

Emergency Planning

Third, the review committee would examine the information presented to ensure that stringent guidelines protecting the rights and civil liberties of individuals are respected.

Fourth, only if the Parliament of Canada declared a national emergency in relation to war or public order and subject to the passage by this House of specific enabling legislation, could internment action actually be taken. It is important to point out that all these safeguards would be taken into consideration before internment action was taken.

Fifth, as a final safeguard against potential injustice, such legislation would guarantee a detainee the right to appeal his detention to an independent advisory committee appointed by the incumbent minister of justice, which would have the power to review all information pertaining to the case, and, if justified, order the release of the detainees.

These proposed procedures clearly illustrate the concern found throughout the federal government, that the security and safety of the state must be preserved by measures that respect the rights and freedoms of individual Canadians to the fullest extent possible. I think anyone who is objective and fair-minded in evaluating these criteria could come to no other conclusion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has expired. The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Kelly).

Mr. Norman Kelly (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, my attention was drawn to this issue for the first time several months ago when I received a number of letters that proclaimed the imminent creation of a fascist dictatorship in Canada. I did not know what those letters were referring to. Like all good members of this House, however, when approached with a question to which I do not know the answer, I made the proper inquiries. I found that the situation is exactly as the preceding speaker outlined it. I communicated that to my constituents. I found that there has always been legislation of this sort; that this is not something new or sudden, and it certainly is not something that is unexpected. I also found out that the legislation is outmoded.

All of us in the House are used to seeing things change through the passage of time, so why should we be surprised that this sort of legislation would have to address itself to situations that change through time as well? Recognizing changing circumstances and the need to respond to those changes, the government decided to review, amend and introduce new portions to this type of legislation which has always been with us. I think every member of the House would be critical of any government that did not do that to all legislation. I do not think anyone in the House would look suspiciously at the government for reviewing and updating this particular legislation at this time.

When we look at the amended document, however, what do we find? What are the horror stories that we have supposedly been hiding from the general public? We find that we have

divided emergencies into two categories—war and peace. I do not think anyone here would dispute that type of categorization. It seems to be obvious. We have tried to target it in such a way that it can be applied to municipalities and to provinces, regionally and nationally.

In light of the debate I have heard in the House over the last few months about the diversity of the country and the need to develop structures, that reflect and cater to this diversity, I wonder what is so offensive or, to the hon. gentlemen opposite, what is so amusing, about creating a piece of legislation that recognizes that diversity and attempts to respond to it?

Mr. Hargrave: You did it by order in council.

Mr. Kelly: We find the government has decided, organizationally, to divide its response—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hour allotted for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock later this day.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

AMENDMENTS WITH RESPECT TO SEXUAL OFFENCES AND THE PROTECTION OF YOUNG PERSONS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Chrétien that Bill C-53, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to sexual offences and the protection of young persons and to amend certain other acts in relation thereto or in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. When the debate was interrupted at five o'clock this afternoon, the hon. member for Lethbridge-Foothills (Mr. Thacker) had the floor.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thacker: Mr. Speaker, at 5 p.m. I had been speaking for some ten minutes, and I had been setting out some of my thoughts on the principle of these sections which are before the House in Bill C-53. At that time, I was pointing out that there has been a general lowering of standards in our country over the last few years, and I think most hon. members would agree. One need only look at the television programs which are the daily fare of our young people, who are of prime interest to me. One need only go into the bookstores and see the books