

*Adjournment Debate*

was a 12.2 per cent increase. This was because the board ignored the fact that the minister had said that people earning under \$7,000 a year could get more than 10 per cent. This was also despite the fact that the wage earned by people at the bottom end of the scale working at the library of the University of Toronto was \$5,771 a year, and that the increase which they negotiated of 21.3 per cent would leave them with a paid rate of \$6.92½ cents an hour, or \$355 a year below the figure permitted by the regulations if the whole increase which the union negotiated with the University of Toronto had been implemented.

I say that the board ignored the guidelines as laid down by the minister which, in my view, it had no right to do. It did that at a time when the board was consistently awarding, to other groups of employees, substantially more than the 10 per cent to 12 per cent permitted under the guidelines. The teachers in Norfolk county in southern Ontario reached a one year agreement which gave them a 34 per cent increase, but the board reduced it to 24 per cent. In Renfrew county the agreement called for 29 per cent, but the board reduced it to 23 per cent. I could go on and on talking about what has happened to teachers. Teachers are getting in the neighbourhood of 20 per cent.

To show how ridiculous the situation is, the union exercised a right which it had under the provisions of the Ontario labour relations act to call for arbitration. Under section 37 of that act the arbitration board which it provided for has the duty to look into the case and to make a finding which is binding on both parties. Today that board made a finding: it directed the university to implement the wage adjustments as outlined in the collective agreement to the extent that it is permitted by law to do so. What law? These people are governed by provincial law; they are provincial employees. They have argued that the federal government has no right to set their wages until the legislature of Ontario passed legislation, which it has not done.

In the moment or two which I have left let me compare the tough attitude of the Anti-Inflation Board with its attitude with regard to price increases and profits. On February 5 the *Ottawa Journal* reported that the Anti-Inflation Board was going to issue tough directives governing the profits made by banks. That is not surprising when one realizes that in the three months ending October 31, 1975, the after tax balance of revenue of banks, which was the equivalent of after tax profit, rose by 87.5 per cent from the year earlier. This is permitted, but the Anti-Inflation Board was going to issue a very tough series of regulations.

One day later, before the regulations were ever promulgated, the *Montreal Gazette* carried a front page story saying that the Anti-Inflation Board regulations limiting banks were expected within a few days but were likely to be a watered down version of restrictions contemplated last month. One banker said the industry screamed bloody murder over the initial proposals. Apparently the board accepted the industry's protests against inequities after negotiations involving the Canadian Bankers Association and the banks.

That is the kind of inequity about which we have protested from the day the Prime Minister announced his program, and I suggest to the parliamentary secretary, who has the unenviable job of explaining this matter, that it is that kind of unfair rough justice the government has

[Mr. Orlikow.]

talked about so much which has so alienated the working people of the country.

**Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I do not necessarily accept the first part of the statement made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow). I think he was quite correct when he stated that the minister would carefully review the question and submit it to the Anti-Inflation Board. That part I do accept. Some of his other statements were incorrect when he was assessing the situation when he took part in the debate when it was first introduced.

With regard to the point raised in the question by the hon. member I should like to say that the Anti-Inflation Board at its meeting of January 14, 1976, reviewed the collective agreement between the University of Toronto and the Canadian Union of Public Employees Local 1230, library technicians. I believe that is the concern expressed by the hon. gentleman.

The agreement was reviewed by the Anti-Inflation Board in light of its decision to approve an increase between the arithmetic formula in instances where an historical relationship has existed with another group or groups of employees. The board was satisfied as to the existence of an historical relationship between bargaining units in the Toronto area. However, the board considers that the historical relationship would be maintained if compensation increases were provided within the permissible limits defined by the formula behind the arithmetic guidelines. Therefore, the Anti-Inflation Board concluded that it could accept increases in total compensation of up to 12.2 per cent for CUPE local 1230.

**Mr. Orlikow:** You don't believe that nonsense, do you?

● (2220)

**Mr. Trudel:** I did not interrupt the hon. member when he spoke, and I wonder if he would have the courtesy to listen. It should be noted that such an increase would be within the limits of the anti-inflation guidelines for this group and applies to a total average increase in compensation for the group.

Part 4, division 1, section 43(2) on page 41 of the regulations reads:

... the compensation of an employee in any guideline year may be increased—(a) to \$3.50 per hour, or (b) \$600 or, where the compensation is paid for less than a year by an amount that bears the same proportion to \$600 that the period for which the compensation is paid bears to a year, whichever results in the greater increase.

The application of increases for this group which would average up to 12.2 per cent does not preclude certain individuals within the group receiving increases in compensation of up to or even higher than \$3.50 per hour or contravene in any way section 43(2).

Employees who receive a total hourly rate of compensation of less than \$3.50 may, along with all other members of this group, receive a maximum average increase of up to 12.2 per cent. If this amount does not bring their total compensation to \$3.50 an hour, the employer may proceed to do so within the necessity of costing in the additional costs to the permissible maximum.