

*Order Paper Questions*

unparliamentary. They were not directed to one person in particular. I am afraid that point of order cannot be taken.

**Mr. Cook:** Madam Speaker, if I may refer you, the word "silly" was declared unparliamentary on January 26, 1961. If he is using it for "idiot", are you suggesting, Madam Speaker, that you cannot defame the whole opposition by an expression?

**Madam Speaker:** I am just checking that. One point is quite clear; that word was not addressed to one person in particular.

**Mr. Trudeau:** I really meant goofy.

**Madam Speaker:** What was declared unparliamentary was "silly reason", not "silly".

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

### QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance):** Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 35, 672, 673, 674, 675, 678, 1,271, 1,272, 1,586, 1,684, 1,685, 1,882, 2,248, 2,287, 2,307, and 2,362.

[Text]

MR. JORZY MROCKOWSKI—EDITOR OF "CZAS"

Question No. 35—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did the RCMP investigate an alleged fraudulent or fake issue of the Polish ethnic newspaper known as CZAS in Winnipeg, Manitoba, issued in August, 1978, and, if so (a) what were the results of the investigation (b) were any charges laid officially or are any charges pending in regard to fraud, etc.?

2. Did the RCMP receive complaints from the editor of CZAS, Mr. Jorzy Mrockowski and, if so, what action was taken?

**Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General):**

1. Yes.

(a) insufficient evidence to lay charges;

(b) see reply to 1(a).

2. Yes. Action was taken in the form of the investigation referred to in part 1 above.

MR. MICHAEL PITFIELD

Question No. 672—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Did Mr. Michael Pitfield, secretary to the cabinet and Clerk of the Privy Council state that he had returned \$10,000 to the Public Treasury calculated on the basis of the time remaining of a 58-week period for which he was being compensated and that this represented "after tax money" and, if so, did the Prime Minister instruct him to commit himself to return the full amount due,

including pre-tax money after applying and receiving from the Department of National Revenue a tax rebate in the current tax year and, if not (a) for what reason (b) will the Prime Minister do so?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I am advised that Mr. Michael Pitfield, Clerk of the Privy Council and secretary to the cabinet, on April 22, 1980, released the following statement to the Parliamentary Press Gallery: "Mr. Cossitt's motion in Parliament today was not based on fact. I am grateful to members of the Press Gallery who delayed filing their stories in order to give me a chance to correct these inaccuracies. As is well known it is very difficult to get the record straight after allegations of this kind have been disseminated across the country. When, after over 20 years in the public service, my employment was suddenly terminated on June 4, 1979, the previous government agreed that I should receive fifty-eight weeks' salary as damages, in addition to the usual termination payment of one week's salary for every year of service which is provided under Treasury Board regulations for any permanent employee departing the public service. The total amount was about \$107,800, not \$150,000, and this amount was fully taxable at the highest rate unless transferred to a fund for my retirement twenty to twenty-five years from now. When I rejoined the public service on March 11, 1980, I offered, and the Prime Minister agreed, that I would give back a part of this amount to the Receiver General on a purely voluntary basis. This is an unusual thing to do and I was not under any legal requirement to do so. The amount—approximately \$10,000—was calculated on the basis of the time remaining of fifty-eight weeks for which I had been compensated, taking account of the fact that whereas what I received was pre-tax, what I was giving back was after tax. Concerning the holding company in which I have an interest only as a preferred shareholder, all details were disclosed, in accordance with the conflict of interest guidelines, when I was last employed by the government, and they will be reported again in the near future when the rearrangement of my affairs in accordance with the existing conflict of interest guidelines is completed. While one would not normally publicize one's personal affairs of this kind, I trust the foregoing will prevent the doubts that Mr. Cossitt's motion has sown from taking root."

Question No. 673—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did Mr. Michael Pitfield, secretary to the cabinet and Clerk of the Privy Council report under the present government disclosure guidelines, the existence of a holding company which he either controlled or in which he had an interest and, if so, on what date?

2. Is the company still in effect and, if so, what is its full name?

3. Did the company do any business with the government and, if so, what are all the details?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):**

1, 2 and 3: See reply to question 672 answered today. In accordance with the Government of Canada's guidelines on conflict of interest, Mr. Pitfield fully declared his interests to the Assistant Deputy Registrar General from the time the guidelines came in force until he left the public service in 1979, and again in 1980 when he was