

line departments to make sure we have adequate training within government, we are going to fall behind.

I know this is just a minor point, but one of the courses which has been taken out of the Public Service Commission's list of courses is driver training and driver safety. This may seem like a small point but I wonder how many people within the federal system at this present time are driving for a living? I suspect we have thousands of people who are driving on a full-time basis and more who are driving on a part-time basis. Defensive driving is a course which may not seem important to a lot of people, but as a high school teacher I remember reading all sorts of statistics about how valuable such a course is to drivers among the general public. If we have people driving for us for part of their living or for their entire living, I think we have an obligation to provide them with that type of course. This is why I am concerned about the present policy. It will take away those types of courses, and, indeed, it already has in the examples I have listed.

I have another concern about the staff training policy as approved in June, 1980. I looked at the composition of the Staff Training Council and found basically the same senior mandarins who are running everything else in the government. I feel they tend to have a conflict of interest because they are running four or five different operations within our system. The membership of the council will consist of the secretary of the Treasury Board, the chairman of the Public Service Commission, the Clerk of the Privy Council, or his nominee, the Comptroller General, four departmental deputy ministers and/or four assistant deputy ministers, one or more training experts, and that is only one or two mentioned in the list so far, the Director General of the Staff Development Branch and the Deputy Secretary of the Personnel Policy Branch. As I looked at that list I was surprised to see how few people are really in the business of training. Most of them are in the business of management.

If we want a training policy and a training council, the majority of people on that council should have some knowledge of training, rather than having management as their main function. Certainly we recognize the need for efficient management just as we recognize the need for efficient government, but I would like to see that training council restructured so that it actually can provide an efficient overview of training in the public service.

In addition, there should be some union representation on that council. If you look through the D'Avignon report and all the other submissions which have been made in the past on staff development, you will notice that PSAC and PIPS and others have been making presentations. They have a lot of expertise in training their members and they are concerned about how their members are educated for their present and future roles within government. They have a legitimate interest in protecting the rights of their members. I think such an addition should be made to this council at this time.

Let me sum up with just a few remarks. We disagree with the previous speaker. The government has a policy but, unfortunately, that policy is very similar to its policy of creating

### *Training of Public Servants*

another large senior management group. In recent days it seems to have been attacking the public service rather than trying to work with its members. The policy of the government with regard to staff training completely ignores affirmative action. For that matter, it works directly against any affirmative action program. It ignores women and those people who are in need of training. It ignores native people and the handicapped and it puts the priority for the training of those people on the departments. Departments are basically set up to provide services to the public and when they are hit with funding cuts, which they will be hit with in the next couple of years if we believe the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Johnston), training programs will be the first to go. This will have little impact on the public but it will have a great impact on public service employees.

I would encourage members on the government and the opposition sides who are concerned about making sure we provide adequate and fair leadership within our public service to get this government to recognize that the direction it is going in is completely opposite to the direction we are asking private enterprise to take, and directly opposite to the direction we are asking the community as a whole to take. We are talking about more fair communities; communities which are more open to women, to the handicapped and native people, yet this staff training policy and the whole treatment of employees by government is going in exactly the opposite direction.

I have risen on a number of occasions in this House to complain about the fact that the government has been dragged to the Human Rights Commission over its treatment of women workers. As far as I know, the government has lost every case that has been taken there. I would argue that as an employing agency, especially when it is the same agency that is making the laws, it should not have to be taken to the Human Rights Commission. There should be a voluntary compliance by the Treasury Board and by departments and agencies of the government. It should not be necessary for the government to be forced by its employees and their unions to abide by its own statutes. The President of the Treasury Board, the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy) and other people in charge of government departments should make sure they are complying. It should not be fighting initiatives which would allow for equality and equal treatment. Unfortunately, there is no government leadership, just as there is no government leadership in the affirmative action field. Instead, the government is fighting progress. The same thing is happening with respect to staff training.

● (1740)

**Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River):** Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak about this motion but, in view of what I am hearing, I feel I should say a word or two. The motion of the hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) reads as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of assessing training and development programs for public service employees with a view to establishing a general policy.