

policy for training and development for public servants and, secondly, a philosophy of the government somewhat in keeping with what Mr. Lambert and Mr. D'Avignon proposed with regard to change.

The basic objective of this policy should be to maintain a public service of the highest quality with employees who have the personal and professional skills to develop and implement government policies and programs.

The second objective should be a plan for the future needs of the public service for talented and skilled manpower.

The D'Avignon report mentioned that we need a management philosophy. I think that this is something which must be addressed seriously by this government. Management must be told what is expected of them and must be given the tools to lead effectively and manage efficiently all the resources at their disposal.

Just a couple of weeks ago I was saying that the government spends \$100 million in training and development each year. According to the Auditor General's report, we spend \$170 million per year in training and development. The report goes further and implies that we may be spending twice that amount. To me, that is an indication of a large expenditure of money without set objectives, proper planning or a philosophy which attacks training and development with a comprehensive, global approach to the problem.

I know that the Public Service Commission is not responsible for all the training. However, Treasury Board is. As my first question, I would like to ask the minister if he is thinking in terms of presenting soon a comprehensive, global approach to training and development and, if so, how soon can we expect this document to be either tabled in the House or discussed publicly in committee?

[Translation]

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to congratulate my friend, the hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier, because he talked about several of the existing problems, problems and challenges for the Treasury Board, if you like. At the same time, I should like to give him the assurance that we are making an in-depth and active examination of the recommendations of the D'Avignon and Lambert commissions. As everyone knows, a few weeks ago, I received from the right hon. Prime Minister a mandate to direct those studies because we give high priority to the questions raised by the hon. member.

[English]

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that within the very near future we would be able to bring forward some specific proposals with respect to training and retraining. As I mentioned during my comments in the House the other night, one of our primary concerns is in the area of retraining personnel who are declared surplus. But the whole area of training is one which is actively under review. It appears to me that it has been unsatisfactory in the past for a variety of reasons. As I said, I hope that we will be bringing forward something in the

Supply

very near future which will meet the high standards that I know the hon. member and many other of his colleagues will insist upon.

In terms of the over-all philosophy of management of human resources, I would like to assure the hon. member that we are pursuing the D'Avignon report and the Lambert report actively. Specific committees have been established which report to me as President of the Treasury Board and which will bring forward recommendations with respect thereto in the very near future.

I hope that we will see rapid progress in this direction because the management of human resources has been neglected in the past. It is essential for the efficiency and morale of the public service, and I am confident that this House will be very responsive and, I hope, supportive of the initiatives that we intend to take in this regard.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow up on that question. I understand that the minister has the Lambert commission report and the D'Avignon report. Could the minister tell the House whether or not he is also utilizing the report of the joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate which sat for 18 months studying amendments to the Public Service Staff Relations Act?

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Chairman, yes, indeed we are.

• (1630)

Mr. Gauthier: Who is doing the study? I understand the minister is co-ordinating it but exactly who is doing the study? Is it an in-House study by the department, an interdepartmental study or a public study? Are members of this House going to be involved in giving advice about what should be done, or is it going to be something cooked by Treasury Board, presented to us and then we must eat it whether we like it or not?

Mr. Johnston: If I may, I should like to expand somewhat on the mechanism as we now envisage them for bringing these reports and studies forward, Mr. Chairman.

There are two groups, one in charge of the D'Avignon recommendations which will put them in a certain form, in dialogue with me, acting through a co-ordinating member of Treasury Board. That group is headed by Mr. Orser.

In addition to that, General Anderson will bring forward recommendations to discuss with me. He is out of the country at the moment but I hope this will take place within a few weeks. The work is well advanced. I must pay tribute to my predecessor who agreed that these were priority areas and made an effort to ensure substantial progress was made.

I am, then, responsible for bringing these matters forward to a committee of cabinet chaired by the President of the Privy Council, the government operations committee. In other words, I report to that committee and the committee would ultimately make the decision with respect to our analyses and the packaging of the recommendations.