

they do they will find it is true that more and more people are going to high school and that life in school and high school is utterly divorced from the life of people who live in the neighbourhood of the school and support them. The result is that too many people are rushed into city enterprises; we have an abundance of people hunting for white collar jobs and too few people who are willing to do the very much nobler and better work of nation-building in the open spaces. I am glad that I have not had too much of that kind of education to prevent me thinking for myself, but we have an educational system that actually stuffs children with facts and creates in them a reverence for things as they are, and this is a great disaster to our children, because it hinders them in creating institutions to meet changed conditions. It is true that the best teachers go to the cities to teach, because they are better paid there. This is also true of preachers, I am sorry to say. The better preachers go to the cities because the salaries are greater. Anything, it seems, does for the country.

One other thing that has a great deal to do with the rural problem is this. Individuals and groups of individuals donate large sums of money to educational and religious institutions which grants have a moderating influence on the attitude of these and similar institutions towards economic reform that would bring about a better condition for the masses of the people. Until lately the fact that the farmer produced goods but did not market them added greatly to the rural problem. He was not a business man. Now the farmer is becoming a business man, and as a keen business man he is not going to put up with the slipshod methods that obtain particularly in this house and in some other places in Canada. I thought it would be worth while putting on Hansard this sentence of Professor Macklin, of Wisconsin university:

The industry that neglects to assume the responsibility of marketing its own products arrives last in the race for the consumers' dollar—like the runt pig.

The farmer is ceasing to be the runt pig and he is learning to market his own products. He is not going to be last in the race for the consumer's dollar, and he is going to demand educational systems that will meet his needs. I should like to know why some fellow, with a fossilized brain sitting in some office in some government service, should direct the kind of education which the children of farmers are to have, and I hope the day may speedily come when that will not be the case.

It would take much longer time than I have at my disposal to review the sufferings

of the farmer in the political field. The farmers, because there are more of them and because they carry on the primary industry of the country, have suffered more than any other class from political policies framed by governments antagonistic to the farmer's economic needs. The full discussion of this question would take me into the realm of finance, transportation, and many other places into which I have not time to go, but I want to review, for the edification of this house and particularly of the Liberal party, a history of the political life of Canada as it is related to the farmers just before and since 1896.

Prior to 1896 the farmers in Canada, to a very great extent, felt that the Liberal party, did voice their aspirations and needs. That is, the Liberal party was the vehicle used by the farmers for the expression of their political needs. For the seventeen years prior to 1896 many able men, particularly Sir Richard Cartwright and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, impressed upon the people of Canada this fact. The farmers believed that the Liberal party was opposed to special privileges, and particularly special privilege as it is embodied in the national policy. Sir Richard Cartwright made some very able speeches, opposing the protective tariff. On one occasion he said:

The moment you introduce the protective system you create a class whose interests are essentially different from those of the people at large, and who become ready contributors to corruption funds sharing with their masters the plunder they have been enabled to take from the people.

Mr. COOTE: It is too bad Cartwright is dead.

Miss MACPHAIL: Yes, it is too bad he is dead but in any case he was ruined before he died. Let me quote from him again:

My objection to this scheme goes deep. I object to it not merely on the ground of the increase of taxes that it involves, or of its complicated details, but on much higher ground than that. I deny entirely the justice of the principle that it is the duty of the government to enable certain sections of the community to tax the rest of the people for their private gain.

I think he puts the principle very clearly. I want to quote an extract from a speech by Sir Wilfrid Laurier given on page 380 of Edward Porritt's Sixty Years of Protection in Canada. This is a famous quotation which we have often heard. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking at Winnipeg as reported in the Free Press, said:

We stand for freedom. I denounce the policy of protection as bondage—yea, bondage; and I refer to bondage in the same manner in which American slavery was bondage. Not in the same degree, perhaps, but in the same manner.