

**Award No. 4275**

**Docket No. 4162**

**2-GN-CM-'63**

**NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD**

**SECOND DIVISION**

The Second Division consisted of the regular members and in addition Referee Joseph M. McDonald when award was rendered.

---

**PARTIES TO DISPUTE:**

**SYSTEM FEDERATION NO. 101, RAILWAY EMPLOYEES'**

**DEPARTMENT, A. F. of L.-C. I. O. (Carmen)**

**GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY**

**DISPUTE: CLAIM OF EMPLOYEES:**

1. That the current agreement was violated when the Carrier failed to compensate Carmen Floyd Watkins and Lester Cannon for time waiting to return to home point on December 13, 1960.

2. That accordingly, the Carrier be ordered to compensate Carmen Watkins and Cannon for fifteen and one-half (15½) hours for December 13, 1960 each at the time and one-half rate.

**EMPLOYEE'S STATEMENT OF FACTS:** The Great Northern Railway Company, hereinafter referred to as the carrier, employs Carmen Floyd Watkins and Lester Cannon, hereinafter referred to as the claimants, at Sioux City, Iowa with assigned hours of duty from 8 A. M. to 4:30 P. M. — thirty minutes for lunch.

On December 13, 1960, claimants were instructed by their supervisor to proceed by company highway truck to Garretson, South Dakota to repair GN No. 55229 stock car and upon completion of such work assignment that if time did not permit their return to home point at Sioux City by their quitting time, they were to tie up until 8 A. M. the following morning and return to Sioux City during the hours of their assignment at home point.

The duty assigned to be performed at Garretson was completed at approximately 4 P. M. In conformity with instructions of their foreman, claimants tied up at 4:30 P. M., remaining thereat over night until 8 A. M. December 14, 1960 to begin their return to Sioux City.

4. The lack of limitations on the maximum length of the non-compensated rest period and the time it may be assigned under Rule 22(b) contrast sharply with the more restrictive provisions for assigning rest periods to wrecking service employes under Rule 22(c).

5. The claimants were tied up for overnight rest periods under Rule 22(b) in conformance with the carrier's responsibility and duty to operate its business in a safe, efficient and economical manner.

6. The organization's contentions that rest periods must be given before freight car repairs are completed and then only in the employe's own discretion without any regard for the safety and economy of operations, are obviously illogical, absurd and wholly unsupported by any language in the agreement.

7. The carrier's interpretation of Rules 22(a) and 22(b) is supported by past practice, and the failure of the Organization to appeal the decisions of the carrier which rejected previous attempts by this organization to change the application of those rules.

8. Award No. 1637 of this Board, involving rules, facts and issues directly in point, supports the carrier's position and should be followed in this case.

For the foregoing reasons, the carrier respectfully requests that the claim of the employes be denied.

**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.

The parties to this dispute are the same as in Award No. 4269, and the facts are essentially the same as there.

The submissions contain the same type of evidence and arguments, and our Award No. 4269 governs here and the claim must be denied.

#### AWARD

Claim denied.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD  
By Order of SECOND DIVISION

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 18th day of July, 1963.

**DISSENT OF LABOR MEMBERS TO AWARDS 4270 THROUGH 4275,  
INCLUSIVE**

The holding of the majority in the above enumerated awards is essentially the same as in Award 4269; therefore, our dissent to that award applies to the present awards and the claims in each instance should have been sustained.

**C. E. Bagwell**

**T. E. Losey**

**E. J. McDermott**

**R. E. Stenzinger**

**James B. Zink**