December 14, 1914.

In re investigation of accident which occurred on the Missouri, Kansas & Texas
Railway of Texas near
Fargent, Texas, on
Movember 10, 1914.

On November 10, 1914, there was a head-end collision on the Missouri, Kensas & Texas Reilway of Texas near Sergent, Texas, which resulted in the injury of 5 employees. After investigation of this accident, the Chief of the Division of Safety reports as follows:

On the day of the accident southbound freight train No. 83, a second-class train, was running in two sections, entrouts from Dallas, Texas, to Bellmead, Texas. The first section consisted of 30 loaded cars, 2 empty cars and a caboose, hauled by lonomotive No. 653, and was in charge of Conductor Thrake and Enginemen Reynolas. It left Dallas at 9.05 p.m., 5 minutes late, and at about 9.22 p.m. collided with second No. 94 at a point about 400 feet south of the north passing track switch at Cargent, which is 3.8 miles ocuth of Dallas.

Was also running in two meetions, the second section being involved in this accident. It assumed up of 10 loaded cars, 12 empty cars and a cabcose, houled by locomotive No. 534, and was in charge of Conductor to ding and Enginemen Swinford. This train left Honey Springs, exas, 1.9 miles south of Sargent, at about 9.16 p.m., colliding ith first No. 94 as above stated. The speed of each train at the time was about 20 miles per hour.

The locomotive of second No. 94 was badly damaged and the first car of the train was destroyed, while the next two cars were slightly damaged. The locomotive of first No. 83 was slightly damaged, the first car badly damaged and the next four cars destroyed, while the sixteenth car in the train broke in two. ... 1th the exception of the tender of the locomotive of second No. 94, neither locomotive was derailed.

This part of the Missouri, Kanses & Texas Bailway of Texas is a single-track line. No block signed system is in uce, trains being operated by train orders and time-card rights. This accident occurred on practically level track, on a curve of 2 degrees leading to the right for northbound trains. There were trees on the inside of this curve which prevented the engine craws from seeing each other until about 1700 feet spart. The weather at the time was cloudy.

Enginemen Twinford stated that at maxehachic, 27.3 miles south of Cargont, train orders were given to him by Broke-wan Ttoner who did not read them to him. Among the orders was train order No. 76, reading as follows: "Geoond No. 94, Lagine 534, hes right over second End 83 to Dailas." He then read them sloud himself and said they had rights over train No. 83 to Dailas, to which Brokeman Stoner replied in the affirmative. After picking up a car at Honoy Springs he whistled off brokes and received a proceed signal from the caboose. Approaching Cargont, he sounded the whistle signal required by the rules when passing a side track and again received a proceed signal from the caboose. He then looked ahead and sew a headlight ---approaching. He did not realize that it was an engine until he

of the crew who were on the engine to get off, at the same time applying the emergency air brokes and sounding the whistle, after which he jumped. Engineman Swinford further stated that when reading over the order he must have overlooked the word "second" and therefore had been under the impression that his train had rights over train No. 85 to Dallas, when as a matter of fact it had rights only over train second No. 65.

Conductor Dowling stated that on arrival at axahachie at 6.10 p.m. he received an order giving his train rights over train second No. 85 to Dallas. He then inquired of the operator as to train first No. 83 and was told that it would be on time. After attending to the unloading of some freight, he sent the orders to the engineman by Brokeman Stoner, telling him that they ought to be able to reach Honey orings for train first No. 32. After stopping at Lancaster, 11.9 miles south of Margent, he again mentioned the matter to press on Stoner and told him that after picking up the car at loney "prings they would wait at that point for train first No. 35. hen the stop was made at Heney Springs he was busy making out his reports. The car was picked up and the train was 10 or 15 our lengths beyond the north switch before he realized where he was. He then asked the brakeman if the enginemen had received enything on train First No. 83 and when the latter replied in the negative, he told him to signal the enginemen to stop. The dar immediately sheed of the cubcose had a broken angle cook on the rear end, and Conductor Dowling therefore started to climb over this car to the car shead in

order to apply the air brakes. He then saw the headlight of first No. 83 and was afraid to climb over the car, returning to the caboose and giving stop signals from there. He further stated that he always kept his orders where the rear brakeman could read them whenever he wanted to. Conductor Dowling also said that he always gave a proceed signal whenever the engineman whistled for it when approaching a passing track.

Brakeman Stoner stated that he did not know what orders were received at waxahachie, that no one read them to him, that he did not see them and that he did not carry them forward to Engineman Swinford, Leaving waxahachie he was riding on the engine and heard the engineman and fireman discussing the orders. The engineman said that they had rights over train No. 93 to Dallas. Brakeman Stoner further stated that he did not know whether the engineman whistled off brakes leaving Boney Springs and did not look back to see if a proceed signal had been received from the caboose; neither did he know whether or not the engineman whistled on approaching the passing track at Sargent.

Rear Brakeman Cault of Second No. 94 stated that he did not read the orders as the conductor did not hake it a practice to let him see them. Then asked by the conductor whether or not the engineman received any orders at Honey Springs relating to train first No. 83, the brakeman said that he did not think he did and at once begen to give stop signals from the cupols of the cabcose. No response to these stop signals was received from the engine crew. Rear Brakeman Gault further stated that he did not think the engineman whistled for the passing track at Sergent, also that he himself would not give a

proceed signal in response to such whistle signal unless instructed by the conductor. Head Brakeman Smiers said that he saw Conductor Dowling give the train orders to Engineman Swinford at Maxahachie. He did not read the orders himself and when he asked about them he was told that they had rights over train No. 83 to Dalles.

Firemen 'pears stated that Brakeman Stoner gave the orders to the engineers, who read them and put them into his pocket. After leaving manahachie he asked the engineers where they were going for train No. 83 and the engineers said that they had rights over that train to Dallas.

cupying the main track on the time of train first No. 83, which was a superior train, for which Jonductor Dowling and Engineman Cwinford are responsible. This there is a dispute as to whether Conductor Dowling gave the orders to the engineman in person or whether he delemented this duty to Brakeman Ttoner, the fact remains that Engineman Suinford and Conductor Dowling were each in possession of colles of train order No. 76, which gave train second No. 94 rights to Dallas only over train second No. 33. This order in no pay relieved the crew of train second No. 94 of the duty of keeping, clear of train first No. 83.

The testimony of the suployees involved indicates that they failed absolutely to carry out the requirements of the rules governing the handlin, of train orders. Rule No. 210 reads in part:

"The copy for such engineman must be delivered to him personally by the conductor."

while rule No. 210-A reads in part as follows:

(

"Enginemen must read their orders aloud to conductors and understand them before acting upon them. Conductors must read their orders to rear brakemen and enginemen to their firemen, and when practicable, to the head brakemen."

while there is a question as to whether or not the conductor obsyed rule No. 210, the statements of these employees clearly indicates that rule No. 210-4 was not obeyed by any member of the crew.

The statements of the conductor and rear brakeman also indicated a general laxity in the observanceoff rule No. 84-4, reading as follows:

"Enginemen of freight trains must get a "proceed" signal from the rear end of train before passing any station or side-track that is designated on timetable. Brakeman must not give (Proceed' signal without instructions from conductor."

From the statements of all the employees it is impossible to say definitely whether or not this rule was complied with in this case, neither does it definitely appear whether or not a 'proceed' signal was given to the engineers when leaving Honey Oprings.

ingineman "winford had been an engineman since 1903, and had been suspended once for sixty days for responsibility in connection with a head-end collision. Conductor Dowling had been a concuctor since 1901. He was discharged in 1905 for responsibility with two trains meeting on the mish line, and was reinstated in connection/to former rights in 1904. Neither of these employees had been on duty in violation of any of the provisions of the Hours of Pervice Law.