

we could keep a day-to-day record of the percentile ownership of Canadian corporations. We currently do this in terms of corporation returns and the Income Tax Act, but I do not know whether it would be a workable concept in terms of an election which could be called mid-year or at any other time. In addition, I am not happy with the expression "trade unions located in Canada". The word "located" does not seem to be particularly suitable when talking about Canadian identity. It would be possible, I think, for trade unions whose essential characteristics in some way relate to foreign trade unions to qualify under this amendment and be capable of making contributions.

We really have not gotten around the problem which I believe is intended to be resolved by this particular amendment. There is a different solution, one which I listened to with a great deal of attention when it was originally proposed in committee. As the bill now stands, it will provide in the order of \$25,000 to \$30,000 per candidate in the average riding. It will provide for the declaration of donors to registered parties. It will remove the anonymity of donors of amounts over \$100. I suggest there is an alternative method by which interference in the Canadian political situation can be reduced. That is publicity. In the first instance, the bill clearly and extensively provides for information with respect to donations to registered parties and/or candidates and provides, as well, for publication of those amounts. I think it quite likely that the four parties now in the House, or any parties as they are currently registered, would be the first to make a great deal of noise to the news media. The news media would be willing to carry stories where contributions are, in fact, made by non-Canadian residents whether corporate, trade unions or individuals.

In the final analysis, rather than attempt to provide legal definitions covering who will have the right to make a donation, it would probably be better to rely on our opposition parties. I think we should rely on all the parties to act as watchdogs for one another in terms of relations of this kind.

● (1620)

As one of the members of the committee, I want to thank all members for the co-operation shown, irrespective of party. A tremendous amount of work and time was put in. As the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) mentioned the other day, this really is a committee bill, the result of an input to which everyone contributed, and I believe it will have a substantial effect upon Canadian elections in the future.

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take the time of the House for long on this subject, but we are dealing here with a very important subamendment; it is not one we can gloss over lightly. I should like to congratulate the mover of the subamendment which in my view deserves to be given serious consideration. It represents a sensible change, one which seeks to introduce a definition which is clearly necessary if the purpose of the legislation is to be achieved.

I wish to comment on the remarks made by the hon. member for Mississauga (Mr. Blenkarn) who spoke on the subamendment yesterday. In the course of his speech the hon. member said, referring to the amendments:

Election Expenses

I suggest they represent a deathbed repentance on the part of the NDP. Suddenly they realized their total source of funding had been the international unions.

Both those statements are blatantly false and I think it proper that someone should rise to challenge that kind of sheer nonsense. The fact is, there has been no deathbed repentance but, rather, a serious attempt to improve this bill. And if there were a deathbed repentance, it is better to have some measure of repentance than none at all—and members of the Conservative party obviously do not intend to repent.

Mr. Horner (Crowfoot): We have nothing to repent for. We do not take money from international unions.

Mr. Leggatt: They certainly do not want to lose the funds which have been flowing to them in the past from the United States and which can continue to flow under the bill as presently drafted, the only difference being that disclosure would now be required. However, people like ITT will not let that stand in the way of supporting their political friends, I am sure. It is patent nonsense to say our major source of funding has been the international unions. In the New Democratic Party, funding for local campaigns comes almost 100 per cent from the local people. That is the difference between the NDP and the Liberals or the Conservatives.

The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon) referred to a paper by Dr. Paltiel who made a careful analysis of the sources of political funds contributed to the various political parties. He pointed out, correctly, that a great deal of the money spent on the national campaign of the NDP comes from the unions. That has never been hidden.

Mr. Horner (Crowfoot): International unions, too.

Mr. Leggatt: But the hon. member failed to tell us that in the same paper Dr. Paltiel had this to say:

In contrast to the major parties, the NDP is financed from the bottom up with both individual and affiliated (trade union) membership fees being paid jointly to the provincial and federal parties.

This is the second difference which the hon. member for Victoria failed to acknowledge: the NDP is financed from the bottom up, while the Liberal and the Conservative parties are financed from the top down.

Mr. Horner (Crowfoot): That is wrong.

Mr. Leggatt: Well, the hon. member will have to argue that with Dr. Khayyam Z. Paltiel who seems to have done a great deal of study on this subject.

Mr. Horner (Crowfoot): Well, he is not an authority on the party to which I belong.

Mr. Leggatt: When he spoke yesterday, the hon. member for Mississauga said that seven members from the New Democratic Party had spoken on this issue during the day, implying that somehow there was an attempt being made to frustrate the wishes of parliament in connection with this legislation.

Mr. Horner (Crowfoot): Not "implying"; it was a statement.