

Business of the House

Messrs.

Douglas (Bruce-Grey)	Lajoie	Ouellet
Duclos	Lalonde	Parent
Dupras	Lamontagne	Pearsall
Duquet	Landers	Penner
Ethier	Lang	Philbrook
Foster	Langlois	Portelance
Fox	Lapointe	Poulin
Francis	Lee	Railton
Gillespie	Lefebvre	Raines
Goodale	Lessard	Roberts
Goyer	Loiselle	Robinson
Gray	(Chambly)	Rompkey
Guay	Lumley	Roy
(St. Boniface)	MacDonald	(Laval)
Guay	(Cardigan)	Saltsman
(Lévis)	MacFarlane	Sauvé (Mrs.)
Haidasz	Maine	Savard
Harquail	Mclsaac	Sharp
Herbert	McRae	Smith
Holt (Mrs.)	Milne	(Saint-Jean)
Hopkins	Munro	Tessier
Joyal	(Hamilton East)	Trudeau
Kaplan	Nicholson (Miss)	Trudel
	O'Connell	Watson
		Young—(86)

● (2330)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motions Nos. 33 and 34 lost.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I thought a vote was called for motion No. 35.

Mr. Paproski: It was disposed of on division this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: Our records indicate that motion No. 35 was negated on division.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is correct.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice) moved that Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the bill be read a third time?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): At the next sitting of the House.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if I may ask the parliamentary secretary if he knows what we will be dealing with tomorrow and in what order the business will be called, and if he has anything else he would like to add we would be delighted to hear it.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to begin tomorrow with Bill C-17, the Air Canada legislation, which is at the report stage. We are optimistic that that bill will be dealt with expeditiously. There are two other items for consideration tomorrow, the third reading stage of Bill C-51 and the third reading stage of Bill C-27. It can be the subject of further discussion with respect to the specific order in which those two items might be called, but it would be my expectation now that we would proceed after Bill C-17 with the third reading of Bill C-51.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—ALLEGED DIFFERENTIATION IN TREATMENT BY CUSTOMS BETWEEN FORCES PERSONNEL AND CIVILIANS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, what brings us together is my question of the other day to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Danson) and the Minister of National Revenue (Miss Bégin) about the practices of the Armed Forces in dealing with people moving through customs, namely, National Defence people, and about whether they should have to make a declaration if it is felt they had made purchases abroad of \$50 or less. The practice for the population as a whole is that they do not have to make any declaration or they may make an oral declaration, and they do not have to fill in any forms. In maritime command personnel do have to fill in a form. Having looked at the documents I can say that somebody in the department has misinterpreted the practice in general, and maritime command people have been required to fill in the form, whereas the rest of the personnel can move back and forth and be treated as civilians.

I am somewhat hampered in this debate because I have probably mislaid the document I once had. I have looked for it in my office and here in my desk. I cannot find it. In any event, a directive was sent out by maritime command stating that these forms did have to be filled in, but the rest of National Defence was not required to do so. I think there is a misunderstanding, and when I raised this matter the other day the Minister of National Revenue and the Minister of National Defence thought one thing, but when I showed the Minister of National Defence the documents, he indicated to me that probably in one part of National Defence there had been a mistake, and that was going to be corrected. I have probably taken more of the time of the House than I originally intended. I think the parliamentary secretary will straighten this up, and I thank the House for its indulgence.