

Order Paper Questions

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has made a statement in the House of Commons that this minister has particular responsibility for the province of Quebec. This was not a question we directed, for example, to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Campbell) about any responsibility he may have in Prince Edward Island. If in fact the responsibilities of the Minister of State (Mr. Joyal), as stated by the Prime Minister, are for the province of Quebec, does that not of itself allow us to ask questions respecting the performance of that minister vis-à-vis the province of Quebec? That is the only clarification I would like to get.

Madam Speaker: I think what I just quoted is quite clear, and I will read it again for the hon. member. Citation 361 reads:

A question may not be asked of a Minister in another capacity, such as being responsible for a province, or part of a province, or as spokesman for a racial or religious group.

That is quite clear. I do not think I can make it any clearer.

Mr. Nowlan: What is his capacity?

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Madam Speaker, I also rise on a point of clarification respecting your ruling.

Madam Speaker: No, no. Order. I cannot—

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): But if there are public funds involved, Madam Speaker, how do we determine—

Madam Speaker: It is quite easy to determine. In this particular case I interrupted the hon. member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) and did not allow him to ask a particular question of a particular minister. That is quite clear, so I do not think hon. members need further clarification. If another situation presents itself in the House, we will rule on that one.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Is the minister unquestionable?

Mr. Nowlan: Take away his ministerial pay, then.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. David Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 2,819, 2,840, 2,858, 2,867, 2,892, 2,893, 2,894, 2,910, 2,915, 2,925, 2,926, 2,935, 2,948, 2,963, 2,978, 3,130, 3,132, 4,152 and 4,210.

[Text]

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE—EDUCATION LEAVE COSTS

Question No. 2,819—**Mr. Clarke:**

1. With reference to the education leave costs recorded by the Department of Finance at page 13.6, volume I of the 1979-80 Public Accounts of Canada, what guidelines were used to determine (a) which employees should obtain educational leave and whether such employees should be granted (i) leave with pay (ii) travel expenses (iii) payment for tuition (b) whether the skills to be acquired were needed on a permanent basis?

2. What percentage of the education leave cost of \$187,834 was necessitated by the acquisition of new equipment and by the need to have new skills in order to use the equipment?

3. What percentage of the education leave was necessitated by reason of job redundancy because of the (a) acquisition of equipment (b) change in the role of the employing agency (c) change in the capabilities of employees?

4. What percentage of employees granted such leave in the past three years have subsequently left the public service?

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of State (Finance)): 1. (a) and (b) Treasury Board Policy: Chapter 110 sub-chapter 5 of the Personnel Management Manual—Conditions Governing Education, Training and Development, including Subsidization.

2. Nil.

3. (a) and (b) Nil. (c) 100 per cent.

4. Nil.

DOT—EDUCATION LEAVE COSTS

Question No. 2,840—**Mr. Clarke:**

1. With reference to the education leave costs recorded by the Department of Transport at page 13.6, volume I of the 1979-80 Public Accounts of Canada, what guidelines were used to determine (a) which employees should obtain educational leave and whether such employees should be granted (i) leave with pay (ii) travel expenses (iii) payment for tuition (b) whether the skills to be acquired were needed on a permanent basis?

2. What percentage of the education leave cost of \$115,844 was necessitated by the acquisition of new equipment and by the need to have new skills in order to use the equipment?

3. What percentage of the education leave was necessitated by reason of job redundancy because of the (a) acquisition of equipment (b) change in the role of the employing agency (c) change in the capabilities of employees?

4. What percentage of employees granted such leave in the past three years have subsequently left the public service?

Mr. Jesse P. Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. (a) Sound needs identification by managers, plus the use of career review boards and training committees, are the major vehicles used to establish education leave for employees. The selection process is governed by Transport Canada's policy on Education Leave, PM3-2(13) and by its policy on Training and Development PM5-2, Part II(4). The administration of costs of such leave is governed by Treasury Board's Personnel Management Manual Chapter 110, sub-