

The cornerstone of Macdonald's dream—of his national policy—was a partnership between English and French speaking Canadians, making the best of the vast geographic challenge confronting them. This goal is as pertinent today as it was then but, like virtually all other things, the nature of the partnership and the details of the arrangements between the partners have changed substantially since the days of Macdonald.

They have been changed, redefined, in some respects even reversed, partly through informal means, partly even by changing the British North America Act. All these changes were necessary and, in the long run, no doubt advisable and desirable. But they have not brought us perfection nor a lastingly satisfactory solution to the kinds of tensions which are inevitable and can even be rewarding, in a multi-ethnic federal state. It is the very fact that we have not reached a lasting solution in the partnership that makes it imperative for each to find a mode of life with and alongside the other, while at the same time not so weakening the joint enterprise as to lay it open to further erosions of Canada's independence of action—economically, culturally, diplomatically—in relation to its powerful southern neighbour.

It is not unfair to say that although much has been achieved in the past in working out arrangements which seemed satisfactory at the time, there is at present clearly much discontent on the part, not only of provincial governments, and particularly that of Quebec, but also of various private groups within the provinces.

Important steps may have to be taken toward a redefinition of the partnership. In so doing, we at the federal level must remember that creative co-operation and interdependence in these fields, as in others, requires continuous consultation, not merely the presenting of proposals for comment. In devising new departures, alternative ways of doing things and compromises aiming at the mutually least disturbing arrangements we must, above all, maintain an open mind and a flexible stance. Nothing can be debarred from discussion and no approach should be ruled out as unthinkable. I am among those Canadians who are convinced that the long-run interests of both English and French speaking Canadians can best be met if we update our partnership in such a way that both come to feel strongly that our respective goals are being served and aided by the presence of the other.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss MacDONALD (Kingston and The Islands): This partnership has been strengthened by the presence of other groups and cultures. In addressing ourselves to the needs of the developing multi-culturalism of Canada I should like to pay particular attention to our native peoples.

The new national policy must spare no effort to provide full partnership to the native peoples. Although the numbers of these Canadians are smaller than those of some of the other main groups making up the country, the resources needed to be applied to achieve this end will have to be enormous—quite beyond what one would arrive at if one attempted to apply some sort of national per capita formula. The reasons are many, and relate to the nature and difficulty of the problem; our neglect of it over the years, and, let us admit it, the moral redress

The Address—Miss F. MacDonald

Canadians owe those they have so shamefully treated in the past.

More perhaps even than money, or at least equally, what is needed is the intellectual and creative effort to evolve new solutions and the moral and ethical courage to assign the problems of the native peoples the highest possible priority.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss MacDONALD (Kingston and The Islands): I must stress that I found the throne speech shockingly inadequate—in fact abysmally silent in this respect. There was not one single word about the native peoples, and yet there are complex and difficult problems associated with efforts to create conditions under which the native peoples can participate on a footing of complete equality with others, whose values they may not share and which they may not wish to adopt. But whatever the size of the challenge, or because of it, we must assign it the highest priority: the nature of the problems requires it, our past neglect imposes it and the human suffering and injustice involved cry for it.

• (1530)

This is not the time or place in which to become involved in the details of this revision of the national policy, but one fact is utterly beyond dispute. In coping with the problems, in all their varied manifestations and at whatever level, the full, free and vigorous participation of the people most affected must be sought and assured. It is no longer good enough to fashion policies and possible solutions, no matter how well-intentioned and, after they have been thought out, written up and congealed, present them for discussion to their "victims". The total involvement of the native peoples themselves, in the evolution of adequate policies must be the top priority and it must be accompanied by an important psychological adjustment on the part of those with previous experience in the field. There are those, Mr. Speaker, who, having spent many years following a paternalistic approach in their work with native peoples, may find the premise difficult to accept, but accept it they must, that even some false starts and potential errors may be valuable beginnings if they are made by a people working out their own difficult problems. In any event, a new national policy must rest on a vast and urgent attack on the inequalities and handicaps affecting Canada's native peoples and this attack must be centred on the full participation, from the beginning to the end, of those most affected.

There is another facet of national policy that is achieving a growing awareness in Canada—national independence. I venture to say that every national parliament that has ever assembled in our country has had to face in one way or another the three great issues of Canadian political history, national unity, national independence and national development. These three issues confront every generation of Canadians with new and different responsibilities; and from every generation of Canadians new policies are needed. But the underlining challenges to our continued life together as one nationality are in this twenty-ninth parliament, as they were in the first, national unity, national independence and national development. It