

communists? Why is it that only communists are always right? When the leaders are communists, they talk about the revolution and when the leaders are from private industry, they talk about reactionary attitude and repression. Then, in the countries where people are fighting for their freedom, they call that a repression.

But, when a government takes over the whole country, they call that a popular revolution for liberation. Let us try to understand something. Let us have a look at the People's Republic of China to see what kind of freedom people have. Let us have a look at the USSR to see what kind of freedom they have. Even scientists are put in prison in Moscow because there is no freedom in that country. If Chartrand, Pépin and Laberge were to act in Cuba as they do in Montreal, they would be sent before the firing squad within 12 hours, everybody knows that. But in this country, they are free to talk. I have no objection to their voicing their opinion. But, Mr. Speaker, those people who call for freedom want to be free to take our freedom from us. You understand what I mean. This is the kind of freedom they want. Once we have lost our freedom, we will be unhappy.

We saw some years ago young students in Czechoslovakia, in Prague, ask for permission to write what they thought. The government said: No. The young people rebelled and they wanted to recover a part of the freedom their parents had abandoned some 30 years earlier. These are the sons of those who made the revolution who ask today for the freedom to write what they want in Czechoslovakia. What was done about it? Russian tanks were sent to crush those who talked about the conquest of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, why does the New Democratic Party always take the defence of communists, socialists, those who reduce the freedom of the worker, of the human being, of industries? We allow them to organize themselves, we have enabled unions to come into existence. Here in Canada, we still have a right to have a different opinion and to tell frankly, bluntly and even stupidly that we do not agree with someone. We have a right to fight. And we would lose this right? They would like to take it from us? If ever people like Messrs. Pépin, Laberge, Chartrand and Charbonneau have the power in a province like Quebec, we could give up our individual freedom as lost. We will no longer have the right to express ourselves freely as we have at present, this sacred right that we wish to preserve and maintain.

Mr. Speaker, once more I will be asked: What has this to do with wiretapping? This has a lot to do. I suggest that these people should be continuously watched. This is why we are surely going to support Bill C-176, because we are neither ashamed nor afraid of our acts, even less afraid to express our views. We will not prevent Mr. Chartrand and others from expressing their views but we will prevent them from organizing indictable offences, killings, like disputes between workmen who are doing the same job. Some people even said that organized crime has infiltrated the QFL. A few politicians said so, and I even think it was Mr. Jérôme Choquette.

Mr. Speaker, we must protect society and in order to trace criminals, even the New Democratic Party agrees that wiretapping must be used. But once they are traced,

Protection of Privacy

they are given too much freedom. Yesterday or the day before the Solicitor General was speaking to students at Vanier College. He was referring to the rights of inmates and he admitted that the latter had not enough freedom. Everyday a few of them escape. Two more escaped yesterday from a penitentiary. Others will do the same. He also referred to capital punishment for notorious criminals who are undoubtedly guilty, but who, he said, would not be hanged. The minister said that he blames first prison guards who are too strict. We should be more liberal, more human, more tolerant in other words, to enable inmates to escape. He is now referring to the death penalty. He says: "I have yet to sign the death warrant of a convict. If I had to as he confided to the Vanier College students, I wonder if I could continue as solicitor general. This means that he would resign if he had to sign a death warrant.

[English]

Mr. Allmand: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I stated my position on this question to the House of Commons, and I do not think the newspaper report correctly states what I said yesterday at Vanier College. If the hon. member wants to know my position on this matter I shall be pleased to convey it to him.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): I take the minister's word. But this appeared in another newspaper this morning, *Le Devoir*. It says:

[Translation]

The restoration of a punitive system would be a backward step." This was stated by the solicitor general. Is it not true?

Mr. Allmand: True.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Is that right?

Mr. Allmand: Yes.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Fine, it is true. In the next column, the following can be read: "An increasing number of abortions are performed in Canada." On the same page, that is on page 7, it says in one column that we must be more lenient for gangsters and prisoners and in the next one: "An increasing number of abortions are performed in Canada." We are increasingly ready to approve that.

Mr. Speaker, this has not much to do with wiretapping, but still then we could probably—

Mr. Prud'homme: Such is not the government's policy.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Indeed no. The minister is entitled to his opinions, but I know that some of his Liberal colleagues entirely disagree with him, especially as far as the death penalty and criminals are concerned. In fact, we saw it when a vote was held on the matter.

However, Mr. Speaker, this is all to say that subversive activities exist and must be controlled. Unless one is a revolutionary, one has clearly nothing to fear from wiretapping, the police, or anything else. I have never been roughed up by the police, yet I have met some. If I made