

in most parts of Canada. We recognize the tremendous contribution the members of the force have given, which forms the roots of the very foundation of justice and security in our Canadian heritage.

We cannot divorce ourselves from what is happening in Canada today. We are debating a bill which is a glaring example of a government out of control, a government which never knew or has forgotten the meaning of the word "restraint". The 1978 spending forecast of \$45.1 billion is rising to approximately \$46.5 billion with the tabling of supplementary estimates. The 1978 authorized spending to date is 10.3 per cent over the total of last year, or 3 per cent higher than the 7.1 per cent forecast by the President of the Treasury Board. We must remember that we still have five months to go to the end of the fiscal year. If that is restraint, what would the government do in the period without any promise? How can the minister request any Canadian to restrain his or her spending when proper leadership is not given?

An excellent example of how the government can cut costs without depriving Canadians of important services would be the disbanding of the security and analysis group of civilians, political appointments of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). Canadians would like to know why such a branch was established when the RCMP always carried out those important tasks without interference from the outside. The cost of that group runs approximately \$500,000. People in this country want to know what are the rules and regulations of that civilian group. I am sure the RCMP would appreciate being informed of that group's mandate, as well as its duties and responsibilities. The group consists of approximately 200 employees, employees duplicating the services of the RCMP. What amount would be saved by the removal of that branch within the Department of the Solicitor General if it is not \$500,000?

The main culprit in today's inflation and the resultant necessity of borrowing an additional \$9 billion, as provided in this legislation, is the government itself. Perhaps the best example of bungling funds and administration is the situation in which the government has placed the RCMP. The government created this mess. Time and time again the Prime Minister was warned of the grave danger of using a police force for political gain. Now that admirable and dedicated force is expected to shoulder the blame for orders issued by a civilian director general of security within that force, another personal appointee of the Prime Minister. Who pays the salary of this person and those under him? None other than the Canadian taxpayer.

While the Prime Minister seeks to give the impression that he is the only saviour of unity in this country, never has an individual done so much to destroy unity under the guise of a great protector. Many taxpayers are of the opinion that he is even using our national police force as a guinea pig.

There is no better way to undermine confidence and strength than to place an outsider in charge of a sensitive arm of the service, that of security. To add to the dilemma, instead of reporting directly to the RCMP Commissioner, that civilian

### *Income Tax*

appointee of the Prime Minister reports to the Prime Minister without the necessity of first communicating with the Commissioner. Let us not stop there. The politically appointed security and analysis group communicates to the Clerk of the Privy Council, who also happens to be chairman of the interdepartmental committee on security and intelligence.

● (2032)

**Mr. Lumley:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We are discussing Bill C-11, a tax bill; we are not discussing the security force of the RCMP.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** We are talking about the expenditure of money.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** I was listening very carefully. The hon. member was coming back to the expenditure of money, so I will continue to listen, and if he strays off the path again, I will warn him.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Let Mr. Speaker do his job.

**Mr. Towers:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can certainly understand that a government which cannot control its expenditures cannot stoop to the lowest aspect of dealing with individual expenditures. I was dealing with the politically appointed security and analysis group. I was trying to explain, for the benefit of the hon. member, that this group costs approximately \$500,000, and I am sure that there are a great many Canadians who would appreciate it if their income taxes could be reduced accordingly. I pointed out that the politically appointed security and analysis group communicates to the Clerk of the Privy Council, who also happens to be chairman of the interdepartmental committee on security and intelligence, and whose superior is none other than the Prime Minister who is also chairman of the cabinet committee on security and intelligence. One cannot help but note how cozy is that arrangement.

Who pays for all this? The Canadian taxpayer. Perhaps that answers the question for the hon. gentleman. How would any of us, as representatives of constituencies at the federal level, like to have someone appointed by the government of the day to investigate and do research in our areas and residences, and then submit the findings to the Prime Minister and not to us? Could we operate under that kind of manoeuvring? How can we expect the RCMP to perform vital and dangerous operations with a non-force group duplicating its services and authorizing orders unknown to the RCMP Commissioner?

I feel very sad indeed that officers and members of the RCMP are now being personally investigated, and perhaps even jailed for misdemeanours carried out under orders allegedly given by a civilian director general of its security services. While we do not know that to be factual until a complete investigation has been completed, our national police force is experiencing frustration, humiliation, and accusation, due to instructions which have been given by senior personnel.

We all know that anyone who has unlimited funds reaches a point when he spends for the joy of spending, eventually