

*Compensation*

tarians and civil servants, maybe, Mr. Speaker, because it would have found that the proposal we are considering today is a method that is too general to determine the compensation at more senior levels in the public service.

In the late sixties, the creation of the Advisory Group on Executive Compensation in the Public Service was a concrete attempt by the government to collect judicious advice on the remuneration of senior officials. Hon. members certainly know that the present advice originates from people who are themselves representative of senior levels in the Canadian business sector.

I am sure you are all aware that the present chairman of the group is Mr. Allen T. Lambert, and I should like to take the opportunity to draw the attention of the House to some very pertinent parts of its most recent report. In the second report of the group, we can read the following, and I quote:

—we were struck by the fact that it is necessary to ensure that executive personnel compensation in the public service should remain at a reasonable level of equality with those in the private sector; this level should however be considered reasonable comparatively to wage levels of other categories of public servants. We think more than ever that the efficiency and effectiveness of the public service, and the importance of this efficiency to the government and to the taxpayers could not be stressed enough, continue to depend to a significant extent on the maintenance of reasonably competitive wage levels for senior public servants.

In the fifth report, the group continues in the same direction, and I quote:

It was impossible for the advisory group to arrive at precise conclusions with respect to the equivalence principles and limitations that should exist between the public and private sectors. We do not believe that specific mathematical formulas could be set. However, the studies undertaken were useful in our considerations on the appropriate rates, and we will continue to take them into account when time comes to formulate recommendations that are made from time to time.

The reports the government got based on the advice of experts in these matters clearly show that the salaries paid to senior officials must compare with those paid to their counterparts in the private sector and must in so far as it is possible remain competitive with the latter. I find it difficult to understand how the hon. member can bring himself to believe that senior officials are going to protect effectively the interests of the public if they receive salaries that differ a lot from those paid in the private sector. So that will not happen, a comparison has to be made between the levels of pay in the public service and the private sector.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that I cannot support this proposal not only because it goes against the policies set by successive governments but also particularly because the remuneration policies of those governments which are intended to achieve over-all comparability with the other sectors of the Canadian economy are still adjusted to needs, and I find it impossible to reject them for the proposal of the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies). Mr. Speaker, we must continue, and I am sure we will, to recruit and keep competent senior officials not only because their work is a challenge and important but also because the pay they get squares with the work they do and compares by and large with what is being offered elsewhere.

● (1742)

[English]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Before recognizing the next hon. member might I be permitted to give my ruling in respect of the proposition moved by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn).

The difficulty I am faced with at this time in respect of the proposed amendment is that the hon. member is proposing two things. If he will refer to citation 200(4) of Beauchesne's fourth edition at page 168 he will see it is clearly stated there that:

A motion which contains two or more distinct propositions may be divided so that the sense of the House may be taken on each separately.

There may not have been too much difficulty in that regard but for the fact that the hon. member is proposing to refer the subject matter to the committee and trying also at the same time to stop the debate by the first part of his amendment. In addition, we might have members in the House who agree with the second part of his amendment but do not agree with the first part.

If the hon. member would take the trouble to read citation 202(6) of Beauchesne he would find that it states as follows:

It is not an amendment to a motion to move that the question go to a committee.

His second proposition is faulty in that it is completely contrary to citation 202(6). On this ground, and because of the fact that I cannot put before the House an amendment, part of which would go against the rules, I must reject the complete amendment moved by the hon. member.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Mr. Speaker, of course I recall the citations to which Your Honour has referred, and they were in my mind when I proposed this particular motion. I would simply like to get some clarification of the point you have raised. The first aspect is, of course, in respect of the nature of the two parts of the amendment. It would seem at first glance that the first part would terminate the debate, but there is no question that it would not have had that effect because the motion itself is debatable. For this reason it seemed to me we might have the opportunity of discussing the merits or otherwise of what I think is a very sensible and worth-while proposition, namely, that this matter should receive more intensive attention than we are able to give it in the course of the one hour allotted for private members' business.

The fact that there seemed to be general acceptance of the proposition put forward by the mover of the motion was the rationale within which I brought this forward.

● (1752)

Secondly, while the motion contained the recommendation that the matter be referred to a standing committee for detailed examination, the most important part of it was that the committee report back to the House, perhaps for further debate. I was wondering whether under those circumstances that would now take the matter outside the *prima facie* objection that you have raised by your ruling, that this matter