AWARD NO. 3 CASE NO. 3

SPECIAL BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 171

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

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY

STATEMENT OF CLAIM:

"Claim of the System Committee of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clarks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes that the Carrier violated the rules of the current Agreement, effective September 1, 1950,

- "1. When on August 6 and 7, 1953 the Carrier required LaVern Iverson, and Henry Petroske, Bill Clerks at Allouez Freight, and other Fill Clerks who performed this work later with a rate of pay at the time of this claim of \$14.33, to take over and perform duties of positions paying a rate of \$15.11 per day,
- "2. That the Carrier now be required to compensate LaVern Iverson and Henry Petroske and all others who were required later to perform this work, the difference of 78¢ per day for August 6 and 7, 1953 and each and every day thereafter that the Carrier required lower rated employes to perform higher rated work."

FINDINGS: This Special Board of Adjustment upon the whole record and all the evidence, finds that:

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

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

The Employees state that on the claim dates enumerated herein the claimants were required to perform certain duties as part of their billing work which were duties that should have been performed and had been assigned to assistant weighmasters; that these duties included adding gross and tare weights and balancing net weights and applying tare weights missed when weighing and sorting weighbills when sorted wrong in preparation for billing.

Employees further contend that due to the fact that the claimants, who were bill clerks, performed the higher rated work, that they should receive the rate of pay of assistant weighmasters. The Employees state that the Carrier has violated Rules 48, 50 and 51.

Award No. 3

The Carrier states that the work performed by the bill clerks, for which they are now asking the higher rate of pay, is work that has always been performed by bill clerks but in a different method: that machines have now been added to

they are now asking the higher rate of pay, is work that has always been performed by bill clerks but in a different method; that machines have now been added to help the bill clerks to perform some of their work. Carrier further states the mere fact that an assistant weighmaster sometimes adds columns of figures and that the billing clerks and the assistant weighmaster use the same machine for adding is no reason to state that the billing clerks are performing assistant weighmaster duties; and that actually adding is a more dominant incident of billing clerks? duties than it is of assistant weighmasters! duties.

The Carrier further states that the duties performed by the claimants have always been assigned duties of billing clerks, but admits that sometimes the assistant weighmaster might perform some of these duties; that the pre-adding procedure was set up so that billing clerks could determine whether or not they had made an error in billing; the tare weight is essential in that it is impossible to bill and arrive at a net without it; and that in sorting if the bill clerks did not correct a sorting error when found, it would simply mean that they would be faced later with the need to rebill this group when the error was discovered, and that when they re-sort in order to consolidate two small groups into one large group, it is for their own convanience in reducing the number of dock waybills they must produce.

From the evidence produced at the hearing, the Board finds that there has been no showing by the Employees that the work performed by the claimants was work that belonged to the classification of assistant weighmasters; that on the other hand the work performed by the claimants was work that properly fell within their classification. Therefore, this claim must be denied.

AWARD

Claim denied.

/s/ Thomas C. Begley
Thomas C. Begley, Chairman

/s/ C. A. Pearson
C. A. Pearson, Carrier Number

/s/ F. A. Emme
F. A. Emme, Employee Member

Signed at St. Paul, Minnesota, this 10th day of April, 1957.