

Kindly advise bearer of this letter when the Committee may expect to receive your reply.

Yours respectfully,

Signed on behalf of the Committee:

W. G. CHESTER, Chairman.
GEO. K. WARK, Secretary.

Moved by Bros. Cobb and Cooke, that the letter be adopted and forwarded to the General Manager. Carried.

Bros. Chester and Cooke retired to deliver the letter, as by the above action.

Meeting adjourned at 12.20.

AFTERNOON SESSION, SATURDAY, AUGUST 5TH, 1911.

Meeting called to order at 14k. All members present.

The following letter was received from the General Manager:
Winnipeg, August 5th, 1911.

W. G. Chester, Empire Hotel, Winnipeg, Man.

Dear Sir,—I have this morning received letter dated August 4th, signed by you in behalf of the Committee consisting of Messrs. Cobb, Wark, Robertson, Cooke, and yourself. In that letter you state that exception is taken by many employees in, or connected with, train service to participation in efficiency testing, or to the making of tests which, in their opinion, involved a violation of or a departure from the Company's rules.

Efficiency tests have from time to time been conducted on different portions of the Canadian Pacific System during the past twenty years, and have been systematically and generally made over Western lines during the past three years. In deciding on the adoption of the system of testing on an extensive scale, we were influenced not only by our own experience, but also by that of several of the best managed railway systems of the United States, including the Pennsylvania and the Union Southern Pacific. The director of operations of the Harriman System has given public expression to the great satisfaction he feels with the results obtained on their line.

As I shall take occasion to explain at more length later in this letter, the objects of the tests is not to entrap the men, with a view to disciplining or humiliating them, as some of them seem to imagine, but to guard against any carelessness, inertia or numbness in the handling of trains.

For very obvious reasons, it is not the policy to invite the assistance of other employees in making the tests, when they can possibly be conducted independent of that assistance.

At the same time, I put it to you as a Committee of practical men, it is not a fact that tests as to the observance of certain very important rules cannot possibly be made without at least the passive participation of other employees.

For example, a few weeks ago we had a most unfortunate accident on the line, when an engineer was killed and a brakeman maimed for life, caused by a train running by a station at which they were to meet an opposing train. At the investigation the conductor stated that he had given the engineer no signal to proceed either at the station at which they were to meet the other train, or the one immediately preceding it, the rule being that on a freight train the engineer is not to run by a station in the absence of a proceed signal from the rear end.

We have for some time been checking up the observance of this rule, the importance of which I need not dilate on. The natural way in which to ascertain if it is being observed is for an officer to direct the conductor to omit the signal when passing a station or siding, in which case it would be the duty of the engineer to stop. No danger is