

Accordingly, I propose the following special order:

That the Green Paper entitled "Members of Parliament and Conflict of Interest" tabled on November 27, 1974, be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections; and

That, after the committee has concluded its deliberations and submitted its report on the aforementioned matter, it be authorized to consider and make recommendations upon the subject-matter of ministers and conflict of interest and public servants and conflict of interest.

That any question or questions necessary to dispose of the said motion and any amendments thereto be put at 9.45 p.m., December 10, 1974;

That, immediately following the disposal of the said motion, the House proceed to the consideration and disposal of any motion or motions and bill or bills based thereon with regard to the business of Supply in the same manner as if December 10, 1974 had been an ordinary allotted day pursuant to Standing Order 58;

That for the period ending March 26, 1975 there be eight allotted days pursuant to Standing Order 58;

And that the Order of the Day "Government Business, number 7" appearing on page 10 of the Order Paper today be discharged.

● (1420)

That is the special order. I can perhaps explain the final paragraph by saying that the reference which appears as No. 7 does refer to a reference to another standing committee and that is why it must be discharged.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations and the order is acceptable to us. I think I should supplement the rather grudging expression of gratitude to the opposition that the minister has made by saying that in order to facilitate the business of the House Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition has lent tomorrow to the government and has deferred one of the opposition days until the next semester. I thought the House should understand that in our anxiety to see the proper business of this country proceed we have agreed to this course.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, the motion as read out by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) does represent the points on which we agreed. We are, therefore, prepared to support the motion. I wonder if there is a slight oversight in the next to last paragraph in that it adds an eighth day to the next period but does not take one away from the current period.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I would presume it is not possible to take any more days away from the current period because it ends tomorrow.

[Translation]

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, the arguments of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp), and the essence of the motion, are precisely what the four parties have agreed upon. Consequently, we respect the agreement.

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The House will understand that for several reasons such a motion can be made at this time only with unanimous consent of the House. I would ask therefore, does the House agree to the terms and conditions of this motion and is it to be so ordered.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is so ordered.

### Order Paper Questions

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

[Text]

**Mr. John M. Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 15, 148, 187, 305, 345, 359, 405, 406, 409, 443, 444, 548, 608, 624, 659, 664, 679, 685, 718, 726, 774, 795, 796 and 849.

Mr. Speaker, if question No. 8 and starred question No. 197 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled immediately.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

### TAX EXEMPTION FOR SUPPORT OF RELATIVES OUTSIDE OF CANADA

#### Question No. 15—Mr. Reynolds:

Is it possible for Canadian residents to send money out of Canada to support relatives and deduct this money from income before calculating their tax payable and, if so (a) how much can they send (b) what is the maximum amount deductible (c) what proof is there that the money actually leaves Canada?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of National Revenue):** Yes. (a) There is no limit on the amount that a taxpayer may send out of the country to support a person but there is a limit on the amount he may claim as a personal exemption in respect of that person. (b) The deduction is limited to the amount actually expended in support or if the dependant is under 16 years of age, \$300 less one-half his net income, if any, in excess of \$1,100, or, if the dependant is 16 years of age or over, \$550 less his net income in excess of \$1,150. (c) The act does not specify what proof of payment is required. However, the act does provide the general authority that a taxpayer wishing to claim a deduction from his income must be prepared to substantiate his claim with receipts or vouchers. The department has administrative rules that require a taxpayer claiming an exemption in respect of a non-resident dependant, to complete and attach to his income tax return, form T1E-N.R. This form stipulates that the taxpayer must submit as proof of support cancelled cheques, bank funds transfer receipts, bills, receipts or other documentary evidence of cash remittance or value of parcels sent directly to the dependant and not an intermediary third party.

### DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE EMPLOYEES IN RECEIPT OF REMUNERATION IN EXCESS OF \$20,000

#### Question No. 148—Mr. Herbert:

How many public servants in the Department of National Revenue received T4 slips for 1973 showing gross remuneration in excess of (a) \$20,000 (b) \$30,000 (c) \$40,000?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of National Revenue):** Departmental personnel records indicate that in 1973: (a) 901; (b) 33; (c) One.