

*The Address—Mr. Pearson*

to deal in its jurisdiction, and which are often parallel to the federal.

● (8.10 p.m.)

A healthy federalism, a co-operative federalism is one in which the two levels of government both fulfil their own responsibilities; and respect each other's, but they do so taking into account their mutual concerns. Where they are responsible for parallel action it should be concerted action and therefore must be built on consultation and co-operation, I believe, Mr. Speaker, to a greater extent than previously, and that is the policy of this government. That is what we mean by co-operative federalism.

It is the policy expressed in, among other things, the formula for making our constitution wholly Canadian by removing the necessity to go to the United Kingdom for amendments. The formula we are proposing—I referred to it this afternoon and am just going to mention it tonight—brings to a culmination many years of patient negotiation on the basis, which all practical Canadians have recognized, that we in Ottawa must have the agreement of all ten provinces on any amending formula. If we cannot get that agreement, and I believe we can—I believe we are getting it now—the alternative is to go back to Westminster and ask the British parliament to take on the responsibility of amending our constitution.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** You are still going to have a British statute for a constitution.

**Mr. Pearson:** This policy involves no abandonment nor weakening of the powers given the federal parliament and the government by the constitution, to act on behalf of all the Canadian people who are represented in this parliament. There are certain powers in the constitution that are reserved to the federal parliament and government, and no government that believes in Canadian strength, progress and unity, and in its duty to all the people of Canada, can give these up.

The point, Mr. Speaker, is that we must exercise these powers effectively, and to do this we must recognize the realities of our history, our geography and our confederation, and the conditions on which our country's unity and progress depend. We must bring the federal-provincial relationship into line with these conditions. That is the basis of co-operation with the provinces which enables us to exercise effectively those powers of national leadership which we must have at the centre, and which it is this government's intention to use, firmly and as wisely as we

can, for the benefit of all of Canada, and only in this parliament is all of Canada represented.

Good federal relations are an important part, an essential part of national unity. Equally important, and in a sense connected with them, is a clear understanding of the nature of our confederation, of our country, dual in its origin, with a basic English speaking-French speaking partnership, multi-cultural and multiracial in its development. We are the stronger and the richer because of the nature of our origin and of our development, although the extremists and the indifferent do not seem to realize it.

It is my view, contrary to what the right hon. gentleman said this afternoon in a very pessimistic statement, that extremism and disunity are weakening, that moderation and good sense, the moderation and good sense of all the Canadian people, are growing, and that difficulties and problems are being faced and that they will be overcome.

Much of our difficulty in strengthening national unity, as I understand it, is due to the ignorance of the character of our confederation, and indeed due in some part at least to confusion and misunderstanding over words. There is no doubt we are one confederation. We are one state, one country before the world. Are we one nation or two? Are we one race, or two, or many? Are we one culture, or two, or many?

There is a special difficulty—and I think we must face up to it and, if we do and solve it, it will remove some of our problems of semantics—over the word "nation"; and this difficulty, which leads to confusion, comes from the identification of nation and state.

France, for instance, is one nation and one state; but not Switzerland, or Belgium, or India, or Malaysia, and a number of other states in the modern world. In this sense many nations do not have, nor do they desire, political sovereignty. The term "nation" as I understand it, belongs to sociology, to history and tradition. It indicates the way of life of a group of human beings, a group with common language, traditions, culture, customs, feelings and, above all, the will to live together as a group. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this justifies and explains the validity of the concept of a French-Canadian nationality.

As the right hon. gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition, said on July 22, 1963, in this house, as recorded at page 2442 of *Hansard*:

When confederation took place, a new nation was created in the partnership of two basic nationalities.