

subject some thought, and I was rather surprised when I noticed it in the Liberal platform during the last federal election. I thought, well, if we seriously believe this, then the time has come when this ought to take place. I put a motion on the order paper, therefore, in similar terms to that of the hon. member, and I received a good deal of comment about it. I have discovered this matter should be seriously discussed in parliament before it is brought into effect. I incurred the hostility of my local newspaper when I set my motion on the order paper.

The Brantford *Expositor* of July 26, 1962 carried a lead editorial entitled, "Paying for Politics." I should like to quote briefly from it:

Like the curate's egg, the proposal of James E. Brown, M.P. for Brantford, that the law relating to parliamentary election expenses should be revised, is good in parts.

The editorial commends the first two parts of my motion which are similar to the hon. member's motion, that is to say, that election expenses should be limited and that the party should be required to give a strict accounting. This editorial was the most definite editorial against my proposal. The newspaper favoured these first two items, and in dealing with the other item the editorial said:

—that the government should pay the legally permitted expenses of any candidate who polls a "reasonable" proportion of the total vote cast, would carry the welfare state idea to a pitch that not even the welfare-minded British have ever thought of.

The government—that is the taxpayer—already foots a \$12 million bill for organizing and running the voting machinery. That, no one will doubt, is a proper function of government in a democratic parliamentary system. But to expect every taxpayer to help pick up the tab for every candidate on the ballot, both the one he would like to see elected and those he wouldn't, is carrying things to absurdity.

That is what the Brantford *Expositor* said at that time. However I was very surprised to find a quotation, in the notes I made on this subject, from the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of February 9, 1962, which devoted an editorial to the cost of elections and took a divergent view from the Brantford *Expositor*. It was commenting on the government of Quebec leading the way in Canada to this type of legislation and was more or less praising that government for what it had done in this regard. It said:

The dominion government may be urged to follow the example set by Mr. Lesage, but the matter should be given thorough consideration before being rushed into practice.

It was this very point which prompted me to put something into my motion that is not in the motion of the hon. member for York South. I suggested that this matter be placed

before the committee on privileges and elections and I would have preferred had the hon. member done that also, because I must admit this is a matter requiring very serious and prolonged discussion. I would like to hear the views of various hon. members, who have considerable experience in the house, on this subject. I wish the hon. member's motion had asked that the matter be referred to that committee, where it would receive more than the one hour's discussion it will receive this evening. The subject is of paramount importance and the time has come to make a great change in Canada's electoral laws.

When the 1948 act was introduced in the British house of commons the home secretary, Mr. Ede, said it was the completion of a long line of reform extending back to the reform bill of 1832, and that the 1948 act was introducing true parliamentary democracy into a modern nation. We must have those reforms in Canada today. I believe these matters will come before the house, despite what is done in tonight's debate, and that in the not too very distant future. I also believe parliament will pass this private legislation and I am certain the hon. member's motion is quite in order at this time and should be considered.

Mr. Berger: I wonder would the hon. member yield the floor to allow a question. In view of Hon. C. G. Power's failure to get the Liberal party to accept the idea of electoral reform, does the hon. member for Brantford feel there is any chance of his own views regarding limitation of election expenditures being accepted by his own party?

Mr. Brown: I can easily answer that question. They have already been accepted, as I understand it, by the Liberal party.

There have been a lot of broadminded men in liberal parliamentary democracies. I shall leave out the word "liberal" as I had not meant it in the context of a capital "L"; but in countries with parliamentary governments many leaders right across the world have been interested in this sort of thing, and none more than the President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, since his election in 1960. I now wish to quote from an article by Philip M. Stern which appeared in *Harper's Magazine* of May, 1962, where he quotes Mr. Kennedy and says:

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is no impecunious professor,—

He had just been talking about another member of the United States government who was a professor and supposedly did not have much money to spend on elections.

—he did not have to mortgage anything to contribute \$60,000 of his own (as he has acknowledged) to his preconvention campaign. Yet two weeks after his election, despite the myriad