

Supply—Justice

this: We are worse off than before and 90 per cent of our economy is still under French control. That is the kind of independence they now have in Algeria, after a bloody seven-year war.

This is the kind of fight the R.I.N. would like to start in the province of Quebec and we refuse, in Canada, and specially in our province, to follow the example of Europe.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit me a question?

Mr. Caouette: Yes.

Mr. Mongrain: Does the hon. member, the leader of the Ralliement Cr ditiste include in his remarks the Ralliement National, or does he speak only of the R.I.N.?

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, if the Ralliement National has dispositions identical to those of the R.I.N., I put it exactly in the same group as the R.I.N.

Whether one is called the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Gr goire) or any other name, it is not by shedding blood that we shall save Canada. That is not true. We shall save the country by good understanding, comprehension; not by understanding only in one corner of the country, but by understanding in every corner of Canada.

Mr. Chairman, the English speaking members from the west or from the maritimes should try to understand our point of view, as we in the province of Quebec understand theirs, and we will then see that everything will be fine even in the York-Humber constituency.

Mr. Chairman, it is a point on which—

Mr. Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): The hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) did not understand.

[English]

Mr. Caouette: I just said one thing. I said that when our English speaking members of parliament from the west, from central Canada and from the maritimes understand those of us from Quebec as we understand them, we shall have co-operation and understanding—even in the riding of York-Humber.

Mr. Cowan: You have that co-operation and understanding in York-Humber now.

[Translation]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to some conditions prevailing in the

[Mr. Caouette.]

province of Quebec. No protection is granted to those who are molested or assaulted by those new modern savages: there seems to be a lack of interest in such behaviour. Public and private property is damaged but this is overlooked.

• (9:00 p.m.)

I think action should be taken. I do not, I repeat, wish to prevent anybody from joining the R.I.N. if he wants to do so—if someone wants to waste his time, let him join—but I do not think anyone should be allowed to tamper with the property of others. We do not want dictatorship, from the R.I.N. or from any other organization.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I wish to add that I agree with what the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent), who spoke before me, said a while ago on the subject of capital punishment. The hon. member said that he himself was in favour of abolishing capital punishment but that a vote had been taken here in parliament, a free vote, and that the house had declared itself to be in favour of retaining capital punishment. It is a fact that the government did not care a rap about the vote taken in the House of Commons. So little store is set by the free vote that another has been announced in the house, to take place in a few weeks.

Are they now trying to prepare a free vote which would not actually be one? I, for one, am having in my riding a referendum on the matters of capital punishment and separatism, so as to know the opinion of my constituents.

As far as capital punishment is concerned, out of 856 answers received, 475 were in favour of maintaining capital punishment, 310 were for its abolition and 71 were undecided. That is the result to date. This means that opinions are rather equally divided; 475 against 381, the difference is less than 100 between those who are in favour of maintaining capital punishment and those who want its abolition. However, the fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that when a vote is taken here in the House of Commons, a free vote, when parliament decides by a majority vote to maintain capital punishment, then the government should take this result into account. We are told that we will be called upon to consider an amendment providing that if a policeman or a prison guard is killed, then the murderer of that policeman or prison guard could be executed.