

*Adjournment Questions*

have the resources and we have the capital to do the job ourselves; we have the know-how. But if we were short of know-how, we should make a deal with the oil companies, with which they can live, to develop our resources just as the OPEC countries have done.

I noticed this morning that Guinea, a country in Africa which has virtually no trained people, is increasing its tax on bauxite in one shot by \$40 million a year. We will not see Alcan, Reynolds, Kaiser or any of the other corporations producing aluminum moving out of Guinea, because they need bauxite and they will pay the higher price. The same thing is happening in Jamaica: They know that the resources are needed and they can get a better price for their people.

**An hon. Member:** You should think about democracy when you suggest that.

**Mr. Orlikow:** This has nothing to do with democracy. In the waters off Norway there are tremendous oil resources and that country is controlling the way in which that oil will be developed and how much ownership it will keep. Great Britain has oil resources in the North Sea and has stated that 51 per cent ownership of the oil will rest with Great Britain. This has nothing to do with democracy. I want to say one more thing with reference to this red herring which the hon. member for Calgary South drew across the trail. He suggested there were no strikes in private industry, but there would be unlimited strikes in that sector. That is so ridiculous I cannot imagine anybody who knows anything about our society making such a statement. The fact is that there have been massive strikes in all major, privately-owned industries in this democratic society.

**Mr. Paproski:** Mr. Chairman, before calling it five o'clock perhaps we could carry clause 36 in order to show some progress on this bill.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Shall the amendment carry?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Order, please. It being five o'clock, it is my duty to rise, report progress and request leave to sit again later this day.

Progress reported.

● (1700)

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

### SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon)—National Defence—Inquiry whether Canada nego-

[Mr. Orlikow.]

tiating with Brazil in purchase of armoured cars; the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Howie)—National Defence—Disbanding of military bands—Request Government review decision.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, private bills, notices of motions.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** On a point of order, Madam Speaker, I understand that the items which precede No. 23 on today's order paper will not lose their place in the scheme of things as a result of calling No. 23.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Is it agreed that those bills be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

### CRIMINAL CODE

#### AMENDMENTS MAKING INSULT TO CANADIAN AND FOREIGN FLAGS AN OFFENCE

**Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew North-Nipissing East)** moved that Bill C-223, to amend the Criminal Code (domestic and foreign flags), be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

He said: Madam Speaker, during the course of the twenty-eighth parliament I had two private members' bills on the order paper of the House of Commons. Bill C-197 was a bill to amend the Criminal Code, and the purpose of that bill was to make it an offence to insult, in any way, a Canadian or provincial flag.

The second, Bill C-198, was a bill to amend the Criminal Code with regard to foreign flags, and the purpose of that bill was to make it an offence to insult, in any way, the flag of a foreign country lawfully represented in Canada.

Neither of those bills came to second reading prior to the end of that particular session of the twenty-eighth parliament.

The bill before us today, Bill C-223, encompasses in its present form all three of the points in the previous two bills. When proposing legislation of this nature it is important to make certain that the law being proposed is practical and can be enforced in the courts. If this is not the case, passing such a law would merely be window dressing instead of something realistic, practical and meaningful on the statute books of Canada. With regard to this latter point I would like to express my appreciation to hon. members in all parties with whom I have had consultations with reference to this bill. I wish to make it quite plain that they have been most co-operative and understanding.

I have also had several discussions with legal authorities who are concerned about the implementation and