

rampant electorally as it is to-day. It is not a case of \$5,000 or \$10,000 in a constituency, but it is a case of large sums of money for corrupt purposes.

I recall the sermon of one minister of the gospel who dealt with the matter in one of the provinces. I recall his observation that after a certain event there were a great many five dollar bills available, and that by reason of that condition there was a prosperous time in the community in question. People gave the names and the days and the dates and seemed to be rather proud of the fact that they got it. What are we going to do to deal with that situation? The election act has to do with it in many ways.

Contributions to political parties are not in any sense censorable. I know of men who make contributions to political parties the same as they do to their churches. But a levy is an entirely different matter. When an organizer goes to a contractor and says that he wants one or ten per cent, that is a levy and not a contribution. What is more, I say that it threatens the very life of this state at this moment.

I am going to remind the Prime Minister that there are two matters which he must not forget. First of all, there is the question of the export of power. The statute confers upon the governor general in council the power to grant or refuse a licence for the export of power or natural gas. Parliament has placed that duty upon the governor general in council. Parliament has decided that that duty should be discharged by that authority. Not long since the Prime Minister said that he did not desire in any sense to be dictatorial about these matters, and the net result was that this matter is referred to parliament.

Let us see what this reference amounts to. I read these words:

Legislation will be introduced with a view to furthering the principle of parliamentary control of the export of electrical power.

Parliamentary control means the voice of the commons, the senate and the crown combined together. This means a statute that either repeals or amends or in some way modifies the existing statute. As I say, parliamentary control means control by parliament, which is the crown and the senate and the commons. If legislation of that character is to be introduced it must be recalled that this house has already given unanimous approval to a bill of that kind.

The power sought to be exported is power which would be derived from the Beauharnois undertaking. That is number one.

[Mr. Bennett.]

If parliament is to pass upon this matter it must be a free parliament. As I say, parliamentary control means the commons and the senate and the crown, but we have something further than that. We know that in the exercise of its power parliament has seen fit to declare that the Beauharnois undertaking is a work for the general advantage of Canada. This parliament has jurisdiction and the power to deal with the whole situation.

There is a history connected with Beauharnois that is not to be forgotten. Evidence has been given under oath that shares in this enterprise are in the hands of members of the senate and that at least one of them received \$200,000 for the Liberal campaign fund from the promoters of the enterprise and made a profit of \$529,000 out of an investment of \$30,000. That is written on the record. The shares acquired were 800 units of the Beauharnois syndicate at a price of \$30,000. These became 1,600 units in the second syndicate and as was his right, the senator subscribed for 1,600 further units in the name of J. R. Lefebvre and that made his holdings 3,200 units. On the whole transaction he realized, as of December 17, 1929, \$529,600 profit and 14,040 shares of class A stock of the Beauharnois Power Corporation Limited.

Then it goes one step further. Mr. Swezey returned to give further evidence that Senator Raymond had received from him some \$200,000 for the campaign fund of the Liberal party. I put this to the house. There is a situation where the treasurer of the Liberal party—Senator Raymond has been appointed treasurer of the Liberal party—and the head of the organization, Senator Lambert, met the cabinet only a few weeks ago, and we now have this obligation that must be dealt with by parliamentary control, meaning the senate the commons and the crown.

In view of what I know of the character of the methods by which contributions are made—they are no longer contributions but levies—I say the time has come when we must provide methods under our electoral law which will not permit such a situation to continue. I am not hypocrite enough to say to the members of this house and the people of this country that I do not know that contributions are made to all parties. A contribution is one thing, but a levy of a certain per cent is another. The time has come when this must stop. The contractors themselves are complaining.

Mr. HOWE: As one who places a great many contracts for this government I ask the right hon. gentleman to give me a specific instance of a levy.