## INTRODUCTION

The exercise of rights and responsibilities is the heart matter of citizenship. It is generally understood that to be a good citizen is to embody both public and private virtue. Historically, citizenship has evoked feelings of belonging and loyalty; the good citizen was not only a law-abiding member of society but also a patriot. As well, an attachment to common purpose and ideals has long been associated with the principle of citizenship, while their setting and definition has occupied the time of many of our best minds. However, despite this intellectual expenditure, there seems to be little agreement on what being a good "Canadian citizen" exactly entails.

As with other political precepts, discussions about citizenship often tend to the search for "ideal types". The assumption is that if we could only come up with an agreed upon definition, or set of qualifying characteristics, then all else -- including appropriate behaviour -- would somehow follow. In our deliberations we have consciously avoided this approach. Rather, we have proceeded sociologically, viewing citizenship as a process or as the vehicle through which it becomes possible to ask a host of questions relating to social and political organization and participation. Citizenship is a dynamic concept that has changed over time and will continue to do so. To those who believe it can be captured in definitive legal terms or gilt bound abstractions hung on study walls, we offer the caution of Kierkegaard's man "who lived his life in increasing degrees of abstraction only to wake up one morning to find that he had died."

Throughout our investigations we heard from those who lamented the apparent absence of a "national spirit" amongst Canadians. By this it was usually meant that for citizenship to have meaning it had to be tied to some overarching or transcendant national goals, myths or symbols with which all could readily identify. However, such a lack of symbols, or sense of mission, is, we suspect, due to the nature of our socio-political development.

Our founding was a "pragmatic" and non-revolutionary one, involving little more than the legitimation of self-government along the lines of traditional British parliamentary practice. Compromises were, of course, made. A federal instead of legislative union was agreed upon; thereby helping to allay fears amongst the population of Lower Canada that its culture would disappear. Such an arrangement also helped offset some of the concerns of reluctant Maritime entrants to Confederation. The provisions for "separate schools" and an Upper House adjusted to meet the requirements of local circumstance were all part of this original compromise. Ours was a founding that contained within it the seeds of pluralism. The survival of the francophone community was provided for and the Senate was to represent regional interests and concerns.

Given the rather mild nature of the exercise, there was little need to search for grand symbols or archetypal heroes; nor was there any reason for them to spring forth. At first, symbolic attachments were readily found in the Crown. As Sir George-Etienne Cartier argued: "If they (French Canadians) had their institutions, their language and their religion intact..., it was precisely because of their adherence to the British Crown." While not all French Canadians were as sanguine about British intentions and institutions as was Cartier, the Crown did provide