

Speaker's Ruling

Mr. Ouellet: There is some courtesy in Parliament sometimes. I certainly appreciate this. If other members want to do the same thing I will gladly accept their advance questions.

The human rights president of Mexico, Jorge Madrazo, was in Ottawa some time ago. He met with the Canadian human rights commissioner. They have agreed to exchange information, to work together and to co-operate on a very wide variety of programs which will certainly go a long way in helping Mexico to cope with its situation.

In his discussions with me Mr. Madrazo has indicated that he is quite pleased with the co-operation he is receiving from his government and hopes to see progress in this regard in the near future.

* * *

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Finance.

At the recent Beijing conference the government committed itself to implementing gender based analysis throughout federal departments and agencies. The need for this analysis is to determine the different social and economic impacts that government policies will have on women and men.

Will his department ensure that full gender based studies in matters relating to his next budget will be undertaken and tabled in the House when the next budget is delivered?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as indicated by the hon. member, the Secretary of State for the Status of Women unveiled a new policy on gender analysis which was very highly applauded by all of the countries that were there.

In the past, individual budget decisions have been studied for their impact on women. It is therefore a major step forward that now each and every government department must look within its own decision making process to make sure no decisions are taken that are hostile to women. It is the view of the government that all decisions taken should be to their benefit.

The Speaker: This brings question period to a close.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

BILL C-106—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: This morning the hon. member for Nanaimo—Cowichan rose on a point of order relating to Standing Order 45 and the timing of the deferred vote scheduled for 5.30 p.m. this day.

His argument is that this vote should have been scheduled for 6.30 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 45(6)(a), when a vote is deferred on a Thursday.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader counter-argued that Standing Order 45(5)(a)(ii) allows the chief government whip to designate another time than the ordinary hour of adjournment so long as he does not set the vote down for a Friday.

I have reviewed the matter and find that the wording of Standing Order 45(6)(a) is very specific. It reads as follows:

A division deferred on Thursday is not held on Friday, but is instead deferred to the next sitting day, at the ordinary hour of daily adjournment.

Because of this very specific wording I can only conclude that the hon. member for Nanaimo—Cowichan has a point. Standing Order 45(6)(a) clearly states what is to happen when a deferral of a division is requested on a Thursday and a Friday.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader did allude to a possible incongruity between the two standing orders. He may wish to pursue that aspect with the committee that he so ably chairs.

• (1505)

For now, and until the House changes the wording of the standing orders, requests by a single whip, acting alone, for the deferral of a division on a Thursday will be automatically set down at the ordinary hour of adjournment on the next sitting day that is not a Friday.

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with regard to the question put by my hon. colleague from Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia. I raise it under citation 485 of Beaudesne. I ask whether you ruled his question out of order on the basis of—

The Speaker: I ruled the question out of order and that is why I never permitted an answer for it. I found that the question was just not in keeping with the administrative responsibilities of anyone identifiable. I found that it was a matter of what was going on in the party and that does not include what we do here in the House for answers from ministers.

I would like to let that matter sit right there.

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, is it appropriate to ask for clarification of a ruling by the Chair? Can a member ask a question for clarification purposes only with regard to a ruling and not on the basis of challenging the Speaker? I certainly understand that rule in Beaudesne, but for clarification cannot a point of order be raised?