

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

based on security considerations, I thought it might be useful to depart at least slightly from the practice I have mentioned without creating a precedent for the future.

Professor Laski was refused an immigrant visa because he is a prohibited person under subsection (1) of Section 5 of the Immigration Act. This prohibits the admission of persons who are or have been, at any time before or after the commencement of the Immigration Act, members of or associated with any organization, group or body of any kind concerning which there are reasonable grounds for believing that it promotes or advocates subversion by force or other means of democratic government, institutions or processes, as they are understood in Canada.

In order to determine whether an independent applicant for an immigrant visa is admissible—Professor Laski was an independent applicant and was not seeking admission as a refugee—he is interviewed at a Canadian immigration visa office abroad to determine whether or not he is able to meet the selection criteria in respect of his work qualifications, is able to pass a medical examination and whether or not he is prohibited by reason of criminality or because of the possibility of his being a risk to Canada's internal security.

In this connection I would remind hon. members of the report of the Royal Commission on security, which membership included a former distinguished member of this House, the Hon. M. J. Coldwell. I believe in considering such a case—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. minister but his time has expired.

TAXATION—WHITE PAPER ON REFORM—
PREPARATION OF SLIDES

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, on December 10 I asked a question in which I set out certain facts as to documents and proposals for tax reform. This related to a film that was prepared in order to sell these proposals to the Canadian people. On December 10, I asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) a question about a film prepared by him in which he discusses, with film illustrations, certain recommendations in "Proposals for Tax Reform", which I have already categorized as a red manifesto. The minister is endeavouring to sell his ideas and his recommendations to the Canadian people. If he goes on the "Nation's Business," by way

of T.V., sets out certain things about the manifesto which he likes and believes that the people like, I have no quarrel with that. All members of Parliament and parties have the same privilege. But when he deals with eight different tax subjects, some of which are individual tax reforms, capital gains, business and property income, and so on, which are discussed in a document containing 96 pages—approximately 500 paragraphs—and reduces that to ten paragraphs, then he is selecting what he believes is palatable and saleable to the Canadian people. The Canadian people are paying for his propaganda. Those who are opposed to this "Red Manifesto" should have the same opportunity, the same resources, to prepare another film pointing out what I consider to be a grave mistake which will reduce the nation to a socialist state and a group of bookkeepers.

For example, the minister speaks in glowing terms about a capital gains tax and naturally, to a person who has never made a capital gain, this sounds like icing on the cake. However, what the minister has really done has been to abolish the whole idea of capital gains and categorize any capital gain as income, whether in the stock market or the result of selling property. A capital gain, if and when it is determined in accordance with his law, will be added to the other income and will become part of taxable income. He has not told the taxpayers, even though they are paying for his picture show, that companies and individuals will be forced to sell stockholdings. They will lose control of their own enterprises and a foreign power will own and control not part of our resources, but all of them. He has not told them in his picture show that the lower income tax bracket people, which he estimates to be 750,000, will be confined and imprisoned to that income for life, because the moment the income exceeds the new exemptions their rate of tax immediately increases. He has not told the Canadian people the truth, by film or otherwise, that the middle income people will carry most of the tax burden. Nor has he told the people what he is going to use the money for. Nor has he told the people the truth about how much money taxing capital gains' income will really net. How many businesses and farms will the government end up owning through confiscatory policy?

He talks of a billion dollars as if he were saving the average man that amount of money when actually to the low income tax bracket group, who should be off the tax rolls now, it amounts to only \$30 million. If a