

CANADIAN RAILWAY OFFICE OF ARBITRATION

CASE NO. 1101

Heard at Montreal, Tuesday, June 14, 1983

Concerning

CANADIAN PACIFIC LIMITED (CP RAIL)

and

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY, AIRLINE AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS,
FREIGHT HANDLERS, EXPRESS AND STATION EMPLOYEES

DISPUTE:

Claim by the Union that the position of Office Boy in the Chief Accountant's Office, Winnipeg, Man. be reclassified to that of Junior Clerk per Article 7.2 of the Collective Agreement.

JOINT STATEMENT OF ISSUE:

The Union claims that duties have been added to the position of Office Boy in the Chief Accountant's Office, Winnipeg, Man. that were previously performed by higher-rated positions. The duties in question are the operation of a Xerox machine, filing and the transfer of documents and machine cards. The Union claims the position should be reclassified as Junior Clerk.

The Company refused the Union's request on the basis that the duties in question are properly included in the Office Boy position, and that no significant change in responsibility of the position has occurred.

FOR THE BROTHERHOOD:

(SGD.) R. WELCH
System General Chairman

FOR THE COMPANY:

(SGD.) W. P. COTNAM
Assistant Comptroller -
Expenses

There appeared on behalf of the Company:

G. M. Booth	- Personnel Manager, Finance and Accounting CPR, Montreal
A. R. Gartshore	- Administrative Assistant to Manager, Expenditure Accounting, CPR, Montreal P. E.
P.E. Timpson	- Labour Relations Officer, CPR, Montreal

And on behalf of the Brotherhood:

Paul L. Rouillard	- Vice General Chairman, BRAC, Vancouver
P. Vermette	- Vice General Chairman, BRAC, Montreal

AWARD OF THE ARBITRATOR

The Collective Agreement, in Article 7.2, calls for adjustment of the rates of pay for a position "where there is a significant change in the responsibilities" of the position.

In 1975 a position of Office Boy was bulletined at Winnipeg. In the bulletin, the nature of the duties of the position was described as follows:

"Handle in and out mail / misc. duties
as may be required."

Since that time, other job bulletins have described the duties of the job in more detail.

Thus, in a bulletin in 1982, the duties of the job were described as follows:

- "1. Incoming mail - obtain, sort, apply office date stamp and distribute to appropriate desks in department.
2. Outgoing mail - Sort and deliver mail destined to offices in station building. For other destinations, insert in properly addressed envelopes, packages, parcels, etc., and deliver to mail room for despatch. Apply value labels as required and register mail under value.
3. Obtain coffee and other refreshments for staff from C.P. Cafeteria for authorized break periods (one in A.M. and one in P.M.).
4. Assist with filing of documents also transfer of documents from general office to vault storage.
5. Assist in placing machine room card and paper stock in storage accommodation.
6. Attend and operate Xerox Copier, also protect supplies for operation.
7. Other related duties as assigned."

It is the Union's contention that the more recent list of duties reveals significant changes in the job in question. In particular, Items (2), (4) and (6) are additional duties.

As to Item (2), the aspect particularly referred to is the applying of value labels. This is, in my view, simply an aspect of the handling of outgoing mail. It is not suggested that any particular clerical functions, such as the determination of values, or preparation of documents, is involved. If the task of applying labels is a new one for the job, it is in any event one which is appropriate for the job and does not involve a significant change.

As to Item (4), the Office Boy "assists in filing" to the extent that

he physically transfers documents to vault storage. It does not appear that any actual filing of correspondence is involved. The physical work is appropriate to the classification, and does not represent a significant change. It may be that the list of duties is not very precise when it refers to this work as "assisting in filing".

As to Item (6), it appears that the operation of the copier, and re-stocking it with paper, have been functions of the job for some time. In any event, such functions would come properly within the scope of such a job.

It was also argued that the Office Boy performed tasks coming within the scope of the job of Junior Clerk, and that that suggested the Office Boy position should be adjusted accordingly. It would appear that there are certain duties common to the two classifications. That is not unusual. These common duties, however, are not the prime duties of the Junior Clerk position, and which justify its higher rate. They are duties which are quite properly performed by an Office Boy.

The material before me does not show that any changes in the duties and responsibilities of an Office Boy have been significant. There is no cause for adjustment of its wage rates. The grievance is accordingly dismissed.

J. F. W. WEATHERILL,
ARBITRATOR.