

that particular period in Canadian history quite substantial sums were being provided to that organization from abroad. I have no reason to believe that that is the case at present with respect to that organization. However, during the time Stalin was the head of the government in the U.S.S.R. I am satisfied from the events that transpired in this country that there was financial intervention into the political affairs of this country through that Canadian medium which, in my view, was deleterious to the processes of democracy in Canada.

So I suggest that we are not dealing with something which is entirely hypothetical when we talk about putting into the law an inhibition against Canadian political parties receiving funding from foreign sources. Coming back to the organization which I mentioned earlier, namely ITT, it is my view that in certain parts of Canada that organization has been given great concessions in respect of jurisdiction over some of Canada's natural resources.

• (1600)

Having regard to the history of its operations in other parts of the world, which operations have been documented in part from time to time, I would say its very existence in Canada is perhaps reason for us taking precautionary measures in the context of this bill and to say to it and to all other foreign interests, "We neither want nor need your money in the conduct of the political affairs of Canada." It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I hope this amendment; either in its present form or with clarification by some of the legal beagles in the House, will receive the support of all hon. members and that in dealing with this question of election funding we take what to me is a basic and rather elementary precaution to ensure that Canadians, in this respect at least, remain masters in their own house.

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to state for the benefit of *Hansard* that I am a Progressive Conservative. The last seven speakers to this bill have been members of the New Democratic Party, at least the last seven substantive speakers. Of course, it may be unfair to say that seven of them made speeches. One of them, the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), took advantage of a question from the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) last night to give him a 20-minute answer which I understand does not count as speaking to the bill. But it should be clear by now that members of the NDP are determined that this bill will have very lengthy passage through the House.

As one of the charter members of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections which considered this bill at committee stage, I would like to express a few general remarks on the bill, and specifically on the amendment later.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret having to interrupt the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon) but I wish to point out that it was agreed yesterday—I am not sure if he was in the House at the time—that after general speeches were made, one from each particular corner of the House, the Chair was directed to ensure that remarks were strictly relevant to the bill. I think the hon. member must be bound by this agreement which was

Election Expenses

suggested by the hon. member for Renfrew-Lanark-Carleton (Mr. Dick).

Mr. McKinnon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I shall try to abide by your direction. But I was present in the House yesterday when the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Knight) took us through his constituency, almost town by town, describing the rallies he held and the relationships he had with his agents in the various parts of the constituency. I shall try to confine myself to amendment No. 7, although I think the second last speaker referred to it as No. 6 in error.

Perhaps I would be permitted the indulgence of the House to extend my congratulations to the committee and to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) who appeared at almost every one of its 51 meetings. I would also like to congratulate the committee chairman, the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme), who chaired the meetings with patience and fairness. The story of the number of amendments found necessary to make the bill at all acceptable has been well told. Each amendment was carefully considered and one by one we dealt with them until the bill was completed. I must admit that while there is no single section of the bill left that I cannot now live with, taken as a whole it is rather frightening. It is like building an airplane in your garage. Although put together with tender loving care, one still remains nervous about flying in it. The main concern I have about the bill is that it will add a large administrative tail to every candidate. I do not know if any candidate really wants to add more administrative structures.

Dealing specifically with amendment No. 7 and the other amendments grouped with it, it was moved by the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) who unfortunately is not in the House today. This amendment is identical to one submitted, considered and rejected in committee. At that time the hon. member for Skeena mentioned, as he did yesterday, that he had consulted a lawyer concerning the wording of the amendment. After the amendment was rejected in committee, partly because of its wording, I thought the hon. member would try a new lawyer, but apparently he did not. I contend that the amendment would lead to confusion. The clause, if amended, would read as follows:

—all money provided by an individual other than the candidate or by a corporation, trade union, unincorporated organization or association for any expenses incurred on account of or in respect of the conduct or management of the election, whether as a contribution, gift, loan, advance, deposit or otherwise, shall be in Canadian funds and directly from Canadian sources, and shall be paid on his or its own behalf out of moneys to which he or it is beneficially entitled to a registered agent of the party—

And so on. It is my contention that this might lead to the conclusion that as long as one dealt in non-Canadian funds, one might be exempted from the restriction to make the donation through an agent, which would defeat the purpose of the section.

A second exception I take to this amendment is its wording concerning Canadian funds. The point raised last night by the hon. member for Hamilton West was well taken. Is the wording "Canadian funds" meaningful or practicable? I phoned my bank manager this morning and asked if it would be possible to exchange \$50,000 U.S. for \$50,000 Canadian. He assured me that there is no restric-