

(from the evidence presented herein) that the Department does virtually nothing by way of preparing its employees for retirement; the retirement procedures, such as they are, are insufficiently thorough - they do not provide the necessary facts that will help an employee to prepare or to unravel the complexities of retirement; there is a lamentable lack of humanity in the procedures. In short, in devising a programme we are virtually free to start from scratch.

It is almost impossible to foretell how any programme will be received by members of the Department - there is no way this can be measured until something is tried. Under the circumstances, it would seem advisable to move into the field by a process of trial and error. Much money and time could be spent in setting up some elaborate programme that would look good on paper but that could easily develop into another "empire" based on Parkinson's Law.

Because the work of each Department varies, the problems of retirement will assume different emphasis. There is no need for uniformity in meeting these problems or in the application of any broad policy objectives that may be laid down by Treasury Board. The interpretation should be left to each Department to work out in accordance with its own particular needs and circumstances.

The "programme" suggested may be considered to be made up of two parts, the active and direct part that hinges around the establishment of a "Personal Counselling Office" under a retired senior officer with a retired senior secretary to help him, both working under contract. The duties of this office and the procedures for handling people coming to retirement and after retirement are spelled out in Section VIII which is the core of the report.