

Question Period, and every day subsequently, if he gets the floor. That is the way to deal with that particular question.

MR. MALONE—DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIAL RESPECTING PENSIONS

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This point of order is one to which I know you will want to give some attention. It relates to the distribution of materials in the House of Commons itself. I make specific reference to the recent tabling by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) of a new pensions approach for Canadians. So far there is nothing wrong. But what happened, as I understand it, is that around 3.30 p.m. that day, arriving here on Parliament Hill was a vehicle containing all of the printed material. Interestingly enough, first to be unloaded were volumes and volumes of specific brochures for the media, after the vehicle had previously stopped at the National Press Club. Again, when Members attempted right after to obtain copies, we found that those materials were not available to us.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I think it will be obvious to the Hon. Member why this particular matter is not my concern. I do not control the buses. I do not control their itinerary, and I have no reason to do so. If the Hon. Member has a complaint, and it might be legitimate, he can make it to the Hon. Minister or to any other person who is in charge of distribution; but those distributions are certainly not my responsibility.

Mr. Malone: Madam Speaker, I hear your comments and I accept them totally. You are absolutely right, and I would not expect you to have any control of the buses. That, however, was not the point. The point I was coming to was that the media had for at least 40 minutes full access to all information while Members of the House of Commons did not. I share this with you, that when we approached distribution, the people in distribution expressed most vividly how concerned they were and told us that if we wanted copies—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I have to correct the Hon. Member. As soon as the document was tabled in the House, it was, in principle, available to Hon. Members and they could consult it. At any rate, if the Hon. Member has a complaint about the press getting one copy or several copies before he did, that might be a legitimate complaint; but he had better make it to the Minister and not to myself. As far as the House is concerned, the document was tabled and Members could consult it.

MR. ANDRE—AUTHORITY FOR SALARY INCREASE FOR MR. MICHAEL PITFIELD

Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Earlier this afternoon the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) a question about the salary increase recently given on November 5 to Michael Pitfield, formerly Principal Secretary to the Privy Council. The Right Hon. Leader of the

Point of Order—Mr. Andre

Opposition asked upon what authority that was done. The Prime Minister replied, perhaps in error, that it was done on the advice of the private sector advisory committee on upper level public servants' salaries. That advisory committee advises on levels only, not on specific elements.

Perhaps the Prime Minister may have unintentionally misled the House, but in terms of that authority, Michael Pitfield when rehired by the Prime Minister in March, 1980, arranged—

Madam Speaker: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Andre: Madam Speaker—

Madam Speaker: No, the Hon. Member may not continue discussion on questions that were raised during Question Period. If he wants to receive more information on that particular matter, he can ask questions tomorrow during Question Period, but he cannot debate this matter in the House now under a point of order. Unless he does have a point of order, I cannot allow the Hon. Member to continue.

• (1630)

Mr. Andre: Madam Speaker, I have a very specific point of order in terms of the authority with regard to Estimates and Appropriations Bills. I will get to that point of order as quickly as possible without making the whole discussion totally incomprehensible because of a tremendous leap being required from the start to the main point.

In response to a question that is highly relevant in this six and five age concerning the ex-Chief Secretary of the Privy Council Office receiving a much more substantial pension increase, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) indicated that authority was based erroneously. We have checked the Order in Council which has adjusted the former Principal Secretary's glorious remuneration and departure scheme. The authority for his recent appointment on December 10 as a special adviser under Order in Council was supposedly gained from Appropriations Bill 1981-82.

Madam Speaker: Order. Does the Hon. Member really feel that it is reasonable to continue debating that question? I have just pointed out to him that a point of order is not to be used to continue to debate a question which the Hon. Member might wish to debate. While I hope he has an opportunity to debate it, he cannot, under a point of order, continue to discuss it. He has been doing so since the very beginning of his intervention.

Mr. Andre: Madam Speaker, Vote 1, Privy Council Estimates, 1981-82, contains this statement at the end of that vote: "—and the establishment of positions of senior adviser to which persons may be appointed by the Governor in Council to hold office during pleasure." That authority, through this Appropriations Act, was used by Order in Council to grant Mr. Pitfield this new position and high salary.

As you are aware, this question of legislating through Appropriations Bills has been a subject of debate on points of