

by spending large sums of money in paying newspapers to print articles which when printed would appear to the public to be from the pen of the editor, or the proprietor, or of some one employed on the paper, but which in reality are simply paid campaign literature. Now, I do not go so far as to say that any corporation or individual shall not have the right to insert in any publication any views or expressions of opinion in the nature of campaign literature which they may wish to present and pay for; but I do say where such contributions are made during an election for the purpose of influencing the electorate, all such matter paid for in that way should show on its face the fact that it is paid for by the particular person or corporation that is contributing in this manner to the election of a candidate or candidates, or to the support of a political party. I think the amendment is one which will appeal to hon. members as being wholly in the public interest, and I hope it will meet with the acceptance of the committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am not opposed altogether to the principle involved in the suggestion, but it is pretty far-reaching, and I would not like to say offhand that I would approve it in the form submitted by my hon. friend. I have not had any opportunity of discussing the question, or of examining it, and I would rather that a matter of such great import as involved in this amendment should be left over until we can give it further consideration. I think there is something to be said in favour of compelling a man who inserts paid advertisements in newspapers to have it stated some place on the advertisement that he has paid for it. I have known articles to appear as news articles which were paid advertisements and in some way or the other they were misleading; but this is a sort of omnibus affair. I think if one paper copied something from another paper, or if I took an editorial from the Ottawa Citizen and had it published in the Toronto papers I might be liable to disqualification, and also to heavy penalties, if I did not state at the bottom of the article that I was paying for its insertion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not under this amendment as drafted.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not know, you read it for yourself; it is too big a proposal to consider offhand. I do not want either to condemn it or to approve it. It is a pretty late hour to bring this question in when

we discussed it at an earlier stage. Very little discussion took place on it, but we did discuss it, and when we did I thought for one that the matter had been dropped. However, my hon. friend has brought forward this amendment. What I would suggest to him is this: Let the Act pass. We are going to have a by-election in the course of a month or two under this Act, and we will see from that election how it works out. If there is necessity for this amendment, bring it up at the next session of Parliament and have a thorough discussion of it. I would not like to commit myself or the Government—I would not seek to commit any one in the House—until I have pretty thoroughly gone into it. On the whole I am not opposed to the principle but I would not like to accept it without further consideration.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have no objection to the minister taking whatever time he wishes to consider this amendment, but I do most strongly object to having this Bill pass without having the committee consider it one way or the other. I regard this amendment as more important than any section of the Bill respecting contributions for political purposes. Unless the minister is agreeable to having it considered, I shall not only press it now, but shall also press it on the motion for the third reading of the Bill. It is directed wholly towards the protection of the public against the corrupting of the press by large business interests and the influencing of the electorate in a manner which is highly contrary to the public interest. I have no objection to the amendment standing until the third reading.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I will agree to that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think if in the meantime hon. members have an opportunity of studying the amendment they will approve of it. I was surprised to hear my hon. friend say he thought it was dropped, because I was most emphatic in declaring that I intended to introduce it. I recall that my hon. friend said when I spoke to him of the amendment that he thought it followed the law in New York State, I have reason to believe that it does follow some law in that State as well as similar laws in a number of other States. It is simply a means of precluding large and powerful wealthy interests corrupting public opinion at the source by inserting articles in the newspapers during an election—it is confined to that period—articles which are in-