

*Order Paper Questions*

\*3 SX 2 (21,000-26,000)

\*1 SX 3 (23,000-29,000)

\*1 SX 4 (28,000-33,000)

3. There were 44,532 full-time employees in the Post Office Department as of January 31, 1973.

4. One hundred eighty-one of those employees were earning more than \$18,000 annually, and distributed according to \$1,000 intervals they were:

21 earning between 18,000 and 18,999

44 earning between 19,000 and 19,999

15 earning between 20,000 and 20,999

22 earning between 21,000 and 21,999

18 earning between 22,000 and 22,999

14 earning between 23,000 and 23,999

15 earning between 24,000 and 24,999

11 earning between 25,000 and 25,999

\* 1 ENG 7 (21,500-27,000)

\*11 SX 1 (22,000-28,000)

\* 4 SX 2 (25,000-31,000)

\* 3 SX 3 (28,000-35,000)

\* 1 SX 4 (34,000-40,000)

\* 1 DM 2 (40,000-45,000)

\* Not separated to \$1,000. intervals in order to protect privacy of salary information in accordance with Treasury Board Circular 1969-206.

CANADIAN PENITENTIARY SERVICE—DISCIPLINARY  
ACTION TAKEN FOLLOWING DISTURBANCE,  
KINGSTON-MILLHAVEN

Question No. 1,505—**Mr. Stackhouse:**

1. What disciplinary actions were taken as a result of the report that inmates being transferred from Kingston to Millhaven Penitentiary received injuries caused by employees of the Canadian Penitentiary Service?

2. How many, if any, were (a) dismissed (b) demoted (c) transferred?

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General):** 1 and 2. Following the disturbances at Kingston Penitentiary in April 1971 and the transfer of inmates from Kingston Penitentiary to Millhaven Institution, an investigation completely independent of the Commission of Inquiry was carried out by the Ontario Provincial Police under the direction of the Attorney General of Ontario. As a result of this investigation, charges were laid against twelve correctional officers who were subsequently tried in criminal court at which time all charges were dismissed. Additionally, the Commission of Inquiry reported upon the actions of four persons employed in a supervisory capacity by the Canadian Penitentiary Service. One of these persons resigned from the Canadian Penitentiary Service before any action was taken and has since deceased. Another person was assigned to other duties. On

[Mr. Ouellet.]

further investigation, it was determined that in the cases of the third and fourth persons, the taking of disciplinary action was not justified. It is deemed inadvisable to reveal publicly the identities of the persons involved.

## LIP PROJECT No. H-3018

Question No. 1,616—**Mr. Latulippe:**

What were the reasons for the acceptance or refusal of LIP project No. H-3018?

**Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Project No. H-3018 was rejected because the Department received a far greater number of applications than funds were available for. All applications were carefully assessed and many difficult decisions not to approve had to be made.

## LIP PROJECT No. H-3205

Question No. 1,617—**Mr. Latulippe:**

What were the reasons for the acceptance or refusal of LIP project No. H-3205?

**Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Project No. H-3205 was rejected because the Department received a far greater number of applications than funds were available for. All applications were carefully assessed and many difficult decisions not to approve had to be made.

## LIP PROJECT No. H-3206

Question No. 1,618—**Mr. Latulippe:**

What were the reasons for the acceptance or refusal of LIP project No. H-3206?

**Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Project No. H-3206 was rejected because the Department received a far greater number of applications than funds were available for. All applications were carefully assessed and many difficult decisions not to approve had to be made.

## LIP PROJECT No. H-3277

Question No. 1,619—**Mr. Latulippe:**

What were the reasons for the acceptance or refusal of LIP project No. H-3277?

**Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Project No. H-3277 was rejected because the Department received a far greater number of applications than funds were available for. All applications were carefully assessed and many difficult decisions not to approve had to be made.

## LIP PROJECT No. H-3280

Question No. 1,620—**Mr. Latulippe:**

What were the reasons for the acceptance or refusal of LIP project No. H-3280?