

that everyone would have an idea where the government was heading and what instructions were being issued to department heads and heads of agencies. I must ask myself at this point, and I also ask the minister, whether all agencies as well as Crown corporations have been included in this round-robin. But even with these reservations and the suggestion that it has not been possible to digest the matter in its entirety and in its detail, I do thank the President of the Treasury Board for the courtesy of that extra little bit of notice.

As to the substance of the statement, namely the progress made in performometrics, I note, first of all, that along with his statement, appendix A, the President of the Treasury Board has tabled a report containing examples of performance indicators developed in departments. This was in response to the request made earlier at a meeting of the miscellaneous estimates committee. I take it as a good omen that the government has responded positively and, I suggest, fairly rapidly to a directive formulated in a standing committee. That is a brownie point and I give him credit for it. It is probably worth acknowledging, further, that the government, in responding so promptly to the directive of the miscellaneous estimates committee, has formulated some high ideals for performance—theoretical ideals though they may be. Transforming those ideals into practical action, of course, without the leadership that is needed is another matter.

In this connection I would like to comment on that part of the statement in which public servants are being urged to "think performance". This, to me, sounds like a college cheerleaders' chorus aimed at spurring on the team to attain a few more goals. To my way of thinking, first of all, I suggest that it is the government that should be "thinking performance" rather than suggesting, as the statement itself does, that failure to perform can be laid at the door of public servants. Such suggestions, I venture to say, are unworthy. From my personal experience, there was no need, in a properly motivated public service, to employ cheerleaders to stand on the sidelines and urge the team on. Public servants were, and I venture to say still are, servants of the public. All they need for fulfilment of that objective is internal motivation and earned loyalty derived from performance attainment set by their political masters, not performometrics such as they are now being called upon to live with.

● (1540)

Another aspect of the statement that worries me, as did the management teams that began to ferret around in the public service seven or eight years ago, is whether with performometricians, those whose business in life is to measure performance in this industry which above all is a service-providing industry, this exercise will end up, as did the others, with a residue of management experts attached to each department to see whether public servants are continually thinking performance and, more important, performing performance.

How many new people will be added laterally to the public service to measure this performance? Are they themselves cost-effective? Who will measure their cost-effectiveness? I do

### *Public Service Performance*

not consider this to be a cost restraint measure. I come back to my earlier comment: a properly motivated public service, inspired by the performance of its political masters, does not require this elaborate paraphernalia. It is a comment on the political masters themselves that these studies have had to be instituted.

The studies or techniques are presumably designed to hold public servants accountable for the services they are expected to deliver. Again, this is a matter of blaming the public service for a sloppy political performance; there is no other way to look at it. Last April, when speaking before the public accounts committee, the Auditor General said he was afraid that the day might come when he really could not give a clear certificate on the accounts of Canada. The real heads of departments, that is, the political heads of departments, have been doing a sloppy job in direction and performance motivation. Otherwise that comment would not have had to be made by the Auditor General. Now the government is seeking to throw the blame for faulty performance on the public servants. It is, after all, the political heads of departments who are accountable to the public.

I favour every practical method of ensuring that public servants are properly accountable to their political masters, but the best way to ensure that, to my way of thinking, as I have already said, is proper motivation and inspired loyalty. Is that what is wrong? Is that what the government is trying to correct by instituting performometrics? I think that might be so because I cannot see performometrics as a proper substitute for adequate motivation.

I have one final comment. It is, of course, individual worth that counts in any public service. That, no one will question. What happens to worthy individuals who may run afoul of the performometrician. Is he to find himself in the street? Are these performance measurement "wallahs" able to assess the performance of individuals, or is the government only thinking of program efficiency? We should be very careful not to let a transfer of the measurement values from projects and programs, where they might properly apply, flow over into the measurement of persons. Elimination of wasteful practices is one thing and if performometrics will ferret these out, all well and good. But we must still rely, as I hope we do, on individual assessments from immediate supervisors to determine career prospects by individual public servants. All these matters must be, and will be, kept constantly under review by members on this side.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I join with the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich in thanking the President of the Treasury Board for having given us in advance a copy of the statement he has just made and also a copy of the documents he tabled in the House this afternoon. Actually, sir, we are again discussing something that comes under the heading of "motherhood".

**Mrs. Holt:** "Fatherhood".