

Measures Against Crime

General (Mr. Allmand) never net any sportsmen or knows nothing about the use of firearms. Do you think a criminal will care about Bill C-83? He keeps on laughing while we discuss it here, and murders are committed in Montreal and all across the country. So instead of eliminating criminals they try to bother a whole group of sportsmen, not only sportsmen but honest people to boot.

Considering that we should never lay the blame on the object, but on the one who uses it;

This is what is important. The guy who uses it is the very one we should catch. The object in itself, registered or not, does not change anything much.

I resume the quotation:

We propose that the highest authorities in the land be asked to see to it that all bills introduced by Messrs. Ron Basford and Warren Allmand be withdrawn which are designed to amend the Criminal Code of Canada in such a way that all owners of sporting guns and rifles be required to have a permit to keep them, that said permit be renewed every five years, that to obtain a permit the applicant be required to produce the statement of two guarantors, that persons of less than 18 years be required to have a special permit signed by two guarantors, or otherwise, to restrict hunters and sportsmen generally.

The association recommends that those things be deleted in the bill.

In the hope that you will act to implement our recommendations, I am

Yours truly,

Acting Secretary
Quebec Wildlife Federation
Raymond Pelletier

I do not know whether the right hon. Prime Minister has replied to that letter, but I feel the letter is entirely proper and logical. The adoption is recommended of an act that would not create problems for sportsmen, hunters and other honest people, but would instead be designed to keep criminals out of circulation.

When one sees how justice applies to criminals today, one wonders. Fellows appeared before the Commission of Enquiry into Organized Crime, whose constitutionality has just been recognized by the Supreme Court of Canada, bandits, in Montreal, guys who admitted having killed. At one point, they were released on bail, they were allowed to go about freely in Montreal, to everybody's knowledge. Is that justice? We wonder then—

At any rate when I hear the Solicitor General declare that there are other ways to protect our society than capital punishment, I ask which are they? Is Bill C-83 supposed to reassure the public? The head of the Commission of Inquiry into Organized Crime, Justice Dutil, has even been heard tell witnesses: Do not worry, do not be afraid, you are protected by the commission. We shall protect you against any aggressor. Since that time, at least half a dozen people have been assaulted and killed, even though Justice Dutil had promised them the protection of justice.

The Solicitor General is an inconsistent dreamer who does not understand anything about the problems of public security. The people are shocked and rising against the irresponsibility of the Solicitor General of Canada. He has to hide to shun police associations as well as other groups of citizens who want justice to prevail. The Solicitor General declared: Before I give up, I shall resign. I held an

[Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue).]

inquiry in my riding recently, I have data which were made available last week end. On Bill C-83, as on other legislation regarding capital punishment, out of 813 answers from all kinds of people, Liberals, Progressive Conservatives, Social Crediters, 706 out of 813 favour restoring capital punishment and 87 are against.

Not too long ago on television, I watched on CBC or a private station an interview with the hon. member whose name of the riding I ignore, the one containing Mirabel not far from Montreal, Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes I believe, who said that the whole population there was in favour of maintaining capital punishment, but that he was against it. It is his business to be against, but when you represent a population, I think you must take into consideration the feeling of that population—

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is giving his own summary of what I said, but they are not my exact words. If by any chance he was interested in receiving the complete account of the proceedings at the Liberal convention, maybe he could be invited in the future. I will take pleasure in sending it to him. His ideas might be broadened, and the report itself might tell him exactly what took place at that time.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I take the hon. member's word but I saw him being interviewed on television. People were being questioned on the street, voters of his riding who were categorically in favour of maintaining the death penalty. And, I saw the hon. member reply on the air that he was personally in favour of abolishing the death penalty and that he was going to vote according to his conscience and not that of the voters of his riding. That is what I heard.

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out once again to the hon. member that I am very glad to see that he listens to me with so much attention when I speak. That is very nice; perhaps I should tell him that I personally made a survey and that on this side of the House we have members as hard working and valiant I think as those who follow the leadership of the hon. member and that in my riding the question that was asked was whether people were in favour of replacing the death penalty by a minimum term of imprisonment of 25 years. In my riding and several others, to the question put in that way, the percentage of people in favour of the death penalty was little over 50 per cent.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): The parliamentary secretary might let me finish my speech and then say the trifle things he just used to suggest that he does not say what he is but admits nevertheless that a majority of people in his riding are in favour of maintaining it. We are outside the subject, and I will come back when we discuss Bill C-84. Mr. Speaker, I am out of order now because we are discussing Bill C-83, but I simply want to draw your attention to the fact that the registration of firearms does not bother me at all. It is mainly a harassment for honest people, those who practice a sport or those who may use a gun or a firearm, for instance, in self-defence. These people may be bothered.

But the criminal, as I say, will not be upset in any way. When a thug is determined to kill somebody, no need to