

not trust to probabilities. The government and legislature would be wanting in their duty to the people if they ran any risk.

Cartier spoke, and he said that—

—the matter resolved itself into this: either we must obtain British North American confederation or be absorbed in an American confederation.

Listen, please, to this, in the same debate. I am going to leave only one paragraph with you. It is a graphic picture presented by that dour Edinburgh Scotsman, George Brown. He was talking about the historic battles between Britain and France, and about a just settlement in Canada, and these were his words:

Here sit the representatives of the French population discussing in the French tongue whether we shall have it. . . . Here sit the children of the victor and the vanquished, all avowing hearty attachment to the British crown, all earnestly deliberating how we shall best extend the blessings of British institutions.

These were three great men speaking in a great debate.

Now I want to say a very brief word about the essential features of the international bill of rights. In considering the proposed international bill of rights and the position which will be taken by Canada in respect thereto, I believe it is necessary that we should give some thought to the nature of the rights which we seek to protect and conserve. Lord John Russell, that great lover of liberty, notes three kinds of liberty, which I will just mention:

(1) Civil liberty . . . the power of doing that and that only, which is not forbidden by the laws. This definition comprehends the security of person and property.

(2) Personal liberty . . . the power of doing that which in itself is harmless, as speaking or writing, and of which the abuse only is criminal. Religious freedom and eligibility to office may also be comprehended under this head.

(3) Political liberty . . . the acknowledged and legal rights of the people to control their government, or to take a share in it.

Later in the same discussion, which is found in Ernest Rhys' "Growth of Political Liberty", Lord John Russell, while pointing out that civil and personal liberty have existed to a certain degree in despotic states, concludes in these words:

The only efficient remedy against oppression is for the people to retain a share of the supreme power in their own possession. This is called political liberty.

Professor Reginald Trotter—and I am sure you have all read his recent book—in his "Charters of our Freedom" comes to a similar conclusion. He says:

Freedom . . . means many things. Freedom in relation to government and law has two sides, civil liberty and political liberty . . . Experience has shown that without political liberty, civil liberty is in danger.

We feel, sir, that in our British and American systems of democratic parliamentary government we have a good working plan of political liberty. But I feel sure that when the question of fundamental human rights and freedoms comes to be debated by the united nations a school of thought will find expression there which will disagree profoundly with our theory that freedom depends upon our system of political democracy. It may well be, Mr. Speaker—and this is a matter for the committee to consider—that the international bill of rights, when it emerges, will fall far short of that which we as Canadians would consider desirable and even fundamentally necessary. If our conceptions of freedom are in the long run to prevail, the minimal bill of rights which is likely to emerge from the united nations assembly will require many amendments and augmentations in the years to come. For that process of spreading the spirit and the substance of freedom among other peoples we must prepare ourselves by experience, by example and by education.

I recall a speech that I heard delivered by Field Marshal Smuts, when I was a young undergraduate, to the red-gowned students of St. Andrew's university in Scotland. He spoke on freedom:

In the long run only the spirit of international comradeship can solve the problems of freedom and of peace. But in the meantime the supreme cause has to be kept going, and to be safeguarded from all danger, till the coming of a new renaissance of the European spirit.

Just a word to the house, if I may, on the source of freedom. As one delves, as I have delved somewhat in recent months, and as my hon. friend from Lake Centre has delved for some years, into the literature of freedom, one observes two specific approaches to the subject, apparently in direct conflict with each other. One school of thought regards freedom as the state of nature and looks upon all law making as tending to restrict man's natural and original freedom. Algernon Sydney says this:

The liberties of nations are from God and nature, not from kings.

Lord John Russell, probably the greatest apostle of liberty in many centuries, said:

What is called love of liberty means the wish that a man feels to have a voice in the disposal of his own property and in the formation of the laws by which his natural freedom is to be restrained.

The other approach seems to regard each segment of freedom as something wrested from authority.

There was a fine presentation made—and I shall not refer to it in detail at the present