

of the Dominion to make anonymous donations to wipe out the national debt. I do not understand why there should be all this modest anonymity. Since we have started to quote Scripture in this chamber, let me cite the following words which I think describe the effect of the budget very accurately: "For he that hath, to him shall be given; and he that hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he hath." The budget plays with the tariff just as a boy plays with marbles to see how many he can catch when he throws them in the air. There is no real reduction in the tariff. No one knows that better than the Minister of Finance. If there is any reduction at all it is on things bought by people who could very well afford to pay higher prices. On the lower grade of cottons there is no reduction. Surely the Minister of Finance does know that the stretching of the percentage of labour and material that is to go into goods which enter under the British preference from 25 per cent to 50 per cent undermines the British preference. He does not think it was patriotic, does he? He does not believe it was in the interests of the common people, does he? I think not. I think the economic classes that control governments whisper very convincingly in the ear of the Minister of Finance, and he kept himself clear from the enlightenment that might have come to him from his western men. By listening to his own supporters and his stepchildren he might have heard the truth regarding this matter. But he shut himself securely away and so hearkened unto those highly organized and exceedingly wealthy groups who whispered to him what would look like a reduction in the tariff but would not hurt them in the least. I hope that my Conservative friends will not be further exercised about the manufacturers: I have no doubt they will pull through this year.

The history of the whole attitude of the Liberal party to the new groups since 1921 has been one of protestations of friendship which, if accepted, have proven to the honest the graveyard of their hopes and to the others a fulfillment of their treacherous plans. Speaking for myself, I would rather have the bitter, uncompromising, unfriendly and snobbish attitude of the Conservative party. At least it was honest and we knew where we stood. I often wonder why these Conservatives think they are so much better than other people.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): They look at the Liberals.

Miss MACPHAIL: I never could understand it. Certainly, however, if they are ever to get into power they need to lose that characteristic as rapidly as they can.

Mr. CHAPLIN: You said that at least they were honest.

Miss MACPHAIL: They were honest in their bitterness towards us. Now, a very great deal of criticism is directed to myself and others any time we try to point out that economic groups do function under parties, and that the only thing for us to do is to come out as an economic unit and find a place in this house, striving to have the rules and usages amended in order that our people may be given real representation. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) the other day quoted in the house an article from the Atlantic Monthly which was reproduced in MacLean's Magazine of August 15, 1927. In that article, under the title "Money dominant in politics," the following sentences appear:

These interest-groups, as we may call them, work for the most part within the ranks of the party organization. Indeed,—

This is an enlightening sentence.

—the chief function of the party organization is to furnish a cover or screen for the political activities of groups which desire to keep their true objectives invisible.

This is perfectly true, and we say therefore that the only thing for us to do is to come out as an economic group—a class group, if you like, for I am not afraid of the word—and seek representation in the House of Commons—a genuine representation of the needs of our industry. Politics is a business, and agriculture being the basic industry in Canada, the most important single industry in the country, has a perfect right to find for itself honest and above-board representation in this house. I should not like to say that only functional or occupational groups should come to this house, but I do think that the two parties are simply that. I would not say that others should not come, but I do say that we live in an age of functional organization: and since political life is only a reflection of economic life it is only reasonable that these new class, or economic, or occupational groups in the country should seek reflection in the House of Commons and should not find it necessary—certainly I do not—to apologise for their place here.

When we have electoral reform, when the Canadian people grasp the idea more clearly, particularly when they know that the old parties are simply systems under which class groups operate we shall see an increase in