

Government Orders

PETITIONS

LAND CLAIMS

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I have the duty to present petitions on behalf of the Kaska Tribal Council of British Columbia and the Yukon. The petition is signed by residents of Watson Lake, Lower Post, British Columbia and that general area covered by the Kaska Tribal Council.

The Kaska Tribal Council in this petition is urging the Minister of Indian Affairs to confirm to the Kaska Tribal Council that Canada will honour its fiduciary obligations to the Kaska Tribal Council under the 1989 framework agreement on land claims. It also urges the minister of Indian affairs to remedy any breaches to date to the 1989 framework agreement, including those that may be contained in the umbrella final agreement signed in May 1993.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Mr. Speaker, I rise today pursuant to Standing Order 36 to present a petition which has been certified correct as to form and content by the clerk of petitions.

The petitioners request that Parliament review Canada's foreign policy through a process involving broad consultation and participation and improve the official development assistance program so as to support more effectively the solutions put forward by poor countries to meet their own peoples' needs.

These petitioners are from Summerland, Penticton and Naramata in the riding of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt. I present this today.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Shall all questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: I wish to inform colleagues that pursuant to Standing Order 33(2)(b) because of the ministerial statements, Governments Orders will be extended by 38 minutes.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 1994

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-17, an act to amend certain statutes to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 22, 1994 be read the second time and referred to a committee; and of the amendment.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, the omnibus nature of this bill makes it very awkward to deal with the component parts contained in it. Some of the items are realistic and reasonable. Some are not.

In normal circumstances one studies a bill and then makes an informed decision whether or not that bill should be supported. In the case of Bill C-17 that decision is not so easy to make.

One of the great political red herrings of the past Parliament was the Charlottetown accord. It too was omnibus in nature. There was something in it which almost everybody could accept collectively and there were areas which almost no one could accept as well. On the whole the majority of the Canadian population rejected the accord because in an all or nothing arrangement there were too many areas that were not acceptable. Therein lies the problem.

● (1600)

Since the rejection of the Charlottetown accord the past and present government have used the rejection to throw back in the faces of people advocating such timely reforms as an elected Senate the fact that such a reform was offered and rejected.

At the same time the government seems able to proceed with such constitutional items as official bilingualism for another province, changes in wording of an agreement which allow a bridge to replace a ferry system and negotiations on aboriginal self-government.

Thus is the problem associated with omnibus type bills which have in the past created a lose-lose situation for many of those involved in the process. It is with this obstacle in mind that I have prepared my position on transportation subsidies.

The prairie grain farmer has many problems in attempting to operate a successful and very necessary business in Canada. For years grain farmers have been receiving freight subsidies to offset the cost of grain transportation. There is in this subsidy a bit of a misconception. The farmers do not receive the subsidy directly. It is paid to the railway and there many unresolved