

*Procedure and Organization*

speech. In our present law we have a limitation in respect to slander, limitations in respect to libel, sedition, obscenity, and so on.

We need to ask ourselves another important question: to what extent should the freedom of debate be tempered by the need for efficient operation and productivity? What should be the balance between freedom and efficiency? When we talk about productivity we get the impression from hon. members opposite that they do not believe productivity in this house to be important. Yet I cannot recall one election campaign in which the main basis of attack by the opposition has not been: how much has the government done? How many bills have they passed? During this debate the opposition gives the impression that productivity is not important—that the important thing is freedom to debate as long as they wish, or for as long as they think is in their interest. What are we to believe? Are we to believe them at election time, or are we to believe what they say in the course of this debate? In my opinion their credibility is greatly in doubt. Both things are important. There must be freedom of debate but there must also be a measure of productivity. I should like to quote from an editorial which appeared in the *Montreal Star* this evening. It is entitled: "Not for freedom". It says:

• (11:30 p.m.)

As they waged their last ditch battle against the government's time-allocation rule, opposition members of Parliament tended to present themselves as the last bastion protecting defenceless citizens from a government anxious to ride roughshod over their liberties. But it is a curious fact that the last time the opposition exercised its power to hold up legislation by filibuster, it was trying its best to prevent an extension of freedom.

The issue was the bill to amend the Criminal Code of Canada. By decreeing that it would no longer imprison homosexuals for acts committed in private, or doctors for performing abortions considered necessary to preserve the health of the mother, the government achieved a modest but genuine increase in human liberty.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Allmand:** I am surprised at the N.D.P., Mr. Speaker. I was attracted to its ideas in earlier years and had always looked on it as a party which believed in planning. I always thought that party was interested in planning and supported the principle that humanity should control its environment by planning, controlling and scheduling. Sad to say, that

[Mr. Allmand.]

party uses the concept of planning for its own political expediency. It is interested in planning when planning helps it and against planning when planning does not help.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** Be accurate, for heaven's sake.

**Mr. Allmand:** The opposition has alleged that this government and this proposed rule are dictatorial and autocratic. I ask, was the government being dictatorial or autocratic when it proposed last fall that the opposition should have more money to spend on research so that it could better criticize the government. Was that a dictatorial or autocratic action?

**An hon. Member:** No.

**Another hon. Member:** That was a waste of public money.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Could we have order so that the hon. member can deliver his remarks.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, he deserves to be interrupted for not being accurate.

**Mr. Allmand:** Was the government being dictatorial or autocratic when it proposed that as a general rule all bills ought to go through committee, thus prolonging the legislative process? Every bill is to be examined in a forum that is open to the participation of the general public. Expert witnesses may be called—

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** For one day.

**Mr. Allmand:** Is this government being dictatorial when it proposes that we have a bill of rights entrenched in the B.N. Act?

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Where is it?

**Mr. Allmand:** Is it being autocratic when it seeks to preserve the civil liberties of Canadians and their language rights? Is the official languages bill, which protects the rights of a minority, dictatorial? Was the government being dictatorial when it introduced the bill providing for regional economic expansion and industrial incentives with respect to underdeveloped areas of Canada? When the Prime Minister went out west recently and sat in the back of a truck in Saskatchewan exchanging ideas with farmers, was he acting as a dictator?