

Award No. 3060

Docket No. 3029

2-GNEW-'58

**NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD**

**SECOND DIVISION**

The Second Division consisted of the regular members and in addition Referee Dudley E. Whiting when award was rendered.

---

**PARTIES TO DISPUTE:**

**SYSTEM FEDERATION NO. 101, RAILWAY EMPLOYEES'  
DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO (Electrical Workers)**

**GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY**

**DISPUTE: CLAIM OF EMPLOYEES:**

1. That under the current agreement Electrician Lloyd Ball was improperly denied the right to work November 28, 1957.

2. That accordingly the carrier be ordered to compensate the aforesaid electrician in the amount of eight (8) hours' pay at the time and one-half rate for the aforesaid date.

**EMPLOYEES' STATEMENT OF FACTS:** At the Klamath Roundhouse, Klamath Falls, Oregon, the carrier employed one electrician on Sundays prior to and following November 28, 1957. On November 28, 1957, the carrier employed no electrician to work that holiday. The claimant was available for service on that date but not used.

The dispute was handled with carrier officials designated to handle such affairs, all of whom declined to adjust the matter.

The agreement effective September 1, 1949, as subsequently amended, is controlling.

**POSITION OF EMPLOYEES:** It is submitted that the facts show that the carrier employed one electrician on Sundays, which means that they, under Rule 11(b)C, captioned and reading as follows:

"C. Seven-day Positions.

On positions which are filled seven days per week any two consecutive days may be the rest days with the presumption in favor of Saturday and Sunday."

"This case is identical with Award No. 2070 (Docket No. 1961) wherein the claim was denied, except in the instant case the classification of workers is different. We find nothing in the record in this case which would justify a different award.

#### AWARD

"Claim denied."

Since this instant claim of the carmen of this property involves a dispute identical to those contained in Second Division Awards Nos. 2070, 2097 and 2471 and in which awards the claims of the employes were denied, your Board must also find the instant claim of no merit whatsoever and render a denial decision consistent with the decisions of the afore-mentioned Second Division denial awards.

#### CONCLUSION

In effect, the employes herein are attempting through the medium of your Board to amend the guarantee rule of their agreement by having you hold that a purely oral statement is a new guarantee rule in the agreement, contrary to the provisions of the one now contained. That is beyond the power of this tribunal. The present rules make no requirement relative to any number of employes to be worked on holidays; nor do they specify any restrictions on management as to the number of employes who may or may not be worked on such holidays. Such restrictions cannot be added to the schedule by Board dictate.

**FINDINGS:** The Second Division of the Adjustment Board, upon the whole record and all the evidence, finds that:

The carrier or carriers and the employe or employes involved in this dispute are respectively carrier and employe within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act as approved June 21, 1934.

This Division of the Adjustment Board has jurisdiction over the dispute involved herein.

Parties to said dispute were given due notice of hearing thereon.

Disposition of this claim is governed by Award No. 3043 (Docket No. 2424).

#### AWARD

Claim denied.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD  
By Order of SECOND DIVISION

ATTEST: Harry J. Sassaman  
Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 8th day of December, 1958.

#### DISSENT OF LABOR MEMBERS TO AWARDS 3043 TO 3060, INCLUSIVE

The majority states that similar claims against this carrier were sustained on the basis of a verbal understanding that forces would not be reduced on holidays below that worked on Sundays. There is no basis for denying the

instant claims on the theory that the verbal understanding between this carrier and System Federation No. 101 was cancelled by the National Agreement of August 21, 1954. In Award 2378 this theory was carefully examined by the referee, former Chairman of the Emergency Board, and it was found that there was no language in the report of Emergency Board No. 106, on which the agreement of August 21, 1954 is premised, or in the agreement itself which would have the effect of setting aside the parties' verbal understanding of 1950 relating to the extent to which carrier will work its forces on a workday of their regularly assigned workweek.

Since it was held in Award No. 2378 that it was not the intention of the Emergency Board, nor of the parties signatory to the August 21, 1954 agreement, to abrogate such agreements, "Rather . . . it was intended to keep them in full force and effect," it can readily be seen that there is no basis for the present inconsistent holding. It is evident that Awards 2378 to 2383, inclusive, were correct and should have been adhered to in Awards 3043 to 3060, inclusive.

/s/ James B. Zink

/s/ R. W. Blake

/s/ Charles E. Goodlin

/s/ T. E. Losey

/s/ Edward W. Wiesner