

Housing

and I can sympathize with the desire of the people who share it to get on with the problems as they see them without regard to the constitution. But what this really amounts to is the view that parliament ought to be able to transfer matters from provincial jurisdiction into federal jurisdiction whenever parliament, in its judgment, decides that a problem within provincial jurisdiction has become national in scope. And it means that parliament ought to be able to make this transfer of jurisdiction on its own initiative and by its single-handed action. If one wanted to be harsh one would say that this view amounts to saying that parliament ought to be able to amend the constitution unilaterally, without reference to the provinces whose jurisdiction is being changed.

The trouble with this view is that it is not really federalism. In many ways it is much more consistent with the operation of a unitary state. And a unitary state simply will not work in Canada. Theoretically—and I suggest that this is the view which is theoretical, not mine—a unitary state enables a country to deal with problems more quickly, more directly, more simply, as they arise. But if it means breaking up the country, what kind of efficiency is that?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: Surely we have learned that society and government must play the game according to the rules of the game. If we do not, then everyone will make up his own rules as he goes along. Some of them may be better rules, but if we have two sets of rules, or eleven sets of rules, we will have first suspicion, then friction, then disruption of the social order, and finally anarchy.

An hon. Member: Revolution.

Mr. Trudeau: You are always afraid of revolution. We hear a lot of talk from the other side—

An hon. Member: You alarm me.

Mr. Trudeau: I can see that you play by many sets of rules.

Federalism has its advantages but it also has its costs, as does everything in life. The cost to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) is having such members as that in his party.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bigg: We were looking for you in 1942.

Mr. Trudeau: Federalism gives us a country, it gives us a rich and diverse society, it gives us a degree of freedom which is to be found in pluralistic communities. But it does mean two orders of government; it means working together in solving some problems, and sometimes it means we have to change the constitution to keep it up to date and give to the federal government and to the provincial governments the new roles which are called for in this society.

I am afraid I shall not have time to go into the details of this debate, some of which were mentioned by the leader of the New Democratic party. All I can say is that the constitutional conferences which began in February of last year are going on as rapidly as the provincial governments and the federal government can make them go on. If the leader of the New Democratic party accuses me of hiding behind the constitution, let me remind him and this house that his was the party which for some years goaded the government side into dealing quickly and urgently with the constitution. At that time he felt this was the most urgent problem. Today it may be some other crisis. They go from crisis to crisis over there.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: I need only a few more minutes in which to finish, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to abuse the indulgence of the house.

This view of federalism does not imply a lack of federal leadership. Federalism means strong provincial governments and a strong federal government each in their respective fields.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: It does not mean a federal government which asks the permission of provincial premiers every time it wants to act, nor which capitulates in the face of provincial demands, whether fiscal or otherwise. It means broad enough constitutional jurisdiction for parliament to enable the government of Canada to act in the interests of the country. On the other hand, this view of federalism does not mean subordinating provincial governments to the will of the government of Canada, whenever, or even if, it would seem to be more efficient to do so. Nor does this view of federalism mean some fuzzy two-nation theory under which two unitary states Canada and Quebec, would somehow heal the wounds of separation and reconcile both old and new-found differences in an