

Moved by Bros. Cobb and Cooke, that the letter as read be approved by the Committee and forwarded to Mr. Hall, Assistant General Manager. Carried.

Moved by Bros. Murdock and Cobb, that the Committee meet at the Bath Hotel, Montreal, at 10 o'clock on Thursday, November 9th, 1911. Carried.

The minutes were then read for correction and adoption.

Moved by Bros. Murdock and Berry, that the minutes be adopted as read. Carried.

Meeting adjourned at 18.15.

BATH HOTEL, MONTREAL, NOVEMBER 9TH, 1911.

Meeting called to order at 10 a.m. Present were: Brothers Ash, Kennedy and R. H. Cobb for the B. of L. E., S. N. Berry, W. G. Chester and C. Harrison for the O. R. C., Jas. Murdock, A. McGovern, C. Bourne and S. W. McDonadd for the B. of R. T., E. A. Ball and Geo. K. Wark for the B. of L. E. and E., Brother Wark representing Brother G. D. Robertson of the O. R. T.; Brother E. H. Cooke, Chairman B. of R. T., being absent because of sickness in his family.

The case of Conductor R. Faught was introduced, and correspondence read which had passed on the question.

Moved by Bros. Murdock and Ball, that the correspondence read in connection with the Faught case be inserted in the minutes. Carried.

Following is the correspondence referred to.

Montreal, June 14th, 1911

D. McNicol, Esq.,

Vice-President, C.P.R.,

Montreal, P. Q.

Dear Sir,—We desire to appeal to you against the decision of Mr. Murphy, General Superintendent of Transportation, in the case of Conductor R. Faught, of Chapleau, who was dismissed for alleged insubordination.

The facts of the case are as follows: On April 7th, Faught was in charge of 3rd 120, leaving Chapleau at 3.45 p.m.

Mr. W. B. Way, Assistant Superintendent, was on the train, and when passing Empire Pit he asked Faught to let him give the proceed signal to the engineer for Paulin. The conductor agreed to this, but when the engineer whistled for Paulin, Mr. Way made no attempt to give the signal, the conductor called Mr. Way's attention to this, and Mr. Way said, "We'll let him go and see if he will stop." The conductor then gave proceed signal to the engineer. Later, Mr. Way reprimanded the conductor for not "doing as he was told," and the reason given by the conductor was that the rule required that the signal be given at this point, and thought it was his duty to give the signal, and also intimated to Mr. Way that he did not consider that one employee should be used by an official to lead a fellow-employee into a trap, without his consent. For the reasons given above, Faught considers that he has been unfairly dealt with, and we are fully in accord with his view, as we do not believe an employee should be forced to be a party to those efficiency tests against his will. Under these circumstances, we believe we are justified in asking for Faught's reinstatement and pay for time lost.

We would be glad to have your views on this matter as early as possible. Kindly send your reply to the undersigned at the Bath Hotel, Montreal.

Yours truly,

(Signed) W. G. CHESTER, General Chairman, O.R.C.

(Signed) A. McGOVERN, General Chairman, B. of R. T.