

the plan, but he was the only person who spoke out. His criticism was based on his professional and personal opinion of its actuarial results and its future effect on the Canadian economy.

On or about March 3 he received a notice from the superintendent of insurance stating that he was being suspended. The reason given was "for reasons that are well known to you". He never received a definition of the reasons for his discharge. He appealed to the Civil Service Appeal Board; his appeal was heard and as a result he was discharged from the service.

Perhaps it might be said, Mr. Speaker, that a civil servant has no right to comment on a government proposal. However, I would point out that in this particular case numerous civil servants were then proceeding to go across the country praising the terms of the Canada Pension Plan, which was and had been a political proposal of the government in power. Therefore I would ask where the difference lies. If a civil servant is permitted to comment at all upon proposed legislation, surely the comment should not be limited merely to the expressions of people who are prepared to go out and support it. Surely those who are expert in the field and who oppose the plan should have some right to express their view in giving advice not only to the government but to parliament on the matter before them.

As a result of his discharge this man has not been able to obtain employment with a life insurance company or an actuarial firm since his release from the civil service. He has made an attempt on his own to find such employment and has been registered with the National Employment Service. He has had offers from the United States but does not wish to leave this country. He is presently self-employed on a commission basis with a financial house.

The first question I want to raise is that of his pension, quite apart from the question of his dismissal. If Mr. Kroeker had resigned he would have received some \$2,000 severance pay. But since he stood by his principles of professional integrity as he saw them, and as a result was discharged, he stands to lose.

I should like to look into this matter for a moment, because I am going to suggest that, regardless of whether Mr. Kroeker was right or wrong in his statements, the then minister of finance, by his statement to the house, in fact deprived this man of his severance pay.

Alleged Irregularities in Public Service

In 1961, when a special committee of the house was discussing section 60 of the Civil Service Act, the question of resignations was raised. A member of the commission on June 2, 1961 stated that employees are normally permitted to retire, in order to protect themselves, and presumably one element of such protection is a financial one. On March 1, 1965 the then minister of finance announced in the house that if Mr. Kroeker did not resign he would be discharged. This act of the government certainly eliminated the possibility of the routine resignation of Mr. Kroeker.

● (9:40 p.m.)

This whole matter concerns me, Mr. Speaker. It raises questions that I think ought to be considered. May I also ask this question: Why should this civil servant be deprived of his severance pay because he chose not to meekly resign? He may have been wrong in the opinions he expressed, but surely he should not be penalized because he decided that he wanted to be discharged so that he could appeal to the Civil Service Appeal Board.

Second, may I ask, what alternative did he have but to take this case to the appeal board, in view of the statement by the Minister of Finance whereby he lost his right to severance pay. This is the financial aspect of the matter.

I want to compare this case with that of George Victor Spencer. The main questions before the commission in that case were the question of Mr. Spencer's release from the government service and his pension rights. Whether or not you agree with Mr. Kroeker, he had the nerve to stand up, to put his job on the line, and to say: "I do not believe in all this. I am going to say so, and by doing that, I think I shall be doing my country a service".

I think that second thoughts about the Canada Pension Plan over a number of years will show that many of the matters that were raised in committee, and many of the matters that he raised were perfectly valid objections. In time amendments will have to be brought in to this plan.

However, here is a man who said: "I do not like this plan. I am involved in it. I know that everybody else is going around saying what a wonderful thing it is, but I know that it is not, from my professional knowledge of the plan itself, and from the way it is designed. I think I ought to say so." This man at