

WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT CAMPAIGN FUNDS—SAYS PARTY SYSTEM MUST BE SUPPORTED

(Floyd S. Chalmers in Financial Post)

The question of how election campaigns are to be financed has assumed considerable importance in the minds of the public generally since the unfortunate revelations in connection with the Beauharnois Power enquiry. There are a few short-sighted people who feel that campaign fund contributions are wrong and that there is nothing more than that to be said. But most people are inclined to take the view that our present system of government makes it essential that there be donations to political party funds and what they are concerned with is finding a way to make such contributions useful to the state without being dangerous.

Our system of government is based upon the party system and, more specifically, upon the two-party system. Theoretically a great deal can be found that is wrong with the two-party system but in actual practice it has the ultimate merit of being satisfactorily workable. There is a great value to the nation in having two parties, each striving to win public favor through its promises or its actions, each watching carefully the other party for signs of wrongdoing and each attempting, through the years, to elevate its own principles and practices.

Where Parliamentary Government Starts

The average man is apt to think of government as starting when Parliament assembles. But before there is a parliament, before any representatives of the people have been chosen an expensive process of selecting, advertising and running candidates has been gone through. The work is as much a part of government under our system as are the actual deliberations of parliament in the making of the laws. The point at which it differs from law making and law enforcement is in the fact that there is no contribution from the public treasury to this expense. The public acts upon the general assumption that it does not cost any money to run for parliament and that there is no need for party organization outside of parliament. But this assumption is nothing but a polite fiction which enables those citizens who wish it entirely to avoid bearing any share of the cost of creating governments.

Since party organization is an integral part of government it should be supported by the citizens. If such support is easily and openly forthcoming from citizens generally there will be no inducement or temptation to scratch for party funds in interested circles where the contributions will be given with unfortunate strings attached. Every citizen in Canada should make some annual contribution to the maintenance of this portion of governmental activity, either by way of fees paid for membership in a political association, or by way of contributions to expenses of political organizations or individual candidates. If everybody in Canada belonged to a political association and paid a nominal annual fee for his membership there would be no need for large campaign fund donations by corporations or wealthy individuals. The man who is a determined Liberal should belong to the Liberal party and pay his annual fees. The man who is a Conservative should belong to the Conservative party and pay his fees to his local organization. The out and out Independent whose motto is "May the best man win" is not debarred from contributing a small sum for campaign expenses to those candidates who, in various elections, provincial, federal or municipal, are supporting the doctrines he believes in. He might even support a Liberal at one election and a Conservative at another.

But this is something of the counsel of perfection and it is hardly to be expected that parties can be managed and campaigns be fought on the money that might be received from many small individual donations. There must be big money in a campaign or at least, so experience in Canada, Britain and the United States seems to indicate. Where is this big money to come from?

Large Contributions

In addition to the individual good

citizens from coast to coast who are interested in the proper functioning of governments, there are many thousands of corporations large and small that have a definite investment in the country which they wish to see protected by good governments. Ideally the corporation should consider its political contributions much as it considers its tax bills or its payments to organized charities. Definite appropriations are made for these annual expenses in business and a definite appropriation might be made by each corporation for its contribution to political funds. Since, in the long run, there is little concern by most companies whether it is a government of one political stripe or of another that is in power, so long as it is good government, the funds might be divided equally between the two major parties with such reservations for other political groups as the directors of the company see fit to make.

But at this point we run into a snag that diverts the current of idealistic philosophy. There are corporations, just as there are individuals, who do not agree that they would as soon have one government as another in power. A company that feels that a protective tariff is essential to the protection of its investments will probably feel that the best interests of its shareholders are served by the rule of a Conservative government. Or at some specific period, a corporation might feel that it would benefit greatly from a trade treaty advocated by a Liberal party organization, or by some policy suggested by a Farmer or Labor group. Are we then to criticize the corporation that makes its entire contribution to one party in the hope that the financial sinews so provided will strengthen that party and give it impetus for victory? No reasonably minded person could object. For an individual or corporation to be expected to contribute to the funds of a party which is advocating policies that that individual or corporation considers to be inimical to its interests and dangerous to its investment is absurd. It is at this point that the menace of campaign fund contributions arises.

Enlightening Incident

It seems to be clearly established, for instance, that the Conservative party prior to the last election turned down an offer of a contribution from the Beauharnois interests. What might be established, if there were further enquiry, is that this contribution actually found its way into the hands of one of the financial officers of the party but was returned at the request of the leaders of the party. Sceptical persons will not agree that the Conservative party took this stand because of any desire to be holier than the Liberals. It may merely have had knowledge of the contributions that were made to the Liberal party and have wished to keep its skirts clear of Beauharnois in order to have a Beauharnois scandal as an anchor to windward in case it failed to win the election. But the money that did not come from Beauharnois to the Conservatives must have come from some one else and there can be little doubt that extensive contributions were received from industrial, transportation and financial interests who—as outlined above—felt that they would achieve more benefit from the election of a Conservative government than from the election of a Liberal government.

If campaign fund contributions by wealthy individuals or corporations are proper, but, while being proper, harbor potential menace, what system can be established to permit such contributions, and still remove the menace? How are we to remove the taint of bribery and corruption from such contributions? There seems to be but one answer to this question: publicity.

Publication One Cure for Wrongs

In the United States publication of all campaign fund contributions is required. The viewpoint of American business men and newspaper men whose opinion was sought is that the system has worked to advantage. It would probably be even more successful in Canada where there is a more acute public insistence upon honesty in high places.

The policy that might be made the basis of concurrent Dominion and provincial legislation is about as follows:

1. Every donation to a political fund or to the expenses of any political body would be published. Whether the donations were published in newspaper advertising, in an official gazette or merely in a typewritten document to be posted on a bulletin board in some governmental office is not material. It is only necessary that they be placed where they could be studied by newspaper men and opposition politicians, who would be quick enough to give larger publicity to any particularly large or suggestive donations.

2. Every candidate would be required to continue the present practice of publishing his campaign expenses but in addition he would be required to state the source of any contribution made to those expenses and to indicate also what share of his expenses were borne solely by himself. Where assistance was provided "in kind," such as through the loan of vehicles, contribution of advertising space, free printing, etc., the extent of such assistance would be shown if it had a fair market value for similar service above a certain nominal minimum, of say \$25.

3. General party organizations also would publish their statement of expenses.

4. Exception would be made of legitimate membership fees, not exceeding a fixed nominal annual amount in party organizations.

Secrecy One Thing Wrong

A policy of publicity in connection with campaign fund and political contributions would go far to remove the odor of impropriety that now surrounds this business. It would not make the financing of political effort more difficult; rather by putting campaign funds on a fixed plane of propriety, it would encourage membership in political parties, and would encourage more small and scattered contributions. It would remove large contributions from the class of graft or bribery, for there can hardly be such a thing as illuminated corruption.

The one thing that is wrong with the financing of political campaigns is not the collection of money but the secrecy that surrounds the transactions.

The answer to corruption is illumination.

SAYS MEN HOLD THEIR OWN AS CANDY EATERS

(New York Sun)

"A headline recently declared that men are the greatest buyers of candy in the United States," declared Mr. Sweetser, although the article modified this somewhat by stipulating that women were the ultimate consumers.

"Be this as it may, I nevertheless think from personal observation that the men can hold their own also when it comes to the matter of candy consumption, and I base my conclusion on what I have observed on subway and elevated stations, where the little slot machines dispensing gum and chocolate are always within arm's reach.

"For some time prior to seeing this article in the paper I have amused myself each morning by watching machines at the station I used. And allow me to state right here that women are not the chief consumers of these sweets by any means. Not so's you could notice it.

"And not only that, but I notice in the trains themselves that if any one happens to be eating candy it's usually a man. Why, I can pick out a man who usually travels on the downtown train with me who makes it a morning practice to indulge in a package of small hard candies from the time he gets on until he gets off at Chambers street.

"Yes, men may be the greatest buyers of candy in the United States, but here in New York at least I wouldn't be a bit surprised if they are the greatest consumers also."

If the South really wants to dispose of that surplus, who doesn't it agitate for a return of cotton stockings and the voluminous old-fashioned night-shirt?

THEY SAY ON TELEPHONE IS NOTHING MUCH

(Chicago News)

"Guess who this is?"
"You wouldn't kid me, would ya?"
"Naw, I wouldn't kid you!"
"Oh, yeah!"
"How about seeing ya?"
"All rightie?"
"See a show?"
"Swell!"

The above conversation, believe it or not, was given as a typical cross-section of what goes over the telephone wires of our great city between 7 and 9 in the evening, and supports nicely the recent survey made in New York by three investigators of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, who found that the average vocabulary used over the telephone consists of 737 words.

Experts Are Questioned

Two telephone officials and a switch-board operator at a busy hotel switch-board were questioned today in an attempt to learn what words are most used by Chicagoans over the telephone.

The results follow:

Everett Friganza, official with Illinois Bell Telephone Company—"We have never made a survey of words used over the telephone, but my personal observations would lead me to believe that 736 is a high estimate. The most used word probably is 'yes' or one of its corruptions. It signifies 'I agree' or 'I hear you' or 'I understand' and very often is the only word a man can get in when talking to his wife.

"Goodmorning, good-by; number, please; thank you and hello follow in close order. Hello, however, is not as popular a word as it used to be, because most companies ask their employees to answer with the name of the firm."

"Number, Please," Ranked High

A. G. Pasnby, traffic engineer with the Illinois Bell Telephone Company—"If you consider the responses of the telephone operators probably the words that go over the wire most often are 'number, please, and 'operator.' Unfortunately, 'hello' is still used widely, although it means nothing as it is used. The word 'yes' should be placed high in the list."

Elizabeth Watson, good looking hello girl in a big hotel—"Sometimes we can't help overhearing conversations and what people say most is: 'Guess who this is,' 'Oh, yeah,' 'All rightie,' 'Nice weather we're having,' 'I'll be seeing you,' 'Give me a ring sometime,' 'Toodles,' 'Well, can you beat that.' They don't know any 737 words."

HARVEY PEOILE IN COLLISION IN SACKVILLE

Sackville, Sept. 13—J. A. Murray, of Harvey Station, York County, and Gordon Swan, of Fredericton, who were in collision with a Sackville car on the Brunswick hill here Friday night. The local car, which belonged to Tom Hing, was being driven by Edward Bonnell, who was accompanied by his brother, Sidney, and Cedric Chase.

Brownell claimed that Murrays car was coming down the hill on the wrong side of the road and that he night. The local car, which belonged to Tom Hing, was being driven by Edward Bonnell, who was accompanied by his brother, Sidney, and Cedric Chase.

Swan, who was cut badly about the head when he was thrown against the windshield, was taken to the Amherst hospital for treatment but was able to return here next day. Brownell had his face cut slightly. Both cars were badly damaged.

Provincial Policeman Morgan, who investigated the case, brought a charge under the Liquor Act against Murray and Swan for consuming liquor in a public place. They were fined by Magistrate Steadman here and proceeded by train to Truro Saturday.

Oh, many a girl a hope-chest has,
Prepared for Cupid's dart,
That all the hope is in her chest,
Instead of in her heart.

FOUNTAIN PICTURES

She was feeding at the fountain—
Feeding doves that flapped in air
Round the spray of splashing waters.
'Twas a picture passing fair.
Roman maid, in flowing garments,
At the fountain's marble brim—
'Tis a painting I'll remember
Though my zest for art grow dim.

In that courtyard, cool, refreshing,
Feathered creatures learned to love
This demure patrician's daughter,
Friend of swallow, wren and dove.
She was feeding at the fountain
When the painter caught the pose
By gay waters, iridescent,
At her sandaled feet, a rose...

She was feeding at the fountain,
And my vision went to smash.
On a drug-store fountain high stool
She was scooping in the hash
With a double chock-lut soda—
What cared she for keeping thin?
She was feeding at the fountain
With a trickle down her chin!

And I thought, oh my, oh mercy!
Maidens, since that ancient time,
Pictured feeding at the fountain,
Do not make a scene sublime!
—Gene Morgan in Chicago News.

"It is made from kaolin, a fine variety of clay resulting from the decomposition of the felspar of granite rock mixed with oxide of zinc and zinc stearate" just a disillusioning analysis of face powder wherewith millady recovers the bloom of youth.

Come To — A Printing Office For Your PRINTING Requirements

LETTER HEADS

ENVELOPES
PROGRAMMES
WEDDING INVITATIONS
BILL HEADS
HONEY LABELS
AUCTION SALE HANGARS
BOOKS
DODGERS
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
MENUS
BUTTER WRAPPERS
VISITING CARDS

CIRCULARS
CARDS
LEGAL FORMS
REPORTS
CATALOGUES
STATEMENTS
RECEIPT BOOKS
POSTERS

ALL KINDS OF
CIRCULARS AND PAMPHLETS
Printed to Order

PRINTING IS OUR BUSINESS
NOT A SIDELINE

The Entire Printing Department of THE
MAIL is at Your Service in Your Printing
Needs.

Mail Printery

Phone 67 627-29 Queen Street
FREDERICTON, N. B.
Printing That Combines Price With
Satisfaction