

tinuing and it is anticipated that it will be introduced later this year.

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

PUBLIC SERVANT PARTICIPATION IN POLITICAL CAUCUSES

Question No. 149—Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain):

1. On how many occasions in the life of the 29th Parliament has a public servant, other than a translator, participated in a caucus meeting of the (a) Liberal (b) Progressive Conservative (c) New Democratic (d) Social Credit Party?

2. In each such case, what was (a) the name of the public servant (b) the dates of the participation (c) the subject-matter discussed?

3. On how many occasions in the life of the 29th Parliament has a public servant who was involved in preparation of a particular piece of legislation discussed the substance of that legislation with the caucus of the (a) Liberal (b) Progressive Conservative (c) New Democratic (d) Social Credit Party before that legislation was tabled in the House of Commons?

4. In each such case, what was (a) the name of the public servant (b) the dates of the participation (c) the subject-matter discussed?

Return tabled.

*OVERTIME PAY TO PUBLIC SERVANTS EARNING \$18,000 OR MORE

Question No. 196—Mr. Orlikow:

1. How many Public Servants, by departments, commissions, Crown corporations, etc. earning over \$18,000 a year in the past year received overtime pay?

2. Of this number, how many received overtime pay (a) up to \$1,000 (b) between \$1,000 and \$2,000 (c) between \$2,000 and \$3,000 (d) between \$3,000 and \$4,000 (e) between \$4,000 and \$5,000 (f) \$5,000 and over?

Return tabled.

PUBLIC SERVANTS IN RECEIPT OF REMUNERATION FROM MORE THAN ONE DEPARTMENT

Question No. 391—Mr. Herbert:

Did any public servants in the last year for which the information is available receive any remuneration from another department while receiving full annual salary from their proper department and, if so, how many received such a remuneration and what were the circumstances that lead to the approval of this "double-dipping"?

Return tabled.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Questions Nos. 636 and 637 were originally placed on the Order Paper of the twenty-ninth parliament on February 28 of last year as questions Nos. 222 and 225. The parliamentary secretary has only two parliamentary days left to save the government from going into year two in answering these questions. One deals with the Olympic program about which members are entitled to some information. The second deals with the information service officers retained by this government. Perhaps the parliamentary secretary can accept the challenge of saving the government from continuing this Rip van Winkle type of approach in not answering these questions.

Order Paper Questions

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I take no responsibility for the answering of those questions. My duty is to report them. I suggest the hon. member take up his quarrel with the relevant ministers who are obviously not doing their work.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the admission just made by the parliamentary secretary will be generally received with acclaim on this side of the House. In fact, the only criticism will be its limitation to the few ministers.

I again raise a matter which reveals the complete contempt this government shows toward questions for which they have answers but refuse to give them. I refer to question No. 1,256. It was placed on the Order Paper last fall and answered in a way that had no regard to parliamentary procedure or to truth.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I put the question back on the Order Paper with a slight alteration on February 5. I simply asked about the pension received by a former minister of the Crown, the Hon. John Whitney Pickersgill, and the salary he received when President of the Canadian Transport Commission. The government and the department are deliberately causing an affront to parliament by not answering. They have the information. They do not want to reveal it. They contemptuously treat members of parliament as though they were not here or had no right to examine anything connected with expenditures.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I placed starred question No. 196 on the Order Paper last October 1. I asked:

How many public servants, by departments, commissions, crown corporations, etc. earning over \$18,000 a year in the past year received overtime pay?

The second part of the question asks how many received overtime pay up to \$1,000 and so on. I do not mind if the parliamentary secretary does not give a verbal answer, but I see no reason for him to ask that it be made an order for return. People are interested in the answer to this question. It should be printed in *Hansard* so they can get a copy and see what are the facts.

Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to draw the attention of the parliamentary secretary to the continuing failure to reply to question No. 782 which has been on the Order Paper in various forms since the last session. It seeks to elicit information as to the number of individuals employed in Crown agencies who began their public service careers in the political offices of ministers of the Crown. The question has acquired particular urgency following the recent Batten report which indicates that the major recruiting office for officials of the Unemployment Insurance Commission is the political office of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

● (1510)

Mr. Schumacher: I should like to bring question No. 1,223 to the attention of the parliamentary secretary in the absence of the Solicitor General. This question has now