

Supply

life of the state of Quebec and of Canada, at least if one believes in democratic representation.

With such a huge deficit and a rather anemic economic recovery, it is essential that the existing resources be allocated and used as efficiently as possible. I am sure you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that in such a context, program evaluation becomes essential. Without effective program evaluation, the government is just not able to best allocate its resources. In fact, parliamentarians are asked to work in the dark, and to allocate resources without knowing what the situation really is.

The Auditor General said in his report that "In the 1990s, program evaluation should be seen as crucial to the management of government expenditures, because it can help to arrive at informed decisions aimed at controlling growth of the public debt". Therein lies our problem.

By comparison, the United Kingdom, Australia and the United States have adopted an external evaluation system for government programs. For example, in the United States all evaluation reports are made public and they are often presented directly to Congress. In addition, Congress can request evaluation reports on programs that it wishes to review. Which means that the legislature has control over the evaluation process.

• (1245)

Again in the United States the general accounting office handles requests for and submits evaluation reports to Congress.

In the United Kingdom managers are responsible for meeting performance objectives, while in Australia, evaluations are used in the budget-making process.

In 1978 the public accounts committee recommended that evaluation results be tabled in the House within 60 days after the evaluations were completed. In 1983—listen to this, Mr. Speaker—only one single study was tabled.

Is this the mark of a conscientious, efficient government administration? Is it not, rather, the trademark of the Liberal Party of Canada? Will the newly announced national infrastructure program, which is being touted as the saviour of the Canadian economy, be subject to an evaluation? Will it be based on effective management criteria? I doubt it. The Auditor General's report has already been forgotten and evaluation criteria will be defined later, or so we are told.

To stop this waste of public funds, the Bloc Québécois is calling for strong action. It wants the House to press the government to strike a special parliamentary committee made up of all official parties. The committee would have a mandate to review federal government expenditures in light of the report

of the Auditor General of Canada, as well as overlap between provincial and federal programs.

The opposition is making this proposal in a spirit of transparency and openness, as it would provide for the public scrutiny of official matters. The committee would have the power to call witnesses if it felt their testimony would be useful.

We are proposing that this committee, which could be called the standing committee on program evaluation, report before June 23, 1994, and that the government undertake to give a formal response to this report by tabling its response to the committee's recommendations on the first sitting day of the 1994 fall session of this House.

The Official Opposition is presenting a constructive proposal aimed at achieving the objectives put forward by the Liberal government in its red book, namely ensuring transparency, restoring the image of politicians and allowing for greater involvement of members of Parliament in the affairs of government and of the House.

This proposal constitutes a formal invitation from the Bloc Québécois, the Official Opposition, to the Liberal government.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Mr. Speaker, I would have a question for the hon. member. I greatly appreciated his remarks and his idea of setting up another House committee.

Mr. Boudria: Another one.

Mr. Milliken: I think we have all the committees we need. We have the public accounts committee, the chairperson of which will be appointed by the Official Opposition. It could examine all these matters the hon. member raised, matters which are really important to all Canadians. This committee is responsible for dealing with the Report of the Auditor General. I wonder why the hon. member could not start examining that report as well as the programs he mentioned in his speech when this committee is convened.

• (1250)

Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe): Mr. Speaker, in response to this question, considering the long experience of the hon. member, I will say this: we must improve transparency. The Auditor General himself indicated in his report that he had been unable to obtain some information. So, what we are proposing is not "committeetitis" so to speak, but one committee with the power to obtain all the information. That is what our proposal is about. If you want transparency, set up a committee that will have access to all the information.