

municipal vote in Toronto was restricted according to property. If one owned property, real estate, if one was a business tenant, or if one was a residential tenant renting two or more rooms in which one ate and slept, one could vote. If one lived in a rooming house, one was nothing and had no vote.

As well, people in those days could vote as many times as they held separate pieces of property, and this was not only the case in Ontario. In other words, votes went partly with humanity and partly with wealth. They still do in the City of Toronto, but not to such a great degree. People with money and wealth still have more votes than ordinary working people in Ontario's municipal elections, both because there are certain privileges, however limited, given to property owners and because the manner of determining the voters' list from the assessment role is inevitably biased in favour of property owners, business tenants and tenants of large dwellings and against the residents of rooming houses, bachelorette apartment buildings and so on, who are more mobile and who may very well be missed and, from my experience, often are missed in large numbers. Whole buildings have been missed so far as their residential tenants go. Therefore, we still have the hangover of a bias from the old Middle Ages, that the votes should go according to property and wealth; the more dollars, the more votes, and the less dollars the less votes or perhaps no votes.

I think this proposal is a hangover from the Middle Ages which we cannot afford. It certainly seems to infringe on the Charter of Rights. Section 2(b) declares the freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including the freedom of the press and other media of communication. We know that candidates of small Parties or independent candidates, particularly if they are not millionaires, have much less access to the media than candidates of the major Parties who are ordinarily millionaires. Therefore, freedom of the press is in fact limited within this country and is not by any means equally shared by all citizens.

To compound matters, this kind of restriction, if it did not go against the letter of the Charter, will at least go against the spirit of it. In Section 3 the Charter states that every citizen of Canada has the right to vote in an election of Members to the House of Commons or to a legislative assembly and to be qualified for membership therein. It does not say that every citizen of Canada who has \$2,000 to spare on an election campaign is qualified for membership therein. It states "every citizen of Canada", and to lay on a requirement of money which might be \$2,000 now or which, if the same people have their way later on, might be \$20,000, would certainly go against the spirit of Section 3, to my reading of our Charter.

While we are dealing with Charters of Rights, I would simply quote as well the Charter of the United Nations, which states, on this same point, that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. I understand that to mean that a man or woman could be a candidate regardless whether he or she could scrape up a spare \$2,000.

It has sometimes been argued that the person could recoup not only the deposit but also other election expenses if he or she received 15 per cent of the vote. That, nevertheless, is still

### *Canada Elections Act*

a strong disincentive toward a person who may in all good faith, as an individual or as a Member of a Party, wish to set out upon the road which everyone here has followed. For instance, a young person who wishes to be a Member of Parliament knows that he or she may not win this election or the next election. I do not know how many people here have run several times before winning. However, it would be unfortunate if we were to now set a barrier in the way of young people who wish to do exactly what many of us have done.

Whatever we may say about this House when we are feeling disgruntled about what some other Party does in the House, I think that most of us are glad that we were able to get here. I might not be equally in favour of all the others who became Members, but I am glad I became one. I have a notion that each Member of the House would have to say as much, that he or she is glad that he or she became a Member. It would be quite unfair to set a barrier in front of other people, many of whom may be acting in full good faith, a barrier which was not placed in front of any of us when we ran and finally succeeded.

The money barrier is really a hangover from the Middle Ages. I want to show Hon. Members how it works in a biased way, because it would certainly bias the standard of choice of candidates. Let me pick the riding of Spadina as an example. I might have given the 1981 statistics for Spadina, but the Government has not seen fit to release them yet. It has been a year and a half since the election but, of course, a Government which cannot even issue its statistics from June of 1981, with regard to income and occupation, almost two years later is not likely to get around to publishing statistics from the 1981 by-elections within two years. I regret the Government's lack of respect when it withholds statistics which it has gathered.

However, let me give some of the figures from the 1980 election in Spadina. I will deal with public and private corporations together, not going into more extensive detail. Twenty-eight corporations gave \$19,825 to the Conservative candidate in Spadina. To the Liberals, four corporations gave \$325. To the NDP, zero corporations gave zero dollars.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** What about the CLC?

**Mr. Heap:** Now someone has raised a question about the CLC unions, so let us go to the general—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Order, please. The Chair is in some difficulty. The Bill proposes a change of deposit for candidates from \$200 to \$2,000. It may be that I have missed the connecting points that the Hon. Member has made, but I think the Hon. Member may want to explain to the House how his current comments relate to the Bill.

● (1630)

**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that the Speaker is being irreverent.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** I have difficulty resisting the impulse to indicate to the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-