

some instances on your relationship with your party. I have run in a number of elections, but I can remember only one election in which I ran where I got the total contribution from the provincial party, and that was in an election where I was a token candidate. They gave me 2,000 posters which I was asked to put up. They had my name on them. They did a very nice job of it. The art work was very good. I have been using the same type of poster ever since. That was the only time, in my experience, when the contribution came from the top.

In all other cases we raised 25 per cent of our total budget and we paid that to our provincial office. We have always made that contribution during the eight elections in which I have run. I therefore believe the series of motions which I anticipate you will be putting as one, Mr. Speaker, are motions which deserve the support of all hon. members who really do not believe that as sitting members of parliament or as members of a major party we have the God-given right always to be elected. It should be possible for a small group formed in any of the constituencies to participate in the democratic process and raise money before an election so as to run candidates who will one day, perhaps, be elected to seats in this chamber. I am opposed to any type of system which will lock in the status quo by providing a sitting member with an unreasonable advantage.

There may be one simple thing which members of this House have forgotten. Many of them have gone a long distance away from the people. If there is one thing which separates Canadians from people of other nationalities, it is the support they are willing to give to the underdog. This could have quite an effect in an election if the kind of motion we are proposing is not accepted.

**Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the series of motions which are under debate. I think it is important to look upon these amendments as typical of the purposes behind the bill and typical of the trend the bill is taking. It is a dangerous trend. It is a trend away from participatory democracy. Before the bill passes, I hope many of these amendments will be given careful scrutiny because when we move away from participatory democracy we move toward a more bureaucratized, a more computerized and a less personal kind of society. In the long run we shall find we have left the voters out entirely. We shall be able to let machines do the job, we shall be able to let the public purse run the campaign and perhaps the Gallup poll will tell us the result.

This may be stretching the argument to some extent, nevertheless the trend is evident within the bill and the amendment is a valid attempt by some members to reverse this trend and continue to seek a meaningful participatory democracy which involves local control and local contributions. I hope all members will support this approach, an approach which would allow a local constituency association to get off the ground regardless of political views, and pick one of their own—not someone superimposed on them from above—to participate actively in the political process. Too often we find we look at the picture from Ottawa, but do not see the picture from the viewpoint of local constituents.

### *Election Expenses*

● (2120)

This bill—and this amendment is an attempt to reverse what I think is a trend in the bill—seeks to avoid that kind of depersonalization. It seeks to avoid locking us into the status quo. The thrust of the bill, in effect, will be an attempt to confirm the existing political parties in this country and will make it extremely difficult for anyone with a new idea or a new approach to fund that idea or approach and bring it forward. What we are really saying is that the political parties we have now are sufficient in terms of their political range and that we do not need any more.

The views of the public change from time to time and we in this House can very easily become out of touch with those views. I think in some areas we are already out of touch, particularly in the area of women's rights and abortion. It may be that if we continue to be out of touch, other political parties will emerge. It is most unfair that this House should see fit to try to protect existing political parties and to injure those who may try to form new political parties. In effect, we would be denying them the kind of democracy that is traditional in this country.

I have no hesitation in rising to support this amendment, which is only one of many that have been presented by this party to try to protect the principle of participatory democracy, the principle of using local citizens and having them actively involved, not merely in making contributions, but in working, knocking on doors, raising funds locally and being responsible for those funds. I would very much commend this particular amendment to the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** The question is on motion No. 3, moved by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Knight), motion No. 4, moved by the hon. member for Assiniboia, motion No. 5, moved by the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) and motion No. 6, moved by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motions?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*