

*Adjournment Motion*

by the inclusion in Bill C-77 of that power to prohibit and regulate public assemblies during public order emergencies.

● (1540)

Public assembly is another interesting concept, one that should be looked at. For example, when the Government assembles people for a meeting, can that be seen as a public assembly? Indeed, could the Government find that it was violating its own orders and then be subjected to some sanction through the court system?

One of the favourite arenas of protest now in Iran, which has one of the most horrendously oppressive and anti-human rights regimes in the entire world, is the soccer match. In that country a soccer match is not seen to be a public assembly. Those who are discontented with the regime's terrible oppression of people of different faiths or different political beliefs frequently congregate at soccer matches and take on from the soccer match to protest against some particularly repugnant act of that Government.

Would worship be defined as a public assembly? Could members of a church gathering on a Sunday morning, in ignorance of something having happened on the Saturday night, assembling for an outdoor service find themselves subjected to some form of control? By meeting outdoors they could be considered a public assembly. Even by meeting indoors they could be considered a public assembly. I believe that the Government would serve the public interest and its own interests better by discarding that provision.

**Mr. Hopkins:** Madam Speaker, I want to ask the Hon. Member who just spoke a question, one which I put to the Conservative Member who spoke last and who did not answer the question. As the Hon. Member knows, in 1960 the Diefenbaker Government brought in its Bill of Rights. After glorying in the publicity surrounding the Bill of Rights it then decided that it would not apply to the War Measures Act. If the Bill of Rights had applied to the War Measures Act over the years there would have been that very definite restraint built into the legislation.

Would the Hon. Member comment as to why the Diefenbaker Government would think of removing the War Measures Act as a piece of legislation that was affected by the Bill of Rights? Why would it not let the Bill of Rights take its way if, indeed, it was to be a meaningful Bill of Rights for the country?

**Mr. Parry:** Madam Speaker, I can understand the previous recipient of the question not answering it. Indeed, the Hon. Member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke (Mr. Hopkins) may find after I have responded that he would like to ask the question of another.

Of course, I cannot speak for the Diefenbaker Government. I can only say that every Government since the Diefenbaker Government of 1960 surely bears equal responsibility for the continued non-application of the Canadian Bill of Rights to

the War Measures Act. Therefore, I would assume that it was not only the Diefenbaker Government in introducing the Bill of Rights which said it did not apply to the War Measures Act but every subsequent Government that did not make the Bill of Rights apply to it. Those Governments are equally responsible for the decision since, of course, not to decide is to decide.

---

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 66, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow)—Science and Technology—Funding of research and development / Consortium's application for financial assistance; the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap)—External Affairs—El Salvador—Discovery of headless body of agricultural workers' representative / Canadian aid to El Salvador; the Hon. Member for Montréal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart)—Regional Economic Development—City of Montréal—Request for \$25 million grant—Government position / Aid—Government position.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### EMERGENCIES ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Beatty that Bill C-77, an Act to authorize the taking of special temporary measures to ensure safety and security during national emergencies and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines):** Madam Speaker, first, I would like to commend the Hon. Member for Kenora—Rainy River (Mr. Parry) on his reasoned approach to this Bill. He pointed out that this Bill far surpasses the War Measures Act in its approach to civil rights and in keeping a balance between emergencies, national disasters, wars or international occasions, and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the Bill of Rights, and the 1967 International Code enacted by the United Nations with respect to political and civil rights. Therefore, I expect the Hon. Member to support this Bill when it comes to a vote.

I am delighted to have this opportunity to speak to a Bill from a rather long record, good or bad, of local government administration where planning and preparedness with respect