

when most people who had come to work for the government went back home. Thus we lost many talented people whose duties here were to second our war effort.

In addition, the requirements dictated by new management techniques resulting mostly from the new role which the federal government was called upon to play, combined with the expansion of services, particularly social services, all that commanded a highly-trained administrative and professional technical staff. Therefore the government had to analyse thoroughly its hiring policies, conditions related to advancement within the public service, administrative classifications, salaries, ways to attract and keep the required staff. You will recall that the Gordon commission was asked to study the personnel management system. The Public Service Commission of Canada published a book entitled "History of an Institution" which covers the period from 1908 to 1968. Here is what it says on page 228 about the Gordon commission:

When members of the Gordon commission undertook to review the situation in the wider perspective they enjoyed through their terms of reference as independent investigators, they were dumbfounded.

Again I quote, from page 229:

—there is no effective mechanism to train, discover, relocate and promote promising men and women among younger employees and public servants who hold intermediary positions.

Having pinpointed the insufficiency of administrative mechanisms, the Gordon commission recommended, and I quote:

—the appointment in each department of a seasoned and competent personnel officer with the necessary title and authority.

One of the roles of this personnel director was to train the staff at the departmental level. Having thus decentralized training responsibilities, the Civil Service Commission continued to give special information to the departments and took charge of the co-ordination and management of training as it applied to departments as a whole.

In 1954, under the government of the Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent, a commission of inquiry was appointed to study the possibility of reviewing the Public Service Act and especially to consider the sensitive issue of the relationship between the Public Service Commission and Treasury Board. I will not spend too much time on that very important issue today, Mr. Speaker, and will deal with it at a more appropriate time. I would certainly not want to rekindle old feelings of animosity between the Public Service Commission and Treasury Board. Those of you who are interested in this issue can read the Heeney report which deals with it.

The Glassco report containing the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Government Organization, published in 1962, confirms the deplorable state of personnel management in the public service. As it states in one of its recommendations, the royal commission—

—had to conclude that in general for many years training and development have not received the attention they deserve in the public service.

Training of Public Servants

That opinion is also expressed on page 317 of a book entitled "History of an Institution".

The Glassco commission suggested that the Public Service Commission should relinquish several management functions. Treasury Board and the various departments were therefore given the responsibility for evaluating the performance of employees, promoting career development and organizing interdepartmental training programs. All these functions were carried out under program directives established by Treasury Board. The management of centralized training programs in effect belonged to the Public Service Commission while Treasury Board was the policymaker.

Naturally, there were many problems with the implementation of the Glassco report. The government set up a government organization office to study the recommendations. We have therefore not invented anything new since the Progressive Conservative government in 1979 and the Liberal government in 1980 only imitated their predecessor of 20 years ago. We also have within the Privy Council and the Treasury Board special committees to study the Lambert and D'Avignon reports on accountability and efficiency in the public service.

In 1965, the Public Service Commission set up the Training and Development Branch to have on hand a pool of specialists able to guide staffing managers and departmental personnel counsellors. It was in 1967 that this House passed an amendment to the Financial Administration Act which made Treasury Board responsible for determining the training and development needs of the public service in general and for establishing the conditions under which such training and development could occur.

Of course, there was some reluctance concerning this new policy. Some people questioned the effectiveness of dividing the function consisting in the determination of training needs and conditions, which would come under the jurisdiction of the Treasury Board, and the implementation of the centralized training and development programs, which come under the Public Service Commission. There is indeed much confusion between the terms training and development. The Glassco report tried to provide a better definition of these two important elements of a good personnel management policy. On page 474 of "History of an Institution", the Glassco report is quoted as follows:

Training is the process of teaching skills to an individual so that he may improve his performance on a particular job.

Development is the process whereby an individual acquires new knowledge, habits, attitudes, self-awareness, and values or maturity.

Training courses and development programs, therefore, entail different methods.

Mr. Speaker, it would be well to understand the difference between these two terms. To simplify, we could say that training has an immediate application and that it is related to needs or requirements, to particular jobs that have to be done.