

*Election Expenses*

tion whatsoever, no records are kept, nor is there a requirement to keep such records. This indicated to me that the result of adding the words "Canadian funds" in this context would be meaningless.

During yesterday's debate the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) quoted Dr. Palteil of Carleton University, but he only quoted him in regard to the financing of the Liberal and Progressive Conservative parties. I would not want this House to be left with the impression that Dr. Palteil only reported upon the two major parties. In fact, I would recommend that all hon. members read Dr. Palteil's August, 1973, paper and also his book "Political Party Financing in Canada" which was published in 1970. I wish to give just a couple of quotations to balance the remarks of the hon. member for Timiskaming. The first is from Dr. Palteil's 1973 paper:

It is clear that trade unions directly or through the Committee on Political Education of the Central Labour Organization are the prime sources of funds for the NDP party's national election fund.

The second quotation is from Palteil's book in which, when he was speaking about the NDP, he said:

Practically all the sums spent by the federal office on the 1962 and 1963 campaigns came from labour sources. In 1965 approximately . . . 72 per cent of the expenditures of the federal party was covered by the trade unions, notably the United Steel Workers and the United Packing House Workers.

Palteil then expresses an opinion on these donors as follows:

Trade unions are the financial foundations of the NDP. While such contributions differ qualitatively from the contributions of business corporations, it is also true that such donations are unlike the voluntary gifts of individual citizens.

I would like to read just one more quotation, this one from last night's speech by the hon. member for Skeena, as reported in *Hansard* at page 8877:

We know that if there is a political party contribution which comes from a particular source there is a tendency for the recipient thereof to lean in that direction.

And later:

There is the tendency to say that he who pays the bills will receive the prime consideration, and that he who pays the accounts will get the attention or that he who does not pay the accounts will not. We are trying to prevent the extraterritorial aspect of corporations, trade unions, individuals, associations and groups in other countries having influence, especially an undue influence, on the politics of this nation.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very fine statement for the hon. member for Skeena to have made and I agree entirely with it, although possibly for different reasons. I submit that the United Steel Workers, the United Packing House Workers, General Motors of Canada and Ford of Canada are all equally suspect in the minds of most Canadians in so far as foreign influence on their policy decisions is concerned. The hon. member for Skeena worries about the influence of corporations and businesses. I worry about the influence of giant, multinational unions. I hope my fears are as ill-founded as his.

● (1610)

I believe that the possibility of tracing the original source of funds suffered a real setback when the President of the Privy Council informed the committee that it was not the intention of the bill to trace donations back to

[Mr. McKinnon.]

their original sources. I am sorry that I have not had time to look up his exact words in the minutes of the committee, but doubt that he would wish to deny the inference I have drawn. Faced with this, I believe the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Nickel Belt would serve only to confuse further an already complex but well-intentioned bill, without achieving its aim. I therefore recommend that the amendments be defeated.

The NDP, as well as our party and the Liberals, submitted many amendments and many were accepted. Our party was particularly appreciative of the NDP amendment submitted by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). One of our amendments proposed that the Auditor General should supervise the act. However, our amendment was rejected. The hon. member for Greenwood suggested the appointment of a commissioner, and we welcomed his amendment.

In closing, I should like to say that I have no particular objection to the 42 amendments having been moved by one party in the House. Despite the fact that almost all the amendments were given a trial run in committee and were rejected, the NDP are within the rules in resubmitting them and that closes the matter as far as I am concerned.

Voltaire, in somewhat similar circumstances, said, "I disapprove of what you say but will defend to the death your right to say it." Well, I disagree with each of these amendments, and while I am not prepared to go to the lengths suggested by the gallant Voltaire, I certainly support their right to move these amendments. Perhaps I am willing to go along to some extent with Voltaire because it has not escaped my attention that Walpole said of Voltaire that he was "one of those heroes who liked better to excite martyrs than to be one".

**Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming):** Mr. Speaker, not being a student of Voltaire in the original French, although having seen his works in translation, I do not know whether I would class myself as one who wants to be a martyr. If, however, I wanted to be a martyr, conceivably I could embrace martyrdom in connection with this particular amendment which I think is fundamental to Canadian democracy. The amendment I refer to deals with contributions to political parties being Canadian contributions made in Canadian funds by Canadian organizations.

I was pleased to hear the argument of the hon. member who preceded me. He suggested in so many words that the NDP is financed by large, American-based unions. That is not correct, Mr. Speaker. Certainly it is not true of the steelworkers with whom I held office for seven or eight years. It is not true of the IWA, with whom I spent some time as international representative for the district of eastern Canada; and it is not true, to my knowledge, of the UAW where I have had experience. However, as the previous speaker, who is an honourable man, believes what he alleges, he will wish to strengthen this clause and make it impossible for the NDP to be financed by those American unions. On the other hand, I firmly believe that the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party are to a large degree financed by multinational corporations with headquarters in the United States. For that reason I am interested in seeing a provision making it mandatory for donations to Canadian political parties to be made by Canadians in