

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10:00 o'clock, Friday, March 13, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Manitoba, praying for the passing of an Act to amend the Chartered Accountants Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General, The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate yesterday for a couple of reasons. First of all, dealing with the matter of the contents of the report, I want to say that I share wholeheartedly the comments that were made yesterday by the Attorney-General as they relate to the new statutes and the capacity that they are going to have in the future of Manitoba. I would like to record along with those names, the names that he mentioned of the Civil Servants that were involved, I think the elected people who were involved as well, for the sake of history, include the name of the Honourable Mr. Mackling himself, who is the present Attorney-General, and I think that if my memory serves me right there were two others when the former administration was in office, the Honourable Sterling Lyon and I think probably the Honourable Stewart McLean during his period of office as well.

I know for all of those people who have over the past number of years had to use the Statutes that were difficult to keep up to date, the patience that they have had to show while this new work was being done, I'm sure, or I certainly hope their patience will have been rewarded in the kind of statutes that will be theirs to use from this day forward. So I won't go on at any greater length than that except to associate myself with the remarks of the Attorney-General.

And then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss just for a moment the manner in which we are receiving this report in the House, because it's true that we did discuss at committee yesterday morning, as we were approving the report, that the Honourable the Attorney-General would be presenting the report and that he would be making some remarks, and it was suggested that myself and others might want to. Well, by virtue of the rules of the House, once the motion is made every member of the House is at perfect liberty to speak on it in any event, but the thing that I want to talk about is the fact that as far as I am aware we have a new precedent here that I wouldn't want to really get off and get started on without a recognition of all Members of the House what they were doing.

I noticed that the Lieutenant-Governor yesterday, Mr. Speaker, said that at this time in our history we need to abandon old ideas, dogmas and traditions. I really hadn't thought we'd get started so quickly, because he hadn't much more than got it out of his mouth than I find that the procedure for the day yesterday was not quite followed to the letter. I have attempted to follow as many as I could in the period of time between yesterday and now but I haven't been able to find, although I must frankly admit, Mr. Speaker, that I haven't been able to check all of the Hansards that are available, but all of the ones that I did check, the Speaker bowed to the Members of the House and they took their seats; the Premier then stood up on, which is Item No. 11, and moved Resolution No. 1; and there was no such thing, Mr. Speaker, as the Speaker moving into the routine Orders of Proceedings which was the case yesterday.

Now I presume it was the case, and it's a presumption on my part, that the reason for it was to enable the laying on the table of the House the Statutes. I appreciate the fact that probably the reason for doing that was that the laying on the table of the House the Statutes was a significant historical event, all of which I agree with, Mr. Speaker, but I think that if it was going to be done that way there should have been agreement and that it should have been indicated within the order of procedure that we had so that there wasn't an interruption, that the Routine Orders shouldn't have been entered on, because it is my view when you enter into

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) the Routine Proceedings the next thing that should naturally follow is the question period and I think it is probably just as well that we don't get that started during the ceremonial of the opening of the Legislature.

So that the thing I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that one thing leads to another sometimes in these things, and being done the way it was, if it had been put in here as something special in terms of procedure it might very well have included a write-up along with the procedure at the opening with the other guests that we had within the Chamber, that in our rule book I think are referred to as strangers within the House, because I think outside of the Members of the Legislature that probably few of the others that were here recognized the significance of what was happening. So what I am pointing out, Mr. Speaker, is that I think there would have been a better way of handling it. I point out that I would hate to see it established because it is on the record of being a precedent, and as we know our rules oftentimes fall on precedent, and I would hope that we could have some kind of recognition within the House about this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, in order to review the report and comment on it properly, I would beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think we should remind the members that motions to adjourn should not be preceded with by editorial comment, and let's stop it right now so it won't happen in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, so that I do not interfere with the traditional proceedings, could I have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, maybe I am departing from past procedure in speaking on this motion at this time, but I think it is only orderly and proper for me to do so. I had rather thought of doing what was done yesterday and speaking on the motion on opening day but I felt some members might not approve of it and therefore I decided not to participate on opening day. However, I feel that this matter of establishing a committee to select or name the various members to the various committees is of prime importance, especially to me, because of what has taken place on past occasions.

Over the years that I have been in the House now, and it's the eleventh regular session, I have always gone along with government procedure in letting the government name the committee without contesting it in any way or amending it in any way. However, at the last session I was asked to give a report to the then House Leader as to the various committees that I would like to serve on and I did so, giving the priorities, but it was rather ignored and was not acted on. That is my reason for coming forward at this time and speaking on the motion before us.

Then, too, I would like to enlarge on some of the matters that the committees as such, and especially this committee, will be asked to do. I feel that honourable members of this House, if they have a desire to serve on any of the committees, they should not be denied the right to do so. I think this should be a privilege and a right to any member of this House. Why should we deny a certain member of contributing to a certain committee? We, over the years now, have agreed that members can participate as far as discussing matters that are before the committee, but to move actual motions and to present new ideas in concrete form to them so they can be acted on, this cannot be done and this is why I have been denied the

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) privilege of this House that do belong to me by right.

Then, too, the size of the various committees - over the years it has more or less been the practice to name a committee of the same size and order of past years, and I don't think that this should be a procedure that had to stand pat and acted on every year in like form because new matters come before certain committees, like the Municipal Affairs Committee over the past couple of years, they have had a tremendous amount of work in bringing forth a new Act. Again this year the Throne Speech mentions that they will be asked to review and recommend in connection with assessment. This is a very very important matter and I certainly feel that I would like to belong to that particular committee for this current session and take part in those deliberations, because this is of tremendous importance to me as a member representing my constituency because it involves the taxes that will be paid by the people in my constituency, because when assessment is involved this has a direct bearing on taxation.

Then, too, in connection with priorities as far as serving on the various committees, to me the Statutory Orders and Regulations Committee is one of the very uppermost in my mind, one of the most important committees of this House, because this committee deals with the regulations that have been passed by Cabinet, by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. These are laws that are being passed by Cabinet and that I feel should be sanctioned by this House. Last year we did not receive a motion of concurrence. This is the first time it has slipped up or it has not been acted on. I feel this is very very improper and that we must have a motion of concurrence in connection with the regulations.

Then, too, I feel if ever the House or the government has exceeded its rights, I think it comes under the aspect of regulations. Not so much -- or I wouldn't say as far as the Act itself, the laws themselves, but because those laws are sometimes very wide and you can have regulations infringing on the rights and privileges of people, individual people, and this has happened in my opinion in certain cases and this is where I feel I would certainly like to be part and party to reviewing these regulations and have a proper chance of discussing them. Last year, because no concurrence motion was brought forward, we didn't even have a chance to discuss them in this Chamber as has been the practice in the past.

I already mentioned the matter of individual provincial rights -- or individual and property rights. I also would like to mention the matter of legislation in connection with marketing. There, too, I felt we were infringing on personal rights and on the privileges granted under the British North America Act. I think we need only quote the examples of the marketing legislation. We have another example presently before us, not from the provincial House but from the federal House as far as the Wheat Board quotas, and I think here again this government should take drastic action to see to it that our people, our farmers especially in southern Manitoba will receive some quota, because under the present quota system, if it is brought in, the majority of farmers in south central Manitoba will have no quota at all. They won't be able to sell a bushel of wheat under that system and therefore I feel that this government should take action. This is probably beside the point at the moment, but I felt this had to be touched on. I will be discussing this further when I speak on the Throne Speech itself.

Another committee is the Public Accounts Committee. Here I feel that another principle is involved because this is the auditor's report, and as far as the auditor's report is concerned all members should have equal rights. This principle should be upheld and this especially incorporated as far as the Public Accounts Committee is concerned. Even the matter of having a government majority should not apply on this particular committee because this committee is there to discuss the public accounts and to review the auditor's report and make recommendations if required.

Then in addition to the Standing Committees we have the Special Committees, of which we had several appointed at the last session. I served on one only. Our committee had two meetings which I attended. I attended meetings of other committees that were established at my own expense, and the reason I do this is to be better informed, because if you attend the committee meetings this means that first of all you are a better informed person and will take up less time in the Chamber to discuss matters that are important and that you should be informed on. For other parties, they will have members on these committees so that they can be informed through their caucus. However, this is not the case as far as I am concerned, nor so of the Honourable Member for Churchill, so that a certain amount of information will

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) not come to us if we are not members of the committee.

I have already discussed the matter of the Municipal Affairs of concurrence motions, and the only one left I think that I should comment on is the Agricultural Committee. Here too, this has not been -- this committee wasn't even called at the last session yet we're in the greatest trouble ever as far as our agricultural situation is concerned, and I feel that this government should call that particular committee at the earliest moment to look into the matter of the agricultural situation and bring forward recommendations to hear the various organizations, and especially to hear the Wheat Board and the various agencies to come up with some plan. In past years I've recommended the matter of inland storage. I still feel that we have to come up with some kind of a proposition for the farmers in Manitoba to get some cash into their hands and to be able to dispose of their crop in a given crop year. This can be done; there's no reason why it can't be done and I think we need to take action in this regard.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move at this time that the name of "Froese" be added to the list composing this committee, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to support the motion, but in supporting it I want to explain why, because I don't think the Honourable Member from Rhineland knows how difficult it is, how difficult it is to apportion representation in the House, particularly with the situation that we have now. Quite frankly, every time that there is representation by either the Member for Rhineland or the Member for Churchill, and I don't object to it, what happens is representation is reduced either on behalf of the Liberal Party or on behalf of our Party, and some of our people have to stay off committees. They do this and they accept it gracefully and graciously and they don't have the opportunity either of taking part in the votes on the committees when they're not on a committee. They sit out; they have the right to participate the same as every other member of the House has a right to participate with everything in terms of vote. The things that do come back in the House, they have an opportunity to go over everything the committee has done again if they so desire. So I think there's all kinds of opportunity there, but I support it because I think it might be helpful if the Member for Rhineland had an opportunity of attempting to help put this committee structure together. He might achieve an understanding of how difficult it is for the members of that committee to develop equal representation in terms of the representation in the House, and that there are parties in the House that do forego some of the representation that they feel is theirs to allow for representation on committees by the Honourable Member for Rhineland and the Member for Churchill and others that may be in that same position. So, Mr. Speaker, while clarifying a position, I do want you to know why I am supporting the motion and why I think it might have an educational effect on our friend from Rhineland.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been drawn to my attention by the Clerk that our Rule 68 (1) makes specific reference to the number "7", that's the number of members to constitute this committee, and if I may read a portion of it, "at the commencement of each session a special committee of seven members shall be appointed."

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, needless to say, in thanking the Clerk and yourself, the motion is out of order. Now that being the case it could possibly be put again -- and I don't think that there would be any objection on this side -- but the honourable member would then have to suggest that the name replace another name.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I sense from your position there that you would like perhaps some further advice as to how to deal with the propriety of the motion. It is obvious, it would seem, Sir, that the motion is clearly out of order, that it could be entertained however if the Honourable Member for Rhineland were to remove his name in substitution for someone else's, then it could be in accordance with the rules.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I would not want to do that because I feel that would be improper for me to do. I think it would be better to suggest that we waive the rule on this occasion and . . .

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the honourable member move that the motion be amended to add his name and possibly that would overcome the problem which you have at this time. I would like to say a few words on it, but if the amendment is there . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm advised by the Clerk, for the information of the Member for Churchill, that the Honourable Member for Rhineland can not amend his own motion, but perhaps with leave of the House he may be allowed to correct it. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Both the Premier and myself have indicated that if the honourable member wishes to change his motion, not amend it, that we would give leave on this side if he made his motion in the appropriate way, that is, he would have to replace one of the names on the list with his own. If he doesn't consider it appropriate to do so then the motion is out of order and I think we should go on with the business of the House.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I think we might solve the problem by proposing an amendment to the rule, that rather than seven persons that the committee be made up of eight persons, and this is within the power of the House to amend if the House so feels. It may not receive the approval of the House, but by amending the motion that the Rule 68 be changed to read from "seven" to "eight" and that the name of the Member for Rhineland be added, then we can proceed and have a vote on it and it may or may not pass.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, we're not about to be amending the rules on cases of this kind on that type of consideration. Now the honourable member's course is plain. He has a way of putting his motion; if he chooses not to put it that way then, Mr. Speaker, I think the point of order has been exhausted, there is an out of order motion on the floor and that we should proceed with the business of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move -- there's no motion . . .

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): . . . possibly would be the main motion.

MR. SPEAKER: That is right. In the light of - and I wish to apologize to the honourable members that I did not become aware of this provision in the rules earlier, prior to the commencement of the debate, but in the context of the rules I must rule the amendment out of order.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on that same point of order, I think the motion already was accepted because you allowed certain people to speak on it. I think it's improper to rule it out of order at this point.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the Speaker's Gallery where we have as our honoured guest Manitoba's youthful representative for the Easter Seal campaign. This year's Tammy is 11-year old Wendy Graham, daughter of Mr. & Mrs. Harvey Graham who farm near Minto in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur. With Tammy are her parents and Mr. Sidney Scott, the Manitoba Chairman of the 1970 Easter Seal Campaign. As members know, the month-long campaign opened February 26th and concludes March 29th, Easter Sunday, and it's conducted in rural Manitoba. Tammy was diagnosed as a spastic quadriplegic from birth, but this affliction has not deterred her from playing an active role in her community. She attends Grade V at Minto School where she is considered a very good student. Her hobbies include swimming and music. Indeed, Wendy is rapidly becoming an accomplished pianist and won high honours in March at the Turtle Mountain Music Festival.

Wendy has a 16-year old brother Roger who plans to farm, and when that time comes he will be the fourth generation to run the family farm which was originally homesteaded by his great grandfather in 1880. Wendy herself has spent a great deal of time in hospital for corrective surgery. Although she still uses crutches, it is hoped, and I know we all join in this wish, that she will be able to discard them in time. As the 1970 Tammy, Wendy represents all handicapped children throughout the province who are looking to Easter Seal contributions to help them grow into happy and useful adults.

We're indeed pleased to have you with us today Tammy. You help give well-deserved public recognition to the Society for Crippled Children and Adults of Manitoba and for its effective work with the handicapped in the province. God bless you.

Consideration of the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RON MCBRYDE (The Pas): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and fellow members. I rise at this time, Mr. Speaker, to move His Honour's Address from the Throne. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to do so, Mr. Speaker, under your guidance in this the second session of the Twenty-ninth Legislature.

I also want to take advantage of this opportunity to thank the Honourable the First Minister for extending to me the privilege of speaking on this occasion. I would like to congratulate him for the excellent manner in which he has carried out the duties of his high office to this date.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to concern myself with the issues and program that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor so ably set out yesterday. To this end perhaps it would be of some use for those present to reflect on their personal situation one year ago. Personally I was, and continue to be, a resident of that part of Manitoba lying north of the 53rd parallel. Like many other Manitobans I was concerned about the attitude and approach of the government in that part of the province. Like many other Manitobans I was concerned about the drift and inaction of the government generally, but in the north, and especially the more isolated areas of the north, we had the feeling that there was a hesitance on the part of government to listen to what the northern residents were saying. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are indeed pleased to read in the speech that this government is not only aware of the problems of the north but, more important, it is prepared to do something about them. The policies as set out clearly indicate that the present government is beginning to move in a new direction, a direction that will give the north the recognition and the emphasis it deserves. The setting up of the Northern Task Force during the first session of the Legislature was the first indication of this. The Speech from the Throne presented to us yesterday continues to build on what was started at that time. This time last year, Mr. Speaker, I listened to the problems and concerns of people in such isolated communities as Wabowden, Thicket Portage and Norway House and other communities. I heard from them their concern over the Northern Affairs Act and how it was being administered. I could feel their tremendous frustration because of their inability to change the situation. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the people whom this Act affects will feel as pleased as I did that this government is proposing to move in a direction which they have requested.

Another example of this new direction, and one in which the Premier is in part responsible, is the naming of The Pas district as a designated area by the Federal Government. It is hoped that as a result of his overtures in the ensuing tentative agreement that we will yet see some co-ordinated and planned development in our area.

Another matter which many of my constituents have discussed with me, Mr. Speaker, is the idea of a Human Rights Commission. By codifying and expanding Human Rights legislation the government is recognizing that whether we like it or not we even have today discrimination in the Province of Manitoba. However, no one would like to be so naive as to believe that this would solve the problem, but it is very significant that we in Manitoba will be putting the law very much on the side of someone who alleges discrimination because of race, creed or colour.

The matter of pollution control is another important concern in my constituency. Recently the fishermen of the Saskatchewan River and its basin have truly come to understand what the word pollution means when they discovered mercury poison in a number of the types of fish they were catching. Mr. Speaker, one plant being careless with its waste material came close to ruining the livelihood of hundreds of fishermen. We have being built in The Pas the type of industry in which pollution control is a problem. As it could affect 140 fishermen in my constituency alone, I'm extremely pleased with the announced intention in regards to pollution control.

Now that I have referred to Churchill Forest Industries, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not say more of this development, as this development in The Pas is very much in the news. I do not know exactly what the conditions were when CFI was attracted to Manitoba, but I do not think that anyone studying the matter today would deny that the Provincial Government and the Town of The Pas did not strike a very good bargain with this company. As a matter of fact, the only basis on which I feel that this agreement and the amount of public money that has been invested can be justified is that it will create enormous employment opportunities for northern people. The people of The Pas and district are generally pleased that this industry is locating in our area and are pleased that the government is now safeguarding this large public investment, but I am concerned, Mr. Speaker,

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd). . . that we be sure that this development will in fact improve the life of a substantial number of northern residents.

During the visits of the Northern Task Force we were continually struck by the fact that the opportunities of economic development had for the most part bypassed the original northern residents. When Lynn Lake was developed, I understand people said, well this will be a tremendous opportunity for local people. When Thompson developed, the politicians said that this would be a tremendous opportunity for the Indian and Metis people in Northern Manitoba. When Gillam came into being with the Kettle Rapids development, we said this would provide opportunities for northern people, but for the most part it did not happen. The record at Churchill Forest Industries thus far is better than the other developments. In the small sawmill they have there, there are 30 workers most of whom are local workers. The Government has sponsored and assisted with a training program at Moose Lake which has now developed into a pulpwood cutting operation involving about 30 people. However, Mr. Speaker, there are about 250 to 300 workers cutting pulp in The Pas area, and I would guess, Mr. Speaker, that no more than 25 of these people are from Northern Manitoba, so this government must make sure that no opportunity is lost and that it, as well as municipal and federal governments and the company and unions, do everything possible to make these employment opportunities available to northern residents.

Although I'm a resident of Northern Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, I would like to attempt to overcome my parochialism and mention some of the items in the Throne Speech that are applicable to the whole province. I'm referring to such things as the proposed amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act which will clarify and improve provisions for compensation for permanent partial disability. We are also asked to consider changes in the Labour Act, changes designed to improve our province's labour-management relations and as such will benefit all Manitobans. The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, the Law Reform Commission and the new laws respecting the invasion of privacy and the election expense legislation are all matters which will help bring Manitoba up to the 20th century.

Mr. Speaker, the matters with which I concern myself today are but a sampling of the totality of the Throne Speech. We know there is still much to be done and many changes still to be made, but I feel that this Throne Speech will take its place in history as an impressive document. Impressive, Mr. Speaker, because of its emphasis on improving the quality of life for all Manitobans. Impressive because it recognizes there is much to be done to improve the human and cultural condition of our province. Impressive because it tells us that the government has a very far-reaching and positive role to play. Impressive, Mr. Speaker, because it says that the acceptance of the status quo is no longer good enough.

I would like to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member from Point Douglas that an Humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:

We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present session.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI (Point Douglas): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to second this motion, Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to congratulate you on your continuation in your high office. I think we have every confidence that you will continue to conduct the affairs of this House with a fairness, natural good humour and impartiality.

I would also like to congratulate our premier as he enters his second legislative session as a leader of our province. One does not have to read newspaper quotes to know that the majority of the people of this province appreciate the leadership and understanding of our premier. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

I should also like at this time to thank the voters of Point Douglas constituency for the trust they have placed in me in electing me to this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like, if I may, to speak briefly about two problems relating to the question of drugs. The first is the problem of misuse or abuse of drugs by the young people in our society today. The second problem is precisely the opposite. It is the inability of pensioners to get the necessary prescription of drugs due to their high cost.

Let me deal with the question of drug abuse in high schools first. This is a problem, Mr. Speaker, which has caused great concern lately in our media and among parents. The

(MR. MALINOWSKI cont'd) statistics apparently show that from the end of 1966 to the beginning of 1970 drug use in our high schools has tripled. A recent study done at the Winnipeg high schools showed that 27 percent of the students have used illegal drugs at least once. Along with the increase in the use of these drugs we are also finding an increase in the abuse of these drugs. Perhaps the most disturbing trend of all is that many students are using . . . drugs and are mixing a variety of drugs that they have bought on black markets and whose composition they do not know.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would be less than frank if I did not say that it was not until marijuana and LSD were used by the children of the well-to-do in our society that the press and the mass media noticed that we had a drug problem. We know that in our working class districts and low income areas drug abuse has been going on for a long time. Particularly severe is the use of solvent inhalants such as nail polish remover, plastic glue and plastic cement which could result in serious damage. We know it is true that all students do not use drugs, but, certainly it is incumbent upon our society to feel responsible for those who do, for those who become vulnerable to criminal charges and for those who become vulnerable to personal disaster.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to know all or even most of the answers to the problems of drug use. Perhaps our students are bored perhaps they have seen the great gulf between what their elders practice and what they preach and are using drugs as a symbol of rebellion. I do not know. But, I believe that we must move with all due haste and expand existing programs so that we may attempt to find out, and I would hope that we could initiate as soon as possible a serious and comprehensive drug education program throughout our schools. I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that many of the students who use drugs, and indeed many students generally, are looking for real moral alternatives to the artificial world represented by drug use and to the hypocritical world they perceive in many of the large organizations they come into contact with. I think we as a representative of the people have a responsibility to help provide some of those moral alternatives.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch briefly on the question of old age pensioners. As has been stated time and time again, many pensioners because they are on fixed incomes have great difficulty in meeting their many costs to live a decent life. The major problem among the pensioners is that of health, and while medicare provides some guarantee of health care, it does not help in the purchase of prescription drugs. Prescriptions, of course, can be obtained with public health if the pensioner can show indigence; but surely this is a shabby way to treat the people who have made a tremendous contribution in building our society. It seems unjust that after a lifetime of hard work and good citizenship that a pensioner should have to almost beg for help in the area of health care. We owe the pensioner this kind of help; and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we shall in the not too distant future be able to provide it through our Medicare plan.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Speech from the Throne is a document which truly reflects the interest and the welfare of all the people of Manitoba. I would hope that each of us regardless of our partisan affiliation will put the interests of the people first; I hope we will recognize that by the co-operation and goodwill we may most effectively benefit all of the citizens of Manitoba.

In concluding the Speech from the Throne His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor said, "I pray that Divine Providence may attend your deliberations and decisions." I hope that we will all be worthy of that prayer. I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in seconding this resolution and asking for its adoption. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Riel, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.