

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
741 5

Review Committee Files Nos. 514 and (515)
Stockton Division Grievances Nos. 15-63-8 and 16-63-9

June 2, 1964

MR. T. J. BIANUCCI, Chairman
Stockton Division
Joint Grievance Committee

The Union has recently informed the Company members of the Review Committee that the above subject grievances have been withdrawn from the agenda of the Review Committee. We are enclosing a copy of the Union's statements of withdrawal for your information.

It will be in order for you to note in the minutes of your next Division Joint Grievance Committee meeting that these cases are considered closed.

L. V. BROWN, Chairman
Review Committee

LVB:RS
Encl.

cc: VJThompson
ESSibley
Clyager
GIWorks
LIMitchell

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO

1913 Grove Street

Oakland 12, California

LOCAL UNION 1245

May 13, 1964

Mr. L. V. Brown, Chairman
Review Committee
Pacific Gas & Electric Company
245 Market Street
San Francisco 6, California

Dear Mr. Brown:

The following Review Committee cases are being withdrawn by the Union for the reasons noted on the enclosed statements:

R.C.#438	- Coast Valleys Division Grievance #18-222
R.C.#443	- Coast Valleys Division Grievances #18-224 & #18-225
R.C.#485	- Coast Valleys Division Grievance #18-63-5
R.C.#486	- San Francisco Division Grievance #2-63-9
R.C.#520	- San Francisco Division Grievance #2-63-15 (L.I.C.#)
R.C.#488	- San Francisco Division Grievance #2-63-15 (G/C #)
R.C.#490	- North Bay Division Grievance #4-63-12
R.C.#344-64-37	- North Bay Division Grievance #4-64-2
R.C.#500	- San Francisco Division Grievance #2-63-13
R.C.#514	- Stockton Division Grievance #16-63-3
R.C.#515	- Stockton Division Grievance #16-63-9
R.C.#535-64-28	- Sacramento Division Grievance #6-63-3

Very truly yours,

L. L. Mitchell

L. L. Mitchell, Secretary
Review Committee

LLM:do
Encls.
cc: CWF/leandag
CWF/leids

oain-20
af1-cio
5186440

Review Committee File No. 514
Stockton Division Grievance No. 16-63-8

Review Committee File No. 515
Stockton Division Grievance No. 16-63-9

Union is withdrawing R. C. #514 and R. C. #515 from the file and will consider these cases closed. It is our feeling that as a matter of contractual right, there is no basis for the adjustment which is sought. We believe that to charge sick leave to a period of absence from normal work time created by long hours of work, or interruptions in proper rest by reason of work assignments, would violate the principle of adequate rest which was sought when Section 208.11 was negotiated. It is recognized that Section 208.11 does not provide this principle in all cases of work assignments during normal hours of rest due to specific time requirements which, by stipulation in this Section, must be met before a paid rest period is provided during normal hours of work. These conditions were not met in these instances.

We do believe that if consideration were to be given to the equities of these cases, some compensation would be justified when the loss of time was as a result of fatigue created by conditions where normal rest was lost in providing a valuable service for the Company. It would seem simple justice would indicate the matter of payment should have been based on a review of the special circumstances and merits in these cases rather than denying payment merely because there is no contractual obligation. People have been given time off with pay in other situations for much less substantial or urgent reasons.

L. L. Mitchell, Secretary
Review Committee

May 18, 1964