

Leaving my listeners to study further in the speech of my colleague the matter of federal aid, I shall advance some ideas: first, on the meaning of education; second, on the place of the educator in a world of social change and, third, on a special organization for education which we might well encourage for the national and international good.

Many and diverse are the definitions of education that have been advanced and great are the differences of opinion in regard thereto. I shall only define it indirectly as I develop my idea. Perhaps I shall define it negatively, as to what it is not, rather than positively, as to what it is. Hon. members would be astonished at some of the misconceptions held and the theories advanced. For example, we find that one hon. member of this house has said:

I suggest that we do not always educate our men and women for the callings for which they are best fitted.

And again:

This nation cannot afford to waste many of those people by educating men and women for the wrong jobs.

Here is a conception or misconception held by some, but surely one would expect more in a speech on education from a public man in this house. It is a question, of course, of the difference between education and training. The terms are not synonymous. Might I suggest to hon. members generally, and to the hon. member whom I have quoted in particular, that education is not necessarily the fitting of a man for a job. Education is a thing of the mind and spirit; its purpose is the creation of a personality, the acquirement on the part of the individual of a broad culture, the creation of a being with a proper sense of values and with the mental equipment for a full and happy life.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Does the hon. member suggest for one second that as much is being done in the old country by way of university training for veterans and ex-service men as is being done in Canada?

Mr. KNIGHT: I did not make any such statement. I said not a word about veterans. The minister seems to be a little touchy on the matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE: We are miles ahead of them.

Mr. KNIGHT: I do not think the minister needs any defence for his scheme, and if I were in his place I would not say so. Nothing used to make me so angry during my teaching years as to have a parent say to me, "But my Willie doesn't need French or literature," or what-

[Mr. Knight.]

ever subject he had failed in, "you know he's just going back to the farm"; or "Mary is going to be a dressmaker; why should she read all these books?" Well, now, we have come to the argument of the hon. gentleman. One should say to such people: "Let Willie be a farmer; we hope he will be a good farmer—it is a fine profession; it will provide food for his body, but why should we on that account starve his soul? If he is to work with his hands, if Mary is to work at what may be a monotonous job, all the more reason why their minds should be stored with some of the great thoughts of literature. All the more reason that they should have at hand the greatest thoughts of the greatest men of all the ages, and what is important, some power to interpret them." I am going to pass over the statement of the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Ross), who, speaking of his Ontario constituency, said: "We do not need education." It is refreshing to read elsewhere the words of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner). He said more in a breath than the author of the speech I quoted said in forty minutes. He said:

A man appreciates being on a farm just a little bit more if he has had the opportunity to get a university education. That should not prevent a man from working with his hands if he has the right kind of stuff in him.

Good! Hear, hear! Education, in the sense I understand it, is not wasted on anyone, no matter what his occupation is to be.

I am not opposed to vocational training or to the teaching of skills; far from it. But let me say this. Let us beware of going too far with this evident trend in utilitarian education. It has been intensified during the war. It is the craze of the machine age.

Knowledge does not necessarily give wisdom, and our science is on the way to destroy us, and will destroy us, if we have not with it the sense of proportion and of values which only true education can bring. Let us beware lest our educational system, in its worship of material things, may gain the whole world and lose its own soul. We must be realistic, you say. Exactly. "Education has now to take on new and terrible responsibilities," President Truman of the United States said the other day. Realism, yes, but the only true realism is idealism; without it civilization cannot survive.

So much for what education is. Now as to the need of it and the teacher's place in it. Harried as we are by the day-to-day call for solution of imminent and immediate national problems, we have been inclined to neglect, federally, the importance of education in a changing social order; and as I speak I am