

fighting pollution and preserving our environment. To date, Mr. Speaker, I believe that in some areas the young people have not been as co-operative and enterprising as they might have been. Some have displayed a contempt for authority and engaged in litterbug tactics which, to me, destroy the credibility of some young people when they cry for business, government and industry to clear up the mess. I suggest that they, too, may be caught in the web of disorder and find it expedient merely to criticize instead of engaging at working co-operatively in the finding of positive and meaningful solutions to some of these very pressing problems.

As I said before, the Speech from the Throne suggests that there will be more white papers and studies during the present session. I ask, Mr. Speaker, what has become of the white paper on Indian affairs and the subsequent response made by the Indian Affairs Association of Alberta? Since the commencement of the twenty-eighth parliament, a vigorous debate has taken place with respect to the policy to be followed in dealing with our Indian peoples, yet very little has been achieved in a concrete way to improve the welfare of our native peoples and to put right some of the social injustices with which our native peoples have been confronted. Perhaps they are more frustrated today than they have been at any time previously as a result of the expectations aroused by the government.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please.

Mr. Mazankowski: May I call it one o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): It being one o'clock, and pursuant to the special order made earlier this day, the sitting stands suspended until eight o'clock, p.m., later this day.

SITTING SUSPENDED

At one o'clock the sitting was suspended.

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MRS. MacINNIS—STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF MEMBER FOR GREENWOOD CONCERNING ARTICLE IN GLOBE AND MAIL

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. This morning a complaint was made against my colleague the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), arising from a news item in the Toronto press. My colleague was not here at the time and the matter was drawn to his attention later. He is not able to be here this evening and has asked me to read the following statement on his behalf.

The Address—Mr. Mazankowski

I understand that the attention of the house was called to a statement in the *Globe and Mail*—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have very serious doubts as to whether the question of privilege is in order. Mr. Speaker heard the question of privilege raised by the hon. member and made a ruling thereon. It is my impression, unless I am mistaken on the procedural aspect, that the subject was closed with Mr. Speaker's ruling.

Mrs. MacInnis: With deference, Mr. Speaker, my colleague was not here this morning. As soon as he heard about it, he decided he would like to deal with the matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether the House would give unanimous consent so there would be no question about impropriety in allowing the hon. member to read the short statement?

Mr. Otto: Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is no consent.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I happen to know that the statement which the hon. member for Greenwood would like read on his behalf is, in fact, an apology which he felt should be made to the House at the earliest opportunity. I believe under those conditions the House will want to grant that privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With the explanation of the hon. member, does the House give unanimous consent?

Mr. Otto: I am surprised that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) would try to promote such a thing. Surely, it cannot be the rule that a member can have another member make a speech for him when he is absent. I ask the member for Winnipeg North Centre, a man learned in the rules, whether he really thinks this is the type of—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is obvious there is not unanimous consent, and I think the House might proceed. The hon. member for Vegreville.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel, for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. Mazankowski: Prior to the adjournment of the debate this afternoon, I was dealing with the white papers referred to in the Speech from the Throne and the various studies to be continued this session. I am somewhat concerned about the fact that the white paper in respect of Indian affairs was not mentioned