

As for Ottawa Airport, the Department of National Health and Welfare has held extensive consultations with the air carriers and their associations and the provinces regarding smoking in public places. Air carriers have voluntarily designated separate areas for smokers and non-smokers. The proportion of non-smoking seats continues to increase. With respect to the Ottawa Airport, it is our understanding that Transport Canada is considering designating air terminals primarily "non-smoking" areas.

As for other federal buildings, two other departments, the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion and the Auditor General, have smoking policies in place at this time. Treasury Board has indicated they are in favour of smoking restrictions and have asked the Medical Services Branch of the Department of National Health and Welfare to provide smoking cessation programs for federal employees.

As for the question: Are measures being taken to ensure that separate ventilation is given to smoking areas? The provision of separate ventilation for smoking areas is a complex issue because of the costs involved, the variation of building design and the fact that buildings are often shared with other departments. Officials of National Health and Welfare have been directed to investigate the possibility of separate ventilation systems in department facilities.

● (1110)

Mr. Lewis: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

[English]

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 29

CANADIAN FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. Speaker: The Chair is in receipt of an application under Standing Order 29 from the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans).

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I regret that my letter was delivered late. However, it being Monday, and with the changes to the Standing Orders, it made it a little difficult for us.

As Your Honour knows, we filed with you the following letter:

Mr. Speaker:

Given the impending action of the U.S. Congress, scheduled for Wednesday of this week against the interests of the Canadian Forestry Industry and the inevitable crisis such action poses, we believe it imperative that the House of Commons make its views known immediately to the U.S. Congress.

We request your permission, under Standing Order 29, for a special debate.

S.O. 29

If I could, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add one comment to the end of the letter. This would be a matter which might normally be dealt with under opposition day motions. However, my concern in that regard is that because a motion put on an opposition day is inevitably a motion of non-confidence, it would be extremely difficult to encourage members of the Government to support such an action. As Your Honour knows, it is not possible to waive the non-confidence nature of a motion on an opposition day—at least it does not appear to be, even though the Standing Orders might allow it. Although it is possible to have a debate, it is not possible to have it concluded with any type of action taken by the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker: First, I would like to say to the Hon. Member that the application was received somewhat late. For reasons which will become clear in what I have to say, I chose to accept it and say something today precisely because of the reason the Hon. Member raises. That is to say that if the Chair is to say something it seemed useful to say it today, before tomorrow and the next day, given what I think is the accepted importance of the subject.

I think the Hon. Member anticipates what the Chair will have to say in this situation, that is, the Chair has to cope with two issues. First, there is the genuine emergency of the subject. Second, there is the urgency of debate for Members; or, in other words, the opportunity for a debate on the subject. As the Hon. Member well knows there are two days scheduled—tomorrow and the next—for the Opposition to determine the subject of debate.

While I appreciate what the Hon. Member is saying about a votable opposition day, he will know that an application under Standing Order 29 merely produces a motion to adjourn. Therefore, it seems to the Chair that even with the constraints imposed, perhaps on a votable opposition day, even a non-votable opposition day is a better proceeding for the Hon. Member's purpose than is a simple motion to adjourn.

On that basis and, more important, on the basis of the question of the urgency of debate, the Chair is inclined to reject the application under Standing Order 29.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on a related but separate matter, then, will the Chair permit me to request of the House of Commons its unanimous consent to move the following motion:

That this House express its grave concern over the action proposed to be taken by the U.S. Congress against the importation of Canadian softwood and request the Prime Minister convey our concern to the U.S. administration.

If there were unanimous consent for such a motion to be moved, then I would be pleased to move it.

Mr. Speaker: That is apparently a request to revert to Motions. The Hon. Member knows that I appreciate his dilemma since he had to wait for a decision with respect to his request under Standing Order 29. There is a request of the House for unanimous consent to revert to Motions.