

Point of Order—Mr. Mazankowski

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Madam Speaker, if the hon. member is suggesting that the government should move in and tell the Indian people how they should cope with the situation themselves at the same time as we are talking in the context of self-government, I think that is contrary to the position not only the official opposition and many others have taken but also the position of the Canadian government. In any event, it has been stated by the Prime Minister and I in the past that, with respect to certain anti-discriminatory provisions of the patriation resolution, within three years this will have application to do away with the type of discrimination about which the hon. member is talking. However, surely it is not unreasonable in the meantime without interference from non-Indians to allow the Indian people themselves to cope with this particular problem.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. MAZANKOWSKI—STATEMENTS MADE BY MR. PEPIN
DURING QUESTION PERIOD ON NOVEMBER 24

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order which arises out of answers to questions given by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin) on Monday last. This is the first opportunity I have had to raise this matter. I regret that the Minister of Transport is not in the House at the present time.

My point of order has to do with answers which were given in connection with questions having to do with funds which were committed by our administration for the purpose of urban transportation improvements in the province of Ontario. This exchange can be found at page 4981 of *Hansard*.

In his customary flippant and superficial manner the minister attempted to discredit the genuine commitment and undertaking which were made by our government at that time. Moreover, in my view, either advertently or inadvertently, the minister imputed motives which I believe are unfair to me but, more particularly, I believe could cast a reflection upon the minister of transportation and communications of the province of Ontario. I simply wish to correct the misunderstanding for the benefit of the minister and, indeed, for the House.

As I am sure the minister is aware, the question of urban transportation and improvement of the urban transportation system in Toronto has been the subject of a tremendous amount of discussion, debate, and exchange of correspondence. I believe it goes back to 1976. There was an extensive exchange of correspondence, telephone calls and discussions. Indeed, this intensified during our tenure of office, particularly during the latter part of 1979 and the early part of 1980, and culminated in an exchange of documents which constituted agreement in principle.

The agreement was to provide for additional funding in the amount of \$10 million for the fiscal year 1979-80 and the next two fiscal years, the sum of which would amount to \$30 million in total. A letter was directed to me from Mr. Snow

outlining the request. I subsequently directed a telex to Mr. Snow which concurred and provided approval of the additional funding in the amount of \$10 million in the current fiscal year and an additional \$10 million for improvements to the Toronto Union Station and the Bathurst railway corridor.

• (1210)

This was also followed by a press release which was issued by the minister of transport and communications of the province of Ontario, and it was very clear, in the exchange of correspondence and in the documentation, that these were funds in addition to the existing program. The Minister of Transport should also note, if he is not aware of it, that each year—

An hon. Member: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Mazankowski: I am correcting the record, or the implication—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: With all due respect, Madam Speaker, members across the way suggest I am wasting the time of the House. It is my integrity and the integrity of the minister of transport and communications of the province of Ontario which are at stake. I believe they are worthy of preserving, and I simply want to—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I believe that the hon. member on the other side was reminding the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) that he was entering into debate, which I think he was doing in exposing this point of order. I would further remind him that if he feels the minister has imputed motives to him, he can perhaps discuss that, but the fact that the minister might have imputed motives to someone else who is not in the House should not be brought out in the manner in which the hon. member is doing it now. I would ask the hon. member to restrict himself to the point of order he wants to raise concerning himself, and not other people who are not in the House.

Mr. Mazankowski: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The point I want to make is that the minister has suggested that the undertaking was simply the shake of a hand, that there was no Treasury Board submission, and that it was, in effect, improper for me to have done what I did. I should indicate to the House and for the benefit of the minister that he should know that every year there were lapsed funds in the UTAP. Last year was no exception, and I am sure that this year is no exception. If he were to check that out, clearly he would find that to be a fact. He also suggested that there was no Treasury Board submission. The fact of the matter is that he should know that Treasury Board approval is not required for the utilization of lapsed funds in the case of the fiscal year 1979-80, provided that the proposal complies with the terms set out governing the program. So clearly the funding was in order, appropriate, quite proper and correct.