

election results in certain areas where rank and file union people reside. They do not necessarily vote the way their union bosses tell them. While we are accused of being responsible only to big business, examination of the situation reveals that this is simply not the case.

Second, I want to comment on the idea of disclosure of sources of financial assistance for campaign purposes. I can only speak for myself; other members can speak for themselves. I do not know where the money comes from which finances my campaign. I have absolutely no knowledge of any individual, corporation or other interested group that may make donations. All I know is that we receive an allocation of funds from our central finance committee.

**Mr. Skoberg:** Now we know.

**Mr. Yewchuk:** Under these circumstances, I think a member of parliament is much more able to function as a free agent and to speak about what he thinks is right for the country without being subject to any kind of pressure from whoever the donor may have been. The party to my left is proposing that we know who gave us our campaign funds because that is the position in which they find themselves; they realize how uncomfortable it is to be subject to pressure from a particular pressure group.

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

**Mr. Yewchuk:** I am in a situation where I would rather not know. I do not want to be subject to pressure by a particular pressure group, telling me what I should be saying in parliament and for whom I should be speaking. I want to be able to speak honestly, sincerely and impartially in the way I think is best for my constituents and the country. Therefore, I am very vigorously opposed to the idea of naming individuals, corporations or any other groups which have made donations, whether big or small, to the political party which I represent.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but since we have reached the hour of four o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, notices of motions and private bills.

\* \* \*

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. MacLean:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps the government House leader will confirm that the business for next week is as he has already announced or will there be any variation?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, the plan is to continue the budget on Tuesday and Wednesday. On Thursday I would like to return to the legislative list that I gave on Thursday last, beginning with the election expenses bill that was before the House a moment ago. If there are any changes, I will communicate them to hon. members.

### *Blue Water Bridge Authority Bill* PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

#### BLUE WATER BRIDGE AUTHORITY BILL

AMENDMENT TO REQUIRE BLUE WATER BRIDGE AUTHORITY TO SUBMIT ANNUAL ACCOUNTS TO AUDITOR GENERAL AND REPORT TO PARLIAMENT

**Mr. Mac T. McCutcheon (Lambton-Kent)** moved that Bill C-16, to amend the Blue Water Bridge Authority Act (public and financial accountability), be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of Bill C-16 it might be well to review some of the events leading up to the situation as it exists at the present time. On April 30, 1964 it was my pleasure to second the motion proposed by Mr. Walter Foy, the then hon. member for Lambton West, as the constituency was then called, respecting Bill S-4 having to do with the international bridge over the St. Clair River known as the Blue Water Bridge. This legislation was brought about because it was necessary that somebody be charged with the maintenance and upkeep of the bridge.

• (1600)

It will perhaps be helpful to explain that the bridge, first built in 1938 with government help, paid off its indebtedness in a period of 23 years. During this time it was operated by the Michigan state bridge commission, but when the indebtedness had been discharged the United States bureau of public roads said that federal grants for Michigan highway construction would be withheld in accordance with an original agreement which stated there could be no tolls on the bridge or on highways in Michigan. Moreover, the village of Point Edward, Ontario, had not been receiving tax revenue from some of its most valuable industrial land upon which the Canadian approach to this bridge is located. Further, virtually no maintenance work was carried out during the period. That little work was carried out was done gratis by the Ontario department of highways. Heat and light in the customs and immigration office was supplied by the federal government.

Having regard to these facts, I was very happy to be the co-sponsor of the bill. Local papers congratulated the then hon. member for Lambton West and myself on the degree of co-operation we displayed at that time as a result of which the measure passed through the House in record time—less than half an hour, in fact.

The commission established to operate the bridge, I naïvely thought, would consist of prominent citizens of the area. However, the members eventually appointed read like a "Who's Who" of the Liberal hierarchy in Sarnia. As a practical politician I could see what had happened and simply assumed this was the way the cookie crumbled. One of the first things the commission did was to reimpose tolls. These were higher than originally envisaged but were accepted as necessary to provide for maintenance. Successive increases have been put into effect over the years, and as co-sponsor of the bill setting up the authority I wondered when some meaningful