

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prudhomme: I thank my colleague for raising this last point. Often, when we make a speech, we get away from the points that we wanted to discuss. I thank him for his comments because I fully agree with him and with several other parliamentarians. Indeed, I would hope that when we table an amendment, a free vote will take place.

[*English*]

I hope we will have a free vote on this issue when we introduce amendments. We believe we should limit indirect expenses as well as direct expenses.

I know my colleague from the New Democratic Party who is still here, the hon. member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan, has been very devoted to this question as have many Conservatives. It is not a question of partisanship.

I would not like people to say they cannot vote for the amendment because the government could be defeated. It is easy to say on this particular item, vote as you see fit, not according to your conscience because some feel this way or some feel that way. You must not say everything is a question of conscience. If you talk too much about that you end up having none, but I passionately believe.

• (2130)

When I said I did not want the Americanization of our Canadian political system, that is exactly what I had in mind. I do not only agree that we should limit, as Lortie said, the direct expenses to \$1,000 so nobody would dare attack us in court according to the charter, but what is not allowed directly should not be allowed indirectly.

I am sure many colleagues and many friends will fight until the very last minute. If we do not get it this time we will have it some day because the Canadian people will understand their political system. They will understand what the member said. They will understand what the NDP and some Conservatives said.

[*Translation*]

I would say: Free us, free us from these occult forces that want to control politicians.

If you really want to democratize Canadian life, free us from those who, behind the scenes imagine that with big

Government Orders

contributions they might eventually get indirectly and secretly what they cannot get directly, openly and publicly. That is the spirit behind this bill, and that spirit will shine through when it is understood, because it is in the best interests of Canadians to support it. Therefore, a maximum of \$1,000 should be allowed for direct advertising since we had to recognize that the Supreme Court would probably decide one day that people have a right to something. We suggest it should be \$1,000. Personally, I would have said zero, but if we settle for \$1,000 worth of direct advertising, I submit that anything that cannot be done directly should not end up being done indirectly.

I know of a proverb, but I seem unable to recall it tonight and I would like our learned Speaker, who is a great linguist and a great Latin scholar, to tell us what it is exactly. I refer to the inscriptions on the wall in the Senate that are all in Latin and all from great Romans. That is why they are so long. There is a proverb by Seneca that says that nothing is well ordered that is hasty and precipitated.

[*English*]

There has to be prudence.

[*Translation*]

These are good living guidelines, these are the very words of Orestes. And Cicero, to close with him, said—and that was probably what motivated Mr. Trudeau—that one had to be guided by reason, not by public opinion. We did an honest job or rather, we tried to do an honest job and we will keep on improving on it. I thank my colleague for his comments.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The question is on the motion of Mr. Milliken. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to.