

Interim Supply

Time and Reader's Digest. I not only made that statement a week ago today, but I have held that stand since the O'Leary report came down in 1961. In speaking on this point I would like to congratulate the Minister of Finance because he listened to my arguments that there should not be any exemptions in that publications legislation, and when introducing amendments to the Bank Act—

The Chairman: Order, please. I should remind the hon. Member—if he will resume his seat—that he cannot revive a matter on which there has been a decision of the House. I assume that the words he has just spoken were by way of introduction of another subject. But certainly the rules of the House do not allow an hon. Member to discuss a matter upon which there has been a resolution of this House.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, my remarks were certainly by way of introduction, because I intend to refer to the proposed amendments to the Bank Act, which have been referred for committee study and I understand will receive consideration by the committee even before this House resumes the session in the fall. I was referring to the introduction of the amendments to the Bank Act. On May 18 the Minister stated:

Before leaving the matter of ownership and control of banking, I should like to point out that there would be very serious implications for Canada if foreign owned banks or their agencies were free to do any substantial volume of banking in this country.

I want to congratulate the Minister of Finance, and I do it now, for not allowing any exemptions in the amendments to the Bank Act to allow foreigners to get into our banking world. I will not refer to the other field, Mr. Chairman, because I understand it has been closed to me for discussion; but if do not know the name of the other field to which I am referring, I will tell you out in the corridor later on.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Cowan: Why there should be no exemption in some industries, and a wide-open exemption in another industry of which I know a bit and of which industry I am very fond, I do not know. But I extend congratulations to the Minister on not giving exemptions in the Bank Act even to a bank which has been established for 13 years in this country and is under foreign ownership. I have always worked on the basis that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, but

[Mr. Cowan.]

obviously this principle does not hold water in some sections of Canada, even though I believe it is true, true, true.

The other matter I wish to refer to has to do with the pensions of certain R.C.M.P. officers. I was born in the City of Ottawa; I am a Canadian through and through, and I never thought I would live to see the day when the Royal Canadian Mounted Police would be publicly criticized in the Parliament of this nation by Members of the House of Commons, as was done yesterday evening.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cowan: I make no comment on the Dorion report in any manner, shape or form. That Commission was appointed by the Liberal Government of which I am a supporter—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Cowan:—and I have no comment on Mr. Justice Dorion. But when I find Members of Parliament standing up and criticizing the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, it provokes me no end. I believe that if the Royal Canadian Mounted Police had less political interference there would be higher morale in the entire force, from the Commissioner down.

I specifically wish to refer to two former members of the force, Chief Superintendent René Jean Bélec and Sub-Inspector Joseph Hosanna Maurice Poitras. I have in my hands the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Pension Continuation Act, which I have studied at length and in some detail previously. In examining the operation of the Pension Act of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police you will find in section 27 these words, that any pension "shall be granted only in consideration of good and faithful service during the period in respect of which it is calculated". I draw that to your attention, Mr. Chairman. I will make further reference to it later. Then in Section 44 of the R.C.M.P. Pension Act you read this:

An officer who is retired compulsorily for any cause other than misconduct or inefficiency after ten years' service, is entitled to a pension for life—

And so on. Notice the phrase, "An officer who is retired compulsorily for any cause other than misconduct or inefficiency". If he is retired for misconduct or inefficiency, he can worry about his future; there will be no pension for him. But it says, "An officer who is retired compulsorily for any cause other than misconduct or inefficiency". So what