

Results of the First Installment of the Enforcement Study

Whenever preparing wage demands, a number of different factors need to be taken into account, arguably one of the most important being what other workers are being paid for performing comparable work. When there is a serious disconnect between what is being paid on the market and the wages of our members, we will on occasion go beyond our internal union research and supplement with a compensation study completed by an independent third party.

In the initial stages of this round of bargaining with CBSA/Treasury Board we were engaged in talks with the Public Service Labour Relations Board (PSLRB) and the employer regarding a pay study to be conducted by the PSLRB. One of the criteria established early in the discussions was that management and the union would need to agree on the external groups that our members would be compared to. After months of talks, our union withdrew from the process when management continued to insist on including incompatible market comparators such as private security guards and airport screeners. We made it clear that we would not agree to any study that included these comparator groups.

After our withdrawal from the PSLRB study, the PSAC retained the firm Morneau Sobeco to conduct an independent study of the competitiveness of certain components of compensation for ten enforcement positions in the federal public administration. Their review focused on two aspects of the total compensation attached to these positions; namely cash compensation and early retirement provisions under pension plans.

We have just received the results of the first instalment of the Morneau Sobeco study, that which deals with cash compensation. We are expecting the results of the pension plan study in the near future and will communicate the results once they come in.

Morneau Sobeco Study, Part1: Cash Compensation

The consultant reviewed applicable collective bargaining agreements at the federal level (including the RCMP) and at the following provincial and municipal levels for 6 benchmark positions:

<u>Provincial governments</u>	<u>Municipalities</u>
Government of Québec	Montréal
Government of Ontario	Toronto
Government of Alberta	Niagara
Government of BC	Windsor
	Calgary
	Vancouver

The table below presents the differential between the actual job rates for the evaluated FB positions (based on the old PM classification pay grid) and their projected job rates found by the study at the average and at the 75th percentile. These reflect market trends for benchmark positions as at June 21, 2006. Under Morneau Sobeco's analysis, the border services officer position is appraised indirectly from a market standpoint since no direct comparator exists in Canada. The consultant adjusted market indicators and observations applicable to First Class Police Officers job rates to determine the market rates for this position.

After meeting with PSAC and CEUDA representatives, the consultant proceeded to conduct a job evaluation relative to internal equity using the Morneau Sobeco job evaluation method for the classification of 10 positions represented by PSAC. The consultant did not use the Treasury Board/CBSA classification standard methodology, one of the reasons being that our Union is in dispute with the employer over the application of this standard to several new FB classifications. After conducting its analysis, the opinion of the consultant relative to the optimal balance that may be achieved between internal equity and market indicators of benchmarked positions is also shown below (as at June 21, 2006):

Level	Benchmark positions	Difference (Projected / Internal) Based on the average market indicator	Difference (Projected / Internal) Based on the 75th percentile market indicator
1	Border services officer	8.1%	12.0%
	Inland enforcement officer	8.1%	12.0%
2	Intelligence officer	7.2%	11.1%
	Senior officer trade compliance	17.4%	21.7%
3	Hearings officer	15.8%	20.0%
	Investigator	15.8%	20.0%

We do not agree with all of the findings of this study. However, the fundamentals demonstrate clearly that union members in the FB bargaining unit at CBSA are well below market comparators – and that is based on 2006 rates. Our bargaining team has taken the relevant pieces of data from the study to make a wage proposal that will help address the chronic recruitment and retention problems at CBSA. Given the extremely tight enforcement labour market and the ever growing problem of turnover at CBSA, we have based our wage demands entirely on 75th percentile market indicators.*

The market adjustment that in our pay proposal would mean significant increases for every employee, and the annual wage increases are designed to ensure that FB wage rates keep pace in a tight labour market.

Again, while the first installment has been completed, we do not yet have the second installment. Once it arrives we will be sure to communicate its findings.

We have tabled our wage demands*. While we have not had a full response from management (we return to the table May 23rd), the Employer was less than enthusiastic in its initial comments when receiving our economic proposal in bargaining. It is now up to all of us to do the work that will need to be done to win the kind of contract that FB workers at CBSA deserve. If you have any questions, follow up with your Shop Steward or Branch President.

* For more information on our wage demands, click here: <http://www.ceuda.psac.com>