

That is done in the present legislation, but in my view is done inadequately and in the wrong way. The third recommendation is as follows:

An effort should be made to increase public participation in politics, by broadening the base of political contribution through tax concessions to donors.

That is covered in this legislation and is welcomed; I think it is a very sound provision. Recommendation No. 4 reads:

Costs of election campaigns should be reduced, by shortening the campaign period, by placing limitations on expenditures on mass media by candidates and parties—

I point out that the recommendation includes the words "and parties", but the legislation ignores the importance of parties in this whole field and is totally inadequate to solve this problem. Recommendation No. 5 reads:

Public confidence in political financing should be strengthened, by requiring candidates and parties to disclose their incomes and expenditures.

I do not think that is adequately done in this legislation. The report then outlines that enforcement machinery through a registry and the supervision of a registrar should be established. I am not satisfied that the present legislation includes adequate provision for enforcement.

When I was first elected to parliament this subject of electoral reform was one of the subjects I felt most strongly about and I hoped during my career in the House to be able to contribute to it. Some years ago I introduced a private member's bill directed to this very subject. When the Barbeau committee was appointed in 1964, making its final report in 1966, I thought we were making excellent progress in this field.

In 1968, when a prime minister was elected who had both privately and publicly expressed his convictions about the necessity of genuine changes in this field, I must say I was encouraged. I do not agree with the report of the special committee in all its details but I think it was an achievement in the history of legislation in this field when the special committee appointed to deal with this matter reported unanimously. Some of its conclusions were the result of compromise but, nevertheless, it was an advance in the field.

Now we have Bill C-211. I am afraid it may be too late. If I had not heard something about an announcement made today, I would have said it was definitely too late. When I prepared my notes I had assumed the impossibility of this legislation being adopted before the next election. I was going to characterize this legislation as window-dressing for that reason. Now we have a breathing space and I urge upon the government, through the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) who is in the House at the moment, that there is a challenge to them to ensure that this legislation, amended in accordance with the will of this House to make it more effective than it is at the present time, should be passed before the next election. If it is not, it will be a test of the sincerity of the government and its desire to reform this vitally important field.

I spoke about the inadequacy of this legislation and said its most glaring inadequacy was its failure to place any limitation upon the expenses of political parties. Everybody knows that major expenditures in an election are

Election Expenses Bill

made by political parties and not individual candidates. Everybody knows that the major scandals in the history of Canada in this field are related to political parties and not individual candidates. I suggest this is a gap which must be filled if parliament is to be able to say it has grasped the subject and dealt with it adequately.

At page 16 of the Barbeau committee report I find a judgment on the law passed in 1874, nearly 100 years ago. It reads:

By failing to come to grips with the reality that politics is more importantly a party process than an individual process, the framers of the 1874 law failed to put together a workable framework for legislation control.

That is precisely the situation we are facing here. Almost 100 years after this ineffective legislation of 1874, we in 1972 are being asked to put into effect legislation which fails to come to grips with the reality that politics is more importantly a party process than an individual process. The report goes on to state, as I have read, that the framers of the 1874 law failed to put together a workable framework for legislative control, and I say that is precisely true of Bill C-211 which fails to put together a workable framework for legislative control of expenditures by parties. In that respect there is a major defect in this legislation.

This legislation will not satisfy the people of Canada or the demands of a popular democracy unless it is remedied before being passed by the House. I do not want to go into all the details, because obviously second reading is not the right place to do so, but there is no provision in this legislation for disclosure of the sources of campaign funds except in regard to candidates, and even in that respect it is inadequate.

I have somewhere here a copy of the remarks made by the President of the Privy Council in introducing second reading of this legislation, but I seem to have mislaid it for the moment. He said no case had been made for special legislation to the effect that foreign sources of support and campaign funds for elections in Canada should be disclosed. I suggest to him it is self-evident that in this country it is highly important, if we are to be influenced by foreign sources in our electoral processes, that this should be known to the Canadian public.

I say to him that the very least this legislation should do—and I do not see that it does it at all—is include provision for the disclosure of foreign sources of contributions to candidates or parties in an election. I suggest those who are worried about our independence should concentrate their minds on this particular subject. It has always been my view that the greatest problem in respect of independence is in obtaining independence of mind and independence of our political system. I suggest that related to that is independence of our political machinery, and we cannot have complete independence if we are to have undisclosed contributions of political funds from foreign sources.

I must say I was amazed at the President of the Privy Council saying there was no reason shown for such a provision. I say this legislation is defective unless it provides adequately for full disclosure of all campaign funds, especially those which come from foreign sources. I do not think any political party in this country wants to be