ITEM 19

This refers to your letter of June 16, 1967 requesting an interpretation of Rules l9(a)(1) and 91 of the road schedule, which was discussed with you in conference on December 19, 1967.

On June 8, 1967 you wrote General Chairman Sippel the following letter:

"I would appreciate your position on the following questions:

"1. Under Schedule Rule 19(1), does this rule mean that an extra passenger conductor whose regular freight turn departs prior to reporting time for the vacancy can be held in for the passenger service vacancy when there are other extra passenger conductors that can be made available for the vacancy?

"2. Under Schedule Rule 91: On the Eastern District what methods are being used to determine how many extra passenger con­ductors are to be promoted (ordered to prepare themselves for passenger service)?"

On June 14, 1967 General Chairman Sippel replied to you as follows:

"This has reference to your letter dated June 8, 1967 in regards to two questions.

 "The answer to Question No. 1 is NO.

"The answer to question No. 2. When the Company and the Local Chairman ORC&B of the passenger district decides they need more passenger conductors for that district the Company notifies the number of men decided on."

The substance of your request, to me, is whether or not the company agrees with General Chairman Sippel's interpretation.

We agree with Mr. Sippel's interpretation in regard to Item No. 1. As for Item No. 2, we also agree with Mr. Sippel's interpretation. However, we do not concede that this first must be handled with the Local Chairman of the ORC&B.

Yours truly,

Is/ J. H. Kenny
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