

Review of Province-Wide Single-Trade Bargaining Process in the Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Sector of Ontario's Construction Industry

**Professor George W. Adams, Q.C.
University of Ottawa
Faculty of Law**

July, 1991

July 18, 1991

To: The Minister of Labour
The Honourable Robert Mackenzie

In an announcement on December 14, 1990, you appointed me to review the operation of the current province-wide single-trade bargaining process in the industrial, commercial, and institutional sector of Ontario's construction industry.

I have the honour to submit my report.

Professor George W. Adams, Q.C.
University of Ottawa
Faculty of Law



**Ontario
Ministry of
Labour**

**Ministère
du Travail
de l'Ontario**

Office
of the
Minister

Bureau
du
Ministre

400 University Ave.
14th Floor,
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1T7
416/326-7600

400, avenue University
14^e étage,
Toronto (Ontario)
M7A 1T7
416/326-7600

December 14, 1990

ANNOUNCEMENT

Bob Mackenzie, Labour Minister, today announced he has asked for a review of the operation of the current province-wide single-trade bargaining process in the industrial, commercial and institutional sector of Ontario's construction industry.

The current bargaining structure has been in place since 1978, with seven rounds of negotiations occurring over this period. The Construction Industry Advisory Board - composed of key representatives from labour and management in the construction industry and chaired by the government's Special Advisor, Labour Management Relations - has recommended this review to the Minister given the importance of the construction industry in the province and the need to reflect changing times and organizations.

Professor George Adams, Q.C., a member of the Faculty of Law, University of Ottawa, and former Chair of the Ontario Labour Relations Board, has agreed to undertake the review and report to the Minister no later than April 30, 1991.

The review will address the following issues:

- (1) Has single-trade province-wide bargaining served the needs of the industry and the public as it was intended?*
- (2) Has the province-wide bargaining responded sufficiently to geographic considerations?*
- (3) Are the existing voting procedures of employer and employee bargaining agencies adequate?*
- (4) Is the current requirement of two-year agreements appropriate?*
- (5) Are there other issues of significant concern meriting better accommodation by the legislation?*

Written briefs will be accepted from all employee and employer bargaining agencies. The brief should set out the consensus opinion of the bargaining agency with respect to each of the terms of reference of the inquiry. Any dissenting positions taken by affiliate members of the bargaining agency must be appended to the brief.

Briefs should be filed no later than February 28, 1991. Please address them to: Professor George W. Adams, Q.C., Construction Industry Review, c/o Special Advisor Labour-Management Relations, Ontario Ministry of Labour, 14th Floor, 400 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1T7.

Acknowledgements

While the errors, omissions and recommendations are my own, I wish to acknowledge the substantial assistance and support I received in doing this study from Victor Pathe, Special Advisor to the Minister of Labour; Len Haywood, Chief Economist, Ministry of Labour; and Jerry Meadows, Senior Policy Advisor, Ministry of Labour.

I also wish to thank all those who took the time to submit briefs. Their insights and interest were most helpful.

George W. Adams Q.C

Contents

	Page
Announcement of Appointment	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
I. Introduction	1
II. Background to Single-Trade Province-wide Bargaining in the ICI Sector in Ontario	3
III. Introduction of Province-Wide Bargaining in Ontario	9
IV. Summary of Submissions	13
V. Discussion and Recommendations	20
VI. Conclusion	41
Appendices	
I. Briefs Filed	44
II. Proposed Language for Enabling Clauses	48
III. Voting Procedures in ICI Sector of the Ontario Construction Industry	50
IV. Settlement Ratifications and Patterns, Comparison of CPI and Package Rate Increases, and Work Stoppages in ICI Construction, 1977-1991	55
V. Union Wage Rates and Fringe Benefit Payments in ICI Construction in Ontario, 1977-1991	80
Selected Bibliography	108

I. INTRODUCTION

On December 14, 1990, the Honourable Bob Mackenzie, Minister of Labour, announced a review of the operation of the current province-wide single-trade bargaining process in the industrial, commercial and institutional (ICI) sector of Ontario's construction industry. In doing so, he pointed out that the current structure has been in place since 1978, with seven rounds of negotiations occurring to the present. He further noted that the Construction Industry Advisory Board (CIAB) - an advisory body to the Minister composed of key representatives from labour and management in the construction industry and chaired by Victor Pathe, the government's Special Advisor, Labour Management Relations - had recommended this review to him, given the importance of the construction industry in the province and the need to reflect changing times and organizations.

The review was asked to address the following issues:

- (1) Has single-trade province-wide bargaining served the needs of the industry and the public as it was intended?
- (2) Has the province-wide bargaining responded sufficiently to geographic considerations?
- (3) Are the existing voting procedures of employer and employee bargaining agencies adequate?
- (4) Is the current requirement of two-year agreements appropriate?
- (5) Are there other issues of significant concern meriting better accommodation by the legislation?

The Minister asked that I accept written briefs from all employee and employer bargaining agencies. He required that a brief set out "the consensus opinion" of the bargaining agency with respect to each of the terms of reference and that all dissenting positions taken by affiliate members of a bargaining agency be appended to the brief. I was given until April 30, 1991, to report to the Minister. I sought an extension of this date to accommodate Ministry of Labour research that was being undertaken in support of the inquiry, and the extension was granted.

In approaching the review, I did not take it as given that reform was necessary. There was no background event or crisis giving rise to the review that I could discern. If anything, the review is a function of the fact that the ICI sector bargaining system is a large, complex and often unpredictable economic process. Each round of bargaining has exhibited conflict and cooperation. Given the significance of the process to the economic well-being of the province, the review makes abundant sense to ensure that policy expectations are being met and to assess any possible modifications that might be made by which cooperation could be enhanced and conflict lessened.

Having regard to this reason for the review and the time limits I was subject to in making my report, the following analysis relies upon: (1) the briefs submitted; (2) research prepared under my direction by the Ministry of Labour; (3) a review of the literature and other key background documents; and (4) several

discussions with the CIAB and a very few others active or previously active in both labour and management circles in the industry. I could not engage in a broad and lengthy consultation with the industry and complete the assigned task within the expected time frame. My review, therefore, was designed as a relatively speedy audit of the industry providing the opportunity to identify possible incremental reforms. If, however, major problems were suggested by the review demanding consideration of more fundamental change, I could only report these suspicions to the Minister given the nature of my mandate. The Minister would then need to assess what more thorough consultative process should be employed to verify my suspicions and, if need be, to fashion sound policy approaches in response.

II. BACKGROUND TO SINGLE TRADE PROVINCE-WIDE BARGAINING IN THE ICI SECTOR IN ONTARIO

Construction activity in Canada is of considerable economic significance to the country. The total value of construction purchased in Canada during 1990 was \$106 billion, representing 15.6 percent of the country's Gross Domestic Product. During 1990, the total value of construction purchased in Ontario was \$40.2 billion, accounting for about 38 percent of the national total. Expenditures for construction in the ICI sector of the Ontario construction industry was \$11.2 billion, representing 28.1 percent of the total value of construction in the province. In 1990, there

were 291,000 individuals employed in construction occupations in Ontario, representing 5.9 percent of the total employed in the province. Statistics Canada's Business Register Master file indicated that in December 1990, there were about 39,600 establishments in the construction industry in Ontario. Employment in the industry is characterized by pronounced seasonal variations; on average, the unemployment rate in construction occupations in Ontario is approximately twice as high in the winter months than in the summer months.

In 1962, the Ontario Legislature recognized that the construction industry has unique characteristics needing to be specifically addressed in the Labour Relations Act. This recognition is reported in detail in the Report of the Royal Commission on Labour-Management Relations in the Construction Industry (the Goldenberg Report) - a commission necessitated by unrest in the industry in the Toronto area. Specifically, the report recognised that, owing to the instability of construction employment, bargaining units in the industry had to be determined by reference to a geographic area and not to a particular project. It made certain recommendations concerning the processing of union certification applications in the construction industry by the Ontario Labour Relations Board (OLRB), including provisions designed to reduce delays in construction bargaining and recognize the peculiarities of construction industry collective agreements, which I will describe shortly.

In 1970, the provisions relating to employer accreditation

were introduced into the Act. They provided for certification of employer bargaining agents to represent employers in bargaining with construction trade unions. By accreditation, an employer organization becomes the exclusive bargaining agent for a group of employers bargaining for the renewal of a collective agreement. Employer accreditation was intended to be the equivalent of union certification. At the root of this analogy is the recognition that collective agreements in the construction industry are generally not made with individual employers but with a number of similar employers.

Prior to accreditation legislation, this "associational" characteristic of construction industry collective agreements and bargaining was voluntary in nature and stemmed from the inherent nature of the construction industry. Rather than simply being the bargaining agent for the employees of an employer, the craft or construction trade union functions as the source of skilled and experienced potential employees of a certain type. Construction employers seldom employ an ongoing complement of employees between projects. Since construction consists of performing a finite amount of work at a particular site, the role of the construction union became one of supplying tradesmen to job sites for the duration of the project. While the particular project may end, tradesmen achieve employment continuity by way of trade union referrals from employer to employer or, more accurately, from job site to job site.

From this perspective, it is not difficult to see why a standard collective agreement evolved to apply to all employers employing members of a particular construction trade union in a given area. Similarly, it is understandable why the collective bargaining that emerged for the industry was multi-employer, as employers joined together in response to construction trade union bargaining strength and the reality that individual employers seldom employed a sufficiently large and constant complement of construction employees to make agreements tailored to individual employers practical. These standard collective agreements also removed competition between employers on the basis of wage rates.

Before accreditation legislation, however, construction industry labour relations was characterized by highly fragmented bargaining structures. Employer associations negotiated with individual craft locals for local geographic area standard agreements. During the 1960's, fragmented bargaining structures coupled with significant economic expansion caused unduly high wage outcomes and excessive strike activity. Local craft unions were able to employ whipsaw tactics because of the voluntary nature of employer associations and, thereby, leapfrog wage settlements within and between trades across the province. Between 1960 and 1969, the industry experienced 5,108,000 person-days lost due to work stoppages, or 16.8 percent of the volume of strike activity in Canada. This was a very sharp increase over the previous decade. In the same period, construction wages rose twice as fast as manufacturing wages. In 1965-1970, the differential between

construction and manufacturing wages increased from 19 to 40 percent. This instability in construction industry labour relations and the significance of the industry to the economy as a whole prompted a call for more legislative reform.

The problem was seen to be weak employer associations in need of countervailing power in collective bargaining. Because employer associations were bargaining agents only on a voluntary basis, they were unable to prevent individual members from entering into agreements or arrangements with unions for the supply of tradesmen during a labour dispute, on the understanding that they would "pick-up" the collective agreement ultimately agreed to by those members of the association who continued to resist the strike activity. The undermining effect on employer association solidarity by this whipsaw tactic is obvious. In related ways, group employer bargaining power was impeded by union contractors in an area who bargained independently or by mega-projects governed by special project agreements. Thus came the call for a system of accreditation of employer bargaining agents to strengthen association bargaining. Accreditation provided employer associations with exclusive bargaining rights and gave them effective direction and control over all union contractors in a geographic area.

Accreditation responded to the specific structural problems to which it was addressed - weak area employer associations - but it did not prevent whip-sawing and leap-frogging between geographic

areas of the province. Substantial instability in the construction industry remained. While it was hoped that broader bargaining structures to counteract this problem would evolve because stronger area contractor associations would be able to insist on it, this did not happen. The proportion of provincial collective agreements in the industry in 1977 stood at 10 percent - virtually unchanged from ten years earlier. This represented the lowest level of consolidation in Canada, leaving Ontario with the most fragmented bargaining structures in the construction industry in Canada in 1977.

The Ontario ICI sector was representative. It experienced multiple work stoppages throughout each year, with each stoppage interfering with the work of the trades working on these same projects. With 202 pattern-setting agreements, uniform expiry dates were impossible to achieve. Frequent and sequential work stoppages adversely affected contractors, workers and owners alike. For example, following the completion of the 1975 negotiations in Toronto, there were five separate expiry dates for collective agreements: April 10, 1976; August 31, 1976; April 30, 1977; July 31, 1977; and October 31, 1977. This situation aggravated the problems of planning construction projects. Just as one collective agreement would be reached, another would expire, leading to the possibility of further disruptions. Purchasers of construction would be uncertain whether their projects would be built because they could not predict when strikes would occur. This added to the difficulty of forecasting the costs of a particular project.

III. INTRODUCTION OF PROVINCE-WIDE BARGAINING IN ONTARIO

In 1974, the Construction Industry Review Panel - the forerunner to the CIAB- urged the Minister of Labour to establish an inquiry commission to study ways of reducing the complexity of the bargaining structures in Ontario. The terms of reference of the Commission appointed were:

1. to inquire into the existing bargaining areas and bargaining patterns in the construction industry;
2. to define the problems resulting from the present bargaining patterns in the construction industry; and
3. to propose methods for reducing and rationalizing the number of bargaining patterns in the construction industry.

The Commission's recommendations became the basis of Bill 22 which was enacted in 1977 and implemented single-trade province-wide bargaining. The new system featured three major changes. First, collective agreements could only be negotiated between designated or certified employee bargaining agencies and designated or accredited employer bargaining agencies. The authority to designate bargaining agencies was vested in the Minister of Labour, and these agencies would have exclusive jurisdiction to bargain for a specific trade or craft throughout the province. Second, only these negotiated provincial collective agreements would be valid; any other form of agreement or arrangement would be void. Third, all collective agreements would expire on April 30, 1978, and thereafter would have a common expiry date calculated biannually from April 30, 1978.

In his "Background Paper", Don Franks, the inquiry commissioner, described the problem province-wide bargaining was intended to deal with in the following terms:

THE PROBLEM STATED

Any attempt to state the basic problem faced by this inquiry probably starts with the observation that there are approximately three hundred standard area collective agreements affecting the construction industry in Ontario. Even after extensive research, one can only state the approximate number of standard area agreements. Further, since these collective agreements are area agreements they apply to a number of employers, in fact, any employer who does the work covered by that collective agreement in unionized construction is bound by such a collective agreement.

As a result of previous collective bargaining, a substantial number of these three hundred agreements had been co-ordinated to expire on April 30th of 1975. Thus in a very short span of time approximately two hundred and fifty collective agreements came up for re-negotiation.

The problem that arises when such a multiplicity of bargaining occurs was succinctly stated by Mr. George Meany, President of the A.F.L.-C.I.O., when he commented recently that "each local negotiates as if there was no other". The problem is that there are other locals and that bargaining is not done in a vacuum. Each settlement affects other settlements and is itself affected by other settlements.

For some time now, the effect of one collective bargaining situation on another bargaining situation has been referred to as either leap-frogging or whip-sawing, depending whether it was between areas or between trades.

The real problem is not that whip-sawing and leap-frogging occur or that such tools are available to one side of the collective bargaining process and not the

other. The real problem is that frequently on both sides of the bargaining table the persons who most affect the bargaining are not present. The problem we are confronted with is how the structure of collective bargaining in the construction industry can be changed so that those who affect bargaining and are affected by it actually do the bargaining. (My emphasis)

The Honourable Bette Stephenson, then Minister of Labour, on introducing Bill 22 to the Legislature described its purposes in these terms:

The bill, as I have emphasized, is confined to the industrial, commercial and institutional sector of the construction industry and will result in the reduction of bargaining situations from 205 to approximately 25, as a result of the requirement that bargaining within that sector be conducted on a single-trade, province-wide basis. This is the prime feature of the bill. There are two important related features: First, all collective agreements within that sector will be for two years and will be required to expire on a common date; second, provision is made for the designation of a co-ordinating agency to enable employer bargaining agencies to exchange information and data and to engage in related co-ordinating activities. [This second feature was dropped from the Bill].

The reduction of key bargaining situations to 25 or so recognized trades or crafts in the industrial, commercial and institutional sector should eliminate disruptive intra-trade and inter-regional bargaining rivalries, and thereby bring a greater measure of rationality and stability to that bargaining process. The requirement to bargain by trade on a province-wide basis should encourage the parties to adopt broader perspectives in bargaining to the benefit of employees, employers and the province as a whole.

Finally, the resulting concentrated nature of bargaining within the sector should enable the Ministry of Labour to

provide even more effective and innovative mediation services to the parties. In the past, with more than 205 key bargaining situations to service, it has been difficult to develop the most effective and systematic approach to dispute resolution in this important sector of the construction industry.

A last observation about Bill 22 I wish to make is that it did not explicitly address the matter of what the designated bargaining agencies ought to look like. However, by choosing the designation process, rather than having litigious labour board proceedings, the Ministry could "consult and assist" the parties with the Minister having ultimate control over the form of organization to be designated. Mr. Franks went on to play that "assisting" role for the Minister and has reported that the Minister was concerned:

"...certain groups, particularly the local unions, would demand veto rights in the ratification of collective agreements. Because bargaining involves trade-offs, not only across the table but also between affiliated local unions on the same side, a veto right would have the effect of letting bargaining proceed to an agreement and then permitting one union local to hold the agreement up to ransom".

After the legislation was passed in 1977, Mr. Franks held extensive consultations with the industry. The consultations were informal and every effort was made to assist the parties to form appropriate agencies for designation. Throughout the consultations, Mr. Franks made it clear that the process could not be used by any party or groups to eliminate anyone else from the bargaining scheme, and that there could not be a veto power given to any one local trade union or contractor association. Mr.

Franks has subsequently noted that as a result of these consultations, although some groups had difficulty in establishing the requisite agency, none proposed an organization that contained a veto power. I will return to this issue of veto power later in the study.

IV. SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

The following is a summary of the forty-five submissions made in response to the Minister's announcement of the review. Those making submissions are identified in Appendix I. The numerical tabulation set out is confined to the bargaining agency consensus positions, but my point form commentary also contains the content of the dissenting appended briefs.

ISSUE #1

Has single-trade province-wide bargaining served the needs of the industry and the public as it was intended?

Total Employer Bargaining Agency Responses	Trade Union Bargaining Agency Responses
20 Yes	11 Yes
1 No	3 No

Commentary

Those replying in the affirmative emphasized:

- reduction in number of strikes
- reduction in whip-sawing and leap-frogging from one region to another
- increased standardization
- increased mobility
- reasonable economic outcomes
- increased predictability
- increased bargaining sophistication and statesmanship
- increased stability
- better communication
- increased productivity
- increased flexibility

Those who said "no" or dissented emphasized:

- only one in seven rounds has been strike free
- increase in person-days lost
- lead settlement problems (Who will settle first?)
- intra-organizational tension caused by two-tier settlements
- regional neglect
- leap-frogging between trades
- "me too" mentality of centralized bargaining
- uncertainty during peak months, every two years
- more in-house and non-union construction
- settlements too high
- failure to deal with training, updating, apprenticeship programs - i.e. quality and survival issues

ISSUE #2

Has the province-wide bargaining responded sufficiently to geographic considerations?

**Total Employer Bargaining
Agency Responses**

10 Yes

11 No

**Trade Union Bargaining
Agency Responses**

12 Yes

2 No

Commentary

Those who said "yes" mentioned:

- parties can create economic zones if they wish
- local "hardship" clauses which allow areas to fashion needed relief on consent of the central agencies are becoming prevalent
- no one area should dominate
- stabilization funds which subsidize approved bids by unionized contractors where necessary have been developed in some areas
- current system recognizes mobility of many construction trades
- inherent flexibility is available in the system to those interested as evidenced by two tier trend to rates and travel

Those who said "no" emphasized:

- hardship clauses ineffective (contracts are let too early)
- increasing number of illegal provincial agreement modification arrangements by local parties to respond to non-union competition and these arrangements are often not known to unionized contractors from outside the particular areas
- domination by "Golden Horseshoe"
- should be four economic regions to the bargaining (Southwest, Central, North and East)
- frozen local appendices are now the rule

- rise of stabilization funds illustrates insensitivity of bargaining
- decline of unionized firms outside Toronto
- political resistance by trade union representatives to "lower than average rates"

ISSUE #3

Are existing voting procedures of employer and employee bargaining agencies adequate?

**Total Employer Bargaining
Agency Responses**

10 Yes

11 No

**Trade Union Bargaining
Agency Responses**

14 Yes

0 No

(i) Commentary

Those who answered in the affirmative emphasized:

- this is purely an internal matter
- no one satisfactory formula exists as illustrated by Appendix III where the approach of each agency is gathered
- emphasis should be democracy tempered by absence of unfair domination by any one area
- need for worker mobility in many construction trade unions

Those who answered "no" emphasized:

- many of the procedures produce unfair domination (whether majority or proportional schemes)
- there is a need for four (4) mandatory economic regions with three (3) out of four (4) constituting a majority for ratification and with Final Offer Selection (FOS) available for the unsettled region.
- briefs variously proposed (1) one vote/each local or (2) one

vote per person or (3) double majority or (4) weighed vote - as the best scheme to achieve democracy while avoiding unfair domination

- there is a problem with S.149(a) of the Labour Relations Act - status on day of vote ought not to determine voting entitlement
- there is a need that secret ballot ratification and strike votes be conducted and their provincial results announced simultaneously
- emphasis should be on democracy and lack of unfair domination
- there is a need for single trade regional bargaining
- pointed out that Commissioner Don Franks recommended weighted voting procedures
- there is a need to create or insure the presence of a review mechanism for proposed changes to voting structures

(ii) Details of Options Set Out In Briefs

(A) Voting Structures

1. Status quo
2. Province to be divided into four regions: (1) south-western; (2) central; (3) northern; (4) eastern. Voting in each region would be done in accordance with the current voting structures and tabulated on a regional basis. The four zone structure would be similar in both Employer and Employee bargaining agencies. If a majority of the regions (a minimum of three regions) voted to accept a memorandum of settlement, the memorandum would be ratified. The dissenting region would either:
 - (a) accept the negotiated settlements, or,
 - (b) submit to "final offer selection" arbitration on total wage package only.
3. One vote for each local or employer zone.
4. One vote for each employer or employee.
5. Double majority (majority of each local/zone and majority of all employees/employers across the province.

6. (a) Weighted votes for each local or zone based exclusively on number of members or man-hours

or

- (b) Weighted formula to prevent any one or two locals or zones from dominating. For example, on trade union side formula could be one vote per local plus one vote for every unit of members with the unit being set or capped to insure that no local had more than a fixed proportion of total available votes.

(B) Status to Vote

1. Status quo.
2. Those having worked a fixed percentage of hours in the ICI during the previous contract or other stipulated time period.

ISSUE #4

Is the current requirement of two-year agreements appropriate?

**Total Employer Bargaining
Agency Responses**

1 Yes

20 No

**Trade Union Bargaining
Agency Responses**

6 Yes

8 No

Commentary

Most parties who believe the current two-year contract period to be inadequate referred to the typically longer construction cycle and the fact that negotiations often carry well into the two-year period in any event. The majority of these parties proposed three years; a few suggested four years. Some trade unions sought statutory COLA protection if there was to be any extension.

There was also the belief expressed that a longer contract term would mean fewer strikes and greater industry stability, but the fear was expressed that too long a contract term might mean collective agreements would become less responsive to economic conditions.

ISSUE #5

Are there other issues of significant concern meriting better accommodation by the legislation?

- It was proposed that when collective agreements have been reached with 75% of designated bargaining agencies, no strike and no lockout should be permitted by the remaining unsettled agencies. Outstanding issues in those relationships should be settled by "final offer selection" arbitration. This is generally the Nova Scotia scheme.
- There should be a system of industry-sponsored intervention following the issuance of "no board" reports and prior to legal strike/lock-out dates.
- Five days notice should be given prior to a strike or lock-out so that all work may be left in a safe condition and all tools, materials and equipment can be stored safely or removed.
- The Provincial Building and Construction Trades Council of Ontario and the Construction Employers Coordinating Council of Ontario (CECCO) should be given statutory roles to convene semi-annual or annual meetings to foster a better understanding of the problems and needs of the industry. Membership in both bodies should be required for the purposes of these meetings.
- Possible further evolution of the provincial bargaining structure to require coordination between trade groupings such as the Civil Trades (Bricklayers, Carpenters, Ironworkers, Labourers, Operators) and the M.E.S.H Trades (Electricians, Plumbers and Sheet Metal Workers); and Interior Trades.
- Requirement that every collective agreement be required to contain "an enabling clause", as attached in Appendix II.
- Pressing need for an expedited jurisdictional dispute

mechanism.

- Make project manager subject to common employer provision of Act (s.1(4)).
- Expedited s.150 sector determination proceedings needed.
- Broaden the ICI sector to include Electrical Power System sector and to ensure construction includes maintenance.
- Better communication required with such key groups as Owner-Clients.
- Need for a more representative Construction Industry Advisory Board.
- Need for a statutory cooling-off period.
- Better design of mandatory strike and lock-out requirements to ensure speedy and effective remedies.
- Pressing need for (1) collective bargaining data collection to enhance rationality of bargaining and (2) monitoring of performance of unionized industry.

V. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) Has single-trade province-wide bargaining served the needs of the industry and the public as it was intended?**

The purposes of Bill 22 as described by the Honourable Bette Stephenson and Donald Franks are set out above. Essentially, the aim was to reduce the number of key bargaining situations in order to lessen or eliminate disruptive inter-trade and inter-regional bargaining rivalries and, thereby, bring a greater measure of rationality and stability to the bargaining process. The parties, by their submissions, clearly believe that the legislation has met these purposes. From over two hundred (200) key bargaining

situations with their collective bargaining agreements expiring in chaotic sequences across the province, the ICI sector's fourteen construction trade unions are now subject to only twenty five (25) designated province-wide employee bargaining agencies which bargain at the same time. This obvious reduction and rationalization of key bargaining structures introduced the "opportunity" for greater rationality and stability in bargaining. An analysis of the performance of collective bargaining in the ICI sector since Bill 22 was introduced shows the parties have seized this opportunity. I have examined performance from two vantage points: (a) work stoppages and (b) wage settlements.

(a) Work Stoppages

Data in the study in Appendix IV on settlements and work stoppages in ICI construction in 1977-1991 show a marked reduction in the frequency of work stoppages, thus facilitating the planning of construction projects and the efficient conduct of labour negotiations. In the ten-year period preceding Bill 22 there were a total of 123 work stoppages occurred whereas 33 have occurred since Bill 22's introduction in 1978. (Appendix IV, Table 5). On the other hand, there has been a significant increase in total person-days lost as a result of the province-wide nature of any work stoppage, but the average duration of strikes has remained more or less constant over the periods compared. Once all of the 25 province-wide collective agreements have been signed, however, contractors now know that they will be able to operate in a stable

labour relations environment without work stoppages or unexpected wage increases for at least one full year. Prior to province-wide bargaining, such stability was not possible. This feature of the system considerably offsets the absolute number of person-days lost.

While the establishment of province-wide bargaining has not eliminated strikes or lockouts, and was not intended to do so, it is now a much more difficult decision to take a whole province out on strike or lockout than it was to make such decisions for a particular region or contractor. Moreover, by prohibiting selective work stoppages, it has become increasingly difficult for both strikers and contractors to find alternative opportunities to mitigate financial losses incurred. The checks and balances of the province-wide context also decrease the influence of local personality differences. For example, if a local trade union in one city is angry at contractors in that city, it cannot strike unless it can convince all other locals that the problem is serious enough that they should all go on strike in support. Accordingly, since the enactment of province-wide bargaining, the conflict which has occurred has been over more fundamental issues and many unnecessary local strikes have been averted. Greater rationality has therefore been a consequence of greater centralization.

The strike activity that has occurred is also much more concentrated and, therefore, now amenable to more intensive mediation efforts. The data show that 93 percent of the person-

days lost in province-wide bargaining have resulted from 17 strikes by six trades: asbestos workers, bricklayers, carpenters, electricians, plumbers and sheet metal workers. (Appendix IV, Table 6). These strikes lasted an average of 26 days, compared to 9 days for the 16 strikes that were taken by 10 other trades. The Ministry and the industry now have the ability to focus on particular relationships to get at the underlying problems.

It should be noted that the number of workers who were involved in the 33 work stoppages that have occurred under province-wide bargaining represented, on average, less than one percent of Ontario's paid non-agricultural work force in the years when the stoppages occurred. (Appendix IV, Table 5). Moreover, the time lost by these workers accounted for less than one-tenth of one percent of the estimated total working time of the paid non-agricultural work force. This record pales in comparison to time lost due to absences from work. In 1989 such absences accounted for 3.8 percent of the estimated total working time of the province's paid work force.

Ontario's time loss performance from strikes is also in line with the national record for work stoppages in the construction industry in Canada during 1978-1990. (Appendix IV, Table 9). Although Ontario had the highest number of work stoppages in the period, which is not surprising given the relative size of its work force, the average duration of the stoppages compares favourably with that for stoppages in Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and Prince

Edward Island, and is better than the average duration for stoppages in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Quebec is among the four provinces with shorter strike durations than Ontario's, although it had the highest number of workers involved in construction stoppages. Quebec's low record, however, may be a function of government intervention in the collective bargaining process. Table 9 also shows that only Manitoba, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Alberta had fewer workers than Ontario involved in construction work stoppages during 1978-1990 as a percent of their paid non-agricultural work force, but that Ontario's proportion was considerably smaller than the national average.

I would also observe, however, that changes in bargaining structure cannot avoid the influence of key economic factors. Economic influences will always shape bargaining agendas and influence bargaining power. For example, notwithstanding the 1981-82 recession, construction activity and double-digit inflation prompted trade union demands for large settlements with resulting strike activity as contractors resisted. Province-wide bargaining cannot avoid these kinds of conflicts. The literature and this study also confirm that whenever broader bargaining structures are introduced there is an associated increase in strike severity. Strikes in the ICI sector are now province-wide, and increased severity is a cost of this form of simplification.

(b) Wage Settlements

Provincial bargaining in Ontario has reduced the leap-frogging

of wages within a trade. It has also become more difficult to leapfrog wages across trades because all bargaining is simultaneous and much communication goes on between both trades and trade groupings. Wage patterns, to a greater or lesser extent, are set in each round and play a key role in the settlement process. Such pattern-setting was unsuccessfully tested by the plumbers in 1982 and these patterns are reviewed in detail in Appendix IV, Table 2.

Biannual rounds of provincial bargaining have also reduced intertemporal pressures or, in other words, claims of "catch-up" with other trades. Several commentators have concluded, after reviewing the data, that the system has produced more moderate wage settlements. This study suggests a similar finding.

Between April 1977 and April 1991, the Canada CPI increased by 149 percent, for an annual average rate increase of 6.8 percent. The data in Appendix IV, Table 3, show that only labourers, roofers, teamsters and glaziers have made gains over inflation. The average package rates for the first three increased by 1.8 to 3.8 percentage points and for the glaziers by 27.2 percentage points over the increase in the Canada CPI. Average package rates for four trades increased by 2.3 to 6.4 percentage points below the increase in the CPI and for 12 trades by 10.6 to 20.3 percentage points below. On an annual basis, average package rate increases for labourers, teamsters and roofers matched the annual average rate of inflation increase, and the average package rate increase for glaziers gained 0.7 percentage points. Average package rate increases for the remaining trades lost an average 0.1 to 0.7

percent annually to inflation. Data for 23 cities (Appendix IV, Table 4) show that average union rates for all these cities were below the CPI for the period 1977-1991.

Looked at in a more aggregate form, the average hourly earnings of construction workers increased by 110.9 percent from \$8.32 in 1977 to \$17.59 in 1990, for an annual average increase of 5.9 percent. (Appendix V, Table 10). This compares to inflation which increased by 132.9 percent over the period for an annual average rate of 6.7 percent. In 1977 construction average hourly earnings were 33.9 percent higher than the average hourly earnings in manufacturing. However, this differential has subsequently dropped in almost each year, reaching 15.1 percent in 1990. This is a very significant reversal of the wage experience of construction workers relative to their manufacturing counterparts that occurred in the late 1960's and early 1970's and which provided the impetus for province-wide bargaining. Indeed, this differential is back to its pre-1965 relationship and constitutes a strong indicator of the moderating effect of consolidated bargaining structures.

Finally, as the study on union wage rates and fringe benefits in Appendix V reveals in Tables 7 and 8, over the 14-year period of province-wide bargaining only small shifts have occurred in 1991 in wage rate and package relationships among trades and cities from the relationships that existed in 1977. Refrigeration mechanics remain at the top of both wage rate and package structures in 1991

as in 1977. Teamsters have moved to the bottom of the wage rate structure in 1991, exchanging seventeenth place in 1977 with the glaziers; labourers have moved to the bottom of the package structure in 1991, exchanging eighteenth place in 1977 with the glaziers. Operating engineers, rodmen, and glaziers have improved their rankings on the 1991 package structure by one step above their 1977 rankings; and millwrights and sprinkler fitters have improved their rankings by three or four steps. Carpenters and labourers have moved one step in the ranking, and plumbers and structural ironworkers have moved by three or five steps. The remaining ten trades have maintained their 1977 rankings. Most of the changes in rankings, even where multiple steps are involved, are the result of minor changes in relative compensation rates.

Regional rank changes are similarly small and reflect considerable stability. Average package amounts for all trades in Belleville, Cornwall, Kingston, Peterborough and Toronto show improved rankings by only two or three steps, although Ottawa rose eight steps in ranking. Timmins, North Bay, Sudbury and Windsor all moved in ranking by one or two steps, Sarnia and Thunder Bay moved by four steps. The remaining eight cities maintained their 1977 ranking in package rates in 1991. Not surprisingly, Toronto has moved to the top of both wage rate and package structures in 1991 from second place in 1977, replacing Sarnia which has moved to fifth place in package structure. Sault Ste Marie remains at the bottom ranking in 1991 as in 1977. There is, however, compression in all city differentials when compared to Toronto because of the

standard cents-per-hour wage increases too generally employed in construction industry bargaining.

One particular indication of the industry's general sensitivity to economic issues and its greater potential for rational outcomes was illustrated in the 1984 round of bargaining. The slack demand for new construction in late 1982 prompted the civil trades to agree to a wage freeze in year one of their 1984 agreement and \$1.00 in the second year. Remarkably, all trades followed this pattern without any work stoppage. Such result would have been inconceivable in the context of the earlier more fragmented structure of ICI sector negotiations.

Based on an analysis of the data, earlier studies, and on the submitted briefs, I have no hesitation in concluding that province-wide bargaining has served the needs of the industry and the public as it was intended. The parties have adjusted reasonably well to the increased centralization, bargaining outcomes appear more stable and more rational, and even the increase in person-days lost comes in a more predictable form. While the locus of decision making in collective bargaining has shifted to a central level, the craft or individual trade union orientation remains a significant force. This balance, complemented by only informal coordination on both the labour and management sides, appears to have worked reasonably well. There has been a stabilization of area wage structures and a more stable trade union pecking order. These

conclusions are consistent with other studies and with the objectives of Bill 22.

However, while the bargaining process is subjected to greater stability, general information on wages, benefits, and other employment conditions is very difficult to obtain. There is little evidence of sufficiently sophisticated or centralized data banks, industry analysis of trends and medium to long-term reflection in either the labour or management communities. There is also a general lack of easily accessible data indicating the general health of the unionized construction industry. For example, while there was the complaint that unionized construction was on the decline generally and in various regions, I could find little easily available data which demonstrate this point or illustrate the overall insensitivity of construction bargaining to general economic conditions. Except for the CIAB, there also does not appear to be regular gatherings of labour and management outside the crisis of collective bargaining to reflect on where the industry is going and on the challenges that lie ahead. Therefore, much improvement is possible in the area of data retrieval, analysis, and the general monitoring of the industry.

Recommendation

- I recommend that all employee and employer bargaining agencies, together with government, be required to form and fund a central body that will administer the collection and

analysis of construction collective bargaining data and the collection and analysis of other relevant industry data to further enhance province-wide single trade bargaining. This body should also be required to convene industry meetings at least twice a year and to issue regular reports to the industry. Such reports and conferences will better inform the bargaining parties and increase the opportunities for understanding and cooperation.

I have not recommended the scheme adopted in the Province of Nova Scotia that terminates continued bargaining when a majority or more of the industry is settled in any particular round. I did not have the time to visit Nova Scotia and assess the operation of that approach. This is something the CIAB might wish to do. While it has its attractions, I suspect the approach may be subject to its own harmful counter-tactics of early strikes or trade alliances to avoid the industry settlement threshold. Further, the data collected do not reveal that strike action in Ontario regularly concentrates in the third and fourth quarters in any event. (Appendix IV, Table 1). While several of the briefs expressed an interest in the Nova Scotia system, I believe such fundamental reform with its associated government intervention requires much more study, consultation and a demonstrable need. In the time available, I was unable to conclude that the current trends in person-days lost could be acceptably minimized in this manner.

- I also have not recommended mandatory multi-trade coordination. Enhanced understanding and communication is evolving in Ontario. Complete centralization, as possibly illustrated by Quebec's need for government intervention in negotiations, carries its own problems. However, greater coordination by trade grouping may be worth further exploration. The M.E.S.H work stoppage statistics indicate why. (Appendix IV, Tables 6, 7, and 8).

(2) Has the province-wide bargaining responded sufficiently to geographic considerations?

The briefs did not reflect the same consensus on this issue. The data in Table 2 in the study in Appendix IV reveal considerable variation in wage increases both in and outside of Toronto and between Toronto and elsewhere in the 1978-80 round; a decrease in such variation up to and including the 1986 round; and an indication of a trend back to significant differences between Toronto and elsewhere and a greater variety in wage increases outside Toronto in subsequent rounds. Data in Table 4 in Appendix IV show that all 23 cities surveyed lost to inflation; and data in Table 4 in Appendix V reveal that the average package rates for all trades advanced to the highest level in Central Ontario at \$29.58 and to the lowest level at \$28.34 in Northern Ontario. However, data in Table 9 in Appendix V show that differentials between Toronto and other cities have generally been compressed due to across-the-board cents-per-hour increases, and suggest that regional variations in settlement patterns have not been featured

in province-side bargaining and may not have been sufficiently significant as suggested by several employer bargaining agency briefs.

There is no denying the recent advent of two-tier settlements; hardship clauses, and stabilization funds. However, a majority of the employer briefs do not accept that these developments have been adequate to meet regional or local needs. Generally, inter-regional differences continue to reflect only those differences that were in place in 1977 with some ensuing compression because of cents-per-hour across-the-board increases. Whether the more recent provincial concern for northern communities and other regional interests will continue and appreciate is difficult to judge. The very need to establish stabilization funds and hardship clauses suggests that the politics of wage determination has impeded trade unions in tailoring wage rates to the competitive realities of Ontario's regions. I am also disturbed by reports of informal side deals between local unions and local contractors not approved by bargaining agencies and unknown to out-of-area unionized contractors.

However, given the nature of the study, it has also been difficult to assess the severity of the impact of regional insensitivity, other than to accept at face value the assertions that non-union competition is more intense. Data showing wage insensitivity to drops in regional construction activity for union firms was not available in the time allotted and requires further

study, possibly through field surveys. Nevertheless, the settlement data seem to point to substantial difficulties for employee bargaining agencies to negotiate other than across-the-board settlements. Adjusting to local crises during the life of an agreement is also difficult, given problems for unions associated with adequate financial disclosure, concerns of contractors over the the timeliness of any such adjustments, and the possibility that existing informal and "illegal" local adjustments are not being extended to all unionized contractors.

On the basis of the briefs, previous studies, and the data appended to this review, I cannot find that province-wide bargaining has responded sufficiently to geographic considerations. Unfortunately, however, I have not been able to document the extent or severity of this problem, a situation which every centralized system of bargaining is afflicted with to a greater or lesser extent. Thus, it is difficult to balance this finding against the obvious benefits produced by single trade province-wide bargaining, and it is equally difficult for me to suggest a meaningful solution.

Recommendation

- Several briefs complaining of a lack of regional insensitivity proposed a restructuring of bargaining that would divide each bargaining agency into four regional components. A settlement would be arrived at when any three of the four regions reached

agreement. A dissenting region or affiliate would have the option of proceeding to speedy final offer selection to have its position compared with the settlement agreed to in light of that region's concerns. One might stipulate in this approach that positions placed before the selector must be the last positions taken at bargaining immediately prior to arriving at the majority settlement.

- The proposal is very creative but entails a significant change to the structure of bargaining throughout the province. It also requires dividing the province into four regions and assigning affiliates of all bargaining agencies to one of these regions. To maintain the same regions for each bargaining agency would entail breaking up existing affiliates - a considerable adjustment at least on the trade union side. While I am intrigued by the proposal, I am very anxious about its complexity, implementation and impact generally on the bargaining process. Province-wide bargaining has produced significant benefits and I worry about undermining the process in the effort to repair one of its by-products.

- I point out that dividing the province into four zones would understate the variety of regional and local wage rates that are contained in most of the ICI collective agreements. Also, the boundaries of any four zones selected would not correlate to the economic regions of Ontario established by Statistics Canada. I am also unclear on how such change would affect the

bargaining pressures within bargaining agencies and the bargaining dynamic between bargaining agencies. In short, a four-zone approach would be almost as dramatic as the implementation of province-wide bargaining itself and cannot be recommended in a review of this nature and on the data before me. In my view, it would take the experience of people like those on the CIAB to judge whether the approach would actually produce more regionally sensitive settlements, and what its effect on the bargaining dynamic would be. For this reason, the proposal may be something the CIAB itself will wish to inquire into more thoroughly and, thereafter, advise the Minister.

- However, I believe that ICI sector bargaining requires more regional sensitivity and, to this end, much more meaningful regional data on unionized construction activity must be gathered and shared between bargaining agencies. I recommend that this be given immediate priority by any industry-government created monitoring body. Alternatively, the impact of regional insensitivity should be the subject-matter of a more detailed study by the Industry and the Ministry of Labour to be completed as soon as possible for assessment by the Minister on the advice of the CIAB. Regional insensitivity is a problem overhanging province-wide bargaining.

(3) Are the existing voting procedures of employer and employee bargaining agencies adequate?

This issue produced a response in the briefs almost identical to the previous issue. Indeed, there may be linkage between the two in that voting structures may contribute to regional sensitivity or insensitivity. Don Franks, in his report, recommended that ratification procedures be by weighted vote of the affiliate members of a bargaining agency on the trade union side. However, as noted above, in facilitating the designation process he was also concerned that no one local have a veto over the outcome of bargaining. With respect to strike votes, he recommended that the votes be conducted concurrently by all of the locals in an employee bargaining agency and the decision be based on the overall result of all members in the province. Alternatively, he recommended a referendum vote conducted of all the members of each local in an employee bargaining agency.

The briefs do not raise a problem with respect to strike votes. However, there is concern, more generally expressed by employers than by unions, with the ratification procedures of certain employee bargaining agencies and the possibility of vetoes existing. However, there is considerable diversity in these voting arrangements as the survey of employee bargaining agencies in Appendix III to this report reveals. One (1) agency does not require any vote; five (5) use a sliding scale; three (3) use a double majority of locals and members; three (3) employ one-local-one-vote; and ten (10) use a one-worker-one-vote system. The voting arrangements are also a matter that the construction trade unions consider to be an internal affair, notwithstanding that

several of the dissenting trade union briefs endorsed the notion that there should to be no domination of or by any one component of an employee bargaining agency. These briefs tended to request that a double majority voting arrangement be imposed on their bargaining agencies.

On the basis of the briefs, I cannot say that any one formula is preferable and should be imposed on all employee bargaining agencies. Unfortunately, like the problems we are experiencing with federalism, mutual concerns for democracy and the avoidance of unfair domination often have difficulty achieving a consensus over a precise formula to express these shared concerns. However, I observe that when the designations were made, great attention was paid by the Minister of Labour to each formula placed before her, with the expressed view that there be no veto and the approach be otherwise consistent with the province-wide bargaining scheme. In other words, the voting procedures were never considered by the government to be the private affair of either employer or employee bargaining agencies.

I also observe that there appears to have been amendments to such voting procedures by five bargaining agencies without first obtaining approval or authorization from the Minister of Labour. While I appreciate there is no express procedure for applying for approval to insure that such changes are consistent with province-wide bargaining, I would think such a procedure, if not implicit in the Act, should be required. The Minister may wish to have the

review conducted by an advisor with resulting recommendations as Don Franks did originally.

I caution that the matter of the "adequacy" of a voting procedure can be very complex. It is difficult to assess the adequacy of the existing unamended voting procedures without an in-depth review of the operation of each bargaining agency's voting procedures, including interviews of key officials and an assessment of each round of bargaining. I point out that many employee bargaining agencies employ the time-honoured democratic approach of one-worker-one-vote. However, one highly populated local union might, in these circumstances, be able to control provincial bargaining and impose its will on all other locals - a veto that the Minister of Labour, in making the designations, wished to avoid. This, of course, may be moderated as a practical matter by the composition of bargaining committees or formally by a weighted voting arrangement which precludes a veto. On the other hand, a more regionally sensitive one-local-one-vote system may run counter to the wishes of the majority of workers represented by an employee bargaining agency. The issue here is one of finding a delicate balance of interests within a bargaining agency.

The regional wage data considered in regard to the previous issue might be relied upon to conclude that voting procedures are inadequate. However, I am unable to draw a direct relationship between that data and the voting procedures of each of the bargaining agencies. I also know all unchanged procedures were, at

one time, considered by the Minister to have been adequate and I have no strong basis for disagreeing with that conclusion now.

There was concern expressed in several employer briefs that some ratification votes by employee bargaining agencies have been conducted in a manner so that when one area of the province voted it knew the results of voting already conducted elsewhere and reported. This is not appropriate, and should be changed. We have so great a stake in province-wide bargaining that the conduct of ratification votes must be beyond reproach.

Finally, several trade union briefs complained of the current requirement that an employee be employed in the ICI sector on the day of a strike or ratification vote to be entitled to vote. While I appreciate that this requirement does not include everyone who may eventually work under a provincial agreement, I see no practical substitute for limiting voting entitlement to those employees who will actually have to engage in a strike if that is the outcome of a vote.

Recommendation

- There is a need to insure by legislation that no member of a bargaining agency has knowledge of the outcome of voting already conducted by the agency elsewhere in the province concerning the ratification of a provincial agreement.

- I also recommend that an explicit statutory procedure be established to permit the Minister to authorize proposed changes to bargaining agency voting procedures, and that those procedures amended since the designations were issued might be reviewed to understand their appropriateness.

(4) Is the current requirement of two-year provincial agreements appropriate?

There was a significant consensus in the briefs that the current two-year period is inadequate. The data in Appendix IV, Table 1, reveal that bargaining often encroaches well into the first year of provincial agreements so that the industry is only effectively getting the benefit of one year of guaranteed peace. Moreover, the construction cycle in this sector, given the scale of many of the projects, would be better accommodated by three year collective agreements rather than the current two year. Finally, with the occurrence of strike and lockout activity in every round of bargaining but one, three years of peace has the prospect of providing an improvement in person-days lost due to work stoppages.

Recommendation

- I recommend that the term of provincial agreements be required to be for a period of three years and that all provincial agreements continue to expire on the same April 30th.

(5) Are there other issues of significant concern meriting better accommodation by the legislation?

The earlier section analyzing the submissions reveals a variety of useful suggestions and proposals in response to this question. While several of the proposals merit close attention in a general sense and have, for some time, I cannot find any particular suggestion under this heading that would clearly improve the quality of bargaining in the ICI sector other than what I have already proposed. In so finding, I am assuming that question five was intended to identify other issues "affecting ICI bargaining", not just other useful things to do to improve labour relations in the construction industry. Accordingly, no recommendation is made under this heading.

VI. CONCLUSION

What the study has demonstrated is a marked improvement in the stability of collective bargaining in the ICI construction sector from 1978 to 1990 in comparison to the equivalent period leading up to the enactment of province-wide single-trade bargaining. Ontario, to-day, exhibits in the ICI sector a solid framework for collective bargaining negotiations. This framework has permitted the collective bargaining process to free itself from the chaotic and sometimes irrational outcomes which hurt the industry through the 1960's and early 1970's. Moreover, and importantly, this result has been achieved by strengthening free collective

not by government-dictated outcomes. Provided with a framework designed to ensure the participation of everyone affected by ICI sector collective bargaining, labour and management in this sector rose to the challenge and fashioned a much more rational and predictable collective negotiations process than previously existed.

This does not mean that the present system is perfect and cannot be improved upon. Indeed, my recommendations are aimed at encouraging further improvements. However, because Ontario has a very viable framework for negotiations currently in place, additional structural reform to deal with apparent regional wage insensitivity must be approached cautiously. No one, I suggest, wants to return to the pre-1978 style of collective bargaining. Furthermore, the current framework shows in recent years the "potential" for more regionally sensitive bargaining with the advent of multi-tier wage rates, and variable travel allowances.

However, I recognise that there have been significant impediments to more regionally sensitive outcomes as I have discussed in the study. The presence of hardship clauses and stabilization funds suggests to me that the parties are having difficulty in making the harder decisions of bringing into place more regionally sensitive general wage rates. I am also concerned about a possible trend to local side deals. In my view, a new industry administered monitoring mechanism would obviously want to make this regional issue an early priority, and the CIAB together

with government may also wish to consider further several of the proposals made to me that were designed to encourage more regionally sensitive collective bargaining responses. It is my hope and belief, however, that this industry with its considerable leadership in both the labour and management communities will find a way to exercise their existing freedom to fashion more regionally sensitive solutions within the current framework. Indeed, as trustees of the process they have the responsibility to do so, and unlike government, are uniquely situated to meet this challenge.

All Of Which is
Respectfully submitted.
George W. Adams Q.C.

July 18, 1991

APPENDIX I

ICI BRIEFS FILES

Trade Unions

((D) signifies a dissenting or additional submission).

1. Operative Plasterers' and Cement Masons' (Provincial Conference of Ontario).
2. Operative Plasterers' and Cement Masons' (Restoration Steeplejacks Local 172).
3. International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers.
4. Carpenters' Bargaining Conference
(D) Carpenter's Local 27.
5. The Millwright District Council of Ontario
6. Ontario Pipe Trades Council.
7. U.A. Local 853, Sprinkler Fitters of Ontario.
8. International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Ironworkers and Ironworkers District Council of Ontario.

(D) International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Ironworkers, Local 721.

(D) International Association of Bridge Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers, Local 736.
9. Labourers' International Union of North America, Ontario Provincial District Council.

(D) Labourers' International Union of North America, Local 506.

(D) Labourers' International Union of North America, Local 527
10. Operating Engineers Employee Bargaining Agency.

(D) Dissents of several regional areas included.

11. International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers, Local 95.
12. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Construction Council of Ontario.
 - (D) IBEW, Local 105
 - (D) IBEW, Local 120
 - (D) IBEW, Local 353
 - (D) IBEW, Local 804
13. (Joint Submission) Ontario Provincial Conference of the International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftsmen.
 - (D) Business Manager of Local, Hamilton
14. Ontario Sheet Metal Workers' and Roofers' Conference.
 - (D) Local Union No. 30
 - (D) Local Union No. 47

Employers

((D) signifies a dissenting or additional submission).

1. Painters Employer Bargaining Agency
2. The Master Insulators Association of Ontario Inc.
3. Ontario Precast Concrete Manufacturers Association (Precast Erectors).
4. Ontario Sheet Metal and Air Handling Group.
5. Ontairo Erectors Association.
6. Association of Millwrighting Contractors of Ontario Inc.
7. Boilermaker Contractors' Association.
8. The Mechanical Contractors' Association of Ontario.
 - (D) Industrial Contractors' Association of Ontario
 - (D) Mechanical Contractors' Association of Windsor
9. Terrazzo, Tile and Marble Guild of Ontario Inc.

10. Ontario Refrigeration and Air Cooking Contractors' Association.
11. Reinforcing Steel Institute (Rodmen Employer Bargaining Agency).
12. Ontario Industrial Roofing Contractors' Association.
13. Electrical Trade Bargaining Agency of the Electrical Contractors of Ontario.
(D) Electrical Contractors' Association of Thunder Bay Inc.
14. Construction Site Teamster Employer Bargaining Agency.
15. Canadian Automatic Sprinkler Association.
16. (Joint Submission) Masonry Industry Employers Council of Ontario.
(D) Sudbury Masonry Contractors' Association.
(D) Northern and Northwestern Ontario Bricklayer Employers.
(D) Labour Relations Bureau of the Ontario General Contractors' Association.
17. Carpenters Employer Bargaining Agency.
(D) Industrial Contractors' Association of Canada.
(D) Acoustical Association of Ontario.
(D) Acme Building and Construction Ltd.
18. Labourers Employer Bargaining Agency.
(D) Industrial Contractors' Association of Canada
(D) Ontario Masonry Contractors' Association.
(D) Acme Building and Construction Ltd.
19. Operating Engineers Employer Bargaining Agency.
(D) Industrial Contractors' Association of Canada.
20. Cement Masons Employer Bargaining Agency.
(D) Industrial Contractors' Association of Canada.
21. Plasterers Employer Bargaining Agency.

OTHER BRIEFS AND COMMENTS

1. Electrical Power Systems Construction Association.
2. The Construction Owners Council of Ontario.
3. The Ontario Allied Construction Trades Council.
4. Catalytic Maintenance.
5. NDT Management Association.
6. Quality Control Council of Canada.
7. Sarnia Construction Association.
8. Northeastern Ontario Building Construction Trades Council.
9. General Presidents' Maintenance Committee.
10. Metropolitan Toronto Apartment Builders Association.

APPENDIX II

PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR ENABLING CLAUSES

Every Collective Agreement shall contain the following language:

The terms and conditions of this Collective Agreement may be changed or amended by written agreement between [Employer] and the [Union].

Any local association or any local trade union may receive approval from the Employer or Employee Bargaining Agency to negotiate specific local issues which it feels are necessary in its area. If the other party refuses to meet or if no agreement is reached, the party making the proposal, may have the matter referred to arbitration by final offer selection. The arbitration shall be held ten (10) days after the request is made in writing. The requesting parties shall submit its position in writing no later than five (5) days prior to the hearing, which position shall include:

- (a) the change requested;
- (b) the need for the change;
- (c) the purpose of the change;
- (d) what the change is hoped to result in;
- (e) how the result can be obtained; and
- (f) evidence that the proposed change may achieve the desired result.

The party refusing the change, within the aforementioned time limits, must in writing put forth its position outlining why the proposed change(s) has been rejected.

Both the Employer and Employee Bargaining agency shall be notified of the hearing and shall attend. Each party shall be allowed a maximum of thirty (30) minutes at the hearing to present its position orally.

The arbitrator shall render a decision by choosing one or other position only and such choice shall be made within three (3) days of the hearing.

APPENDIX III

Voting Procedures in the ICI Sector of the Ontario Construction Industry

Part I: Employee Bargaining Agencies

Trade	<u>Strike Votes</u>		<u>Ratification Votes</u>	
	<u>Required</u>	<u>How Votes Counted</u>	<u>Required</u>	<u>How Votes Counted</u>
Boilermakers	Yes	1 worker-1 vote	No	No vote
Bricklayers	Yes	1 worker-1 vote	Yes	Sliding scale ¹
Carpenters	Yes	Double majority ²	Yes	Double majority ²
Cement Masons	Yes	Double majority ²	Yes	Double majority ²
Electricians	Yes	1 worker-1 vote	Yes	1 local-1 vote
Elevator Constructors		No Response		No Response
Glaziers	Yes	1 worker-1 vote	Yes	1 worker-1 vote
Insulators	Yes	1 worker-1 vote	Yes	1 worker-1 vote
Ironworkers	Yes	1 worker-1 vote	Yes	1 local-1 vote (to break a tie, 1 worker-1 vote)
Labourers	Yes	Sliding scale ¹	Yes	Sliding scale ¹
Precast Concrete	Yes	Sliding scale ¹	Yes	Sliding scale ¹
Demolition	Yes	Sliding scale ¹	Yes	Sliding scale ¹
Millwrights	Yes	1 worker-1 vote	Yes	1 worker-1 vote
Operating Engineers	Yes	1 worker-1 vote	Yes	1 worker-1 vote
Painters	Yes	1 worker-1 vote	Yes	1 worker-1 vote
Plasterers	Yes	Double majority ²	Yes	Double majority ²
Plumbers	Yes	1 worker-1 vote	Yes	1 worker-1 vote
Refrigeration Mechanics	Yes	1 worker-1 vote	Yes	1 worker-1 vote

Part I: Employee Bargaining Agencies (Cont'd)

<u>Trade</u>	<u>Strike Vote</u>		<u>Ratification Votes</u>	
	<u>Required</u>	<u>How Votes Counted</u>	<u>Required</u>	<u>How Votes Counted</u>
Rodmen	Yes	1 worker-1 vote	Yes	1 local-1 vote (to break a tie, 1 worker-1 vote)
Roofers	Yes	1 worker-1 vote	Yes	1 worker-1 vote
Sheet Metal Workers	Yes	1 worker-1 vote	Yes	1 worker-1 vote
Sprinkler Fitters		No Response		No Response
Steeplejacks	Yes	1 worker-1 vote	Yes	1 worker-1 vote
Teamsters		No Response		No Response
Tile and Terrazzo	Yes	1 worker-1 vote	Yes	Sliding scale ¹

Part II: Employer Bargaining Agencies

<u>Trade</u>	<u>Lockout Votes</u>		<u>Ratification Votes</u>	
	<u>Required</u>	<u>How Votes Counted</u>	<u>Required</u>	<u>How Votes Counted</u>
Boilermakers	No	1 contractor-1 vote	No	1 contractor-1 vote (the practice, though by-laws silent)
Bricklayers	No	Weighted by Assn.	No	Weighted by Assn.
Carpenters	Yes	Weighted by Assn.	Yes	Weighted by Assn.
Cement Masons	Yes	Weighted by Assn.	Yes	Weighted by Assn.
Electricians	No	Not specified	No	Not specified
Elevator Constructors	No	Not specified	No	Not specified
Glaziers	Yes	Double majority ³	Yes	Double majority ³

Part II: Employer Bargaining Agencies (Cont'd)

<u>Trade</u>	<u>Lockout Votes</u>		<u>Ratification Votes</u>	
	<u>Required</u>	<u>How Votes Counted</u>	<u>Required</u>	<u>How Votes Counted</u>
Insulators	No	Not specified	Yes	No. of votes tied to manhours
Ironworkers	Yes	1 contractor-1 vote	Yes	1 contractor-1 vote
Labourers	Yes	Weighted by Assn.	Yes	Weighted by Assn.
Precast Concrete	Yes	1 contractor-1 vote	Yes	1 contractor-1 vote
Demolition	Yes	No. of votes tied to manhours	Yes	No. of votes tied to manhours
Millwrights	No	Majority vote by Board of Directors	No	Majority vote by Board of Directors
Operating Engineers	Yes	Weighted by Assn.	Yes	Weighted by Assn.
Painters	No	Weighted by Assn.	Yes	Weighted by Assn.
Plasterers	Yes	Weighted by Assn.	Yes	Weighted by Assn.
Plumbers	Yes	1 region-1 vote	Yes	1 region-1 vote (70% of votes required)
Refrigeration Mechanics	Yes	Contractor gets 1 vote per 5 workers	Yes	Contractor gets 1 vote per 5 workers
Rodmen	No	Weighted by Assn.	No	Weighted by Assn.
Roofers	Yes	1 contractor-1 vote	Yes	1 contractor-1 vote
Sheet Metal Workers	Yes	1 region-1 vote	Yes	1 region-1 vote
Sprinkler Fitters	No	1 contractor-1 vote	No	1 contractor-1 vote
Steeplejacks	Yes	No. of votes tied to manhours	Yes	No. of votes tied to manhours
Teamsters	Yes	1 vote per contractor Assn.	Yes	1 vote per contractor Assn.
Tile and Terrazzo	No	Vote of steering and negotiating committees	No	Vote of steering and negotiating committees

Part III: Summary of Voting Procedures

(a) Employee Bargaining Agencies

Strike Votes Required:

Yes	22
No	0
Not Reported	3

Method of Counting Strikes Votes:

1 Worker-1 Vote	16
Double Majority	3
Sliding Scale of votes per local	3

Ratification Votes Required:

Yes	21
No	1

Method of Counting Ratification Votes:

1 Worker-1 Vote	10
Double Majority	3
Votes per Local	3
No Vote	1

(b) Employer Bargaining Agencies

Lockout Votes Required

Yes	15
No	10
Not Reported	0

Method of Counting Lockout Votes:

1 Contractor-1 vote	5
Double Majority	1
Weighted by Assn.	8
No. Votes Tied to Manhours or No. of Workers	3
1 Region-1 Vote	2
1 Vote per Contractor Assn.	1
Other	5

Ratification Votes Required:

Yes	17
No	8

Method of Counting Ratification Votes:

1 Contractor-1 Vote	5
Weighted by Assn	8
Double Majority	1
1 Region-1 Vote	2

Part IV: Changes to EBA Constitutions and By-laws Related to Voting Methods

Employee Bargaining Agencies

1. Electricians
Stayed with one-local/one-vote for ratifications, but reduced the number of locals for a majority to seven (from eight) when two locals amalgamated.
2. Plumbers - October 1980
Changed from one-local/one-vote to one-worker/one-vote
3. Sheet Metal Workers - 1981
Changed from one-local/one-vote to one-worker/one-vote (both strike and ratification votes)
4. Roofers
Same as Sheet Metal Workers

Employer Bargaining Agencies

1. Operating Engineers
(Redistributed number of votes each association receives (both lockout and ratification))

-
1. Number of votes per local tied to number of members in the local.
 2. Requires both a majority of the total membership voting and a majority of locals.
 3. One vote per region and a ballot by the EBA's Board of Directors.
 4. The number of votes per contractor depends on the number of manhours the contractor employs tradesmen.

APPENDIX IV

**Settlement Ratifications and Patterns, Comparison
CPI and Package Rate Increases, and Work Stoppages
in ICI Construction, 1977-1991**

Len Haywood
Industrial Relations Division
Ontario Ministry of Labour
July 1991

I. Settlement Ratifications in ICI Construction Bargaining, 1978-1990

Table 1 shows the stages at which settlements were reached and the months the settlements were ratified during the seven rounds of province-wide bargaining in ICI construction since 1978.

- 1978 Following settlements by painters and refrigeration mechanics in April, eleven other trades reached agreements by the end of June. Five trades settled during the third quarter, and the remaining seven trades prolonged negotiations into the fourth quarter, with general labourers and precast labourers settling in December.
- 1980 Plasterers settled early in March; and cement masons and again painters and refrigeration mechanics settled in April. Following these settlements, thirteen other trades reached agreements by the end of June, and the remaining eight trades completed negotiations in the third quarter, with asbestos workers settling in September.
- 1982 Following a settlement by refrigeration mechanics in April for the third successive time, thirteen other trades settled by the end of June. Eight trades settled during the third quarter; and negotiations extended beyond December for the remaining three trades, ending with a settlement by demolition labourers in March 1983.
- 1984 Nine trades reached settlements early, in December 1983 and January 1984, including the seven basic trades. Thirteen trades concluded agreements during the second and third quarters, with painters again settling in April. Three trades prolonged negotiations beyond October, ending with a settlement by boilermakers in May 1985.
- 1986 The first settlements were concluded in May by bricklayers, plumbers and roofers. Thirteen trades settled in June, and eight during the third quarter. Boilermakers again settled last, in November.

- 1988** Following settlements by steeplejacks and teamsters in April, nineteen other trades reached agreements during May and June. Negotiations were completed during the third quarter, with boilermakers again the last to settle in September.
- 1990** The first settlement was reached by general labourers on May 14th, and by the end of June, fifteen other trades had concluded agreements. The remaining trades reached agreements during the third quarter, with boilermakers again the last to settle, in September.

II. Settlement Patterns in ICI Construction Bargaining, 1978-1990

Table 2 shows wage package adjustments in ICI construction settlements in the seven rounds of negotiations under province-wide bargaining.

- 1978-1980** In this first round, package rate adjustments varied considerably. Uniform adjustments ranging from 25 cents to \$1.50 over the life of the agreement were received by workers in ten trades. Refrigeration mechanics in Toronto received a larger adjustment than all their counterparts outside Toronto, \$1.30 compared with 98 cents; but millwrights received a smaller adjustment than their counterparts outside Toronto, \$1.12 compared with \$1.19.

Workers in the remaining thirteen trades received ranges of adjustments in which minimum amounts were smaller than the adjustment for Toronto workers, and maximum amounts were mostly larger than Toronto's adjustment.

- 1980-1982** In this round, teamsters outside Toronto received adjustments equal to or larger than the adjustment workers in Toronto

received. Workers in the other trades, inside and outside Toronto, received the same adjustments, ranging from \$1.70 to \$2.55.

- 1982-1984 In this round, bricklayers outside Toronto received the same adjustment as workers in Toronto - \$4.00, or larger - \$4.25. Cement masons outside Toronto also received the same adjustment as workers in Toronto - \$3.75, or larger - \$3.85. Workers in the other trades, inside and outside Toronto, received the same adjustments, ranging from \$3.25 to \$4.00.
- 1984-1986 In this round, workers in all trades received a uniform package rate adjustment of \$1.00.
- 1986-1988 In this round, cement masons, plasterers and rodmen outside Toronto received adjustments equal to or smaller than the adjustment workers in Toronto received. Demolition labourers outside Toronto received adjustments that were smaller than the amount workers in Toronto received; and painters outside Toronto received adjustments of \$1.64-\$2.02, compared with \$1.92 received by workers in Toronto. The remaining trades, inside and outside Toronto, received the same adjustments, ranging from \$1.65 to \$2.00.
- 1988-1990 In this round, all trades in Toronto received a package rate adjustment of \$3.00, except steeplejacks who received \$1.80. Workers outside Toronto received adjustments equal to, smaller than or larger than these amounts.
- 1990-1992 In this round, workers in seven trades received the same adjustments inside and outside Toronto, ranging from \$3.00-\$4.06. For the other trades, workers outside Toronto received smaller adjustments than the amounts received by Toronto workers, which ranged from \$4.00-\$5.29.

III. Comparison of Package Rate and CPI Increases

Between April 1977 and April 1991, the Canada CPI increased by 149 percent, for an annual average rate of increase of 6.8 percent. Table 3 compares these increases with increases in package rates for the 19 trades studied; and Table 4 compares them with increases in package rates for the 23 cities surveyed.

Trade Package Rates

Table 3 shows that only labourers, roofers, teamsters and glaziers have made gains over inflation. The average package rates for the first three increased between May 1977 and May 1991 by 1.8-3.8 percentage points, and for glaziers by 27.2 percentage points over the increase in the Canada CPI between April 1977 and April 1991. Average package rates for four trades increased by 2.3-6.4 percentage points below the increase in the CPI, and for 12 trades by 10.6-20.3 percentage points below.

On an annual basis, average package rate increases for labourers, teamsters and roofers matched the annual average rate of increase in inflation; and the average package rate increase for glaziers gained 0.7 percentage points. Average package rate increases for the remaining trades lost on average 0.1-0.7 percentage points annually to inflation.

City Package Rates

Table 4 shows that all 23 cities surveyed lost to inflation. The average package rate for all trades in Toronto increased between May 1977 and May 1991 by 8.8 percentage points below the increase in the CPI between April 1977 and April 1991. Average package rate increases for thirteen trade were 8.1-8.7 percentage points below the increase in the CPI, and average package rate increases for the remaining nine cities were 9.1-21.2 percentage points below.

On an annual basis, the average package rate increases for Toronto and five other cities were 0.4 percentage points below the annual average rate of increase in inflation. Sarnia's rate increase was 0.7 percentage points below, and rate increases for the remaining cities were 0.2-0.5

percentage points below.

IV. Work Stoppages in ICI Construction, 1978-1990

Professor Rose's analysis is based on strike data for all sectors of construction, divided into pre- and post-1978 periods. Table 5 provides data on only ICI strikes, divided into three periods: pre-accreditation period, prior to 1971; accreditation period, 1971-1977; and province-wide bargaining period, 1978-1990. Table 6 shows the number of strikes that have occurred under province-wide bargaining by trade; and Table 7 and 8 show the years in which individual trades struck.

Pre-Accreditation

For this period, strike data for only 1969 and 1970 are shown (Table 5). Nineteen sixty-nine was the peak year for person-days lost by strikes in the construction industry. The ICI sector accounted for 92 percent of this time loss, with the 38 strikes involved lasting 28 days on average.

Accreditation Period

During this period, 85 strikes occurred in the ICI sector. They accounted for 88 percent of the person-days lost in the pre-accreditation period and lasted 21 days on average, 7 days less than the average for the pre-accreditation period.

Province-wide Bargaining

Strikes have occurred in every round of province-wide bargaining except in the 1984 round, totalling 33 stoppages. They accounted for more than two and a half times the person-days lost in the pre-accreditation period, and about three times the person-days lost in the accreditation period. However, the strikes lasted an average of 23 days, about the same as in the accreditation period, and five days less than the average

duration in the pre-accreditation period.

As Table 6 shows, 93 percent of the person-days lost in the province-wide bargaining period have resulted from 17 strikes by six trades: asbestos workers, bricklayers, carpenters, electricians, plumbers and sheet metal workers. These strikes lasted an average of 26 days, compared to 9 days for the 16 strikes that were taken by 10 other trades.

As Tables 7 and 8 show, marble masons struck in five of the six rounds of province-wide bargaining in which strikes occurred. Electricians struck in four rounds; carpenters, plumbers and sheet metal workers in three rounds; asbestos workers, bricklayers, demolition labourers, and roofers in two rounds; and elevator mechanics, general labourers, glaziers, operating engineers, painters, refrigeration mechanics and rodmen in one round. Nine trades: boilermakers, cement masons, millwrights, plasterers, precast labourers, sprinkler fitters, steeplejacks, structural iron workers and teamsters have not engaged in strikes under province-wide bargaining.

Severity of ICI Work Stoppages

The severity of work stoppages in the ICI sector is not as alarming as the number of workers involved and person-days lost appear to show when these two dimensions are related to total employment and total working time. As Table 5 shows, the number of workers involved in stoppages in the pre-accreditation period accounted for just 0.94 percent of average paid non-agricultural employment in the province over the period, although the proportion was as high as 1.31 percent in 1969. The proportion dropped considerably during the accreditation period, averaging 0.67 percent under province-wide bargaining, well below the average for the pre-accreditation period.

Table 5 also shows that the number of person-days lost by stoppages in the pre-accreditation period accounted for just 0.10 percent of the average estimated total working time of the province's paid non-agricultural work force. The proportion dropped to an average of 0.02 percent during the accreditation period, but increased to 0.06 percent under province-wide bargaining, below the average for the pre-accreditation period.

Comparison with Rose's Data

Rose's data, based on strikes in all sectors of construction, show an average duration of 13.9 days for strikes that occurred during 1970-1977 and 18.2 days for those that occurred during 1978-1982. When data for only strikes in ICI construction for these two periods are considered, they show a pattern similar to Rose's finding: a shorter average duration of 17.6 days for the strikes that occurred during 1970-1977, and 21.2 days for those that occurred during 1978-1982. The comparison is shown in the following table.

**Comparison of Data on ICI Construction Strikes with
Rose's Data on Strikes in All Sectors, 1970-1982**

Period	Stoppages	Workers involved	Average duration	Person days lost
ICI Sector				
1970-1977	100	75,900	17.6	1,303,500
1978-1982	16	80,200	21.2	1,703,000
Rose's data all sectors				
1970-1977	229	111,130	13.9	1,541,460
1978-1982	80	107,290	18.2	1,957,300

Provincial Comparison

Data on work stoppages in ICI construction are not available for other provinces. However, when stoppages in all sectors of the industry in the period 1978-1990 are considered, Ontario's record compares favourably with the record of most of the other provinces.

As Table 9 shows, Ontario accounted for 26 percent of the total number of work stoppages that occurred in the construction industry in Canada during 1978-1990, for 34 percent of the total number of workers involved, and for 46 percent of the total person-days lost. However, Ontario's stoppages lasted an average 20.3 days compared to 21.7 to 75.5

days for stoppages in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan and Manitoba which together contributed 18.8 percent of all stoppages, 4.5 percent of all workers involved, and 10.3 percent of total person-days lost.

Newfoundland had 6.5 percent of the total work stoppages, 2.2 percent of the workers involved and about 3 percent of the person-days lost, but the average duration of these stoppages was about the same as Ontario's. New Brunswick and Quebec had the lowest average strike duration, at 5.4 and 8.1 days respectively, and together accounted for 23.9 percent of all stoppages, 4.1 percent of the workers involved and 4.1 percent of the person-days lost.

Table 1

Ratification Time and Settlement Stage in ICI Construction Bargaining, by Trade, 1978-1990

Bargaining Year	First Quarter*		Second Quarter		Third Quarter		Fourth Quarter**	
	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage
1978 . . .	-	-	April		July		October	
			Painters	Bargaining	Demolition labourers	Mediation	Boilermakers	Bargaining
			Refrigeration mechanics	Bargaining	Glaziers	Conciliation	Cement masons	Conciliation
			May		Rodmen	Bargaining	Plasterers	Conciliation
			Asbestos workers	Conciliation	August		Teamsters	Bargaining
			Bricklayers	Bargaining	Elevator constructors	Bargaining	November	
			Electricians	Mediation	September		Sprinkler fitters	Bargaining
			Marble masons	Bargaining	Carpenters	Strike	December	
			Plumbers	Conciliation			General labourers	Strike
			June				Precast labourers	Bargaining
			Engineers	Conciliation				
			Millwrights	Bargaining				
			Roofers	Bargaining				
			Sheet metal workers	Conciliation				
			Steeplejacks	Conciliation				
			Structural iron workers	Conciliation				
			1980 . . .	March Plasterers	Bargaining	April		July
Cement workers	Bargaining	Carpenters				Strike		
Painters	Bargaining	Marble masons				Strike		
Refrigeration mechanics	Bargaining	Rodmen				Mediation		
May		Roofers				Mediation		
Electricians	Conciliation	Steeplejacks				Conciliation		
Engineers	Bargaining	August						
Millwrights	Bargaining	Boilermakers				Bargaining		
Sheet metal workers	Conciliation	Precast labourers				Bargaining		
Structural iron workers	Conciliation	September						
June		Asbestos workers				Strike		
Bricklayers	Strike							

* Includes ratifications prior to January and during January-March.

** Includes ratifications during October-December and after December.

Ratification Time and Settlement Stage in ICI Construction Bargaining, by Trade, 1978-1990

Bargaining Year	First Quarter*		Second Quarter		Third Quarter		Fourth Quarter**	
	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage
1980 (Cont'd)			Demolition labourers	Mediation				
			Elevator constructors	Bargaining				
			General labourers	Conciliation				
			Glaziers	Conciliation				
			Plumbers	Strike				
			Sprinkler fitters	Bargaining				
			Teamsters	Bargaining				
1982			April		July		January 1983	
			Refrigeration mechanics	Bargaining	Glaziers	Strike	Asbestos mechanics	Strike
			June		Steeplejacks	Conciliation	Plumbers	Arbitration***
			Bricklayers	Strike	August		March 1983	
			Carpenters	Mediation	Boilermakers	Conciliation	Demolition labourers	Strike
			Cement masons	Conciliation	Engineers	Conciliation		
			Electricians	Strike	Precast labourers	Mediation		
			Elevator mechanics	Bargaining	September			
			Marble masons	Strike	General labourers	Mediation		
			Millwrights	Bargaining	Sprinkler fitters	Bargaining		
			Painters	Conciliation	Teamsters	Bargaining		
			Plasterers	Conciliation				
			Rodmen	Bargaining				
			Roofers	Strike				
			Sheet metal workers	Strike				
			Structural iron workers	Bargaining				
1984	December 1983		April		July		November	
	Cement masons	Bargaining	Glaziers	Bargaining	Millwrights	Bargaining	Sprinkler fitters	Bargaining
	Engineers	Bargaining	Painters	Bargaining	Refrigeration mechanics	Mediation	December	
	General labourers	Bargaining	May		Steeplejacks	Bargaining	Demolition labourers	Mediation

* Includes ratifications prior to January and during January-March.

** Includes ratifications during October-December and after December.

*** Wages settled by arbitration in January 1983. All other items settled after a work stoppage in August 1982.

Table 1 (Cont'd)

Ratification Time and Settlement Stage in ICI Construction Bargaining, by Trade, 1978-1990

Bargaining Year	First Quarter*		Second Quarter		Third Quarter		Fourth Quarter**	
	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage
1984 (Cont'd)	Plasterers	Bargaining	Asbestos workers	Bargaining	August		May 1985	
	Rodmen	Bargaining	Electricians	Mediation	Elevator constructors	Bargaining	Boilermakers	Conciliation
	Structural iron workers	Bargaining	Precast labourers	Bargaining				
	January		Plumbers	Mediation				
	Bricklayers	Bargaining	Roofers	Conciliation				
	Carpenters	Bargaining	Sheet metal workers	Mediation				
	Teamsters	Bargaining	June					
			Marble masons	Conciliation				
			May		July		November	
			Bricklayers	Mediation	Cement masons	Conciliation	Boilermakers	Bargaining
			Plumbers	Mediation	Demolition labourers	Strike		
			Roofers	Strike	Elevator constructors	Conciliation		
1986			June		Plasterers	Conciliation		
			Asbestos workers	Mediation	Steeplejacks	Conciliation		
			Carpenters	Conciliation	August			
			Electricians	Strike	Engineers	Strike		
			General labourers	Mediation	Rodmen	Strike		
			Glaziers	Mediation	September			
			Marble masons	Strike	Teamsters	Bargaining		
			Millwrights	Conciliation				
			Painters	Strike				
			Precast labourers	Conciliation				
			Refrigeration mechanics	Bargaining				
			Sheet metal workers	Strike				
			Sprinkler fitters	Bargaining				
			Structural iron workers	Conciliation				

* Includes ratifications prior to January and during January-March.

** Includes ratifications during October-December and after December.

Ratification Time and Settlement Stage in ICI Construction Bargaining, by Trade, 1978-1990

Bargaining Year	First Quarter*		Second Quarter		Third Quarter		Fourth Quarter**	
	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage
1988	-	-	<p>April</p> <p>Steeplejacks Bargaining</p> <p>Teamsters Conciliation</p> <p>May</p> <p>Asbestos workers Bargaining</p> <p>Bricklayers Mediation</p> <p>Cement masons Conciliation</p> <p>Demolition labourers Mediation</p> <p>Electricians Strike</p> <p>Engineers Mediation</p> <p>General labourers Mediation</p> <p>Glaziers Mediation</p> <p>Marble masons Mediation</p> <p>Millwrights Bargaining</p> <p>Plumbers Mediation</p> <p>Rodmen Mediation</p> <p>Sheet metal workers Bargaining</p> <p>Structural iron workers Bargaining</p> <p>June</p> <p>Carpenters Bargaining</p> <p>Painters Bargaining</p> <p>Plasterers Conciliation</p> <p>Precast labourers Mediation</p>	<p>July</p> <p>Elevator constructors Strike</p> <p>Refrigeration mechanics Strike</p> <p>Sprinkler fitters Mediation</p> <p>September</p> <p>Boilermakers Bargaining</p>	-	-		
1990	-	-	<p>May</p> <p>Asbestos workers Mediation</p> <p>Bricklayers Mediation</p>	<p>July</p> <p>Demolition labourers Mediation</p> <p>Electricians Strike</p>	-	-		

* Includes ratifications prior to January and during January-March.

** Includes ratifications during October-December and after December.

TABLE 1 (Cont'd)

Ratification Time and Settlement Stage in ICI Construction Bargaining, by Trade, 1978-1990

Bargaining Year	First Quarter*		Second Quarter		Third Quarter		Fourth Quarter**	
	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage	Month and Trade	Settlement Stage
1990 (Cont'd)	-	-	Carpenters	Mediation	Elevator constructors	Mediation		
			Cement masons	Mediation	Millwrights	Bargaining		
			Engineers	Mediation	Precast labourers	Mediation		
			General labourers	Mediation	Refrigeration mechanics	Bargaining		
			Plasterers	Mediation	Sprinkler fitters	Conciliation		
			Roofers	Mediation	August			
			June		Plumbers	Strike		
			Glaziers	Mediation	September			
			Marble masons	Strike	Boilermakers	Mediation		
			Painters	Mediation				
			Rodmen	Mediation				
			Sheet metal workers	Strike				
			Steeplejacks	Mediation				
			Structural iron workers	Mediation				
		Teamsters	Bargaining					

* Includes ratifications prior to January and during January-March.

** Includes ratifications during October-December and after December.

Table 2

Patterns of Settlements in ICI Construction Bargaining, 1978-1992

Trade	Package Settlement							
	1978-1980		1980-1982		1982-1984		1984-1986	
	Toronto*	Outside Toronto	Toronto*	Outside Toronto	Toronto*	Outside Toronto	Toronto*	Outside Toronto
Asbestos Workers	\$0.25	\$0.25	\$2.55	\$2.55	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Boilermakers	\$1.03	\$1.03	\$2.50	\$2.50	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Bricklayers	\$1.32	\$1.32	\$2.50	\$2.50	\$4.00	\$4.00-\$4.25	\$1.00	\$1.00
Carpenters	\$1.19	\$1.07-\$1.36	\$2.45	\$2.45	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Cement masons	\$1.55	\$1.22-\$1.29	\$1.75	\$1.75	\$3.85	\$3.75-\$3.85	\$1.00	\$1.00
Demolition labourers . .	\$0.35	\$0.35	\$1.88	\$1.88	**	**	\$1.00	\$1.00
Electricians	\$1.50	\$0.25-\$1.50	\$2.50	\$2.50	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Elevator constructors . .	\$1.03	\$1.03	\$2.45	\$2.45	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
General labourers	\$1.19	\$0.05-\$1.39	\$1.90	\$1.90	\$3.60	\$3.60	\$1.00	\$1.00
Glaziers	\$1.20	\$0.72-\$1.33	\$2.30	\$2.30	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Millwrights	\$1.12	\$1.19	\$2.45	\$2.45	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Operating engineers . . .	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.98	\$1.98	\$4.42	\$4.42	\$1.00	\$1.00
Painters	\$0.95	\$0.85-\$1.40	\$1.98	\$1.98	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Plasterers	\$1.61	\$0.89-\$1.75	\$1.70	\$1.70	\$3.25	\$3.25	\$1.00	\$1.00
Plumbers	\$1.24	\$0.27-\$1.37	\$2.50	\$2.50	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Precast labourers	\$1.19	\$1.19	\$1.90	\$1.90	\$3.60	\$3.60	\$1.00	\$1.00
Refrigeration mechanics .	\$1.30	\$0.98	\$2.80	\$2.80	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Rodmen	\$1.21	\$0.63-\$1.46	\$2.50	\$2.50	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Roofers	\$1.19	\$0.25-\$1.78	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Sheet metal workers . . .	\$1.35	\$1.07-\$1.57	\$2.50	\$2.50	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Sprinkler fitters	\$1.32	\$1.32	\$2.52	\$2.52	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Steeplejacks	\$0.95	\$0.95	**	**	\$3.65	\$3.65	\$1.00	\$1.00
Structural iron workers .	\$1.02	\$0.63-\$1.44	\$2.50	\$2.50	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Teamsters	\$1.40	\$0.30-\$1.40	\$1.98	\$1.98-\$2.58	\$3.80	\$3.80	\$1.00	\$1.00
Tile and terrazzo workers	\$1.12	\$1.12	\$2.50	\$2.50	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$1.00	\$1.00

* Settlements apply to the geographic area referred to as Toronto in the collective agreements.

** Not available.

Patterns of Settlements in ICI Construction Bargaining, 1978-1992 (Cont'd)

Trade	Package Settlement					
	1986-1988		1988-1990		1990-1992	
	Toronto*	Outside Toronto	Toronto*	Outside Toronto	Toronto*	Outside Toronto
Asbestos Workers	\$1.65	\$1.65	\$3.00	\$3.00-\$3.15	\$4.06	\$4.06
Boilermakers	\$1.80	\$1.80	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.95	\$3.95
Bricklayers	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$4.10	\$3.10
Carpenters	\$1.75	\$1.75	\$3.00	\$2.60	\$4.15	\$3.00
Cement masons	\$2.17	\$1.75-\$2.17	\$3.00	\$2.00-\$2.25	\$4.50	\$3.00-\$3.50
Demolition labourers	\$1.84	\$0.40-\$1.70	\$3.00	\$1.80-\$2.00	\$2.80	\$2.80
Electricians	\$1.87	\$1.87	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$4.60	\$3.85
Elevator constructors	\$1.77	\$1.77	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$5.29	\$4.53-\$4.48
General labourers	\$1.70	\$1.70	\$3.00	\$2.00-\$2.35	\$4.00	\$3.00
Glaziers	\$1.70	\$1.70	\$3.00	\$1.80-\$2.40	\$4.00	\$2.00-\$3.30
Millwrights	\$1.75	\$1.75	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.90	\$3.90
Operating engineers	\$1.75	\$1.75	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$4.00	\$3.00
Painters	\$1.92	\$1.64-\$2.02	\$3.00	\$2.00-\$2.40	\$4.00	\$2.50-\$3.00
Plasterers	\$1.75	\$0.65-\$1.75	\$3.00	\$2.00-\$2.35	\$4.00	\$3.00
Plumbers	\$1.75	\$1.75	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$4.50	\$3.75-\$4.00
Precast labourers	\$1.70	\$1.70	\$3.00	\$2.00	\$4.00	\$3.00
Refrigeration mechanics	\$1.70	\$1.70	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$4.50	\$4.50
Rodmen	\$2.00	\$1.75-\$2.00	\$3.00	\$2.75	\$3.60	\$3.60
Roofers	\$1.75	\$1.75	\$3.00	\$2.50-\$3.00	\$4.00	\$3.00
Sheet metal workers	\$1.87	\$1.87	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$4.40	\$3.65
Sprinkler fitters	\$1.75	\$1.75	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$4.50	\$3.75
Steeplejacks	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.80	\$1.80	\$3.00	\$3.00
Structural iron workers	\$1.75	\$1.75	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.60	\$3.60
Teamsters	\$1.75	\$1.75	\$3.00	\$2.00	\$4.00	\$3.00
Tile and terrazzo workers	\$2.00	\$1.75	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$4.40	\$3.60

* Settlements apply to the geographic area referred to as Toronto in the collective agreements.

Table 3

**Difference between Percent Change in Average Union Hourly Wage Rates and Employer Contributions*
For Nineteen Trades in ICI Construction in Cities of 35,000 Population or More and
Percent Change in Consumer Price Index (1986=100) for Canada, 1977-1991**

Trade	Percent increase in average wage rate plus employer contributions 1977-1991	Difference from percent increase in Canada CPI 1977-1991*	Average annual percent increase in average wage rate plus employer contributions 1977-1991	Difference from average annual percent increase in Canada CPI 1977-1991*
All trades	139.8	-9.2	6.4	-0.4
Basic trades	140.1	-8.9	6.5	-0.3
Carpenters	138.4	-10.6	6.4	-0.4
Cement masons	137.9	-11.1	6.4	-0.4
Labourers	150.8	+1.8	6.8	0.0
Operating Engineers	132.2	-16.8	6.2	-0.6
Rodmen	146.7	-2.3	6.7	-0.1
Structural iron workers	127.9	-21.1	6.1	-0.7
Teamsters	152.8	+3.8	6.8	0.0
Specialty trades	139.8	-9.2	6.4	-0.4
Asbestos workers	131.5	-17.5	6.2	-0.6
Bricklayers	146.1	-2.9	6.6	-0.2
Electricians	131.9	-17.1	6.2	-0.6
Glaziers	176.2	+27.2	7.5	+0.7
Millwrights	144.0	-5.0	6.6	-0.2
Painters	142.6	-6.4	6.5	-0.3
Plasterers	134.2	-14.8	6.3	-0.5
Plumbers	128.7	-20.3	6.1	-0.7
Refrigeration mechanics	136.2	-12.8	6.3	-0.5
Roofers	151.6	+2.6	6.8	0.0
Sheet metal workers	134.2	-14.8	6.3	-0.5
Sprinkler fitters	136.3	-12.7	6.3	-0.5

* The Consumer Price Index (1986=100) for Canada increased 149.0 percent between April 1977 and April 1991 for an annual average increase of 6.8 percent.

Table 4

Difference between Percent Change in Average Union Wage Rates and Employer Contributions*
in Cities of 35,000 Population or more for Nineteen Trades in ICI Construction and
Percent Change in Consumer Price Index (1986=100) for Canada, 1977-1991

City	Percent increase in average wage rate plus employee contributions 1977-1991	Difference from percent increase in Canada CPI 1977-1991*	Average annual percent increase in average wage rate plus employer contributions 1977-1991	Difference from average annual percent increase in Canada CPI 1977-1991*
All cities	139.8	-9.2	6.4	-0.4
Eastern Ontario	142.4	-6.6	6.5	-0.3
Belleville	140.9	-8.1	6.5	-0.3
Cornwall	145.2	-3.8	6.6	-0.2
Kingston	143.2	-5.8	6.4	-0.4
Ottawa	140.3	-8.7	6.5	-0.3
Central Ontario	141.9	-7.1	6.5	-0.3
Barrie	139.2	-9.8	6.5	-0.3
Oshawa	142.6	-6.4	6.4	-0.4
Peterborough	138.1	-10.9	6.5	-0.3
Toronto	140.2	-8.8	6.4	-0.4
Mid-western Ontario	142.1	-6.9	6.5	-0.3
Cambridge	142.1	-6.9	6.5	-0.3
Guelph	142.1	-6.9	6.5	-0.3
Kitchener	142.1	-6.9	6.5	-0.3
Brantford	139.8	-9.2	6.4	-0.4
Hamilton	134.9	-14.1	6.3	-0.5
St. Catharines	140.4	-8.6	6.5	-0.3
Western Ontario	135.4	-13.6	6.3	-0.5
Chatham	139.7	-9.3	6.4	-0.4
London	140.8	-8.2	6.5	-0.3
Sarnia	127.8	-21.2	6.1	-0.7
Windsor	134.1	-14.9	6.3	-0.5
Northern Ontario	141.0	-8.0	6.5	-0.3
North Bay	139.9	-9.1	6.5	-0.3
Sault Ste Marie	143.6	-5.4	6.6	-0.2
Sudbury	140.7	-8.3	6.5	-0.3
Thunder Bay	138.3	-9.7	6.4	-0.4
Timmins	141.8	-7.2	6.5	-0.3

* The Consumer Price Index (1986=100) for Canada increased 149.0 percent between April 1977 and April 1991 for an annual average increase of 6.8 percent.

Table 5

Work Stoppages in ICI Construction in Ontario, 1969-1990

Year	Stoppages	Workers Involved		Average duration	Person-days lost	
		Number	Percent of Paid Labour Force		Number	Percent of Estimated Work Time
Pre-accreditation						
1969	23	33,800	1.31	37	1,252,000	0.19
1970	15	15,500	0.58	7	104,900	0.02
Total	38	49,300	0.94**	28	1,356,900	0.10**
Accreditation period						
1971	10	7,300	0.26	26	189,900	0.03
1972	9	7,600	0.26	22	169,400	0.02
1973	14	9,900	0.33	15	153,300	0.02
1974	1	300	*	66	19,800	*
1975	32	16,900	0.52	19	327,100	0.04
1976	1	100	*	13	1,300	*
1977	13	15,500	0.47	21	331,000	0.04
1978	5	800	*	9	6,800	*
Total	85	58,400	0.23**	21	1,198,600	0.02**
Province-wide bargaining						
1978	2	26,000	0.76	24	611,000	0.08
1980	5	23,400	0.64	13	312,000	0.03
1982	9	30,800	0.84	25	780,600	0.08
1984	-	-	-	-	-	-
1986	8	21,400	0.52	14	295,600	0.03
1988	5	26,700	0.60	20	535,900	0.05
1990	4	29,400	0.65	36	1,038,300	0.09
Total	33	157,400	0.67**	23	3,573,400	0.06**

* Less than 0.01 percent.

** Annual average.

Table 6

Work Stoppages in ICI Construction by Trades, 1978-1990

Trade	Stoppages	Workers involved	Average duration	Person days lost
Asbestos workers	2	2,200	57	124,300
Bricklayers	2	10,000	10	100,000
Carpenters	3	37,500	28	1,040,000
Demolition labourers	2	600	17	9,900
Electricians	4	43,000	20	845,000
Elevator mechanics	1	1,200	32	37,900
General labourers	1	13,000	33	39,000
Glaziers	1	1,000	23	23,000
Marble masons	5	4,700	18	85,400
Operating engineers	1	2,000	2	4,000
Painters	1	1,300	8	10,400
Plumbers	3	20,000	40	798,700
Refrigeration mechanics	1	1,000	6	6,000
Rodmen	1	800	8	6,400
Roofers	2	2,100	18	38,400
Sheet metal workers	3	17,000	24	405,000
Total	33	157,400	23	3,573,400

Table 7

Work Stoppages in ICI Construction by Year and Trade, 1978-1990

Year and Trade	Workers Involved	Duration	Person days lost
1978			
Carpenters	13,000	44	572,000
General labourers	13,000	3	39,000
1980			
Asbestos workers	1,500	39	88,500
Bricklayers	5,000	6	30,000
Carpenters	12,000	14	168,000
Marble masons	900	15	12,800
Plumbers	4,000	10	12,700
1982			
Asbestos workers	700	55	35,800
Bricklayers	5,000	14	70,000
Demolition workers	200	38	4,200
Electricians	10,000	5	50,000
Glaziers	1,000	23	23,000
Marble masons	800	29	23,200
Plumbers	7,000	66	462,000
Roofers	1,100	34	37,400
Sheet metal workers	5,000	15	75,000
1986			
Demolition labourers	400	16	5,700
Electricians	10,000	14	140,000
Marble masons	900	9	8,100
Operating engineers	2,000	2	4,000
Painters	1,300	8	10,400
Rodmen	800	8	6,400
Roofers	1,000	1	1,000
Sheet metal workers	5,000	24	120,000
1988			
Carpenters	12,500	24	300,000
Electricians	11,000	17	187,000
Elevator mechanics	1,200	39	37,900
Marble masons	1,000	5	5,000
Refrigeration mechanics	1,000	3	6,000

Table 7 (Cont'd)

Work Stoppages in ICI Construction by Year and Trade, 1978-1990

Year and Trade	Workers Involved	Duration	Person days lost
1990			
Electricians	12,000	39	468,000
Marble masons	1,100	33	36,300
Plumbers	9,000	36	324,000
Sheet metal workers	7,000	30	210,000

Table 8

Work Stoppages in ICI Construction by Trade and Year, 1978-1990

Year and Trade	Workers Involved	Duration	Person days lost
Asbestos workers		57	124,300
1980	1,500	59	88,500
1982	700	55	35,800
Bricklayers			100,000
1980	5,000	6	30,000
1982	5,000	14	70,000
Carpenters			
1978	13,000	44	572,000
1980	12,000	14	168,000
1988	12,500	24	300,000
Demolition labourers			
1982	200	38	4,200
1986	400	16	5,700
Electricians			
1982	10,000	5	50,000
1986	10,000	14	140,000
1988	11,000	17	187,000
1990	12,000	39	468,000
Elevator mechanics			
1988	1,200	39	37,900
General labourers			
1978	13,000	3	39,000
Glaziers			
1982	1,000	23	23,000
Marble masons			
1980	900	15	12,800
1982	800	29	23,200
1986	900	9	8,100
1988	1,000	5	5,000
1990	1,100	33	36,000
Operating Engineers			
1986	2,000	2	4,000
Painters			
1986	1,300	8	10,400

Table 8 (Cont'd)

Work Stoppages in ICI Construction by Trade and Year, 1978-1990

Year and Trade	Workers Involved	Duration	Person days lost
Plumbers			
1980	4,000	10	12,700
1982	7,000	66	462,000
1990	9,000	36	324,000
Refrigeration mechanics			
1988	1,000	3	6,000
Rodmen			
1986	800	8	6,400
Roofers			
1982	1,100	34	37,400
1986	1,000	1	1,000
Sheet metal workers			
1982	5,000	15	75,000
1986	5,000	24	120,000
1990	7,000	30	210,000

Table 9

Work Stoppages in the Construction Industry in Canada, 1978-1990

Province	Stoppages	Workers Involved		Average Duration	Person days lost	
		Number	Percent of Labour Force		Number	Percent of Estimated Work Time
Alberta	85	40,540	0.32	11.9	481,530	0.02
British Columbia	49	71,220	0.48	17.0	1,207,760	0.03
Manitoba	11	2,070	0.04	75.5	155,360	0.01
New Brunswick	107	15,740	0.52	5.4	84,470	0.01
Newfoundland	36	13,440	0.65	20.2	271,080	0.05
Nova Scotia	37	7,850	0.20	28.2	221,530	0.02
Ontario	143	207,730	0.41	20.3	4,206,960	0.03
Prince Edward Island	6	1,000	0.20	21.7	32,600	0.03
Quebec	25	228,700	0.71	8.1	1,842,780	0.02
Saskatchewan	50	15,420	0.38	34.4	530,630	0.05
Canada	552	603,020	0.60	15.1	9,132,680	0.03

APPENDIX V

**Union Wage Rates and Fringe Benefit Payments
in ICI Construction in Ontario, 1977-1991**

Len Haywood
Industrial Relations Division
Ontario Ministry of Labour
July 1991

Union Wage Rates and Fringe Benefit Payments in ICI Construction in Ontario, 1977-1991

Introduction

This report traces the movements of wage rates and fringe benefit payments in ICI construction in Ontario by using data on 19 trades in 23 central cities for the years May 1977, 1984 and 1991. Data for May 1977 show the occupational and regional wage rate and fringe benefit relationships that existed a year prior to legislated province-wide bargaining in the ICI sector. They form the basis for measuring shifts that have occurred in the relative positions of trade and city wage rates and fringe benefits in May 1984, mid-way in the 14-year history of province-wide bargaining, and in the May 1991, the last year of the current agreements.

Part 1 of the report deals with the wage and fringe benefits structures that existed in May 1977 for the trades and in the cities selected. Part 2 measures the changes that have occurred in these structures in May 1984 and May 1991. Part 3 compares the wage and fringe benefit rankings of the trades and cities selected differentials in 1977, 1984, and 1991 between Toronto and the other cities surveyed.

Part 1 Wage Rate and Fringe Benefit Levels, 1977

In May 1977, a year before province-wide bargaining was legislated in ICI construction, union wage rates and fringe benefit payments in the sector varied widely among the local unions that represented the 19 trades studied, and also within the geographic coverage of many of the locals. One hundred and seventy locals were involved that bargained mostly individually with local employer groups.

Trade Wage Rates

Table 1 shows averages of the wage rates that were negotiated for May 1977 for each of 19 trades studied in all the 23 cities surveyed.

- The average wage rate for all 19 trades was \$10.37. For the basic on civil trades as a group, the average rate was \$10.07; and for the 12 specialty trades examined the average rate was \$10.54.
- Among the individual basic trades, operating engineers had the highest average rate with \$11.79, followed by structural iron workers with \$11.17 and carpenters with \$10.57. Labourers had the lowest average rate with \$8.34; and average rates for the remaining basic trades ranged from \$8.59 for teamsters to \$10.16 for rodmen.
- Among the individual specialty trades, refrigeration mechanics had the highest average rate with \$12.47, followed by asbestos workers with \$11.63 and electricians with \$11.54. Glaziers had the lowest average rate with \$7.78; and average rates for the remaining specialty trades ranged from \$9.21 for roofers to \$11.23 for plumbers.

Trade Fringe Benefits

Table 1 shows averages of the amounts that were contributed by employers to vacation and holiday pay, health and welfare, pension, supplementary unemployment benefit and savings funds for the 19 trades in May 1977.

- The average employer contribution for these benefits for all 19 trades was \$1.66. For the basic trades as a group, the average contribution was \$1.63; and for the 12 specialty trades examined the average contribution was \$1.68.
- Among the individual basic trades, the largest average contribution was \$2.43 for structural iron workers, followed by \$1.84 for rodmen and \$1.77 for operating engineers. The smallest average contribution was \$1.24 for teamsters; and average contributions for the remaining basic trades ranged from \$1.31 for labourers to \$1.45 for carpenters.
- Among the individual specialty trades, the largest average contribution was \$2.42 for millwrights followed by \$2.16 for plumbers and \$2.02 for sprinkler fitters. The smallest average contribution was \$1.06 for roofers; and average contributions for the remaining specialty trades ranged from \$1.18 for glaziers to \$1.89 for sheet metal workers.

Trade Wage Rates Plus Fringe Benefits

Table 1 shows averages of the package amounts combining wage rates and fringe benefit contributions that were paid to the 19 trades in May 1977.

- The average package rate for all 19 trades was \$12.03. For the basic trades as a group the average package rate was \$11.70; and for the 12 specialty trades examined the average package rate was \$12.22.
- Among the individual basic trades, structural iron workers had the highest average package rate with \$13.60, followed by operating engineers with \$13.56 and carpenters with \$12.02. Labourers had the lowest average package rate with \$9.65; and average package rates for the remaining basic trades ranged from \$9.83 for teamsters to \$12.00 for rodmen.
- Among the individuals specialty trades, refrigeration mechanics had the highest average package rate with \$13.72, followed by asbestos workers with \$13.42. Glaziers had the lowest average package rate with \$8.96; and average package rates for the remaining specialty trades ranged from \$10.78 for painters to \$13.39 for plumbers.

Regional Wage Rates

Table 4 shows averages of the wage rates that were paid in May 1977 to all the 19 trades studied in each of the 23 cities surveyed. These cities are grouped into five regions matching the geographic coverage of the wage rates negotiated by most construction locals.

- Western Ontario had the highest average wage rate for all trades, with \$10.61. Among the cities in this region, Sarnia had the highest average rate with \$11.22. Average rates for other cities ranged from \$10.30 in Chatham to \$10.58 in Windsor.
- Central Ontario had the second highest average rate for all trades, with \$10.53. Within this region Toronto had the highest average rate with \$10.96. Average rates for other cities ranged from \$10.07 in Peterborough to \$10.62 in Oshawa.

- Mid-western Ontario had the third highest average wage rate for all trades, with \$10.38. Within this region Hamilton had the highest average rate with \$10.82. Average rates for other cities ranged from \$10.17 to \$10.57.
- Eastern Ontario and Northern Ontario had average wage rates of \$10.18 and \$10.17 for all trades, respectively. Within Eastern Ontario, Kingston had the highest average rate with \$10.36; and average rates for other cities ranged from \$9.98 in Cornwall to \$10.24 in Belleville. Within Northern Ontario, Thunder Bay had the highest average rate with \$10.53, and average rates for other cities ranged from \$9.92 to \$10.15.

Regional Fringe Benefits

Table 4 shows averages of the amounts that were contributed by employers in May 1977 to fringe benefit funds for all the 19 trades studied in each of the 23 cities surveyed.

- Central Ontario had the largest average payment for fringe benefits for all trades, with \$1.78. Toronto in this region had the highest average payment with \$1.89. Other cities had average payments ranging from \$1.69 in Barrie to \$1.82 in Oshawa.
- Western Ontario had the second largest average payment for fringe benefits for all trades, with \$1.71. In this region, Windsor had the highest average payment with \$1.79. Average payments for other cities ranged from \$1.64 in London to \$1.73 in Chatham.
- Mid-western Ontario had the third largest payment for fringe benefits for all trades, with \$1.65. Within this region, Hamilton had the highest average payment with \$1.74. Average payments for other cities ranged from \$1.60 to \$1.64.
- Eastern Ontario and Northern Ontario had average payments for fringe benefits of \$1.60 and \$1.59 for all trades, respectively. Within Eastern Ontario, Belleville had the highest average payment, with \$1.63; and other cities had average payments ranging from \$1.58 for Kingston to \$1.61 for Ottawa. Within Northern Ontario, average payments ranged from \$1.47 to \$1.64.

Regional Wage Rates Plus Fringe Benefits

Table 4 shows averages of the package amounts combining wage rates and fringe benefit contributions that were paid in May 1977 to all the 19 trades studied in each of the 23 cities surveyed.

- Western Ontario and Central Ontario had about the same average rate for wages and fringe benefits payments combined for all trades, at \$12.32 and \$12.31 respectively. Within Western Ontario, Sarnia had the highest average package rate with \$12.90; and average package rates for other cities ranged from \$11.97 in London to \$12.37 in Windsor. Within Central Ontario, Toronto had the highest average package rate with \$12.85; and average package rates for other cities ranged from \$11.97 in London to \$12.37 in Windsor. Within Central Ontario, Toronto had the highest average package rate with \$12.85; and average package rates for other cities ranged from \$11.77 in Peterborough to \$12.44 in Oshawa.
- Mid-western Ontario had the third highest average package rate for all trades with \$12.03. Within this region, Hamilton had the highest average package rate with \$12.56. For other cities average package rates ranged from \$11.81 to \$12.20.
- Average package rates for all trades in Eastern Ontario and Northern Ontario were close at \$11.78 and \$11.76 respectively. Within Eastern Ontario, Kingston had highest average package rate with \$11.94, and other cities had average package rates ranging from \$11.57 in Cornwall to \$11.87 in Belleville. Within Northern Ontario, Thunder Bay had the highest average package rate with \$12.00, and other cities had average package rates ranging from \$11.51 to \$11.79.

Part 2. Wage Rate and Fringe Benefit Levels, 1991.

This part examines the wage rates and fringe benefit payments that are made as of May 1991 to the 19 trades studied in the 23 cities surveyed, and measures the changes these rates represent from the rates that were paid in May 1977.

Trade Wage Rates

Table 1 shows averages of the wage rates that were negotiated for May 1991 for each of the 19 trades studied in all the 23 cities surveyed. Tables 2 and 3 show the changes these rates represent from the 1977 levels in dollar and percentage terms respectively.

- As of May 1991, the average wage rate for all 19 trades has advanced to \$23.46, an increase of \$13.09 or 126.2 percent over the average rate in May 1977. For the basic trades as a group the average rate has advanced to \$22.58, an increase of \$12.51 per 124.2 percent over the average rate in 1977. For the 12 specialty trades studied the average wage rate has advanced to \$23.97, an increase of \$13.43 or 127.4 percent over the average rate in 1977.
- For the individual basic trades, average wage rates have advanced to levels ranging from \$20.23 for teamsters to \$25.31 for operating engineers. These rates reflect increases over 1977 scales, of \$11.64 for teamsters to \$13.52 for operating engineers or 114.7 percent for operating engineers to 143.8 percent for labourers.
- Except for teamsters and labourers, the basic trades have maintained their 1977 rankings on the 1991 wage structure. The average rate for teamsters has changed ranking with labourers rate to become the lowest in the 1991 wage structure.
- For the individual specialty trades, average wage rates have advanced to levels ranging from \$20.65 for glaziers to \$27.24 for refrigeration mechanics. These rates reflect increases over 1977 scales, of \$11.19 for plasterers to \$14.77 for refrigeration mechanics or 115.8 percent for plumbers to 165.4 percent for glaziers.
- Rankings of the specialty trades on the 1991 wage structure have shifted considerably from their 1977 positions. Refrigeration mechanics, electricians and glaziers have maintained their 1977 rankings of first, third and lowest, respectively. Bricklayers, millwrights, roofers, sheet metal workers and sprinkler fitters have improved their 1977 rankings by two or

three steps. Asbestos workers, painters plasterers and plumbers have dropped by one to five steps from their 1977 rankings.

Trade Fringe Benefits

Table 1 shows averages of the amounts that were negotiated for fringe benefits for May 1991 for each of the 19 trades studied in all the 23 cities surveyed. Tables 2 and 3 show the changes these payments represent from their 1977 levels in dollar and percentage terms, respectively.

- As of May 1991, the average payment made by employers for fringe benefits for all 19 trades has advanced to \$5.39, an increase of \$3.73 or 224.7 percent over the average payment in May 1977. For the basic trades as a group the average payment has advanced to \$5.51, an increase of \$3.88 or 238 percent over the average payment in 1977. For the 12 specialty trades studied the average payment advanced to \$5.33, an increase of \$3.65 or 217.3 percent over the average payment in 1977.
- For the individual basic trades average fringe benefit payments have advanced to levels ranging from \$3.87 for labourers to \$7.34 for structural iron workers. These payments reflect increases over 1977 levels, of \$2.56 for labourers to \$4.91 for structural iron workers or 195.4 per cent for labourers to 275.8 percent for carpenters.
- Structural iron workers, rodmen, operating engineers and carpenters have maintained their 1977 rankings on the 1991 fringe benefit payment structure. The teamsters have improved their 1977 ranking by two steps to be replaced by labourer with the lowest ranking in 1991.
- For the individual specialty trades average fringe benefit payments have advanced to levels ranging from \$3.19 for roofers to \$6.69 for asbestos workers. These payments reflect increases over 1977 levels, of \$2.13 for roofers to \$4.88 for asbestos workers or 200.9 percent for roofers to 313.6 percent for refrigeration mechanics.
- Rankings of the specialty trades on the 1991 fringe benefit payment structure have shifted considerably from their 1977 positions. Sheet metal workers,

bricklayers and roofers have maintained their 1977 rankings of fourth, seventh and lowest respectively. Asbestos workers have improved their 1977 ranking by five steps to top the 1991 structure; refrigeration mechanics have improved their ranking by four steps; and electricians, glaziers, plasterers and roofers have improved their rankings by one step. Millwrights, painters, plumbers and sprinkler fitters have dropped by one or two steps from their 1977 rankings.

Trade Wage Rates Plus Fringe Benefits

Table 1 shows averages of the package amounts combining wage rates and fringe benefit contributions that were negotiated for May 1991 for each of the 19 trades studied in all the 23 cities surveyed. Tables 2 and 3 show the changes these package rates represent from their 1977 levels in dollar and percentage terms, respectively.

- As of May 1991, the average package rates for all 19 trades have advanced to \$28.85, an increase of \$16.82 or 139.8 percent over the average package rate in May 1977. For the basic trades as a group the average package rate has advanced to \$28.09, an increase of \$16.71 or 142.4 percent over the average package rate in 1977. For the 12 specialty trades studied the average package rate has advanced to \$29.30, an increase of \$17.08 or 139.8 percent over the average package rate in 1977.
- For the individual basic trades average package rates have advanced to levels ranging from \$24.20 for labourers to \$31.49 for operating engineers. The new rates reflect increases over 1977 levels, of \$15.02 for teamsters to \$17.93 for operating engineers, 127.9 percent for structural iron workers to 152.8 percent for teamsters.
- Of the basic trades only labourers have maintained the 1977 ranking, with the lowest position in the 1991 package rate structure. Three trades have improved and three have dropped their 1977 rankings each by one step in 1991.
- For the individual specialty trades average package rates have advanced to levels ranging from \$24.74 for glaziers to \$32.41 for refrigeration mechanics. The new rates reflect increases over 1977 levels of \$15.37 for

painters to \$18.69 for refrigeration mechanics or 131.5 percent for bricklayers to 176.2 percent for glaziers.

- Of the specialty trades, six have maintained their 1977 rankings, with refrigeration mechanics at the top and glaziers at the bottom of the package rate structure in 1991. Two trades have improved their 1977 rankings by two or three steps and four have dropped their rankings by one or two steps in 1991.

Regional Wage Rates

Table 4 shows averages of the wage rates that were negotiated for May 1991 for all the 19 trades studied in each of the 23 cities surveyed. Tables 5 and 6 show the changes these rates represent from their 1977 levels in dollar and percentage terms, respectively.

- As of May 1991, the average wage rate for all trades has advanced the highest in Central Ontario to \$24.16, an increase of \$13.63 or 139.4 percent over the average wage rate in May 1977. Average rates for the individual cities in this region have advanced to levels ranging from \$10.29 to \$24.99 for increases of 13.22 to \$14.03 or 128 percent to 131.5 percent over 1977 average rates.
- The average wage rate for all trades has advanced to the second highest in Western Ontario to \$23.64, an increase of \$13.03 or 128.8 percent over the average wage rate in 1977. Average rates for the individual cities in this region have advanced to levels ranging from \$23.41 to \$23.62 for increases of \$12.80 to \$13.29 or 122.3 percent to 128.7 percent over 1977 average rates.
- The average wage rate for all trades in Mid-western Ontario advanced to \$23.48, an increase of \$13.10 or 126.2 percent over the average wage rate in 1977. Average rates for the individual cities in this region have advanced to levels ranging from \$23.27 to \$23.94 for increases of \$12.94 to \$13.22 or 121.3 percent to 128.8 percent over 1977 average rates.
- The average wage rate for all trades in Eastern Ontario has advanced to \$23.19, an increase of \$13.01 or 127.8 percent over the average wage rate in

1977. Average rates for the individual cities in this region have advanced to levels ranging from \$22.94 to \$23.34 for increases of \$12.96 to \$13.07 or 125.3 percent to 129.9 percent over 1977 average rates.

- The average wage rate for all trades has advanced the lowest in Northern Ontario at \$22.93, an increase of \$12.75 or 125.5 percent over the average wage rate in 1977. Average rates for the individual cities in this region have advanced to levels ranging from \$22.56 to \$23.39 for increases of \$12.64 to \$12.87 or 122.1 percent to 127.4 percent over 1977 average rates.

Regional Fringe Benefits

Table 4 shows averages of the amounts of employer contributions to fringe benefit funds that were negotiated for May 1991 for all the 19 trades studied in each of the 23 cities surveyed. Tables 5 and 6 show the changes these contributions represent from their 1977 levels in dollar and percentage terms, respectively.

- As of May 1991, the average payment for fringe benefits for all trades has advanced the highest in Central and Mid-western Ontario to the same level, at \$5.42. For Central Ontario, this amount represents an increase of \$3.64 or 204.5 percent over the average payment in May 1977. For Mid-western Ontario, this amount represents an increase of \$3.77 or 228.5 percent over the average payment for fringe benefits in May 1977.
- For the individual cities in Central Ontario average payments for fringe benefits have advanced to levels ranging from \$5.26 to \$5.61 for increases of \$3.56 to \$3.72 or 196.8 percent to 219.5 percent over 1977 average payments. For the individual cities in Mid-western Ontario average payments for fringe benefits have advanced to levels ranging from \$5.32 to \$5.57 for increases of \$3.68 to \$3.91 or 218.4 percent to 228.8 percent over 1977 average payments.
- The average payment for fringe benefits for all trades has advanced to the second highest level in Northern Ontario \$5.41, an increase of \$3.83 or 244.6 percent over the average payment for fringe in 1977. Average payments for the individual cities have advanced to levels ranging from \$5.20 to \$5.48 for

increases of \$3.73 to \$3.89 or 217.1 percent to 270.1 percent over 1977 average payments.

- The average payment for fringe benefits for all trades has advanced to the same level in Eastern and Western Ontario, at \$5.36. For Eastern Ontario, this amount represents an increase of \$3.76 or 235.0 percent over the average payment for fringe benefits in 1977. For Western Ontario, this amount represents an increase of \$3.65 or 216.9 percent over the average payment for fringe benefits in 1977.
- For the individual cities in Eastern Ontario, average payments for fringe benefit have advanced to levels ranging from \$5.29 to \$5.43 for increases of \$3.69 to \$3.84 or 226.4 percent to 241.5 percent over 1977 average payments. For the individual cities in Western Ontario, average payments for fringe benefits have advanced to levels ranging from \$5.20 to \$5.44 for increases of \$3.56 to \$3.69 or 202.2 percent to 226.8 percent over 1977 average payments.

Regional Wage Rates Plus Fringe Benefits

Table 4 shows averages of the package amounts combining wage rates and fringe benefit contributions that were negotiated for May 1991 for all the 19 trades studied in each of the 23 cities surveyed. Tables 5 and 6 show the changes these package rates represent from their 1977 levels in dollar and percentage terms, respectively.

- As of May 1991, the average package rate for all trades has advanced to the highest level in Central Ontario at \$29.58, an increase of \$17.27 or 141.9 percent over the package rate in May 1977. Average package rates for the individual cities in this region have advanced to levels ranging from \$29.42 to \$30.60 for increases of \$16.78 to \$17.75 or 138.1 percent to 140.2 percent over 1977 average package rates.
- The average package rate for all trades has advanced to the second highest level in Western Ontario at \$29.00, an increase of \$16.68 or 135.4 percent over the package rate in 1977. Average package rates for the individual cities in this region have advanced to levels ranging from \$28.82 to \$29.38

for increases of \$16.48 to \$16.85 or 127.8 percent to 140.8 percent over 1977 average package rates.

- The average package rate for all trades had advanced to the third highest level in Mid-western Ontario at \$28.90, an increase of \$16.87 or 142.1 percent over the average package rate in 1977. Average package rates for the individual cities in this region have advanced to levels ranging from \$28.59 to \$29.51 for increases of \$16.78 to \$17.13 or 134.9 percent over 1977 average package rates.
- The average package rate for all trades in Eastern Ontario has advanced to \$28.55, an increase of \$16.71 or 142.4 percent over the average package rate in 1977. Average package rates for the individual cities in this region have advanced to levels ranging from \$28.37 to \$28.63 for increases of \$16.69 to \$16.84 or 140.3 percent to 145.2 percent over 1977 average package rates.
- The average package rate for all trades has advanced to the lowest level in Northern Ontario at \$28.34, an increase of \$16.58 or 141.0 percent over the average package rate in 1977. Average package rates for the individual cities in this region have advanced to levels ranging from \$28.04 to \$28.59 for increases of \$16.53 to \$16.61 or 138.3 percent to 143.6 percent over 1977 average package rates.

Part 3. Comparison of Trade and Regional Wage Rate and Fringe Benefit Rankings in 1977 and 1991

Although payments allocated by unions to fringe benefit funds have varied considerably over the 14-year period of province-wide bargaining only small shifts have occurred in 1991 in wage rate and package relationships among the trades and cities studied from the relationships that existed in 1977.

Trade Wage Rate and Fringe Benefit Rankings

Table 7 shows the rankings of average wage rates, fringe benefit contributions and package payments in 1977, 1984 and 1991 among the 19 trades studied. Shifts in

the 1991 rankings of wage rates and package payments from 1977 rankings are noted below.

Trade Wage Rates

- Average wage rates for refrigeration mechanics, electricians, cement masons and labourers have maintained their 1977 ranking on the 1991 wage rate structure.
- Rodmen, glaziers and sheet metal workers have improved their 1991 average wage rate rankings; and bricklayers, millwrights, plumbers and sprinkler fitters have improved their rankings by four steps.
- Operating engineers, painters, structural iron workers and teamsters have dropped in rankings on the 1991 wage rate structure by one or two steps from their 1977 rankings; and plasterers, roofers and asbestos workers have dropped in rankings by three or five steps.

Trade Wage Rates Plus Fringe Benefits

- Average package amounts combining wage rates and fringe benefit contributions for operating engineers, rodmen and glaziers have improved their rankings on the 1991 package structure by one step above their 1977 rankings; and millwrights and sprinkler fitters have improved their rankings by three or four steps.
- Carpenters and labourers have dropped in rankings on the 1991 package structure by one step from their 1977 rankings; and plumbers and structural iron workers have dropped in rankings by three or five steps.
- The remaining ten trades have maintained their 1977 rankings on the 1991 package structure.
- Refrigeration mechanics remain at the top of both the wage rate and package structures in 1991 as in 1977. Teamsters have dropped to bottom of the wage rate structure in 1991, exchanging seventeenth place in 1977 with the glaziers; and labourers have dropped to the bottom of the package structure in 1991, exchanging eighteenth place in 1977 with the glaziers.

Regional Wage Rate and Fringe Benefit Rankings

Table 8 shows the ranking of average wage rates, fringe benefit contributions and package payments in 1977, 1984 and 1991 for the 19 trades among the 23 cities studied. Shifts in 1991 rankings of wage rates and package payments, from 1977 ranking are noted below.

Regional Wage Rates

- Average wage rates for all trades in St. Catharines and Sault Ste. Marie have maintained their 1977 rankings in the 1991 wage rate structure.
- Toronto, Oshawa, Cornwall and Chatham have improved their 1991 rankings by one to three steps over their 1977 rankings; and London, Barrie and Peterborough have improved their rankings by four to eight steps.
- Belleville, Ottawa, Cambridge and Kitchener have dropped in rankings on the 1991 wage rate structure by one step from their 1977 rankings; Kingston, Brantford, Sarnia and Timmins have dropped in rankings by two steps from their 1977 rankings; and Hamilton, Windsor, North Bay, Sudbury and Thunder Bay have dropped in rankings by three steps from their 1977 rankings.

Regional Wage Rates Plus Fringe Benefits

- Average package amounts combining wage rates and fringe benefit contributions for all trades in Belleville, Cornwall, Kingston, Peterborough and Toronto have improved their 1991 rankings by one step above their 1977 rankings; Oshawa, London and Barrie have improved their rankings by two or three steps; and Ottawa has improved its ranking by eight steps.
- Timmins, North Bay, Sudbury and Windsor have dropped in rankings on the 1991 package structure by one or two steps from their 1977 rankings; and Sarnia and Thunder Bay have dropped in rankings by four steps.
- The remaining eight cities have maintained their 1977 rankings on the 1991 package structure.

- Toronto has moved to the top of both the wage rate and package structures in 1991 from second place in 1977, replacing Sarnia which has dropped to third place on the wage rate structure and fifth place on the package structure in 1991. Sault Ste. Marie remains at the bottom of both the wage rate and package structures in 1991 as in 1977.

Differentials from Toronto Package Rates

Table 9 shows the percent differentials in May 1977, 1984 and 1991 between the package rate for all 19 trades in Toronto and the package rates in the other 22 cities surveyed.

- In May 1977, the average package rate in Toronto for all 19 trades in Toronto was 0.4 percent less than the average package rate for all trades in Sarnia. However, Toronto's rate was 10.4 percent higher than Sault Ste. Marie's average rate, 9.9 percent higher than Cornwall's average rate and from 2.3 percent to 8.8 percent higher than the average rates in the remaining 19 cities.
- In May 1984, the average package rate for all trades in Toronto was higher than those in the other 22 cities. Sarnia's average rate dropped from being 0.4 percent higher than Toronto's rate in 1977 to being 0.8 percent below Toronto's rate. However, the differentials between Toronto's rate and those in the other cities were smaller than in 1977, ranging from 1.1 percent to 6.8 percent, compared to 2.3 percent to 10.4 percent in 1977.
- As of May 1991, the average package rate for all trades in Toronto is still higher than those in the other 22 cities, with larger differentials than in 1984, ranging from 2.7 percent to 8.4 percent.

Summary

In 1977, a wide range of wage rates and fringe benefits contributions covered the trades studied, in a highly fragmented bargaining structure prevailing in ICI construction at the time. Refrigeration mechanics were at the top of the package rate schedules, and glaziers were at the bottom with a large differential of \$4.76

from the average package rate for refrigeration mechanics. Differentials for the other trades studied ranged from 12 cents for structural iron workers to \$4.07 for labourers from refrigeration mechanics average package rate.

Only modest shifts have occurred from the 1977 package rate relationships during the fourteen-year period of legislated province-wide bargaining. In 1991 refrigeration mechanics have the highest package rate, and glaziers have moved one step upward to be replaced by labourers at the bottom of the schedules. Nine other trades have maintained their 1977 rankings, and the remaining trades have moved one to three steps up or down from their 1977 rankings. Differentials in 1991 between the average package rate for refrigeration mechanics and those for other trades range from 92 cents for operating engineers to \$8.21 for labourers.

On a regional basis, Western Ontario was at the top of the package rate schedules in 1977, and Northern Ontario was at the bottom with a 56-cent differential from the average package rate for Western Ontario. Since then Central Ontario has moved to the top of the schedules, and as of May 1991 has an average package rate that is 58 cents higher than the rate for Western Ontario. Northern Ontario has remained at the bottom of the schedules and other regions have also maintained their 1977 rankings.

On a city basis, Sarnia had the highest average package rate in 1977, with a differential of \$1.39 from the rate for Sault Ste. Marie at the bottom of the schedules. Since then Toronto has moved to the top of the schedules, and as of May 1991 has an average package rate that is \$1.22 higher than the rate for Sarnia which has dropped to fifth place on the schedules. Sault Ste. Marie has remained at the bottom of the schedules, seven other cities have also maintained their 1977 rankings, and the remaining thirteen cities have moved one to eight steps up or down from their 1977 rankings. Differentials in 1991 between the average package rate for Toronto and those for other cities range from 84 cents for Oshawa to \$2.56 for Sault Ste. Marie.

Construction and Manufacturing Earnings Comparison

The actual earnings of Ontario construction workers have been considerably lower than the union wage rates discussed above seem to indicate. However, the earnings of construction workers have been substantially higher than the earnings of manufacturing workers which, nonetheless, have increased at a faster rate than the earnings of construction workers.

As Table 10 shows, the hourly earnings of construction workers, which averaged \$8.34 in 1977, increased by 110.9 percent to \$17.59 in 1990. This represents an

annual average increase of 5.9 percent which is 0.8 percentage points less than the annual average rate of increase in the Consumer Price Index between 1977 and 1990. By contrast, the average hourly earnings of manufacturing workers, which were \$2.11 less than the average hourly earnings of construction workers in 1977, increased by 135.2 percent to \$14.65 in 1990. This represents an annual average increase of 6.8 percent which is 0.1 percentage point more than the annual average increase in the Consumer Price Index.

Table 10 further shows, that in 1977 the average hourly earnings of construction workers were 33.9 percent higher than the average hourly earnings of manufacturing workers. However, during the next nine years, the differential dropped steadily to 15.1 percent in 1986, except for a small increase in 1980. The differential increased to 18.7 percent in 1987, and after dropping again in 1988 advanced to 20.1 percent in 1990.

Table 1

**Average Union Hourly Wage Rates and Employer Contributions* for Nineteen Trades in ICI Construction
in Cities of 35,000 Population or More, May 1977, 1984 and 1991**

Trade	May 1977			May 1984			May 1991		
	Wage Rate	Employer Contributions	Wage Rate plus Employer Contributions	Wage Rate	Employer Contributions	Wage Rate plus Employer Contributions	Wage Rate	Employer Contributions	Wage Rate plus Employer Contributions
All trades	10.37	1.66	12.03	16.75	3.35	20.10	23.46	5.39	28.85
Basic trades	10.07	1.63	11.70	16.17	3.34	19.51	22.58	5.51	28.09
Carpenters	10.57	1.45	12.02	16.82	3.33	20.15	23.21	5.45	28.66
Cement masons	9.90	1.37	11.27	15.56	2.85	18.41	22.37	4.44	26.81
Labourers	8.34	1.31	9.65	14.00	2.64	16.65	20.33	3.87	24.20
Operating Engineers	11.79	1.77	13.56	18.39	3.33	21.72	25.31	6.18	31.49
Rodmen	10.16	1.84	12.00	16.57	4.05	20.62	22.97	6.63	29.60
Structural iron workers	11.17	2.43	13.60	17.54	4.48	22.02	23.66	7.34	31.00
Teamsters	8.59	1.24	9.83	14.33	2.68	17.01	20.23	4.62	24.85
Specialty trades	10.54	1.68	12.22	17.09	3.36	20.45	23.97	5.33	29.30
Asbestos workers	11.63	1.81	13.44	18.74	3.04	21.78	24.42	6.69	31.17
Bricklayers	10.35	1.70	12.05	17.47	3.11	20.58	24.60	5.06	29.66
Electricians	11.59	1.83	13.42	18.11	3.71	21.82	25.27	5.84	31.11
Glaziers	7.78	1.18	8.96	14.24	2.66	16.90	20.65	4.10	24.75
Millwrights	10.32	2.42	12.74	17.03	4.71	21.74	24.57	6.52	31.09
Painters	9.28	1.50	10.78	15.00	3.25	18.25	21.50	4.65	26.15
Plasterers	10.20	1.30	11.50	15.40	3.12	18.52	22.14	4.79	26.93
Plumbers	11.23	2.16	13.39	17.63	3.91	21.54	24.23	6.39	30.62
Refrigeration mechanics	12.47	1.25	13.72	19.52	3.40	22.92	27.24	5.17	32.41
Roofers	9.21	1.06	10.27	15.57	2.06	17.63	22.65	3.19	25.84
Sheet metal workers	11.19	1.89	13.08	17.84	3.55	21.39	24.79	5.84	30.63
Sprinkler fitters	11.22	2.02	13.24	18.52	3.80	22.32	25.52	5.76	31.28

* Includes employer contributions to vacation and holiday pay funds, health and welfare funds, pension funds, savings funds and supplementary unemployment benefit funds.

Note: Because of rounding, sums of individual items may not equal totals.

Table 2

**Dollar Change in Average Union Hourly Wage Rates and Employer Contributions* for Nineteen Trades in ICI Construction
in Cities of 35,000 Population or More, May 1977, 1984 and 1991**

Trade	1977-1984			1984-1991			1977-1991		
	Dollar change in wage rate	Dollar change in employer contributions	Dollar change in wage rate plus employer contributions	Dollar change in wage rate	Dollar change in employer contributions	Dollar change in wage rate plus employer contributions	Dollar change in wage rate	Dollar change in employer contributions	Dollar change in wage rate plus employer contributions
All trades . . .	6.38	1.69	8.07	6.71	2.04	8.75	13.09	3.73	16.82
Basic trades	6.10	1.71	7.81	6.41	2.17	9.58	12.51	3.88	16.39
Carpenters	6.25	1.88	8.13	6.39	2.12	8.51	12.64	4.00	16.64
Cement masons	5.66	1.48	7.14	6.81	1.59	8.40	12.47	3.07	15.54
Labourers	5.67	1.33	7.00	6.32	1.23	7.55	11.99	2.56	14.55
Operating Engineers . . .	6.60	1.56	8.16	6.92	2.85	9.77	13.52	4.41	17.93
Rodmen	6.41	2.21	8.62	6.40	2.58	8.98	12.81	4.79	17.60
Structural iron workers .	6.37	2.05	8.42	6.12	2.86	8.98	12.49	4.91	17.40
Teamsters	5.74	1.44	7.18	5.90	1.94	7.84	11.64	3.38	15.02
Specialty trades . . .	6.55	1.68	8.23	6.88	1.97	8.85	13.43	3.65	17.08
Asbestos workers	7.11	1.23	8.34	5.68	3.65	9.33	12.79	4.88	17.67
Bricklayers	7.12	1.41	8.53	7.13	1.95	9.08	14.25	3.36	17.61
Electricians	6.52	1.88	8.40	7.16	2.13	9.29	13.68	4.01	17.69
Glaziers	6.46	1.48	7.94	6.41	1.44	7.85	12.87	2.92	15.79
Millwrights	6.71	2.29	9.00	7.54	1.81	9.35	14.25	4.10	18.35
Painters	5.72	1.75	7.47	6.50	1.40	7.90	12.22	3.15	15.37
Plasterers	5.20	2.82	7.02	6.74	1.67	8.41	11.94	3.49	15.43
Plumbers	6.40	1.75	8.15	6.60	2.48	9.08	13.00	4.23	17.23
Refrigeration mechanics .	7.05	2.15	9.20	7.72	1.77	9.49	14.77	3.92	18.69
Roofers	6.36	1.00	7.36	7.08	1.13	8.21	13.44	2.13	15.57
Sheet metal workers . . .	6.65	1.66	8.31	6.95	2.29	9.24	13.60	3.95	17.55
Sprinkler fitters	7.30	1.78	9.08	7.00	1.96	8.96	14.30	3.74	18.04

* Includes employer contributions to vacation and holiday pay funds, health and welfare funds, pension funds, savings funds and supplementary unemployment insurance funds.

Note: Because of rounding, sums of individual items may not equal totals.

Table 3

**Percent Change in Average Union Hourly Wages Rates and Employer Contributions* for Nineteen Trades In ICI Construction
in Cities of 35,000 Population or More, May 1977, 1984 and 1991**

Trade	1977-1984			1984-1991			1977-1991		
	Percent change in wage rate	Percent change in employer contributions	Percent change in wage rate plus employer contributions	Percent change in wage rate	Percent change in employer contributions	Percent change in wage rate plus employer contributions	Percent change in wage rate	Percent change in employer contributions	Percent change in wage rate plus employer contributions
All trades . . .	61.5	101.8	67.1	40.1	60.9	43.5	126.2	224.7	139.8
Basic trades	60.6	104.9	66.8	39.6	65.0	44.0	124.2	238.0	140.1
Carpenters	59.1	129.6	67.6	38.0	63.7	42.2	119.6	275.8	138.4
Cement masons	57.2	108.0	63.4	43.8	55.8	45.6	126.0	224.1	137.9
Labourers	68.0	101.5	72.5	45.1	46.6	45.3	143.8	195.4	150.8
Operating Engineers . . .	56.0	88.1	60.2	37.6	85.6	45.0	114.7	249.1	132.2
Rodmen	63.1	110.1	71.8	38.6	63.7	43.5	126.1	260.3	146.7
Structural iron workers .	57.0	84.4	61.9	34.9	63.8	40.8	111.8	202.0	127.9
Teamsters	66.8	116.1	73.0	41.2	72.4	46.1	135.5	272.6	152.8
Specialty trades . .	62.1	100.0	67.3	40.1	58.6	43.3	127.4	217.2	139.8
Asbestos workers	61.1	68.0	62.6	30.3	120.1	42.8	109.8	269.6	131.5
Bricklayers	68.8	82.9	70.8	40.8	62.7	44.1	137.7	197.6	146.1
Electricians	56.3	102.7	62.6	39.5	57.4	42.6	118.0	219.1	131.9
Glaziers	83.0	125.4	88.6	45.0	54.1	46.4	165.4	247.4	176.2
Millwrights	65.0	94.6	70.6	44.3	38.4	43.0	138.1	169.4	144.0
Painters	61.6	116.7	69.3	43.3	43.1	43.3	131.7	210.0	142.6
Plasterers	51.0	140.0	61.0	43.8	53.5	45.4	117.1	268.5	134.2
Plumbers	57.0	81.0	60.9	37.4	63.4	42.2	115.8	195.8	128.7
Refrigeration mechanics .	56.5	172.0	67.1	39.5	52.1	41.4	118.4	313.6	136.2
Roofers	69.0	94.3	71.7	45.5	54.8	46.6	146.0	200.9	151.6
Sheet metal workers . . .	59.4	87.7	63.5	39.0	64.5	43.2	121.5	208.9	134.2
Sprinkler fitters	65.1	88.1	68.6	37.8	51.6	40.1	127.5	185.1	136.3

* Includes employer contributions to vacation and holiday pay funds, health and welfare funds, pension funds, savings funds and supplementary unemployment benefit funds.

Note: Because of rounding, sums of individual items may not equal totals.

Table 4

**Average Union Hourly Wage Rates and Employer Contributions* in Cities of 35,000 Population or More
for Nineteen Trades in ICI Construction, May 1977, 1984 and 1991**

City	May 1977			May 1984			May 1991		
	Wage Rate	Employer Contributions	Wage Rate Plus Employer Contributions	Wage Rate	Employer Contributions	Wage Rate plus Employer Contributions	Wage Rate	Employer Contributions	Wage Rates plus Employer Contributions
All cities	10.37	1.66	12.03	16.75	3.35	20.10	23.46	5.39	28.85
Eastern Ontario . .	10.18	1.60	11.78	16.64	3.18	19.82	23.19	5.36	28.55
Belleville	10.24	1.63	11.87	16.67	3.26	19.93	23.28	5.32	28.60
Cornwall	9.98	1.59	11.57	16.45	3.15	19.60	22.94	5.43	28.37
Kingston	10.36	1.58	11.94	16.85	3.12	19.97	23.34	5.29	28.63
Ottawa	10.15	1.61	11.76	16.60	3.19	19.79	23.22	5.38	28.60
Central Ontario	10.53	1.78	12.31	16.89	3.48	20.37	24.16	5.42	29.58
Barrie	10.47	1.69	12.16	16.79	3.38	20.17	24.02	5.40	29.42
Oshawa	10.62	1.82	12.44	16.95	3.56	20.51	24.35	5.41	29.76
Peterborough	10.07	1.70	11.77	16.53	3.31	19.84	23.29	5.26	28.55
Toronto	10.96	1.89	12.85	17.28	3.67	20.95	24.99	5.61	30.60
Mid-western Ontario .	10.38	1.65	12.03	16.78	3.36	20.14	23.48	5.42	28.90
Cambridge	10.17	1.64	11.81	16.55	3.30	19.85	23.27	5.32	28.59
Guelph	10.17	1.64	11.81	16.56	3.30	19.86	23.27	5.32	28.59
Kitchener	10.17	1.64	11.81	16.55	3.30	19.85	23.27	5.32	28.59
Brantford	10.42	1.60	12.02	16.87	3.30	20.17	23.36	5.46	28.82
Hamilton	10.82	1.74	12.56	17.28	3.44	20.72	23.94	5.57	29.51
St. Catharines	10.57	1.63	12.20	16.90	3.54	20.44	23.79	5.54	29.33
Western Ontario . .	10.61	1.71	12.32	17.12	3.33	20.45	23.64	5.36	29.00
Chatham	10.30	1.73	12.03	16.94	3.37	20.31	23.41	5.42	28.83
London	10.33	1.64	11.97	16.99	3.24	20.23	23.62	5.20	28.82
Sarnia	11.22	1.68	12.90	17.52	3.27	20.79	24.02	5.36	29.38
Windsor	10.58	1.79	12.37	17.02	3.44	20.46	23.52	5.44	28.96
Northern Ontario . .	10.17	1.59	11.76	16.40	3.38	19.78	22.93	5.41	28.34
North Bay	10.15	1.64	11.79	16.35	3.47	19.82	22.90	5.48	28.38
Sault Ste Marie	9.92	1.59	11.51	16.08	3.44	19.52	22.56	5.48	28.04
Sudbury	10.15	1.64	11.79	16.35	3.47	19.82	22.90	5.48	28.38
Thunder Bay	10.53	1.47	12.00	16.92	3.09	20.01	23.39	5.20	28.59
Timmins	10.11	1.60	11.71	16.28	3.45	19.73	22.88	5.44	28.32

* Includes employer contributions to vacation and holiday pay funds, health and welfare funds, pension funds, savings funds and supplementary unemployment benefit funds.

Note: Because of rounding, sums of individual items may not equal totals.

Table 3

Dollar Change in Average Union Hourly Wage Rates and Employer Contributions* in Cities of 35,000 Population or More for Nineteen Trades in ICI Construction, May 1977, 1984 and 1991

City	1977-1984			1984-1991			1977-1991		
	Dollar change in wage rate	Dollar change in employer contributions	Dollar change in wage rate plus employer contributions	Dollar change in wage rate	Dollar change in employer contributions	Dollar change in wage rate plus employer contributions	Dollar change in wage rate	Dollar change in employer contributions	Dollar change in wage rate plus employer contributions
All cities	6.38	1.69	8.07	6.71	2.04	8.75	13.09	3.73	16.82
Eastern Ontario . . .	6.46	1.58	8.04	6.55	2.18	8.73	13.01	3.76	16.71
Belleville	6.43	1.63	8.06	6.61	2.06	8.67	13.04	3.69	16.73
Cornwall	6.47	1.56	8.03	6.49	2.28	8.77	12.96	3.84	16.80
Kingston	6.49	1.54	8.03	6.49	2.17	8.66	12.98	3.71	16.69
Ottawa	6.45	1.58	8.03	6.62	2.19	8.81	13.07	3.77	16.84
Central Ontario . . .	6.36	1.70	8.06	7.27	1.94	9.21	13.63	3.64	17.27
Barrie	6.32	1.69	8.01	7.23	2.02	9.25	13.55	3.71	17.26
Oshawa	6.33	1.74	8.07	7.40	1.85	9.25	13.73	3.59	17.32
Peterborough	6.46	1.61	8.07	6.76	1.95	8.71	13.22	3.56	16.78
Toronto	6.32	1.78	8.10	7.71	1.94	9.65	14.03	3.72	17.75
Mid-western Ontario . .	6.40	1.71	8.11	6.70	2.06	8.76	13.10	3.77	16.87
Cambridge	6.38	1.66	8.04	6.72	2.02	8.74	13.10	3.68	16.78
Guelph	6.39	1.66	8.05	6.71	2.02	8.73	13.10	3.68	16.78
Kitchener	6.38	1.66	8.04	6.72	2.02	8.74	13.10	3.68	16.78
Brantford	6.45	1.70	8.15	6.49	2.16	8.65	12.94	3.86	16.80
Hamilton	6.46	1.70	8.16	6.66	2.13	8.79	13.12	3.83	16.95
St. Catharines	6.33	1.91	8.24	6.89	2.00	8.89	13.22	3.91	17.13
Western Ontario . . .	6.51	1.62	8.13	6.52	2.03	8.59	13.03	3.65	16.68
Chatham	6.64	1.64	8.28	6.47	2.05	8.52	13.11	3.69	16.80
London	6.66	1.60	8.26	6.63	1.96	8.59	13.29	3.56	16.85
Sarnia	6.30	1.59	7.89	6.50	2.09	8.59	12.80	3.68	16.48
Windsor	6.44	1.65	8.08	6.50	2.00	8.50	12.94	3.65	16.59
Northern Ontario . . .	6.23	1.79	8.02	6.53	2.03	8.56	12.75	3.83	16.58
North Bay	6.20	1.83	8.03	6.55	2.01	8.56	12.75	3.84	16.59
Sault Ste Marie	6.16	1.85	8.01	6.48	2.04	8.52	12.64	3.89	16.53
Sudbury	6.20	1.83	8.03	6.55	2.1	8.56	12.75	3.84	16.59
Thunder Bay	6.39	1.62	8.01	6.47	2.01	8.58	12.86	3.73	16.59
Timmins	6.17	1.85	8.02	6.60	1.99	8.59	12.77	3.84	16.61

* Includes employer contributions to vacation and holiday pay funds, health and welfare funds, pension funds, savings funds and supplementary unemployment benefit funds.

Note: Because of rounding, sums of individual items may not equal totals.

1 2

Percent Change in Average Union Hourly Wage Rates and Employer Contributions* in Cities of 35,000 Population or More for Nineteen Trades in ICI Construction, May 1977, 1984 and 1991

City	1977-1984			1984-1991			1977-1991		
	Percent change in wage rate	Percent change in employer contributions	Percent change in wage rate plus employer contributions	Percent change in wage rate	Percent change in employer contributions	Percent change in wage rate plus employer contributions	Percent change in wage rate	Percent change in employer contributions	Percent change in wage rate plus employer contributions
All cities . . .	61.5	101.8	67.1	40.1	60.9	43.5	126.2	224.7	139.8
Eastern Ontario . .	63.5	98.7	68.3	39.4	68.5	44.0	127.8	235.0	142.4
Belleville	62.8	100.0	67.9	39.7	63.2	43.5	127.3	226.4	140.9
Cornwall	64.8	98.1	69.4	39.5	72.4	44.7	129.9	241.5	145.2
Kingston	62.6	97.5	67.3	38.5	69.6	43.4	125.3	234.8	143.2
Ottawa	63.5	98.1	68.3	39.9	68.6	44.5	128.8	234.2	140.3
Central Ontario . .	60.4	95.5	65.5	43.0	55.7	45.2	129.4	204.5	141.9
Barrie	60.4	100.0	65.9	43.1	59.7	45.9	129.4	219.5	139.2
Oshawa	59.6	95.6	64.9	43.7	51.9	45.1	129.3	197.2	142.6
Peterborough	64.1	94.7	68.6	40.9	58.9	43.9	131.3	209.4	138.1
Toronto	57.6	94.2	63.0	44.6	52.9	46.1	128.0	196.8	140.2
Mid-western Ontario .	61.7	103.6	67.4	39.9	61.3	43.5	126.2	228.5	142.1
Cambridge	62.7	101.2	68.1	40.6	61.2	44.0	128.8	224.4	142.1
Guelph	62.8	101.2	68.2	40.5	61.2	44.0	128.8	224.4	142.1
Kitchener	62.7	101.2	68.1	40.6	65.4	44.0	128.8	232.9	142.1
Brantford	61.9	106.3	67.8	38.5	68.8	42.9	124.2	248.1	139.8
Hamilton	59.7	97.7	65.0	38.5	61.0	42.4	121.3	218.4	134.9
St. Catharines	59.9	117.2	67.5	40.8	51.4	43.5	125.1	228.8	140.4
Western Ontario . .	61.4	94.7	66.0	38.1	62.8	41.8	122.8	216.9	135.4
Chatham	64.5	94.8	68.8	38.2	54.3	41.9	127.3	200.6	139.7
London	64.4	97.6	69.0	39.0	65.4	42.5	128.7	226.8	140.8
Sarnia	56.1	94.6	61.2	37.1	64.7	41.7	117.1	227.2	127.8
Windsor	60.9	92.2	65.4	38.2	57.3	41.5	122.3	202.2	134.1
Northern Ontario .	61.2	112.6	68.2	39.8	62.1	43.3	125.5	244.6	141.0
North Bay	61.1	111.6	68.1	40.1	57.9	42.7	125.6	234.1	139.9
Sault Ste Marie	62.1	116.4	69.6	40.3	59.3	43.6	127.4	244.6	143.6
Sudbury	61.1	111.6	68.1	40.1	49.8	43.2	125.6	217.1	140.7
Thunder Bay	60.7	110.2	66.8	38.2	76.1	42.9	122.1	270.1	138.3
Timmins	61.0	115.6	68.5	40.5	57.7	43.5	126.3	240.0	141.8

* Includes employer contributions to vacation and holiday pay funds, health and welfare funds, pension funds, savings funds and supplementary unemployment benefit funds.

Note: Because of rounding, sums of individual items may not equal totals.

Table 7

Ranking of Average Union Hourly Wage Rate and Employer Contributions* for Nineteen Trades in ICI Construction in Cities of 35,000 Population or More, May 1977, 1984 and 1991

Trade	Ranking								
	1977			1984			1991		
	Wage rate	Employer contributions	Wage rate plus employer contributions	Wage rate	Employer contributions	Wage rate plus employer contributions	Wage rate	Employer contributions	Wage rate plus employer contributions
Basic trades									
Carpenters	9	12	11	11	9	12	11	10	12
Cement masons	14	13	14	14	15	14	14	16	14
Labourers	18	14	18	19	18	19	18	18	19
Operating Engineers	2	9	3	4	9	7	3	6	2
Rodmen	13	6	12	12	3	10	12	3	11
Structural iron workers	8	1	2	8	1	3	10	1	7
Teamsters	17	17	17	17	16	17	19	15	17
Specialty trades									
Asbestos workers	3	8	4	2	14	5	8	2	4
Bricklayers	10	10	10	9	13	11	6	12	10
Electricians	4	7	5	5	6	4	4	7	5
Glaziers	19	18	19	18	17	18	17	17	18
Millwrights	11	2	9	10	2	6	7	4	6
Painters	15	11	15	16	11	15	16	14	15
Plasterers	12	15	13	15	12	13	15	13	13
Plumbers	5	3	6	7	4	8	9	5	9
Refrigeration mechanics	1	16	1	1	8	1	1	11	1
Roofers	16	19	16	13	19	16	13	19	16
Sheet metal workers	7	5	8	6	7	9	5	7	8
Sprinkler fitters	6	4	7	3	5	2	2	9	3

* Includes employer contributions to vacation and holiday pay funds, health and welfare funds, pension funds, savings funds and supplementary unemployment benefit funds.

Ranking of Average Union Hourly Wage Rates and Employer Contributions* in Cities of 35,000 Population or more for Nineteen Trades In ICI Construction, May 1977, 1984 and 1991

City	Ranking								
	1977			1984			1991		
	Wage rate	Employer contributions	Wage rate plus employer contributions	Wage rate	Employer contributions	Wage rate plus employer contributions	Wage rate	Employer contributions	Wage rate plus employer contributions
Eastern Ontario									
Belleville	13	15	13	13	18	13	14	16	12
Cornwall	22	20	22	19	21	2	19	10	21
Kingston	10	22	12	11	22	12	12	20	11
Ottawa	17	17	20	14	20	20	18	14	12
Central Ontario									
Barrie	8	7	7	12	10	9	3	14	4
Oshawa	4	2	4	6	2	4	2	12	2
Peterborough	21	6	19	18	12	17	13	21	18
Toronto	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
Mid-western Ontario									
Cambridge	14	9	14	16	13	15	15	16	14
Guelph	14	9	14	15	13	14	15	16	14
Kitchener	14	9	14	16	13	15	15	16	14
Brantford	9	18	9	10	13	9	11	7	9
Hamilton	3	4	3	3	7	3	5	2	3
St. Catharines	6	15	6	9	3	6	6	3	6
Western Ontario									
Chatham	12	5	8	7	11	7	9	11	8
London	11	9	11	5	19	8	7	22	9
Sarnia	1	8	1	1	17	2	3	15	5
Windsor	5	3	5	4	7	5	8	8	7
Northern Ontario									
North Bay	17	9	17	20	4	18	20	4	19
Sault Ste Marie	23	20	23	23	7	23	23	4	23
Sudbury	17	9	17	20	4	18	20	4	19
Thunder Bay	7	23	10	8	23	11	10	22	14
Timmins	20	18	21	22	6	21	22	8	22

* Includes employer contributions to vacation and holiday pay funds, health and welfare funds, pensions funds, savings funds and supplementary unemployment benefit funds.

Table 9

Percent Differentials from Toronto Average Union Hourly Wage Rates Plus Employer Contributions in Cities
of 35,000 Population or More for Nineteen Trades in ICI Construction, May 1977, 1984 and 1991

City	1977		1984		1991	
	Wage rate plus employer contributions	Percent difference from Toronto wage rate plus employer contributions	Wage rate plus employer contributions	Percent difference from Toronto wage rate plus employer contributions	Wage rate plus employer contributions	Percent difference from Toronto wage rate plus employer contributions
Barrie	12.16	-5.4	20.17	-3.7	29.42	-3.9
Belleville	11.87	-7.6	19.93	-4.9	28.60	-6.5
Brantford	12.02	-6.5	20.17	-3.7	28.82	-5.8
Cambridge	11.81	-8.1	19.85	-5.3	28.59	-6.6
Chatham	12.03	-6.4	20.31	-3.1	28.83	-5.8
Cornwall	11.57	-9.9	19.60	-6.4	28.37	-7.3
Guelph	11.81	-8.1	19.86	-5.2	28.59	-6.6
Hamilton	12.56	-2.3	20.72	-1.1	29.51	-3.6
Kingston	11.94	-7.1	19.97	-4.7	28.63	-6.4
Kitchener	11.81	-8.1	19.85	-5.3	28.59	-6.6
London	11.97	-6.8	20.23	-3.4	28.82	-5.8
North Bay	11.79	-8.2	19.82	-5.4	28.38	-7.3
Oshawa	12.44	-3.2	20.51	-2.1	29.76	-2.7
Ottawa	11.76	-8.5	19.79	-5.5	28.60	-6.5
Peterborough	11.77	-8.4	19.84	-5.3	28.55	-6.7
Sarnia	12.90	+0.4	20.79	-0.8	29.38	-3.9
Sault Ste. Marie	11.51	-10.4	19.52	-6.8	28.04	-8.4
St. Catharines	12.20	-5.1	20.44	-2.4	29.33	-4.1
Sudbury	11.79	-8.2	19.82	-5.4	28.38	-7.3
Thunder Bay	12.00	-6.6	20.01	-4.5	28.59	-6.6
Timmins	11.71	-8.8	19.73	-5.8	28.32	-7.5
Toronto	12.85	-	20.95	-	30.60	-
Windsor	12.37	-3.7	20.46	-2.3	28.96	-5.3

* Includes employer contributions to vacation and holiday pay funds, health and welfare funds, pension funds, savings funds and supplementary unemployment insurance funds.

Table 10

Average Hourly Earnings in Construction
and Manufacturing in Ontario, 1977-1990

Year	Manufacturing	Construction	All Industries	Construction as Percent of	
				Manufacturing	All Industries
1977	6.23	8.34	*	133.9	**
1978	6.65	8.80	*	132.3	**
1979	7.20	9.38	*	130.3	**
1980	7.87	10.28	*	130.6	**
1981	8.79	11.37	*	129.4	**
1982	9.78	12.36	*	126.4	**
1983	10.53	12.76	9.54	121.2	133.8
1984	11.17	12.99	9.99	116.3	130.0
1985	11.61	13.43	10.39	115.7	129.0
1986	12.11	13.94	10.71	115.1	130.2
1987	12.55	14.90	11.26	118.7	132.3
1988	13.22	15.43	11.85	116.7	130.2
1989	13.89	16.45	12.61	118.4	130.5
1990	14.65	17.59	13.23	120.1	133.1

* Not available.

** Data not available to determine percentage.

Selected Bibliography

- Adams, George W: *Canadian Labour Law*. (Aurora: Canada Law Book, 1985), Chapter 15.
- Affidavits of Michael Eayrs, Donald Franks and Jerry Meadows filed in Arlington Crane Service Ltd and Ronald Porter V. Minister of Labour and the Attorney General of Ontario; Supreme Court of Ontario No. 2745/85.
- Arthurs, H.W. and Crispo, John H.G: 'Countervailing Employer Power: Accreditation of Construction Associations'. In H. Carl Goldenberg and John H.G Crispo, eds. *Construction Labour Relations*. (Ottawa: Canadian Construction Association, 1968)
- Bertram, Gordon W: 'The Structure and Performance of Collective Bargaining Systems'. In H. Carl Goldenberg and John H.G. Crispo, eds., *Construction Labour Relations*. (Ottawa: Canadian Construction Association, 1968).
- Brown, Richard M: 'The Reform of Bargaining Structure in the Canadian Construction Industry'. (1979), 3 *Industrial Relations Law Journal*, 539.
- Construction Labour Relation: H. Carl Goldenberg and John H.G. Crispo, eds. (Ottawa: Canadian Construction Association, 1968).
- Cullen, Donald E. and Feinberg, Louis: *The Bargaining Structure in Construction: Problems and Prospects*. (Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Labour, 1980)
- Foster, Howard G. and Strauss, George: 'Labour Problems in Construction: A Review'. (1972), 11 *Industrial Relations* 289.
- Franks, D.E: *Background Paper: Concerning Submissions to the Industrial Inquiry Commission into Bargaining Patterns in the Construction Industry in Ontario*. (Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Labour, 1975)
- Hartman, P.T. and Franks, W.H: 'The Changing Bargaining Structure in Construction: Wider Area and Multicraft Bargaining'. (1980), 33 *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*, 170.
- Herbert, Gerard: *Labour Relations in the Quebec Construction Industry, Part 1: The System of Labour Relations*. (Ottawa: Economic Council of Canada, 1977)
- Lipsky, David B. and Farber, Henry S: 'The Composition of Strike Activity in the Construction Industry'. (1976), 29 *Industrial and Labour Relations Review* 350.
- Malkin, B: 'Some Aspects of Labour Relations in Quebec's Construction Industry'. (1978), 78 *Labour Gazette* 250.
- Mills, Daniel Quinn: *Industrial Relations and Manpower in Construction*. (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1972).
- Report of the Industrial Inquiry Commission into Bargaining Patterns in the Construction Industry in Ontario* (The Franks Report). (Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Labour, 1976).
- Report of the Royal Commission on Labour-Management Relations in the Construction Industry* (The Goldenberg Report). (Toronto: 1962)

- Report of the Southern New Brunswick Construction Industry Industrial Relations* (The Woods Report). (March, 1981).
- Report of the Royal Commission on Certain Sectors of the Building Industry* (The Waisberg Report). (Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1974).
- Rose, Joseph B: *Public Policy, Bargaining Structure and the Construction Industry*. (Toronto: Butterworths, 1980).
- Rose, Joseph B: 'Accreditation: A Representative Plan for Employers in the Construction Industry'. In *Canadian Labour and Industrial Relations*. H.C. Jain, ed. (Toronto: Mc-Graw-Hill Ryerson Ltd., 1975).
- Rose, Joseph B: 'Construction Labour Relations'. In *Union-Management Relations in Canada*, J. Anderson and M. Gunderson, eds. (Don Mills: Addison-Wesley Publishers, 1982).
- Rose, Joseph B: 'Employer Accreditation: A Retrospective'. In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual Meeting of the Canadian Industrial Relations Association*. (Quebec: Laval University, 1984).
- Rose, Joseph B, and Wetzel, Kurt: 'Outcomes of Bargaining Structures, in Ontario and Saskatchewan Construction Industries'. (1986), 41 *Relations Industrielles*, 256.
- Rose, Joseph B: Legislative Support For Multi-Employer Bargaining: The Canadian Experience. (1986), 40 *Industrial and Labour Relations Review* 3.
- Special Commission of Inquiry into British Columbia Constuction (The Kinnaird Inquiry). (October 1975).
- Strand, Kenneth: *Non-Union Construction in British Columbia*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Industrial Relations Association, May 30, 1985.
- Weiler, Paul C: *Reconcilable Differences: New Directions in Canadian Labour Law*. (Toronto; Carswell, 1980), Chapter 6.
- Weiler, Paul C: *Mega Projects: The Collective Bargaining Dimension*. (Ottawa: Canadian Construction Association, 1981).
- Willes, J.A: *The Craft Bargaining Unit*. (Kingston: Industrial Relations Centre, Queen's University , 1970).