

*Public Service*

lutely necessary to continue that policy because it would be detrimental to those who, for example, work in private enterprise. Indeed, the hon. member for Winnipeg North said he knew nothing but he nevertheless submitted a series of figures pertaining to senior officials salaries. On the other hand, he is asking us to produce all that when he already knows those things.

An article was published in the November 2, 1974 edition of the *Financial Post*, entitled: "Executive salaries keep up with inflation, too" and here is what follows: "What top executives earn:" in private enterprises for instance, under the heading "position", "Chief executive officer (president)": His salary increased by 9.7 per cent in the year 1973-74 and since he was eligible for a bonus of 23.3 per cent, his average salary was \$41,226, plus the bonus of \$11,410, which makes a total of \$52,636. I shall spare the House the other figures mentioned, and I see there is no possible comparison with the salaries of the members of the House of Commons of Canada. These figures are given in this article of the *Financial Post*.

As for making public the confidential information requested by the government from the business sector, what confidence could people have in the government of their country if it revealed tomorrow morning figures which were given on a confidential basis.

If such a thing happened in the future, the private sector would never agree to send the government this information it finds most useful to determine the salaries of its own employees.

For those reasons then, Mr. Speaker, I think it is normal that we follow the same policy applied until now by the government, that is that we preserve the confidentiality under which the information have been given.

[English]

**Mr. J.-J. Blais (Nipissing):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to deal with such an interesting problem, because ever since I have been in the House I have been concerned with the matter of production of papers and I found out that the policy already adopted by the government and that we follow is an ideal one in that it creates a balance between what is available to members and what must be kept secret for public security reasons.

I am pleased to note that the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) has chosen this opportune time to draw attention to the salaries being paid to senior civil servants. Of course salaries have been in the public mind and under public scrutiny since before Christmas, and this scrutiny has not always been flattering to public servants and members of this House. I think the hon. member, in view of his party's position, was astute in bringing in through the back door what he could not bring in through the front door. He did a wonderful job in presenting his argument.

In addition to discussing the upper and lower limits of senior civil servant's salaries, it might be of benefit to members and the public generally if I were to describe the salary ranges of various civil service posts. Before I do this let me correct an impression left by the hon. member for Winnipeg North, namely, that there has been a three-fold increase in the number of people being paid the top salary range.

[Mr. Béchard.]

● (1750)

It is true that in 1968 there were roughly 300 SX's. However, subsequent to 1968 there was a reclassification at the senior level. In effect one of the reasons why there was a three-fold increase was because the reclassification took people away from other groups and put them into the SX group. Therefore, to say that there was a three-fold increase is slightly misleading. One of the reasons there was that change was because of the report of the Advisory Group on Executive Compensation in the Public Service, which was formed as the result of a recommendation of a prior joint Senate-House of Commons committee studying employer-employee relations in the public service.

I now wish to deal with the classifications. There are two classifications at the upper level. There are the public servants who come through the ranks and are usually referred to as SX's. These are people of considerable experience. This group is subdivided into four classes. SX-1 is paid \$25,500 to \$32,500; SX-2, \$29,000 to \$37,000; SX-3, \$33,000 to \$42,000 and SX-4, \$38,000 to \$48,000. These are not the order in council appointments. That is a separate category called DM's. A DM-1 is paid \$37,000 to \$47,500. No one in the DM class is paid less than 37,000 smackers. Class DM-2 is paid \$44,000 to \$54,000 and DM-3, \$50,000 to \$60,000. I suggest that is a substantial sum.

How is this sum arrived at? The advisory committee in its latest report indicated it had examined the salary structure in the private sector. It established these rates based upon what is being paid in the private sector. That is quite apart from the issue the hon. member has brought to the attention of the House.

A cabinet minister, who sits on the treasury benches, is paid \$18,000 a year. He receives an additional amount as a minister of between \$17,000 and \$18,000. Therefore the minister, who is in charge of the executive, in charge of the direction of this country, who is subjected to the opposition every day, who is in the public eye and is disrobed by the public and the opposition constantly, receives a maximum of \$35,000. The minister receives less than the lowest paid DM.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** It is \$43,000. Get your figures right.

**Mr. Blais:** Those are the irreversible facts. There is no one in the classes we are discussing, executives, who earn anywhere close to the \$18,000 which members of parliament earn. Each of the 895 senior civil servants earn no less than \$25,500. In addition all their expenses are paid as long as they submit a chit. They travel first class. They get the best hotel accommodation.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like your ruling as to whether this kind of debate is in order on a motion for the tabling of documents. Are we debating Bill C-44?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner):** The point of order raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is well taken. The Chair is troubled from time to time when we have a notice of motion for the production of papers. The purpose of the debate is to show cause on the one hand why the papers ought to be pro-