

Inquiries of the Ministry

urgency; Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 100(2). As I have said many times, "urgency" within standing order No. 26 does not apply to the matter itself but means urgency of debate. The question must be so pressing that public interest would suffer if it was not given immediate consideration.

In respect of citation 100(8), Beauchesne's fourth edition again, this is stated:

What I think was contemplated, was an occurrence of some sudden emergency, either in home or in foreign affairs.

It seems to me that any such sudden emergency should be sufficient to justify the setting aside of the important business of the house. Many things are important and urgent, especially following the eight weeks vacation which hon. members have recently enjoyed, but it seems to me that what has been referred to today is more in the nature of a grievance than a matter so urgent that the important business of the house should be immediately set aside so we could indulge in a long debate.

For those reasons I regret that in my opinion the urgency is not so great that the motion should be put to the house.

[Later:]

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Will he tell us what were the circumstances under which he followed the rather extraordinary course of issuing a statement respecting the testimony of the deputy commissioner of the R.C.M.P., and issuing it through the Prime Minister's office? What were the circumstances that activated the minister to do this and to be, in effect, giving evidence before he went on the stand?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I first deny each and every implication of that question. Second, I think it is not in order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the question of order will not be determined by the same cavalier method the minister used with officials of the R.C.M.P. I ask him, how did he come to do this extraordinary thing? He is going to give evidence this week, according to the press, yet he decided to give evidence in this way before he was actually before the commission. What an amazing thing to do.

Mr. Favreau: The main reason, Mr. Speaker, was so that, as the result of a statement in the newspapers reporting evidence which had

been decided by the commissioner not to be evidence and which should be disregarded, during those four days the Prime Minister of this country would not be unfairly slandered or ill judged.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why then did the Prime Minister not—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: They have not got much to applaud these days. Why was this ex parte method adopted? Why not have the Prime Minister say what he in fact had said or done? Why was the statement made through the instrumentality of a third party, the Minister of Justice?

PENSIONS**CANADA PLAN—REPORTED STATEMENT BY GOVERNMENT ACTUARY**

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance, prompted by a statement made today by Mr. John Kroeker, senior actuary with the Department of Insurance with particular responsibilities in the fields of unemployment insurance and evaluation of private pension plans. Mr. Kroeker's statement had reference to the Canada pension plan, and he said that at its best it is well-intentioned bungling and at its worst it is a colossal fraud of all Canadians. He said this plan is not the child of reason and liberty, but that it is a creature of propaganda and fear. I wonder whether the Minister of Finance has any comment to make.

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I was informed this morning that Mr. Kroeker had held a press conference and had issued a statement respecting the proposed Canada pension plan, which I would remind all hon. members was approved unanimously in principle by this house. This action on the part of Mr. Kroeker was, of course, incompatible with his position as a civil servant.

On Thursday of last week Mr. Humphrys, superintendent of insurance, came to see me about Mr. Kroeker. Mr. Humphrys said that in his opinion, for reasons which he explained to me, Mr. Kroeker had completely destroyed his usefulness to the department. He said he planned to ask Mr. Kroeker to resign and if he failed to do so his employment should be terminated. In the normal course this would be done in the manner provided under section 60 of the Civil Service Act.