

right to speak. That is a matter of shame for all of us, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that incidents like that make it doubly clear how necessary it is for us to establish this committee and also how necessary it is for the committee seriously to consider recommending a definite declaration of rights for our Canadian people.

Having made it as clear as I can that I support actively and aggressively without any reservation those who, like the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), press the necessity of maintaining and preserving our traditional freedoms, I want to go on and say that it seems to me that we must now move further. In my view, freedom today is threatened principally on a different front from what has been the case in the past. Freedom is threatened today by the tyranny of economic processes which doom hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of people to a lesser life than that to which they are entitled. The great charters of freedom which we have had in the past and to which reference has so fittingly been made in the course of this debate all came out of precise situations. They expressed the desire of mankind at a particular stage in his development to win his freedom from a certain kind of oppression which was bearing down upon him at that particular time. Freedom is not an abstract, nebulous thing. Freedom to human beings means freedom from whatever tyranny would enslave man at that particular time. So it was with Magna Carta, so with the Bill of Rights, so with the declaration of independence, so with the declaration of rights of 1789 and so on. It is still true that we must guard against the tyranny of the state, as was the case with all those declarations. But it is also true that in our world today we have another kind of tyranny which is even worse than that which our grandfathers and those who came before us experienced. One of the beginnings of that realization was high-lighted in the enunciation of the four freedoms when it was declared that, in addition to freedom of speech and of religion and of assembly, we must also have freedom from fear and freedom from want.

I have used the illustration before, and perhaps I might be permitted to use it again, that our grandparents in this country twenty-five, fifty and seventy-five years ago lived economically at a level much below ours today. They struggled with the elements and with primitive means of agriculture and industry. In their day the main freedom they required was freedom from the interference of the state and freedom for Canada in terms of responsible government. We still need

those freedoms. But for us, and particularly for our children and our grandchildren, there is something else. Even if they have freedom from domination of the state, they will not really be free unless there is economic freedom, unless the people have an opportunity to live in the kind of homes which make possible healthful and decent living standards, unless all children born in this country have an opportunity for equal education, and for all such education as they are capable of taking. People will not be free unless there is security against unemployment and against having their whole lives mortgaged by the expenses of hospital and doctor bills. In particular, they must have security in their old age.

Our grandfathers did not have to worry so much about economic forces. They were all together in the battle against nature, the battle against the conditions of that day, with the primitive means at their hand. But our children and our grandchildren are up against forces of an economic nature over which, as individuals, they have no control.

It is still true that the state must not dominate the individual; but it is not good enough just to say that the state must be pulled off. The state also has a responsibility to individuals to see to it that their freedom and their fundamental rights are not interfered with.

I know that this poses a real problem for our day, and for the generation which succeeds us. The problem is one of how to achieve security without losing one iota of freedom. I have already admitted it will be a task. We shall have to carry forward the eternal vigilance which has always been the price of freedom. But the tragedy today, as I see it, is that so many people who espouse the cause of freedom take it for granted that it is a choice between freedom on the one hand and security on the other. This is portrayed before us in ideological terms. We have had it suggested that there is no other choice than one between the supposed freedom of western capitalism without security and the supposed security of soviet communism without freedom. But one of the most sinister threats to freedom today is the confusion of thought which takes that view and stops there. If we are to think this thing through we shall come to the place where we shall realize that neither is satisfactory, and that it is not a choice of either security or freedom; they go together or both will be lost.

I want to make my position perfectly clear, that if that choice had to be made I would choose freedom, and use that freedom to fight for security, rather than give up my freedom for the purpose of attaining security. But that