

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: See reply to Question No. 1,446.

OIL PIPELINE

Question No. 1,459—Mr. Howie:

Are there any plans regarding the development of a cross-Canada oil pipeline, extending it beyond Montreal to the Atlantic Provinces?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources reports as follows: The immediate objective is to have the oil pipeline extended to Montreal. There have been discussions with various interested parties with respect to an improvement of pipeline facilities east of Montreal but as yet no definitive proposal has been concluded.

LANGUAGE TRAINING FOR WIVES OF SENIOR OFFICIALS

Question No. 1,467—Mr. Cossitt:

With reference to the answer to Question No. 24 that included Mrs. J. F. Hudon and Mrs. Barbara Stephens among the list of wives of members of the Public Service taking French Language courses at public expense although not members of the Public Service themselves (a) are these persons the wives of Mr. L. D. Hudon, Deputy Secretary to the Cabinet and Mr. D. R. Stephens, Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet (b) what are the annual salaries of Mr. Hudon and Mr. Stephens (c) for what reason did the government use public funds to pay for such language lessons (d) what are the dates these persons attended language courses, where did they attend and what was the cost to the taxpayers in each case?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: See reply to Question No. 1,446.

LANGUAGE TRAINING FOR WIVES OF SENIOR OFFICIALS

Question No. 1,468—Mr. Cossitt:

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 24 that included the names of Mrs. D. H. Jones, Mrs. Evelyn F. March and Mrs. Violet B. Thomson among the list of wives of members of the Public Service taking French language courses at public expense although not members of the Public Service themselves (a) are these persons the wives of Commissioners D. H. Jones, R. M. March and J. B. G. Thomson of the Canadian Transport Commission (b) what are the annual salaries of each of these Commissioners (c) for what reason did the government use public funds to pay for such language lessons (d) what are the dates these wives attended such language courses, where did they attend and what was the cost to the taxpayers in each case?

2. Is the Mrs. L. Arbiqque shown in the answer to Question No. 24 the wife of Mr. H. Arbiqque, Secretary of the Canadian Transport Commission (a) what is Mr. Arbiqque's annual salary (b) for what reason were public funds used to pay for his wife's language lessons (c) what are the dates she took such lessons, where did she attend and what was the total amount to the taxpayers?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: See reply to Question No. 1,446.

Order Paper Questions

LANGUAGE TRAINING FOR WIVES OF SENIOR OFFICIALS

Question No. 1,471—Mr. Cossitt:

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 24 which, among other persons, listed S. Boughner, wife of an employee of the Post Office Department, as one of those taking French language courses at government expense while not herself a member of the Public Service, is this individual the wife of Mr. A.C. Boughner, Assistant Deputy Postmaster General in the Post Office Department?

2. What is the exact annual salary in dollars paid to Mr. Boughner?

3. For what reason did the government at taxpayer's expense pay for Mrs. Boughner's French language courses (a) was one of the reasons because the government believed that Mr. Boughner's salary was not sufficient for him to pay this expense himself (b) over how long a period of time did Mrs. Boughner take French language courses at taxpayer's expense and what was the total annual salary of Mr. Boughner during that period of time?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: See reply to Question No. 1,446.

LANGUAGE TRAINING FOR WIVES OF SENIOR OFFICIALS

Question No. 1,472—Mr. Cossitt:

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 24 which, among other persons, listed M. Pageau, wife of an employee of the Post Office Department, as one of those taking French language courses at government expense while not herself a member of the Public Service, is this individual the wife of Mr. F. Pageau, Director of International Postal Affairs Branch in the Post Office Department?

2. What is the exact annual salary in dollars paid to Mr. Pageau?

3. For what reason did the government at taxpayer's expense pay for Mrs. Pageau's French language courses (a) was one of the reasons because the government believed that Mr. Pageau's salary was not sufficient for him to pay this expense himself (b) over how long a period of time did Mrs. Pageau take French language courses at taxpayer's expense and what was the total annual salary of Mr. Pageau during that period of time?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: See reply to Question No. 1,446.

OLYMPIC STAMPS AND OLYMPIC COINS

Question No. 1,476—Mr. Reynolds:

Are (a) Olympic Stamps (b) Olympic Coins classed as tax deductible items and, if they are not classed the same, for what reason?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of National Revenue): Olympic stamps and Olympic coins are treated differently under the Income Tax Act. Paragraph 7(b) of the Olympic (1976) Act specifically provides that in addition to the amount of the postage rate indicated on the Olympic Action Stamp, an additional amount may be fixed for the purpose of providing financial assistance to the Olympics. This additional amount may reasonably be held to be a charitable gift, and is deductible therefore under paragraph 110(1)(b) of the Income Tax Act. The Olympic (1976) Act makes no similar provision with respect to Olympic coins, providing only that the proceeds to be received by the government of Canada shall not be less than the face value of the coins. In this case we consider that the purchaser has simply acquired a property at a price which is the total amount paid and no part of which