

involved in the course, and I venture to say that there is no other method of conducting the test which would be as effective and as innocuous.

Take another example, the rules require that when a train is carrying signals for a following section, it will, by a certain number of whistle blasts, call attention of trains met or passed to those signals. A certain reply is to be returned, and in the absence of that reply it is the duty of the first-mentioned train to stop and make enquiry. It sometimes has happened that a train, say, in a ballast pit spur, has failed to hear the blast or to observe the signals, and has run in the face of following signals, the first section took no notice of the failure to respond, and proceeded, instead of following the rule. Now, the only reasonable way I can think of for testing the observance of that rule, is for an officer with a train in a siding or spur to instruct the engineer not to respond to the whistle blasts, and see if the train bearing signals will proceed without enquiry.

Just one more case: The rules provide that when a train stops under certain conditions, a flagman is to be sent out, and when it is ready to proceed he is to be recalled by a specified number of whistle blasts, varying in number according to the direction in which he had proceeded. There is only one way in which to satisfactorily test the attention paid by the flagman to these whistles. That is, to have an officer when the train is ready to proceed to instruct the engineer to give the whistle blasts for the return of flagman in the direction contrary to the one in which the man actually is, and to see if he would wrongly accept it as authority to return.

I have given you three instances of most important rules in connection with which a test, in my opinion, could not be properly and promptly made without the intervention of other employees. Considering the stake at issue in connection with the observance of these particular rules, it is hard to understand how any employee could look with anything but sympathy on a proceeding designed to contribute to that observance.

I need scarcely say to you, I think, that there is no ulterior purpose behind the system. The fact that men who fail to meet the test have, except in aggravated cases, been merely warned, should be an indication of this. Our great purpose is to place the strongest possible protection about the lives of passengers and employees. We all know that familiarity and habit will play pranks with the memory and intellect of the best of men. The handling of train orders becomes, after a time, almost a mechanical process. Then the danger starts. Surely none will say that a system which tends to keep the man alert, vigilant and on the guard is not a blessing to any one!

It is not the intention that any test shall be made which involves violations of the rules; it is not proposed to make any which in the remotest degree involves danger to the employees; it is not our wish to invite the men to assist in the testing where it can be done without that; but I am so thoroughly convinced of the value of these tests that I could not consider any proposal to discontinue them, or to so hedge them about with restrictions that they would be useless.

Yours truly,

(Signed) GEORGE BURY.

Moved by Bros. Wark and Cobb, that the letter be considered clause by clause. Carried.

The contents of the letter were given careful consideration

Moved by Bros. Wark and Robertson, that the General Manager be advised that his reply to our request, in regard to the efficiency test, being so indefinite, is not satisfactory, and that we respectfully advise him that the matter will be referred to Sir William Whyte, Vice-President, in appeal. Carried.

The following letter was also received and read before the Committee:—