365

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

(Supplemental)

Gene T. Ritter, Referee

PARTIES TO DISPUTE:

ROBERT N. SOBLE

Vs.

ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY

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

STATEMENT OF CLAIM:

- 1. This is to advise that I, Robert N. Soble and others intend to file a submission between the Illinois Central Railroad and the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes within thirty (30) days from the date this Notice is given.
- 2. The question involved is whether or not eleven (11) employes are protected under the provisions of the Employes Stabilization Agreement of February 7, 1965, etc.

OPINION OF BOARD: In January of 1963, Soo Line passenger trains which carried United States Mail discontinued service into and out of Grand Central Station and moved to the Central Station of the Illinois Central Railroad in Chicago. The transition involved a transfer of mail handling work. Claimant followed the work pursuant to an agreement between the B&O Chicago Terminal Railroad, Illinois Central Railroad and the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes.

On January 16, 1965, Soo Line passenger trains were discontinued at Central Station. The Mail Handlers' work was transferred to another Carrier, and Claimant and other Employes involved could not follow the work.

Section 8 of the January 11, 1963 Agreement was for the purpose of defining pass privileges and setting qualifications for future vacations. That rule lends absolutely no support to this Claim.

This claim was filed on the basis of alleged protection under terms of the February 7, 1965 Job Stabilization Agreement. Article 7, Section 1 thereof, provides the appropriate machinery for the resolution of any disputes involving the interpretation or application of that Agreement.

This Board finds that such procedures established and accepted by the parties themselves for resolving disputes under the Job Stabilization Agreement should be respected. [Award 14471, Ives.]

FINDINGS: The Third Division of the Adjustment Board, upon the whole record and all the evidence, finds and holds:

That the parties waived oral hearing;

That the Carrier and the Employes involved in this dispute are respectively Carrier and Employes 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 Agreement was not violated.

AWARD

Claim denied.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD By Order of THIRD DIVISION

ATTEST: S. H. Schulty Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 30th day of November 1966.

14979