

S. O. 31

the minister should come before the appropriate committee and answer our questions.

Mr. Benoît Tremblay (Rosemont): Madam Speaker, I have another question for the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville.

He pointed out that the bill covers the re-organization or privatization of several very different corporations.

I am wondering whether a single committee would be able to deal with them all, because we are looking at issues related to agriculture, to science and technology, and to other topics more closely tied to the real estate field.

Can the same committee, usually made up of members whose abilities and expertise have something in common, consider the advisability of re-organizing, abolishing or even privatizing various government activities covered in a single bill? Can a committee member be all at once expert in agriculture, expert in science and technology patents, and expert in matters related to real estate.

I have some reservations as to how this might be worked out and, if we are to achieve the goals you have in mind, I should like to hear your suggestions in that respect.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): That is a good question, Madam Speaker.

We have a problem here because, as the hon. member said, we are dealing with six corporations operating in very different fields. For example, one of them is very important to the farming community. Yet another one is a leading concern in research and development in Canada. I would suggest that we need a parliamentary reform, Madam Speaker, for we are often asked to consider what we call omnibus bills which cover a wide range of issues.

It would be a problem because I happen to know that the member for Saskatoon—Humboldt, knowledgeable as he is in the agricultural sector, would want to attend the committee proceedings on the bill. As to research and development patents, Madam Speaker, the member for Windsor is our party spokesman.

I agree with my colleague from Rosemont that the matter deserves more consideration, but the government is putting us in a tight spot.

Madam Deputy Speaker: It being 11 o'clock, pursuant to Standing Orders 35 and 31, the House will now proceed with members' statements.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[English]

WORLD SUMMIT FOR CHILDREN

Mr. Ken James (Sarnia—Lambton): Mr. Speaker, as all members of this House will know, this weekend the World Summit for Children takes place in New York. For the first time ever, heads of state or government will meet to discuss one important social concern, the health and welfare of the weakest and most vulnerable of society, children.

For Canada, the summit is an international event, around which we can find common national purpose. It can be a catalyst which can focus world attention on the specific and urgent needs of children. Children are one of a country's most vital resources. The World Summit is a unique opportunity to draw attention to the specific problems facing children in all parts of the globe.

Mr. Speaker, while much has been accomplished, there is still a long way to go. Children must become a higher political priority in the 1990s.

I applaud the leadership of our government and our Prime Minister in our participation at this historical summit and look forward to our commitment to focus on "doing the do-able" for the children of Canada and around the world.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception): Mr. Speaker, through the mist of the very heady stuff that we have been discussing this opening week of the fall session of Parliament, we find another problem of a different nature but no less magnitude.

In rural Newfoundland, the high number of people who do not qualify for unemployment insurance this year is nothing short of awesome. They do not qualify because this government will not reinstate the variable entrance requirement that takes into account the realities of high unemployment and that would have their qualifying time