

but it identified the broader themes which underlie the specifics and which cannot be addressed by just one department, but which need the commitment of the whole Government to bring about the substantial changes in attitude and profit so desperately required to make the federal Government's programs and programs delivery more efficient, more effective and more responsive to the people of this country.

Some specific findings of the study teams, in addition to the more pervasive issues, included procurement. The study team noted that the federal Government spends more than \$9 billion a year on procurement. This study team concluded that the Government can "spend smarter" by better managing the system currently in place and by increasing competitive tendering and promoting contracting out initiatives. The study team which examined services and subsidies to business subtitled their report "giving with both hands". This refers to an overly rich, overlapping industrial incentive program. This study team undertook 140 program reviews, encompassing 218 separate federal programs costing \$16.4 billion in 1984-85, and involving more than 68,000 public servants.

The study team found that this incentive program needed rationalizing to allow Government input to be better targeted and to require sufficient private sector input. For example, federal assistance for any private investment from tax expenditures, ERDAs and grants should not exceed 50 per cent of a project's cost. These are just two of the hundreds of program areas examined by the study teams.

The many recommendations and options put forward by the task force deserve serious examination. The appropriate standing committees will be examining these options and, indeed, the Government had put into effect some recommendations prior to the publication of the full report. It is vital, however, now that we have a comprehensive overview of government programs, that the examination of the recommendations be monitored correctly, that the appropriate changes, especially with regard to the pervasive attitudinal ones, be made as quickly as possible. This should be done in order to improve services to the public, promote more efficient management, lighten the burden of bureaucratic regulations on all of us and, most important, lighten the load of the taxpayers in Canada who are sick and tired of a high taxation level on the one hand and poor programs on the other.

While I commend the efforts of everyone involved in this task force, I now strongly urge the respective committees to get on with dealing with those substantial recommendations and options so that we can save the people hundreds of millions in tax dollars.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pierre H. Vincent (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance):** First, Mr. Speaker, allow me to thank and congratulate the Hon. Member for Don Valley East (Mr. Attewell) for his interest in following up the outstanding report

### Adjournment Debate

tabled by the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Nielsen) and his team last March 11, as you know.

When tabling the 20 studies the Deputy Prime Minister had given—and the House followed that recommendation: each study was referred to the appropriate standing committee of the House. So the report on the study on agriculture was referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture—transport, finance, consumer and corporate affairs, forests, environment, culture, and so forth. As you know, Mr. Speaker, each standing committee will hear witnesses, consider the studies in question, and eventually table in the House its major conclusions on the study.

A number of committees, including that of Agriculture, have already started and, as you know, each House Standing Committee has its own working schedule. It is the committee itself which will decide when it will hear the various witnesses, and on what it will report to the House of Commons later on.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is marvelous. It was part of the program which the Government had in mind, when elected on September 4, 1984, to make sure that all Members of the House are involved in the decision making process of all the policies involving Canada nationally.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister responsible for a particular dossier is only one of many parties involved and will have to follow the procedure established and the decisions made by the Standing Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I think therefore that we should be satisfied with the work that will be made by each of the Standing Committees, following the 20 studies tabled, and by the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs. I am sure that the Committee will make proper and timely decisions and then report to the House, and that both the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) and its Department will consider the various recommendations with utmost interest.

• (1820)

[English]

REFUGEES—NEW DETERMINATION PROCESS. (B) PORTUGUESE VISAS INQUIRY

**Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to pursue in this adjournment debate a question which I asked of the Minister of State for Immigration (Mr. McLean) on May 22, the day immediately following his announcement on the refugee determination process which he plans to establish. The Minister's announcement was followed by immediate criticism from the community.

I feel that the Minister and the Government betrayed the constituency, which led to the consultative process on the evaluation and establishment of a new refugee determination process. The failure was largely in three monumental areas. The first was the right of legal counsel to refugee claimants, the second on the question of universal accessibility which