

Order Paper Questions

LANGUAGE TRAINING FOR WIVES OF SENIOR OFFICIALS
APPROACHING RETIREMENT AGE

Question No. 1,922—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 24 listing a number of wives of senior public servants who are not themselves members of the Public Service and who have received language training at public expense, how many husbands of such persons (a) are within five years of possible retirement (b) have already retired as of this date (c) in each case, what is the husband's (i) name, (ii) position in government service (iii) earliest possible retirement date?

2. What are all the justifications for giving language training to wives of Public Service employees approaching retirement age?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: 1. It is the policy of the Public Service Commission not to establish arbitrary age limits as a factor in selections for appointments or for training courses, unless there are compelling reasons to do so. An amendment to the Public Service Employment Act to extend the prohibitions against discrimination contained therein to age and marital status has in fact received second reading in the House of Commons and is now before the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs (Bill C-16).

With regard to language training, the President of Treasury Board announced in the House of Commons on November 21, 1974 a Cabinet decision that, on economic grounds, unilingual public servants over 60 years of age who occupy or are appointed to bilingual positions would be exempted from the requirement to undertake language training.

Records are not kept in such a way that the specific information requested in this question can be readily supplied. A reply would require the review of the personal files of every public servant involved and the necessary staff is not available to undertake such a review.

2. See first paragraph of one above and the answer given to Question No. 1,446, March 12, 1975.

PURCHASE OF YACHT BY HAMILTON HARBOURS COMMISSION

Question No. 2,117—**Mr. Coates:**

Was there any government involvement, financially or otherwise, in the purchase of a yacht by the Hamilton Harbour Commission and, if so (a) what was the nature of the involvement (b) on what date was it purchased (c) from whom and by whom was it purchased (d) for what purpose (e) for what amount?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Transport): No.

ELECTRIFYING THE RAILWAY SYSTEM OF CANADA

Question No. 2,127—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the government consider the advisability of electrifying the railway system of Canada?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Transport): The benefits of the electrification of a railway line are a function of the traffic density over that particular line. Enough savings have to be made on fuel, maintenance and locomotive capital costs to pay for the construction of the catenary and electric power distribution systems. In Canada many studies have been conducted by railways to determine whether electrification was economical. So far

[Mr. Faulkner.]

these studies have revealed that electrification could be marginally profitable but only on very few sections of the line. In the context of more restrictive fuel policies, electrification could be advisable.

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

LIP—GRANTS IN THE CONSTITUENCY OF ROSEDALE, ONTARIO

Question No. 53—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 46 of the Second Session of the 29th Parliament, which states in part that a total of \$1,669,213 was allocated under the Local Initiatives Programme for 1972-73 in the constituency of Rosedale, Ontario (a) what are the names of all projects involved along with their addresses and the names and addresses of those signing the applications (b) in each case what is a detailed description of the actual project, specifically including the functions performed under the project?

2. What are the names and addresses of all persons or organizations who recommended each project in any manner whatsoever to the Department?

Return tabled.

CONSULTANTS HIRED BY CROWN CORPORATIONS FROM 1968
TO DATE

Question No. 401—**M. MacKay:**

1. From the 1968 fiscal year to date (a) how many consultants were hired (b) what were the terms of reference and time length of the work assignment (c) what was the amount paid to each (d) what was the name of each for all Crown corporations?

2. What are the names, positions, number and salaries of public servants for all Crown corporations that held a position similar to that of the outside consultant hired by the government?

Return tabled.

LIP—ALLOCATIONS IN CONSTITUENCY OF CAPE BRETON
HIGHLANDS—CANSO, NOVA SCOTIA

Question No. 615—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What was the total amount of money allocated under the Local Initiatives Programme for 1973-74 in the constituency of Cape Breton Highlands-Canso, Nova Scotia (a) what are the names of all projects involved along with their addresses and the names and addresses of those signing the applications (b) in each case what is a detailed description of the actual project, specifically including the functions performed under the project?

2. What are the names and addresses of all persons or organizations who recommended each project in any manner whatsoever to the Department?

Return tabled.

PUBLIC SERVANTS CLASSIFICATIONS

Question No. 769—**M. Stevens:**

As of October 31, 1967, 1970, 1972 and 1974 (a) how many public servants were classified as or had an equivalent pay range to DM 3, DM 2, SX 4/DM 1, SX 3, SX 2, SX 1 (b) how many vacancies were there in each classification (c) what were the minimum, mid-point and maximum salaries in each classification (d) who, by name, were classified as DM 3, DM 2, DM 1, SX 4, and on each date, what title did they hold?

Return tabled.