

The philosophy of the minister—Professor of National Health—is only too apparent. Is Canada a tired old country with a tired, sick and incompetent population that some of our politicians think she is? Not yet, thanks be! But how soon will she be?

Sweden, the model socialist country, with the highest suicide rate in the world—which I have visited numbers of times and have lectured in—is frustrated and unhappy. Socialist Great Britain is almost bankrupt, yet we rush into socialism with far costlier schemes than ever thought of. The minister's edict that we must keep everyone that refuses to work, his contemplated scheme to guarantee an adequate yearly income for all Canadians—to a degree that is right—and now this compulsory medical services scheme, only portrays too well his philosophy and his thinking—mere textbook economics. But just as economic servitude makes for political helplessness, so does economic freedom make for political independence.

In a speech in Toronto recently the minister, when talking about automation and cybernation, made this remark:

It may well pioneer a new system of income maintenance and social welfare for all the population. . .

The wrongness of this legislation lies in the opportunism with which it has exploited a few splinter party votes, to make basic changes in the fabric of Canadian life. These rash and radical political pressures have left us in an economic mess in which the Minister of Finance has indirectly attempted to forestall the onrush of socialism. We face a tangle of welfare programs which have so institutionalized poverty as to make the practice of being poor, and on the public dole, a legitimate job classification in the eyes of many.

In his remarks on automation and cybernetics—the latter word coming from the Greek word meaning myth, the study of communication and control in living organisms or machines, which the medical profession have been doing for years—he stated it was the building of a new and great society. We cannot have the so-called new and great society until we have the responsible society—the society where it is more profitable to work than not to work. You do not help a man by constantly giving him more handouts. I accept the opinion of Penfield rather than that of the minister.

For centuries, philosophers and patriots have repeatedly warned mankind to guard against unchecked majority rule. Popular

sovereignty is a safeguard against certain forms of tyranny: it can also be as tyrannical as any other form of despotism. It may ignore all restraints, claim an unlimited power and justify that power on the grounds that its actions represent the general will. Madison, the great constitutionalist, said:

There is nothing to check the inducements to sacrifice the weaker party or an obnoxious individual.

Alexander Hamilton added:

You must first enable the government to control the governed, and in the next place oblige it to control itself.

In the western democracies the doctrine of the general will, which places the power of governing in the hands of the majority, emerged only after the people's basic individual liberties were firmly established and powerful non-governmental organizations and institutions existed to defend individual liberty.

It must be remembered that individual liberties were not created by the relatively simple act of granting the franchise.

Liberties and freedom were created by various interests so organizing themselves that they were in a position to fight for their rights. The franchise was the reward of such determination and conviction. In this regard, John Stuart Mill has stated:

The rights and interests of every or any person are only secure from being disregarded when the person interested is himself able, and habitually disposed to stand up for them. . . Each is the only safe guardian of his own rights and interests. Human beings are only secure from evil at the hands of others in proportion as they have the power of being, and are, self-protecting.

And, as Pope John XXIII stated in *Mater et Magistra*—Mother and Teacher:

Experience, in fact, shows that where the private initiative of individuals is lacking, political tyranny appears.

John goes on further to state:

At the outset it should be affirmed that in economic affairs first place is to be given to the private initiative of individual men who, either working by themselves, or with others in one fashion or another, pursue their common interests.