

Will the minister agree that at least some of the humanitarian funds designated by Canada in the same fashion as is being done from Germany will be set aside for those women, victims of sexual assault and rape in Bosnia, as a mark of our concern in honour of the national day of remembrance in this country?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we have looked at a number of ways in which to make our aid to that region as effective as possible. I know there were some suggestions on this subject which came forward from the human rights group that was headed by Mr. Broadbent.

I should say that we do this in some areas in the world. We do it in Africa, for example, where there is specific funding targeted toward women in development. We have done it for women in other areas.

I am certainly open to the idea. We want to use our funding for humanitarian aid in that region as well as we can.

There is no question that what is going on there with regard to the Muslims and the atrocities committed on all sides are in many ways particularly hard on women. I would be quite happy to see if there is something we can do along these lines.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, my first question to the minister of employment was regarding a worker fired with cause. The minister responded twice that this policy only applies to voluntary quits. In the economic and fiscal statement it states: "Persons who voluntarily quit their jobs—"

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, I have to advise the hon. member that is a question of debate. She may wish to pursue it further, but it is not an appropriate point of order.

BILL C-93—SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: I have a judgment to render. On Friday, December 4, 1992, the hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond rose on a point of order relating to the omnibus nature of Bill C-93, an act to implement certain government organization provisions of the budget tabled

in the House of Commons on February 25, 1992. I would like to thank him for the succinctness of his presentation. I would also like to thank the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader for his intervention.

[*Translation*]

I have reviewed the matter and am now prepared to rule on the point of order.

The purpose of Bill C-93 is to wind up and transfer or merge the functions, and in some cases the staff, of nine government organizations to other government agencies or departments, and provide for the continuation and ultimate dissolution of the Canadian Commercial Corporation.

[*English*]

The objections raised by the hon. member were that the bill not only would wind up some agencies, but it would also make major changes to public policy with regard to the role of government. The House leader of the Official Opposition stated that if properly drafted, the long title of the bill would indicate its purpose of terminating specific agencies by name, revealing what he felt was the real purpose of the bill. He also argued that it is an omnibus bill and ought to be sent back to the drafters to be divided.

These points are very similar to the arguments presented by the hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond concerning the omnibus nature of Bill C-63, an act to dissolve or terminate certain corporations and other bodies, on which I ruled on April 1, 1992. As noted at that time, one of the purposes of omnibus bills is to group together multiple statutory amendments so that discussion in the House may be focused. It was also pointed out that the Speaker has not been given any specific authority over the form or content of omnibus bills.

I would refer hon. members to the ruling of April 1, 1992, which dealt in some detail with the very points raised on Friday last by the hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond. The arguments presented in relation to Bill C-93, while put forward with skill, have not convinced me that the Chair should deviate from our practice. Accordingly, I must conclude that it would not be appropriate under these circumstances to accept the objections raised.

Therefore, the bill is properly before the House.