

approximately the same monetary return as that given in the private sector. This began with a five cent an hour difference, to which the percentages were added. I suppose the unions and the present Government had no choice but to maintain some difference in their negotiations. However, I and I believe a member of the general public would consider it to be illegal and absolutely against the spirit of the law of Canada to sign agreements such as those agreed to on Friday and today by the federal Government. I believe it is even against the spirit of this Bill. It is against the spirit of the Charter and the spirit of the Canadian Human Rights Act.

It would be very interesting if the Government allowed the Official Opposition to change Clause 3 to allow corporations and Departments of the Government to be covered by this Bill so that they would have to report the salary ranges of employees to see if there was any discrimination.

The Human Rights Commission has responded to the point I am making by saying that this involves a negotiated settlement. While there is nothing in black and white that requires equal pay for equal work, it is written in black and white that there should be equal pay for work of equal value. I cannot imagine accepting the fact that you have equal pay for work of equal value but there is not equal pay for equal work.

I say to the Government of Canada and its unions that since the enforcement of the Charter and the Government's commitment to employment equity and equal pay for work of equal value, the Treasury Board should provide the money to bring the wages of those people who are performing the same job for the Government of Canada, in the same job classification, up to those of the person who is earning the highest wage in the same field.

Let us look at the occupations on the list. There is a \$3 difference in precision working. There is a difference of at least \$4 an hour in vehicle and heavy equipment maintenance. There is a difference of at least \$4 in electrical installing and maintenance. There is a difference of over \$2 an hour for different groups in machine driving operating. There is a difference of at least \$3 an hour with respect to the manipulating subgroup working for the same employer and in the same job classification, depending on where one works in Canada. There is a \$4 an hour difference for the woodworking subgroup, depending on where one is working. With respect to the pipe fitting subgroup, there is a \$2 an hour difference. In Kingston, an area which the Minister of Employment and Immigration represents, it is substantially less than the wage settlements for the same group in Toronto.

I realize that the Government of Canada and the unions have a problem in negotiating a change to the system. However, the law of Canada is the law of Canada; the spirit of the law is the spirit of the law; the Canadian Human Rights Act is the Canadian Human Rights Act; the Charter is the Charter, and employment equity is employment equity. We cannot make a distinction between people because of where they live or where they happen to travel during their work.

Employment Equity

The Government attempts to appear lily-white with respect to the question of employment equity and equal pay for equal work. That is simply not the case. The Treasury Board would certainly need much more money from the Government in order to bring the lowest paid workers to the level of the highest paid workers.

Today, Members of Parliament are receiving letters from their constituents who are pointing out that they are making less money than someone performing the same job in the next constituency. What should a Member of Parliament do? First, we phone the Human Rights Commission, which states that it does not have jurisdiction in this area because it only deals with equal pay for work of equal value. The union says that while the problem is serious, it cannot negotiate for enough money to bring every one up to the same standard. We are told by Treasury Board that this is an historical settlement which was negotiated with the union. There is nothing in the Charter or the employment equity Bill dealing with this situation. However, we know that the employee of the federal Government and anyone else who has looked into this situation is absolutely correct that it is total discrimination against certain workers because of where they live.

Newfoundland is the lowest on the scale in every negotiated salary as far as zone rates of pay are concerned. Under their negotiated contract, Newfoundland workers are paid \$2, \$3 and sometimes \$4 an hour less for performing the same job for the federal Government. The Government of Canada says that it cannot cure the problem because of the Charter of Rights, the Bill of Rights or anything else.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but his time has expired. We still have a question and comment period.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has made some valid points with respect to employment equity as it affects workers from different regions of Canada.

As he knows, this Bill asks that employers carry out employment equity only for those in designated groups. Those designated groups are women, visible minorities, native people and the disabled. It does not say anything about other groups or individuals who might be discriminated against on the basis of national or ethnic origin, religion, age or the region from which they come.

It is interesting to note that Section 15 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms bans discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability. That is nine different bases for outlawing discrimination. This Bill on employment equity deals with only four groups. I think that it is very important that we deal with those four groups, but I guess what the Hon. Member is saying to us is that there are other types of employment equity in the country that are not being dealt with.