

*Interim Supply*

1964. I say to you that in private industry and in other Departments of Government former employees are not treated in this manner or anything like it.

Last February there was brought down a return in reply to a question asked by the hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Howard). The number of the question was 2,603 and the heading in *Hansard* is "Criminal charges, Indian Affairs employees". The hon. Member asked:

Since January 1, 1952 has any employee, or former employee, of the Indian affairs branch been charged with contravening any of the provisions of the Criminal Code or any other federal statute and, if so, with respect to each such person by name what was (a) his position with the branch at the time the alleged offence took place (b) the nature of the alleged offence and, if any money was involved, the amount thereof and the details about it (c) the amount of restitution of any stolen or misappropriated money—

The answer takes up the entire page 11684 of *Hansard* for February 24 and shows eight cases in which people had misappropriated funds in the Indian Affairs Branch, and what their fate was. They are not identified by name, I am happy to say, because I do not wish to use their names. The former superintendent of an Indian agency, Ontario, misappropriated government funds in the amount of \$5,894, paid it all back, and he resigned. A former clerk at an Indian agency, Ontario, misappropriated government funds in the amount of \$1,330, paid it all back and he resigned. The former superintendent, Indian agency, Quebec, misappropriated property to the value of \$1,355 and he was dismissed on October 15, 1958. Why could he not have been compulsorily retired so that he could promote efficiency in the Indian Affairs Branch of the Department?

A former clerk, Indian agency, Saskatchewan, for being short in departmental receipts to the extent of \$173.62, was dismissed on August 28, 1957. I think that he too should have been compulsorily retired so that he could promote the efficiency of the Indian Affairs Branch of the Department of the Government, and given a pension. The former superintendent of an Indian agency, Manitoba, misappropriated Government funds in the amount of \$3,250.25, which he paid back, being dismissed on August 28, 1957. A former clerk, Indian agency, New Brunswick, misappropriated building materials and committed cheque forgeries in the amount of \$897.46, paid it all back, and was dismissed on April 1, 1963. A former superintendent, Indian Agency, British Columbia

[Mr. Cowan.]

and Yukon, misappropriated \$3,473, building materials and cheque forgeries, paid the entire amount back and was dismissed on January 1, 1963. A former clerk, Indian agency, British Columbia, misappropriated \$1,325 in forged cheques, was brought to court on 22 charges of forgery, found guilty, is presently serving a one year sentence and was dismissed on April 1, 1964.

**Mr. Alkenbrack:** No pension?

**Mr. Cowan:** No pension at all. These fellows were not compulsorily retired to promote efficiency in the Indian Affairs Branch but were dismissed just because they had done something they should not have done.

According to the way pensions are calculated in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act, any pension shall be granted only in consideration of good and faithful service during the period in respect of which it is calculated. The businessmen in the House know very well that the longer a person is employed by a firm which operates a pension plan, the larger will be his pension. Not only does the pension become increased in value as continuity of office continues, but more and more the responsibility increases because more and more trust is placed in him, because people expect him to be a fit and proper person in whom to place responsibility.

But what happens in the R.C.M.P.? The longer a man is with the R.C.M.P. and the more senior his position becomes, the more responsibility he has. When he defaults, then the politicians do not calculate the last week or so of his service when he defaulted but go back over a long period of time and calculate the wonderful service he has given them. As his responsibility became bigger and bigger and his pay became larger and larger, so his pension became greater. But as his responsibility reached its zenith, the period when the greatest trust is placed in him, he then defaults. What happens? You do not consider that last week; you consider the 30 years prior to that when he was a good guy and had not defaulted. You calculate his pension on his 30 years service and forget the last week when he should have been dismissed for inefficiency.

• (6:30 p.m.)

**Mr. More:** I wonder whether I may ask the hon. Member a question. His statement seems to leave the inference that these pensions were granted on the recommendation of the governing officers of the R.C.M.P. It is my impression and understanding that those officers recommended their dismissal and that