

after listening to him, I still believe that a great deal of it comes from international unions.

It is interesting to read the subamendment which has been moved. Many members were not present to hear it when it was moved. After the word "sources" it would add:

—citizens, persons with landed immigrant status, corporations which have no less than 50 per cent of their voting stock owned by Canadian citizens and no more than 10 per cent of this voting stock owned by any foreign group or person, trade unions which are located in Canada—

In other words, no political contributions should come from a corporation which has more than 50 per cent of its stock owned outside Canada. But with respect to unions, the reverse is stipulated, the figure there being 10 per cent with respect to trade unions which are located in Canada. Isn't that interesting, Mr. Speaker?

Imperial Oil of Canada is 30 per cent owned by Canadians, and 70 per cent owned in the United States; but it is located in Canada. International unions may be located in Canada, and in this part of the amendment "located" is the key word for unions. The hon. member tries to create two worlds, one for the sanctity and safety of his group and the other for those terrible giants, the corporations. He is out to get them. This is going back to the old myth that the CCF portrayed across Saskatchewan years ago when there was always somebody they had to get. The hon. member is always after the corporations while protecting the unions, which is not a very honourable thing for a member to do with regard to an election expenses act which is very important to all members of this House.

I do not want to prolong this debate, Mr. Speaker, but if this amendment is to be voted on, I would certainly give some thought to changing that figure of 10 per cent. Why allow a union 10 per cent that is located in Canada? That is the way I interpret that amendment, that if it is 10 per cent owned in Canada, it can contribute funds. I see the hon. member for Timiskaming shaking his head in a negative manner. I hope he will have somebody get up and explain this amendment, because that is the way I interpret it.

Maybe I have a suspicious mind, but I think all people should have suspicious minds when we are talking about involving the government of Canada in paying part of our election expenses. We do not have to look very far for examples. Everybody thought that control over election expense contributions would clean up the problem with elections in the United States. The Americans passed a bill, and then got into difficulty in the Watergate affair. I say that we must be very careful when passing this bill.

As I said at the beginning, there is no question in my mind that there is some merit to the amendment as it stood before the subamendment was moved, some merit to the suggestion that funds should come directly from Canadian sources. It would be very difficult to control and police, but at least it would be something which would prohibit what we saw during the last election campaign when Liberal party finance men were phoning businesses and corporations in the United States seeking donations. It would cut out that; that would be taboo.

I well remember the 1963 election when the Liberal Party accepted one of the top men in the Democratic Party

### *Election Expenses*

in the United States to come up here and run their campaign for them in Canada. There is hidden secret about that. Money came with that man. He was one of the key advisers to the President of the United States, or his brother was a key adviser to the President of the United States. He masterminded the Liberal Party campaign in 1963 and brought money with him, and the government changed hands in Canada. I am not suggesting for a minute that it was because of this person's interference that it changed hands.

**Mr. Reid:** Who was he?

**Mr. Horner (Crowfoot):** You check back in the records. Your government House leader knows who he was.

**Mr. MacEachen:** I would like to know.

**Mr. Horner (Crowfoot):** I know his name very well.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Let us in on it.

**Mr. Horner (Crowfoot):** It is common knowledge. Ask one of the venerable press men for the Southam chain. Charlie Lynch knows his name.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Charlie isn't here. You are.

**Mr. Horner (Crowfoot):** I am here and I guess, Mr. Speaker, I am going to be here next week too, and I will speak next week too and maybe I will be able to find out the exact spelling of that person's name and be able to put it on the record next week. I will have another speech on this bill ready by then. As I was saying, it is common knowledge that in 1963 a foreign government, a foreign country deliberately interfered with the elections—I might say with the free elections in Canada. It is common knowledge who the Liberal Party hired from the United States; let me put it that way. Maybe they did not send him up here, but they hired him. It is common knowledge, also, that in the last election campaign Liberal Party finance men went to the United States, to ITT and other corporations and asked for money.

Can the amendment as it was first moved be policed? I readily admit that this would be very difficult. But the moral spirit of that amendment would have to be lived up to by the parties. They would not be able openly to send their finance men into the United States to collect money. They would not be able to go down to the United States and hire men, something which is not necessarily wrong but in spirit might not be quite correct. But this subamendment, tagged on this afternoon, certainly spoiled what was a good intention. Rather than attempting to clarify and simplify the situation, it has only complicated it by creating two levels, 50 per cent for corporations and 10 per cent for unions located in Canada. An international union may have its head office in Chicago and it may locate in Canada if it so desires. Many international companies locate in Canada and international unions could locate here also if they desired to change their head offices before an election. To move from Chicago to Toronto would not be an impossible thing for the Brotherhood of Railway Engineers. That could be done in order to contribute legally to the party of hon. friends to my left.