

*Customs Act*

remarks. I can assure hon. members that his observations will not be in the same category as mine. I did not object to Your Honour's advice to me because of circumstances which I have already indicated, but these do not apply to my hon. friend. Maybe the house would be disposed to listen to what he has to say on this subject.

**Some hon. Members:** Carry on.

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, it is not my wish to delay the passage of this bill but there are one or two points I should like to raise in connection with the legislation before us.

I believe several additional amendments could and should be included in this legislation. A number of problems have been experienced in my area in connection with the Customs Act. I should like to ask questions about these points and possibly the minister could answer them later. We have in the city of Nelson a customs warehouse for perishable goods. Why cannot its use be extended to cover general goods? An application in this connection has gone to the department. It has been approved by the region and by the local people. It would not cost the department one single penny to implement it. The customs officers are there. The buildings are there. This is something which would prove of immense convenience to the business people of the area. To my mind, this is a logical and sensible request by the people of this area and I can think of no reason why the department should turn it down. In fact, I cannot imagine why a general customs warehouse was not set up many years ago. That is one question I wanted to raise in connection with this bill.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I have one more point to make. I have received another complaint from people in my area concerning goods sent over the border. In this case they were wedding gifts. If a wedding gift costs more than \$10, customs duty is charged on it. I say this is sheer and utter nonsense. In this age of inflation, and with customs regulations that were drawn up donkeys years ago, I suggest there should be an upward revision in the value of goods crossing the border duty free. Certainly, the ceiling of \$10 on genuine wedding gifts that are sent to a couple should be sharply raised. In the particular case to which I refer the couple was forced to return a number of gifts to the senders and they will have to pick

[Mr. Peters.]

them up in a year or two's time. I do not think that this type of gift is really what those who drew the regulations had in mind. This is something that the minister should look into.

With those few remarks I close, and I should like to thank the house for its generosity in allowing me these few moments to express my views on this particular piece of legislation.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** It being four o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business, as listed on today's order paper, namely private bills.

**PRIVATE BILLS**

On the order: Private Bills:

January 23, 1969—Consideration of Bill S-6, an act respecting The Canada Trust Company as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs—Mr. Blair.

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair), who is responsible for this bill and also the following one on today's list, is ill. Therefore I would ask the agreement of the house to stand these two items, retaining their position on the order paper.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** Shall items 1 and 2 stand at the request of the government?

**Mr. Peters:** Mr. Speaker, before we proceed I should like to raise a point of order; this is the first opportunity that has arisen to do so. Your Honour will note that under item No. 1 there is this statement:

For text of amendment to be proposed at report stage, pursuant to section (5) of standing order 75—see Notice Paper as appended to Votes and Proceedings of January 28, 1969.

My point is that if an amendment is going to be moved, then for the orderly conduct of business it should be attached to the original motion on this paper. I suggest hon. members will be confused if they have to look at *Votes and Proceedings* to find amendments. Obviously, the amendment has to be recorded in *Votes and Proceedings*, but in the interest of the orderly conduct of our business it seems to me that Your Honour would serve us well