

kind of security we want or could tolerate. The truth seems to be that to get security we must take risks. I ventured to suggest that to the minister the other day when he was speaking about the foreign exchange control board. Perhaps that was in Shakespeare's mind when he made one of his characters say—I think it was in Macbeth—"You all know security is mortals' chiefest enemy." That may be a somewhat mysterious statement; nevertheless I believe if we examine into our own minds and study history we shall find that if a man or nation concentrates exclusively on the getting of security, that man or that nation will not get security. I believe we can say that security in a free economy depends on having enough people who are ready to take risks. These are the people who get the thing going; these are the people who provide work for others, and the role of the state is not primarily to provide security but to provide opportunity, and to create an economy conducive to freedom and enterprise. No one will say that we have made a perfect job of it, but great things have been done, and what we need to do is not to change the mainspring, though we may need a better regulator.

Security has come through a multitude of individuals prepared to make the most of their opportunities. At this point I should like to interject this question: what brought our ancestors to this country, from the earliest ones who came from the north of France and then from Britain, on down to the ones who came more recently from the continent of Europe? Did they come here looking for security? They came here looking for opportunity. That is what brought all of them here. Almost without exception they came looking for opportunity, and happily we are able to say that on the whole they found it.

This is not the time or the place for me to take time to discuss the merits of free enterprise and socialism, but I should like to quote something from a man whom I believe no one will regard as a reactionary or a narrow-minded supporter of free enterprise. I refer to the late Lord Keynes. Before quoting him I want to say that just before the statement I wish to quote he had spoken about the extension in certain ways of the traditional functions of government. I trust that hon. members to my left may listen to what Lord Keynes said, because I believe they have respect for him and because I think it tells the story so well. After speaking of the functions of government Lord Keynes said:

There will still remain a wide field for the exercise of private initiative and responsibility. Within this field the traditional advantages of individualism will still hold good.

Let us stop for a moment to remind ourselves what these advantages are. They are partly advantages of efficiency—the advantages of decentralization and of the play of self-interest. The advantage to efficiency of the decentralization of decision and of individual responsibility is even greater perhaps than the nineteenth century supposed; and the reaction against the appeal to self-interest may have gone too far.

He is a little cagey there. I continue.

But above all, individualism, if it can be purged of its defects and its abuses, is the best safeguard to personal liberty in the sense that, compared with any other system, it greatly widens—

Mr. MacINNIS: That is a big "if."

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I am ready to admit that. You see, I did not leave out that "if." I continue with the quotation:

—it greatly widens the field for the exercise of personal choice. It is also the best safeguard of the variety of life which emerges precisely from this extended field of personal choice and the loss of which is the greatest of all the losses of the homogeneous or totalitarian state.

I commend this particularly to the hon. friends to my left, many of whom come from Saskatchewan, because that province probably is the most individualist and the most capitalist province in the whole dominion, composed, as it is, largely of farmers.

Under our system the duty of government is to create conditions to increase the number of those who will provide employment. There must be more enterprises, more people to take risks. For that there must be freedom for profits, too, because that is the way to distinguish between efficiency and inefficiency. That is the way and the only way to get the maximum production in a free country.

I want to say a word about workers on their own. Sometimes I think we forget them. A reference to security impels me, naturally, to speak of them. In the house the other day the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Claxton) said, as I recall it, that workers on their own numbered about half of the employed people in the dominion. I was surprised when he said that, but at any rate, it is a very large number. Workers on their own number something over 1,100,000. They include 630,000 farmers, 54,000 manufacturers, 99,000 in trade, 49,000 in fishing and logging, and so on. I should also add over a million people who are taking part in pension schemes, in other words, seeking to look after themselves. What is the characteristic of all these people? The characteristic is that they have a sense of responsibility in that they want to look after themselves. My own riding is full of people like that. There are hardly any other people in it. There are large numbers of them in every riding.