

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

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. 2,810, 2,833, 2,849, 2,865, 2,913, 2,952, 2,953, 3,553, 3,556, 3,896 and 4,149.

[Text]

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS—EDUCATION LEAVE COSTS

Question No. 2,810—**Mr. Clarke:**

1. With reference to the education leave costs recorded by the Department of Communications 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 \$118,708 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. Jack Masters (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): In so far as the Department of Communications is concerned, the answer to the above question is as follows: 1. (a) and (b) Please refer to Treasury Board Policy, Personnel Management Manual, chapter 110-5, "Conditions governing education, training and development, including subsidization".

2 and 3. Nil.

4. Fourteen per cent.

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL—EDUCATION LEAVE COSTS

Question No. 2,833—**Mr. Clarke:**

1. With reference to the education leave costs recorded by the Ministry of State for Science and Technology for the National Research Council of Canada 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 \$19,891 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?

Order Paper Questions

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

Mr. Jim Schroder (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment and Minister of State for Science and Technology): In so far as the National Research Council is concerned, the reply is as follows:

1. (a) The eligibility provisions for a recommendation put forward for a member of the scientific or professional staff are defined as staff who: (i) does not possess a doctor's degree, (ii) has academic qualifications of scholarship calibre, (iii) has been on staff for at least two years and has demonstrated outstanding ability, (iv) is considered suitable to become a member of the permanent staff of the council.

Education leave is normally granted at half pay, but may be granted at a greater or lesser rate. An employee who does not meet the requirements detailed above may be granted education leave without pay. A recommendation may be made by the director of a division to the executive vice-president who may approve it on behalf of the president.

(b) The eligibility provisions make it clear that the skills to be acquired are needed on a permanent basis.

2. None.

3. None.

4. Thirty-three per cent. Two employees out of six have left NRC.

DOT—HOSPITALITY SERVICES

Question No. 2,849—**Mr. Clarke:**

With reference to the professional and special services recorded by the Department of Transport under the Air Transportation Program at page 32.40, volume II of the 1979-80 Public Accounts of Canada, with particular reference to hospitality services (a) how does the department account for the 38 per cent increase in expenditure for the item over that for 1978-79 (b) what is a list of each contract of a value more than \$2,000 (c) are guidelines used to determine when the department will pay for hospitality and, if so, what are they (d) of the \$37,594 paid for hospitality, what percentage was principally used to entertain (i) foreign visitors (ii) Canadian businessmen (iii) provincial public servants (iv) federal public servants (v) ministerial exempt staff (vi) Members of Parliament (vii) Members of Provincial Parliaments, Legislative Assemblies and the National Assembly (viii) Canadian dignitaries, such as the Governor General and Lieutenant Governors General (ix) federal Crown corporation executives (x) provincial Crown corporation executives (xi) members of federal commissions, boards and councils (xii) any other categories?

Mr. Jesse P. Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): (a) Increase in 1979-80 due to: (i) \$6,500 spent for a reception hosting the Royal Canadian Flying Clubs, (ii) \$1,200 spent for the Dubin Inquiry on Air Safety, (iii) price increases in meal allowances and entertainment.

(b) None.

(c) Guidelines used are those stated in chapter 360 of the Treasury Board Administrative Policy on hospitality.