

The Budget—Mr. Champagne (Champlain)

opposed to increasing it because, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) said, it is the silent killer of jobs.

The Hon. Member asked me whether I speak for my Party or for myself when I talk about deferred taxes. Several Members in this corner of the House have asked already: "Why do we not at least charge interest on deferred tax accounts?" If the Government is letting people with such accounts use that money for whatever purpose, for whatever time, recognizing that it is only deferred, only postponed, then let us get interest on it in the meantime.

Mr. Thacker: What about capital gains to farmers?

Mr. Stupich: The Party position is that if the farm is staying within the family and is being passed down in the form of an inheritance or a transfer, then there should be no tax at all, at least not on the first half million. However, if it is being sold to someone else, then why should it not be like any other asset of industry or business?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Forestry)): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to what my New Democratic colleague said and I realize that the New Democratic Party is talking out of both sides of its mouth. When they are close to winning an election, they are ready to reconsider, for example, as former MP Michael Cassidy said, they are ready to reconsider tax breaks for flow-through shares. At first, when they were far from power, they said that this left the rich too much money. When they were close to power, they wanted to restore flow-through shares for those people. They even had a special day on it, because they were close to power, Mr. Speaker.

But we also realize that the New Democrats do not have a certain economic vision of Canada. They are prepared, Mr. Speaker, because they say that we absolutely must make the rich pay, and they are the first to get up and say that in the present budget reform, it is incompatible for a Finance Minister to say that those earning \$50,000 and more will gradually have to give back up to \$70,000 they received. They make no distinction, Mr. Speaker, between those with high salaries and people on low wages. They make no difference— That is

a comment, my dear friend. They make no distinction between the rich and the poorest people and the measures the Government took in that direction.

What I would like to ask my colleague, Mr. Speaker, and I ask him to answer as honestly as possible, is how he as a New Democrat can claim to defend the interests of the weakest and most disadvantaged when he gets up to say that those receiving \$50,000 and more should be given the benefit of the doubt, have greater eligibility for federal programs, while those who need them most are those who earn the least. And that is why the federal Government's Budget, the Finance Minister's Budget, takes into consideration the least fortunate and is not based on the interests of the New Democratic Party.

[*English*]

Mr. Stupich: Mr. Speaker, it is a real surprise to me that any Tory would stand up to accuse somebody else of talking out of both sides of their mouth during the election campaign.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stupich: I made no comment about flow-through shares. I recall the discussion prior to the election—

Mr. Champagne (Champlain): Your colleagues and your Party did.

Mr. Stupich: I thought we were talking about my speech this morning. I said nothing at all about flow-through shares. Given another opportunity, I might.

Mr. Barrett: He needs another 20 minutes. I ask the House to give the Hon. Member another 20 minutes.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stupich: I had a little trouble keeping up with the Hon. Member, Mr. Speaker, since the interpreter had a little trouble keeping up. I may have lost something.

An Hon. Member: You didn't lose a thing.

Mr. Stupich: The Hon. Member talked about the claw-back on the family allowance and old age pensions. Mr. Speaker, did you hear me mention anything about that issue during my speech? He is talking about a speech I have not yet made.

Mr. Barrett: Let us hear that speech.