federal civil servants directly affected by Bill C-45 and civil servants elsewhere in Canada who suffer from the kind of federal discrimination which has become institutionalized since the election of this Government some 18 months ago.

A moment ago, I rose to ask the Hon. Member if he could assure me of the accuracy of the report he made to Parliament indicating that an extremely visible and perhaps the most visible Crown corporation actually offered a tender opportunity to four American companies to do the refuelling of Air Canada jets and did not offer that opportunity to Canadian companies. He said it did this in order to reduce the costs of refuelling services because it knows American companies pay vastly lower salaries than Canadian companies. When the Hon. Member said that and when he reconfirmed that the Crown corporation that carries the flag of Canada would engage in such an activity, the spindles in my brain became lubricated and I decided I had to rise to my feet.

That kind of preying on Canadian workers, that kind of manipulation of Canadian labour law, that kind of exploitation of federal property and federal labour jurisdiction which could otherwise not occur if a worker were to be classified under provincial labour laws has to come to an end. The whistle has to be blown on that kind of abuse of our citizens.

When Members of Parliament from all three Parties make comments about what is happening in Alberta with the Gainers strike, when Hon. Members shake their heads and wonder if that kind of confrontation is really necessary, when Hon. Members collectively recognize that the seeds of that confrontation arose out of a basic perception that workers are nothing more than company assets, and when Hon. Members regret that kind of development, they ought to remind themselves that the example followed by the Peter Pocklingtons of the world is not found in the shadows of their minds but in pieces of legislation like Bill C-45.

Bill C-45 denies the employees of Parliament Hill normal collective bargaining rights and federal labour law classification codes. As my colleague, the Hon. Member for Gander—Twillingate has pointed out, this is the kind of legislation that allows an employee on a federal ship in Newfoundland to be paid $400 per month or up to $6,000 per year less than someone in British Columbia with exactly the same classification working on exactly the same kind of ship and doing exactly the same kind of job. That is possible under federal legislation and it has happened.

Hon. Members opposite who are looking at me and saying to themselves that this simply cannot be true will have either received a visit from the union representing these employees in the last few weeks or will receive one. The action taken by a union recently on Parliament Hill was unique and almost unprecedented. Representatives of that union, including those who come from the privileged area of British Columbia and those who come from the underprivileged area of Atlantic Canada, the area of disparity in respect of wages, came to Parliament Hill. For example, a representative from British Columbia told Members of Parliament that he was here to fight for his colleagues in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Newfoundland. He said that he was paid $400 more for the same job as his colleagues in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Newfoundland. He thought that was wrong. That case is being made today to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) and to the President of the Teasury Board (Mr. de Cotret). Thus far institutionalized discrimination has not been addressed.

• (1950)

Why am I concerned about Bill C-45? I agree with the Hon. Member for Gander—Twillingate that it is a step in the right direction. It begins to take Hill employees down the road toward the ability to represent themselves and to negotiate on their own behalf. It is not collective bargaining, and it does not go far enough. I am not only talking about the right to strike which is the final weapon in any collective negotiation, a weapon which most other Canadians have. The Bill was improved because it was amended to provide for a grievance procedure. As I said, it does not go far enough; it does not include the right to strike for non-essential employees, those people who are not deemed essential for the operation of these premises.

The Bill would prevent the PSAC from taking policy issues to grievance. The Government has been granted a one-year period to reorganize classifications. During that period, PSAC cannot file any grievances whatsoever. The Bill should set an example for the private sector, for the country in general. It purports to allow employees of the Hill to organize and to represent themselves. It is shameful, not because it is a total failure, but because it should be setting an example for the people of Canada. It is Hon. Members, who have been elected to fill these seats, who should be setting an example of the kind of society we can create and build. When we as Members of Parliament, who hold positions of responsibility, cannot organize ourselves to set up an arrangement with our own employees which allows them the dignity of collective bargaining and the normal rights afforded to other federal employees, we are like all those people who say: "Yes, but not in my back yard".

As we forsake the employees of Parliament Hill, as we deny employees of Parliament Hill normal collective bargaining rights which accrue to any other worker in the country, so too do we forsake and deny our right to speak with a conscience and with effect about the kind of labour abuse we see going on today in respect of the Gainers strike in Alberta. This kind of legislation gives comfort to the Peter Pocklingtons. This kind of legislation draws a map for the Peter Pocklingtons. This kind of legislation flowing from this Chamber wipes out whatever moral authority parliamentarians have to make a positive contribution in a world too often filled with labour strife.

I urge the Government to consider withdrawing the Bill—not to have it defeated forever—for two reasons. The first reason is that Hill employees have launched an appeal of the