

*Order Paper Questions*

ever finding its way on to the Supreme Court file in the first instance.

**Madam Speaker:** I believe we have had a debate; that is quite clear to me. I think the House will agree that both parties have made their point, and the House will also agree that I was wise in letting it take place.

\* \* \*

**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. 2,340, 2,341, 2,342, 2,826, 2,836, 2,883, 2,954, 2,971, 2,974, 3,609 and 3,901.

[Text]

## HOUSE OF COMMONS—AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

**Question No. 2,340—Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Will the government, in keeping with the Auditor General's comprehensive audit of April, 1980, released in the Standing Committee on Public Accounts on February 5, 1981, introduce "specific legislation" in this session to legalize, regularize and authorize appointments of the officers of the House since repeal of the Civil Service Act by unilateral application of the system of orders in council?

2. Will all such orders in council be tabled for examination and report by the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments?

**Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council):** 1. No. 2. No. The standing joint committee examines only regulations and statutory instruments as defined in the Statutory Instruments Act. Orders in council making appointments are not included in the definitions in the act.

**Question No. 2,341—Mr. Cossitt:**

In the light of the higher salaries recommended in the comprehensive audit by the Auditor General, for what reasons were officers of the House appointed by the government at salary levels below the minimum paid to their respective predecessors, as disclosed by the Auditor General, and below those authorized and paid by the House to incumbents of positions several responsibility levels lower?

**Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council):** The government has appointed no officers of the House since the Auditor General's 1980 report was released.

**Question No. 2,342—Mr. Cossitt:**

Did the Auditor General recently convey to the government, as have his predecessors since 1870, that the management and regulation of the internal affairs and control of staff of the House of Commons without interference from the executive is the undoubted right of the House of Commons?

**Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council):** No. The Auditor General's report to the House of Commons for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1980, made certain observations and specific recommendations to the House concerning appointment, classification and compensation related to senior House officer positions. The government is aware of these observations and recommendations.

## DND—EDUCATION LEAVE COSTS

**Question No. 2,826—Mr. Clarke:**

1. With reference to the education leave costs recorded by the Department of National Defence 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 \$186,385 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. George Henderson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** 1. (a) and (b) The guidelines concerning educational leave are listed in the Personnel Management Manual published by the Treasury Board—chapter 110, sub-chapter 110-5 "Conditions governing education, training and development including subsidization". These guidelines in conjunction with pertinent management recommendations formed the basis of decision for educational leave.

2 and 3. None.

4. It is 13.24 per cent.

## PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION—EDUCATION LEAVE COSTS

**Question No. 2,836—Mr. Clarke:**

1. With reference to the education leave costs recorded by the Department of the Secretary of State for the Public Service Commission 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 \$159,740 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. Gerald Regan (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the Public Service Commission: 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. Of the seventy-three employees granted education leave in the last three years, 11 or 15.06 per cent, have left the public service.