

*Training of Public Servants*

types of training to be provided, specifies the conditions under which the training will be provided, deals with the selection of trainees, defines the roles and responsibilities of departments, the Public Service Commission, Treasury Board Canada and individual employees, and provides for the certification of trainers and for the evaluation of training. The new staff training policy is now being implemented by departments.

The policy also provides for the creation of a staff training council to provide over-all direction and co-ordination of training throughout the public service. Its specific responsibilities include determining training needs and setting priorities for meeting these needs. The council will also be responsible for setting standards for training programs and those who provide training.

Membership on the council includes: the secretary of the Treasury Board, who is to act as chairman; the chairman of the Public Service Commission; the clerk of the Privy Council or his nominee; the Comptroller General; four deputy ministers; and a number of other government officials.

The staff training policy states that training is an essential component of good management and an accepted cost of doing business. It is the government's policy that training will be provided where necessary and appropriate. The government will be committed neither to training for its own sake, nor to a specific quantity of training unrelated to need.

Furthermore, the policy states that it is the responsibility of individual employees to plan their careers and to develop their own skills. Government support of training and development will be limited to activities directly related to the operational needs of the public service.

Training will be provided for a variety of purposes including improvement of job performance, preparation for new responsibilities or changes in technology, the maintenance of sufficient quantities of necessary skills, retraining, safety training, and to give effect to government objectives regarding under-represented groups.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hour provided for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock tonight.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

**AFTER RECESS**

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**INCOME TAX ACT****MEASURE TO AMEND**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen that Bill C-54, to amend the statute law relating to income tax, be read the second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole.

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta):** Mr. Speaker, at five o'clock I mentioned the fact that in 1972 the fruits of the Carter commission report began to appear in the tax act with the introduction of the concept "a buck is a buck." This really does not take into account the social implications of that measure on Canadians.

If it was not true in 1972 that a buck was a buck, certainly it is not true today with the inflated dollars we use. Just over the weekend I saw a BCTV news report on real estate in the lower mainland of British Columbia. It made the point that in the lower mainland \$115,000 to \$130,000 is the cost of an average house which in Ottawa might cost \$40,000 or \$50,000. With those kinds of costs and the inflated dollars involved in the construction industry, the concept of the Carter commission report really does not work because it punishes the people who will buy those homes. Right now in the lower mainland of British Columbia according to that report the cost, of an average house rises \$80 per day. That is all right for those persons who happen to own them, but it is not so good for some others, particularly young people who want to buy homes. One cannot have the advantage of selling without paying capital gains as tax as is the case with a farm. I realize at the present time that an owner does not have to pay capital gains tax on a principal home, but the developer does and that cost is added to the price of the home. When it comes to family farms I am particularly thinking of the social costs. All through western Canada many people are looking forward to the day when they can pass their farms on to their children.

They want to keep their families together, they want to contribute to the welfare of their children, but when they retire they must pay capital gains tax on the major part of their properties. They cannot roll it over, for example, into an RRSP as they ought to be able to; then the children must pay the increased cost of that farm. That whole policy or problem is not dealt with in this tax legislation.

The government has not taken into consideration the social implications of some of its taxation policies and what they do to people. I think of the many people who come out to my constituency and those surrounding Surrey-White Rock-North Delta to retire. Between the May election and the February election, the voters' list in my constituency increased by 6,000 names, 6,000 people in a matter of eight months moved into that area. A good many of them are people who retired. They thought that they were looking after their own interests. They wanted to maintain a life of dignity and be independent in their retirement years. They provided for their own retirement