it down to 75 per cent. Some people say, "What for? You get no thanks. They are just making you a target." Propaganda is used to destroy people. That is not what we need in Canada at this moment. Our fight is over a silly thing called money. It is not worth while breaking up our country by trying to use the technique of destroying a person and trying to make people think that he is the leader of the opposition.

● (2050)

Before I leave this question of rights, whether you entrench it or leave it as a statute, it cannot be perfect. You try to level best to make it perfect, but it changes. Should you leave it so you can change it easily, or entrench it so it is hard to change? There are good arguments in both cases. All I am saying is I do not care which way it is done, it is not going to be perfect. The minute you get it done, someone will come along and say you have to change it because our ideas have changed.

Above all, I would hesitate to take away rights from a province in which there is a deep cultural feeling. It is very dangerous in the name of bilingualism to take away from Quebec, Manitoba, and I might even say British Columbia the right to control the language. The language is the key to their educational cultural function. In my view, we have no choice of saying that if you do not trust the provinces, you are not a country.

I would hesitate to divide the country on such an extraneous issue. It has been and is being resolved. A lot of credit goes to men like René Lévesque. He scared us into taking a hard look at it. There were others before, but René did it well. He really gives a shot. Sure, René is a socialist. He admits honestly he does not like English-speaking people, particularly from England and Montreal, but he likes the rest of us. I can understand that.

Let us get rid of these extraneous issues. Let us go forward together to see how we can get these rights put in there. Whether you take John Diefenbaker's bill of rights and entrench it it does not make any difference. This brings me to the point I started to talk about. I am glad the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) is in the chamber. Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that this is the only member of Parliament on either side of the House who agrees with me that for seven or eight years, through federal legislation and administration, in her department, under several ministers, we in Canada have deliberately discriminated against orphans? All the rest of the members seem to have had no great interest. There are not that many orphans. She has the courage to stand up and agree with me that there is discrimination, but we cannot get it changed. When you want to change the mandarins, there has to be awful pressure put on them. That pressure can only be put when the Prime Minister is behind the ministers. I am simply pointing out that not one of us is free from blame.

I could talk about air safety. We discriminate in our administration of government in Ottawa against all those who fly in commercial aircraft. I am talking about dying in a commercial aircraft.

Look at the attacks on the family which have occurred in this House over the past ten years. There have been insidious attacks on the family, the fundamental institution of any race, whether it be yellow, black, red or white. We, in the name of great objectives, have seen the family institution attacked. The family is in John Diefenbaker's bill of rights. It was the only bill of rights in the world to mention the family because all previous bills of rights had been brought in by Liberal governments all over the world. The Liberal doctrine is individualism above all. You naturally expect a Conservative government to mention the family because we add to individualism the right of groups, and the main group is the family.

The family has been attacked in this House and I have sat silent, wondering how I could sit there knowing that the bill of rights was being infringed before my very eyes. I do not excuse myself at all. It is so bad that the two Houses of Parliament, the Senate and the House of Commons, have set up a committee to look into this main technique of taking away our freedoms. It is the committee on instruments. They have a list a mile long where we have infringed the bill of rights. They will sit on that committee for God knows how many years. They will come back and we will put it into another committee to be examined.

Where are the voices of freedom when we lose these rights every day in the House? Now we all stand up on this resolution and sanctimoniously say we stand for freedom and want to entrench the rights, put them into a bill of rights. There is not one of us who would dare look in a mirror and say he is honest on that score.

I want to end my remarks with something positive. I stated earlier that if I had the time, I would mention co-operative federalism. These issues that we are fighting and trying to do something about today are not new. I belonged to a government which, rightly or wrongly, tried to establish a new technique of dealing with the provinces. I think I am the one who started the use of the phrase "co-operative federalism".

At one time I had 60 or 70 agreements with the provinces; roads to resources, forestry agreements, and transmission agreements. You name it, and I had an agreement and all the rest of it. We got along fine.

We set up the Canadian council of resource ministers. The first chairman was René Lévesque. When he found out that our interest was not politics but what was best for that resource, we decided on the jurisdiction, and asked those people to perform their function. We got along fine. We had co-operation on rivers. That is our record. We worked with municipalities. Even Duplessis worked with us. That co-operative federalism was based on sitting around with everybody as an equal, whether it was Prince Edward Island or Ontario, until we came to paying for it and then we had to share the costs.

We did a lot of work and spent a lot of time, but we had a considerable track record. Today we follow a different technique. It started in the Pearson days. He picked up the co-operative federalism concept. He thought it meant putting the ten premiers on one side of the table and him on the other. With