

*The Address—Mr. Goyer*

jurisdiction, which, at any rate, are theirs under the constitution.

Moreover, French Canada makes sure of having safety-catches, especially in the field of their language and culture, and that is normal.

But, in doing so, they are not advocating isolationism. On the contrary, this action, in my view, reflects the will to have vested rights respected and to claim the means by which those rights can blossom out to benefit national unity.

On the other hand, in matters of joint jurisdiction each government should agree to co-operate closely and constantly.

Let us take the case of the St. Lawrence river, for instance. It has, of course, lost nothing of its majesty over the years but, to-day, its waters are polluted and this spoils any pleasure which the riverside population, particularly the people of Montreal, could enjoy. The province and the municipal governments can certainly help lessen water pollution in the St. Lawrence by providing a sewage disposal plant. But what will the result be if the federal government does not shoulder its responsibilities? It falls to the government to ensure observance of the required sanitary measures all along this river which starts at the Great Lakes.

That is practically a new field of endeavour which calls for concerted action by all levels of government.

What about the Ottawa River, one side of which is polluted by factories while the other is kept clean for summer vacationers?

Many examples could be given to prove beyond doubt the interdependence of the different governments.

Finally, there are matters which fall exclusively under the federal jurisdiction and about which there could not be any agreements with one or more provinces without jeopardizing the national unity and throwing the general interest of the country out of balance.

This does not rule out consultation, always possible and often useful, between governments, but such consultation could not lead to specific agreements without the entire approval of the federal government.

What I deplore is the fact that the federal government has often lacked originality, not above all, in the preparation of new policies,—quite to the contrary—but in the modernization of its existing policies and in the expression of the positions it adopts. We seem to be lulled by red tape and to be delighted by past experiences, in contrast to the dynamic and adaptable nature of a modern government.

For instance, transportation in general comes within the federal jurisdiction. How come there is hardly more than a start on the co-ordination of the various means of transportation in Canada? While it is not proof in itself, this example could be multiplied and lead to the conclusion that there is, in areas of exclusive federal jurisdiction, room for improvement of current laws and corresponding services and for the elaboration of a new act, and all this for many parliaments to come.

[*English*]

I should like to refer now to a field which is exclusively federal. The Speech from the Throne contains an announcement concerning a bill to give our country a national anthem, "O Canada". I hope that this debate, relating to a very distinctive sign of our national entity, will be pursued in a constructive manner. Personally, as a French Canadian I have no objection to the preservation of certain ties with the Crown, ties that can be depicted by external signs. I have no objection even if the only reason for this were the recognition of the historical role British institutions played with regard to the survival of the French fact in Canada.

I will add a more fundamental reason. This action would be an appeal to the feeling of mutual understanding which should inspire all of us if we wish to live together as partners. If a number of Canadians deem it necessary to retain certain external signs of attachment to the Crown, we should be ready to accept them. It is my fervent hope that we may show deference to the Crown while accentuating more and more our national identity.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, although I have discussed at length the problem of provincial-federal relations and of strictly federal jurisdiction, I would not like to leave hon. members under the impression that this is the only high priority question in Canada. It seems to me equally urgent to adjust our economy to changing conditions and to new techniques, to maintain our continuing growth, to quickly balance the rate of economic development in the various areas of Canada and to restore human dignity to those who wallow in poverty; our responsibility to share in a peace offensive throughout the world and to raise the living standards of the hungry.

Upon reading the second annual report of the Economic Council of Canada, I noticed in