous donations? How can any audit be successfully conducted? How can any audit be accurately conducted? Therefore the word of someone other than the candidate must be accepted. What kind of a charade would that be? Although I am critical of this bill, Mr. Speaker, I am one of the first to agree that election expenses are mounting beyond reason with every parliament. That is a result of the fierce political and electoral competition that is indulged in, and of the current inflationary spiral that has been generated by the Liberal party.

I would like to support the parts of the bill which sensibly limit expenditures in constituencies and that would tend to be fair and equitable in the allotment of radio and television time to the candidates of all recognized parties. But, again, I will not support any more free time on the airways, both radio and television, than has been granted in the past. This decision should be left to the existing T.V. authorities and the radio and T.V. stations. In other words, if my opponent has more money to spend on television than I have, we can just say that is my tough luck and let him spend it. In many cases it is not always the candidate whose face appears most frequently and for longer periods on television who wins an election. Sometimes the viewers get tired of this. Sometimes over-exposure is the cause of a candidate's defeat. Anything beyond what has been granted in the past should be paid for by the candidate and/or his party.

I have been critical of this bill. I am most concerned, as I said, about clause 11 which proposes a new section 63.1 and compels taxpayers to reimburse candidates' expenses. If it remains in the bill, I serve notice that I cannot and I will not support it.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, this kind of bill gives the government an opportunity to do something that I had occasion to do once when negotiating a contract in a new plant. In such a case you look at all the other contracts around the country, pick out the best of everything, list which is the best one, the next best one, the one that is not so good and the one that is very

Election Expenses Bill

bad, and deal with each section of the new contract, trying to get the best possible even if it is not with respect to the sections that are concerned only with money. I remember that in one contract I secured agreement on a five-week holiday after 15 years' service. The reason the company agreed to this was that it had been in operation for little over a year and the day of reckoning seemed far distant.

But what does the government do with this legislation? It has examined similar legislation in other countries. The Barbeau report indicates that a study was made over a number of years of legislation in other countries. The government has discovered some of the mistakes which other countries made. It has discovered that in countries where expenditures on behalf of a candidate are limited, a more democratic distribution of representation is possible and many abuses have been eliminated. Yet it comes before parliament after all this investigation and presents legislation with provisions that have proven to be deficient in other countries.

This bill is providing the very minimum possible. It is putting a timid foot in the door when really we should be dealing with legislation that would make the last speaker cry—legislation that would provide equality, that would eliminate the last vestiges of wealth being used to win elections. As the last speaker said, some 20 or 30 years ago it was possible to be elected because of one's position in the community. A man may have owned the local mill. He may have been the son of a man who had been a Member of parliament. He may have been the son of someone in the militia. He may have been a very rich person and on his name alone could be elected. However, during the limited time that I have been a member of this House I have noticed that members more and more must depend on their own ability and on their own initiative to retain their seats in this place. This is a trend that will continue. Those who are capable will probably be elected. The amount of money spent will not necessarily determine the outcome of an election.

Earlier this afternoon I made an offhand remark to a previous speaker in the debate, knowing that he was a very wealthy man. I asked what was he worried about, and quite rightly he replied that during election campaigns he goes round and raps on doors. I know he does this, and it benefits him. That holds true in many ridings. I know that in my own riding on a couple of occasions the amount of money available to a candidate was detrimental to his cause because he had difficulty in spending all of it.

I am sure that many people who read the Barbeau report were surprised at the cost of elections. I was a little surprised. I have heard various figures used, but it was interesting to note that in the 1962 election the figures revealed a very sharp rise over all previous elections. The president of the National Liberal Federation, Senator J. J. Connolly, told *Maclean's* as reported at page 281 of the report of the committee on election expenses in 1966:

• (2150)

—the rise in costs "is not a matter of addition . . . but of multiplication." That article states that "the consensus in Ottawa" is that the campaign will cost at least \$11 million, "about \$3 million more than the estimate made for the 1958 election."