

The Address—Mr. Pearson

And as Dr. Eugene Forsey put it, I think very well, in the Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, some time ago:

Canada is both two nations and one; two nations in the ethnic cultural sociological sense; one nation in the political legal constitutional sense.

I believe we should recognize that in the historical and linguistic and cultural sense our country is basically composed of two nations which must have equal rights and equal opportunity in our land. But that is not enough, Mr. Speaker. May I quote from the brief of McGill University to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, some words which I think are very pertinent on this point, and very wise:

The future of Canadian federalism depends upon a series of new relationships in which minority and majority perspectives from the older period become refashioned. This means particularly not only that French speaking Canadians shall feel at home in Quebec, but also that they shall have opportunities for fulfilment without minority feelings in Canada as a whole.

The same applies to the English speaking majority, and this is the basis of partnership. But partnership itself is not enough in this country. The brief goes on to say this:

Whatever the character of the Canadian future, any suggestion that a two-culture society means a two-race outlook would be totally incompatible with the multi-ethnic character of the present Canadian population. While a partnership between the two founding peoples and cultures may have some historical validity—

I believe it has.

—such a partnership concept has no meaning today except for the partnership between cultures. There are no second-class Canadians, and the future of a socially healthy Canada depends not merely upon a recognition of the vitality and relevance of both cultures but equally on the vitality and relevance of all the non-French, non-Anglo-Celtic minority groups that comprise the Canadian montage of today.

● (8:20 p.m.)

I believe these words to be profoundly true and the concept embodied in them is the only concept on which we can grow as a united, progressive Canada. But above all—and I should like to end with these words—we must also recognize that a single Canadian state, a federation, also exists which unites as Canadians the two founding groups and those of other races who have joined us. So there is a Canada above its parts to which we owe loyalty and service. This need not conflict with any other loyalty to province or race.

When we no longer talk about Canada and Canadian unity in this country, Canada is on the way to disappearing, and who will gain

[Mr. Pearson.]

by that among all the people who have settled and developed this great country? None of us wants this to happen, and it will not happen.

I know, and I have emphasized, that regional, provincial or racial feeling is legitimate and important in itself. As Lord Acton put it in a famous essay, the combination of different nations in one state may be as necessary a condition of civilized life as the combination of men in society. That is true. But Canadian unity cannot be maintained nor the federation whose centennial we shall soon be celebrating survive, if provincial or racial feeling is carried to the point of reducing to a weak abstraction loyalty and love for Canada as a country. There is no more important task before us in this parliament as representatives of all the Canadian people from every province and from every part of Canada than to see that this does not happen. And I believe that in this session of parliament we can make a useful contribution to seeing that it does not happen.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, the house has listened attentively to the far-ranging and interesting speech which the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has just delivered. Many of the things he said this afternoon and this evening will, I am sure, be concurred in by members of this party. I could not help but feel, however, when I was listening to the right hon. gentleman, that in his recent trip to Camp David to visit with President Johnson he must have made a deal by which in return for supporting United States policy in Viet Nam, President Johnson allowed him to use some of the left-over slogans from the recent election campaign down there.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Cheap.

Mr. Douglas: I am sure I will be pardoned if I have become somewhat sceptical about the sudden enthusiasm for social and economic reform which the Liberal party always displays when it is in trouble. When the Prime Minister was outlining some of the facts regarding poverty and suffering in this country—facts which some of us have been drawing to the attention of successive governments for more than a quarter of a century—I could not help but recall that we have had a Liberal government in Ottawa for 33 years out of the last 45.

We now find that after 33 years of Liberal administration we have to mobilize a war