

● (1720)

[English]

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Madam Speaker, although the hon. member who introduced this bill did not obtain unanimous consent for his amending proposal, he gave a certain undertaking. I think the House agrees with the bill in principle, and perhaps we could give it second reading and refer it to the appropriate committee without delay or further debate. As unanimous consent was not given for the hon. member's proposal, perhaps the committee might deal with it.

This matter deals with questions of propriety, and some may think that the federal parliament is not displaying good manners if it deals with the matter, as some provinces may be offended. I say this because of certain opinions which have been expressed in the past by the Department of External Affairs. I remember one occasion when the Department of External Affairs gave an opinion about the propriety of flying the flag of the Ukraine in front of City Hall. That opinion was not an opinion in the legal sense so much as an expression of belief. The department suggested it would be improper to fly the flag, and great difficulty resulted. Eventually the city decided not to heed that dubious advice of the Department of External Affairs and flew the flag of the Ukraine on Ukrainian national day.

Perhaps we ought to commend the hon. member for Moncton (Mr. Jones) for withholding unanimous consent. The hon. member who introduced the bill gave an undertaking; consequently, as I think there is general agreement, the subject matter of the bill should be sent to committee.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) was surprised because representatives of the official opposition and of my party had not taken part in this debate. The reason has now been given by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker). We know that some genuine questions could be asked about this bill, but we think that the idea that we should make sure respect is shown for the emblem of this country is good, and we support it. Therefore, we think it would be a good idea to read the bill the second time and send it to the committee.

The hon. member who introduced the bill has indicated the changes he will make. He was not given consent for those changes to be made in the House, but this can be done in committee if the committee is so disposed. That was our reason for not participating in the debate, lest the bill get talked out. We are prepared to allow the bill to be read the second time and be sent to committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Is the House ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

An hon. Member: Six o'clock.

Income Tax

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Before we call it six o'clock does the House agree to revert to committee of the whole for the consideration of Bill C-49?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

INCOME TAX ACT

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-49, to amend the statute law relating to income tax—Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)—Mrs. Morin in the chair.

An hon. Member: Six o'clock.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: As the committee has agreed to call it six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock.

At 5.30 p.m. the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

The Deputy Chairman: When the committee rose at six o'clock, it was considering the amendment to clause 36.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I wish to take a few moments to complete the argument I was advancing when the committee stopped discussing this matter. In particular I want to comment on the suggestions made by the hon. member for Calgary that not only will it be bad business for the people of Canada if the oil corporations are operated through public ownership, but there would be many strikes and this would really drive the industry to the wall.

There is no evidence, in this or any other country, that people who work for the government or crown corporations are more likely to strike than workers in private industry. There have not been many strikes in the oil industry. That industry has not been highly unionized. It has been an extremely efficient industry in terms of finding oil and selling it at a high price. There is no evidence that under public ownership the workers in the oil industry would be more likely to strike than at present.

An hon. Member: What about British Railways?

Mr. Orlikow: I would be very happy to discuss the sorry plight of Great Britain with the hon. member on a more appropriate occasion. If he wants to look really at Great Britain, he should look at how little Conservative governments, which have been in power for most of the last century, have done to force British industry to modernize its equipment and management techniques. Therefore I do not think we need to look at Great Britain to see what they have done. We are talking about Canada.