

national wage parity, but failing this they would like to be paid as well as their provincial counterparts.

Briefly, some of the worst areas are these: the maritimes, where nurses at the maximum level are about \$570 behind; Quebec, where they are \$1,491 behind; Alberta, \$556 behind; Manitoba, \$381 behind; and British Columbia, where they are \$426 behind the maximum level. In Nova Scotia, public health nurses are below their provincial counterparts by at least \$1,000. Also, the federal government has the worst vacation arrangements because their nurses get only four weeks vacation after ten years of service, whilst most provinces give four weeks after five years of service.

In the Treasury Board's arbitration brief which was submitted in relation to this particular group of nurses, I believe it was stated that as a nationwide employer it was essential that the government's policy on pay benefits take into account the rates of pay and patterns of benefits applying to workers in related employment in the private sector. It is very obvious that this is not the case, Mr. Speaker, and that the government has not in fact lived up to this policy.

I realize, as does our party, that it is not realistic to think that wage inequities can be corrected overnight, but we can surely make a beginning. Our national economy should accept the philosophy of equal pay for equal work, which could be carried out in basic stages. The first step would be immediate acceptance of equal pay increases so that the disparities are not forever increased. Secondly, one could immediately commence upward revisions and gradually phase out inequities on a regional basis over an appropriate period of time.

I suggest again, with deference, that for a change the government should practice what it preaches. The minister knows very well that the present position regarding nurses is not equitable. I earnestly ask the minister to take steps to give nurses under federal jurisdiction a better deal as a step toward more equitable regional pay in the public service generally.

**Mr. Joseph-Philippe Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Answering the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay), Mr. Speaker, may I say that I hoped he might have said other things pertaining to nurses. For example, he could also have spoken about holidays and other fringe benefits. I say that from a personal point of view, with due respect.

If I may more directly answer his question, let me say the following. As the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) has said on more than one occasion, the government, as employer, is committed to paying rates which are equitable and competitive with rates being paid outside the public service for similar occupations. Where the outside pay data for occupational groups indicate significant variations from the Canadian average, and where the area of recruitment and the mobility of employees within the public service is limited, the government, as employer, considers it appropriate to pay regional and not national rates of pay.

Paying national rates of pay in such circumstances would only serve to overpay employees in some regions and to underpay employees in other regions in relation to

### Adjournment Debate

the rates of pay prevailing in those regions, neither of which situation, from the employer's point of view, is desirable or viable.

With reference to the rates of pay for hon. members of this House, the Beaupré committee set up to make recommendations to the government did not, it will be remembered, recommend regional rates for members of parliament.

● (2210)

[Translation]

AIRPORTS—MIRABEL—EXPROPRIATION PROCEDURE—DISPARITY IN OFFERS

**Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, on July 5, I directed to the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) the following question:

Mr. Speaker, since there are disparities or differences in prices for those who are expropriated, ...

depending on the airports and for pieces of land of equal value ...

... can the minister ensure the House that he will carry on an investigation with the officials responsible for the expropriations ...

Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the significant differences which exist between the prices paid to the land owners who have been expropriated to make room for the Mirabel Airport in Sainte-Scholastique and those paid for similar purposes at Pickering, in Ontario. I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, the difference between the prices that officials offer to pay in relation with expropriations for the construction of both airports and even to the expropriated owners at the same airport location. The last figures we got give a good idea of the extent of the problem.

As the owners at Sainte-Scholastique receive on an average \$200 per arpent—or acre—compared with \$2,200 per acre to the expropriated owners at Pickering; as \$3,000 are given to all former owners in compensation for the relocation when nothing is given to the owners at Sainte-Scholastique and as an annual rent of \$2,000 is required from the former owners at Sainte-Scholastique compared with \$1 a year plus taxes from the former owners at Pickering and as 10 per cent per acre above the evaluation price of \$2,200 per acre is given at the time of purchase to the expropriated owners at Pickering as a readjustment for the cost of living when nothing at all is given to the expropriated owners at Sainte-Scholastique, and as an amount of \$300 million has been set for the expropriation of the 18,000 acres of land for the construction of the Pickering airport when only \$125 million have been set for the purchase of 88,000 acres of land at Sainte-Scholastique, I think it would be wise to study these enormous differences in evaluation.

I fail to understand the difference in the advance paid to the expropriated owners at Sainte-Scholastique and that vary between nothing at all and 100 per cent of the amount in some instances. Then I find difficult to explain why, after four years, some of these expropriated owners did not receive a letter or an offer in writing telling exactly what they will receive for their assets and damages incurred by the obligation to move out.