

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Ernest M. Tipton, Referee

PARTIES TO DISPUTE:

**BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS,
FREIGHT HANDLERS, EXPRESS AND STATION EMPLOYES**

LEHIGH VALLEY RAILROAD COMPANY

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: Claim of the System Committee of the Brotherhood that the Carrier violated the Clerks' Agreement:

1. When it failed and refused to compensate employees for time lost account of death in family—as provided in Rule 56 (b) of current agreement and Memorandum Agreement effective March 16, 1945.

2. That the Carrier shall be required to apply the provisions of Rule 56 (b) of the current agreement and Memorandum Agreement effective March 16, 1945, as applied prior to April 1, 1945.

3. That Carrier be required to compensate employee Daniel Sloat, Clerk, Sayre, Pennsylvania, for time lost June 10, 1945, account of death in family, due to Carrier's arbitrary action.

EMPLOYEES' STATEMENT OF FACTS: A revised working agreement between the parties, was effected March 1, 1939, Rule 56 (b) reading:

"SICK LEAVE—RULE 56 (b): A limited amount of sick leave without loss of pay may be granted monthly rated employees, subject to approval of the officer in charge of seniority district. Time absent account of sickness or other good cause will not be charged to vacation allowances." (Underscoring ours.)

Effective June 1, 1940, President Williams issued the following instructions:

LEHIGH VALLEY RAILROAD COMPANY

GENERAL ORDER No. 4

"New York, May 23, 1940.

ALL CONCERNED:

Effective June 1st, payments for time lost account sickness or other causes will be made only upon authority of the President.

A separate request for authority should be made on Form 37-A for each employee. All information called for by the Form must be shown.

Forms must be signed in the appropriate place by the employee's immediate superior who recommends the payment, must be approved by the official head of the Department and forwarded to the President for approval.

1942 to the present time." By no wishful thinking on the part of the Employees, could anyone read into the phraseology of this letter any reference to a memorandum of agreement regarding any provisions for sick claim allowances beyond the period of the old claims then being handled.

In the settlement of these old claims, we agreed, as a concession in them only, that employees absent on account of death in family would be paid maximum of three working days, same to be included in sick allowance granted for length of service. This feature of settlement of the claims then before the Carrier did not change the contracted rule. If this were intended, it would have been so stated and a proper agreement negotiated.

Under date of March 31, 1945, the Carrier wrote the General Chairman regarding an erroneous impression which came to its attention in connection with the application of the provisions of Rule 56 (b), as it seemed the Clerks felt the settlement of the old claims established the basis for future payments under this rule, and called attention to the fact that the settlement agreed to in the old claims did not establish a precedent for the settlement of future claims, and asked the General Chairman, if he had issued instructions to the Clerks contrary to the understanding had, that his instructions be corrected. This matter was further discussed with the General Chairman at conference on April 3, 1945, and on April 14, 1945 he acknowledged Carrier's letter of March 31, 1945. We maintain this exchange of letters definitely confirms our statement that the letter of Carrier of March 16, 1945, was not construed by either party as a memorandum of agreement for any claims beyond those presented at that time. Copy of Carrier's letter of March 31, 1945, and of General Chairman's letter of April 14, 1945, are submitted.

Rule 56 (b) is very definitely a sick leave rule and makes no provisions for payment for time lost for any other reason. There is no question of what the intent of the parties was when this rule was negotiated, and if it had been intended that claims for time lost in cases other than sickness were to be considered for payment, such a provision would have been written into this rule.

In the light of the foregoing facts and circumstances set forth in this submission, it is the contention of the Carrier that the claim of the Employees should be denied.

OPINION OF BOARD: The issues in claim are identical with Award No. 3347, Docket No. CL-3337, and for the reasons stated in that Award, the claim is denied.

FINDINGS: The Third Division of the Adjustment Board, after giving the parties to this dispute due notice of hearing thereon, and upon the whole record and all the evidence, finds and holds:

That the Carrier and the Employees involved in this dispute are respectively carrier and employees within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act, as approved June 21, 1934;

That this Division of the Adjustment Board has jurisdiction over the dispute involved herein; and

That the Carrier has not violated the Agreement as contended.

AWARD

Claim denied.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD
By Order of Third Division

ATTEST: H. A. Johnson
Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 6th day of December, 1946.