

tion was able to file first was that we were not prepared to file until we were sure that it did not have in mind to give us one of the two days.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Nonsense!

**Mr. Deans:** We were awaiting some indication that perhaps the Official Opposition would change its mind and that we would be able to have one of the days. We had to wait until we were sure that both today and Monday next were going to be taken up by the Official Opposition, that it had that intent. Otherwise, the House Leader for the Official Opposition could then legitimately claim that we had no knowledge of what was going to happen on the subsequent day of Monday next, and we therefore were moving without justification to ask for something which those Members themselves might otherwise be prepared to see us have. Therefore, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the time of filing is irrelevant.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** There being no further comments, I will now proceed with my ruling on the matter.

I should point out initially though that the Chair is again faced with a situation whereby Hon. Members—if I may put it in these terms—agree to disagree among themselves. As the Hon. Member for Yukon so rightly pointed out, it is not for the Chair to meddle in those affairs, and the Chair respects that entirely. However, there are three motions standing on the Order Paper under today's supply proceedings; two motions are sponsored by Hon. Members of the Official Opposition and one motion is sponsored by the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap.

The Chair finds itself in the unenviable position of having to exercise its power of selection under Standing Order 62(4)(c). However, the Standing Order places a clear duty on the Chair to make a choice under such circumstances. It is a clear duty imposed on the Chair by the Standing Orders. The Standing Order is very clear and explicit about the Speaker's power of selection in this situation, and I will read Standing Order 62(4)(c):

When notice has been given of two or more motions by Members in opposition to the government for consideration on an allotted day, the Speaker shall have power to select which of the proposed motions shall have precedence in that sitting.

I draw the attention of the Hon. Members to the words "by Members in opposition". The Chair is clearly in the presence of a situation where Parties disagree among themselves. The argument that the Chair should take into account the time of filing may be an argument which the Chair certainly would want to look at, and has looked at, but it does not appear to be the paramount factor in the case this morning. Past practice indicates that Parties in opposition to the Government, other than the Official Opposition, have received their share of allotted days in any supply period. Since this is the fourth day of a five-day period, and taking into account that three of the days have been used by Hon. Members of the Official Opposition, it is my intention to put to the House the motion standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap.

### Supply

This ruling is consistent with the duty of the Chair to give special attention to the protection of minorities. Should debate terminate before the ordinary hour of adjournment later today, this does not prevent the House from moving on to one of the other motions now standing on the Order Paper.

#### ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62—FORESTRY

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap)** moved:

That the Government respond to the emergency in the forestry sector by:

1. creating a new Forestry Ministry with the mandate to advance the Canadian forestry industry; and
2. convening a conference at the earliest opportunity of responsible Federal and Provincial Ministers to address the challenges presently facing the forestry sector.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that, apart from the very eloquent argument put forward by my House Leader, the reason that we in the New Democratic Party felt it was so important—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Order. The Hon. Member was recognized to make remarks on the motion now before the House. I do not believe he should reflect in any way upon arguments advanced previous to the ruling, or the ruling itself.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate those comments. I would like to say that we were very anxious to have this motion before the House today for three substantive reasons. One reason, of course, is that we are talking about such a major industry in our country, a major industry which certainly deserves more attention than it has received in the past.

Just to take a moment or two to present in some context the importance of the forest industry, I would like to remind Hon. Members that it is an industry which results in a \$23 billion income to this country on an annual basis. In terms of our balance of payments, it plays a more significant role than all of the exports from mining, combined with all the exports from agriculture, combined with all the exports from fishing, and then combined, Mr. Speaker, with all the exports from the automobile industry. That is some idea of the size of the exports from the forest industry of this fine country.

It is an immense industry, Mr. Speaker, which employs somewhere in the neighbourhood of 5,000 different companies from one end of Canada to the other. It employs 300,000 Canadians directly in the forest industry and at least a million other Canadians in related industries which service the forest industry in one form or another. It is an incredible sector of our economy.

● (1150)

As well as the forest industry itself, which includes the sawmills, logging operations, pulp and paper mills, plywood mills, shingle mills, shake mills and other aspects of the forest industry that are directly related, one must not lose sight of the fact that we are talking about forests today and the importance of Canadian forests. We have to remind ourselves