

There is another matter which I have to bring before you in reference to Mr. Hacket's paper given on "Railroad Signaling," some time ago. We have been in communication with Mr. Hacket, and his reply is a little too lengthy for me to take up to-night, but it will appear in this month's Journal.

MONTREAL, March 16, 1911.

MR. C. L. WORTH, SEC.-TREAS.

THE CENTRAL RAILWAY AND ENGINEERING CLUB
OF CANADA,

Room 409 Union Station, Toronto, Ont.

DEAR SIR,—

Replying to yours of Feb. 16th, which I find on my return from abroad, and relating to a statement in the "*Canadian Engineer*" to the effect that the Whyte crossing signal obtained the energy for operating the bell and light, which they use, from different sources, would say that this must be an entirely new departure in this signal, as at the time my article was written one battery or source of energy was used, and the failure of this would give both a negative audible and visual indication.

I should be greatly interested to hear what new development the Whyte Railway Signal Co. have made, as apart from the objectional feature I mentioned and which is common to almost all crossing bells, their signal possessed considerable merit.

There seems also to be a misunderstanding as to what I intended to convey in my paper which was not so much that the failure of the bell would mean the failure of the light or *vice versa*, but that the failure of the energy would effect both as they relied on the effectiveness of this to give their danger signal and which is entirely against the fundamental principles of railway signalling.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) C. L. HACKET.

The Secretary is all right for papers up to the end of September. If there are any of the members who would care to get up a paper for October, November or December, I shall be very pleased if they will drop a card to the Secretary, advising him to that effect.

I also wish to state that some members of the Executive and Reception Committees are not attending to their business as they