

(1) Number of pages 1004(2) Date of repair 2 5 11

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 427	Press ~~Mis.~~
263-64	
Dated 10. 2. 1871.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
10th February 1871.*

No. 263. Read the following letter from the Acting Consulting Engineer for Railways, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 27th January 1871, No. 45 —

I HAVE the honour to submit a letter from the Postmaster General, with enclosures, asking for the orders of the Government on the question whether it should not be the duty of the Guard in charge of a Railway train to ascertain that the mail compartment is ready to start before the train moves.

2. The Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway supports the opinion of the Traffic Manager that such duty does not at all belong to the Guard of the train, and deprecates any change in a system which has worked well for a number of years. In answer to further enquiry as to the precise meaning of the expression, that the onus of making known the need of extra time rests with the Mail Guard, the Traffic Manager states that he considers that, on any occasion when the Mail Guard has not done his work of receiving and delivering packets at the moment when the train should start, it is incumbent on him to make known to the Train Guard that he requires a little more time.

3 I do not find any orders that bear upon this question, and none are given in the rules of the Government of India G O, No. 2,461, dated 4th August 1866. of the 6th July 1866. The Mail Guard is held entirely responsible for the mails in his charge; but the Guard of the train has the control of the train when in motion, and is responsible for the safety and regularity of the whole; the Train Guard sees that every passenger carriage has its door shut, and is ready to start, before he gives the signal for the train to move, and I certainly think he should be required also to ascertain that the mail carriage is ready.

4 The Traffic Manager represents that if the Train Guard has to perform this duty, he will be adding to his own responsibility in ascertaining whether the Mail Guard has performed his work or not. But the Mail Guard is held responsible in the Postal Department for the performance of his duties; he would be severely punished for causing unnecessary delay, and would be answerable to the Train Guard, not as to the manner in which he has done his duty, but only so far as to say whether, at that instant, his carriage was ready to go on or not.

5 The point to be determined is simply, whether the Mail Guard shall signify to the Train Guard that he is prepared to start, or whether the Train Guard must ask the Mail Guard.

6. It is, I believe, impossible that the former course should be followed; if from any cause the mail compartment is not all right at the time when the starting bell would ring, the Mail Guard cannot leave his packets, for the safety of which he is so heavily responsible; and if the Train Guard should be at a distance on a crowded platform, the Mail Guard will be perfectly helpless as to communicating that he requires more time.

7. On the other hand, the Train Guard is obliged to see that the whole of the train is in order before starting, including the remainder of the carriage which

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department
10th February 1871.

contains the mail compartment; and I do not think the slight additional duty imposed on the Guard of the train is of any consequence, or will add appreciably to his legitimate responsibility.

From the Postmaster General, Madras, to the Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 17th January 1871, No 5,442-2,992

I HAVE the honour to request that you will be good enough to submit the following question for the consideration and orders of Government

2 On the 29th of October last, the train was put in motion to leave the Cuddapah Station before the runner who brought the mails had finished his duty of delivering and receiving packets. The runner consequently jumped out of the mail compartment while the train was in motion, and part of the mail which should have been despatched was kept back

3. I wrote to the Agent and Manager, forwarding a copy of the Inspecting Postmaster's report of the occurrence for such notice as he might think necessary

4. Mr Elwin, in reply, sent me a copy of a letter from the Traffic Manager, who characterizes the complaint as "frivolous and unfounded," and shows that the Post Office servants had ample time to complete all they had to do before the train moved off

5 I annex a copy of the correspondence which followed, the result of which is that the Agent and Manager refuses to admit that it is the duty of the Train Guard to see that the mail compartment is "all right" before he starts the train. He also thinks that it would be unwise to disturb a system which has worked for 14½ years without giving rise to complaints

6. It appears to me, on the contrary, unwise to defer a reform until some serious accident proves its necessity. And I submit that if it is not now the duty, it ought to be made the duty of the Train Guard to ascertain that the mail compartment (as well as all others) is ready to start before he moves off.

7 It is scarcely necessary for me to say that I have no wish to relieve the servants of the Post Office from any responsibility. If they should ever delay the train unnecessarily, they would be severely punished. But I think it highly inexpedient that this should in any way affect the duty of the Train Guard or his responsibility for the safety of all travelling under his charge.

From the Postmaster General, to the Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, dated Madras, 5th January 1871, No. 5,032-2,992.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No 4,566, dated 10th ultimo, enclosing copy of letter from the Traffic Manager of the same date, No 533-768

2. From Mr Church's statement I have no doubt that it was the fault of one or other of the servants of the Postal Department that their duties were not performed in time on the occasion in question. Of this due notice will be taken

3. At the same time I cannot admit that the complaint was either frivolous or unfounded as Mr Church describes it. It is clear that the Guard of the train did not ascertain that the mail compartment was "all right" before he put the train in motion.

4. This, I think, ought invariably to be done, and as it is a point of some importance, upon which there ought to be a clear understanding, I beg the favour of your informing me whether you agree with me.

From the Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, to the Postmaster General, Madras, dated Madras, 10th January 1871, No. 125

WITH reference to your letter of the 5th instant, No 5,032-2,992, I have the honour to solicit your attention to the enclosed copy of a communication from the Traffic Manager, in whose conclusions I entirely concur

2 We have, as stated by Mr Church, been working with your department for 14½ years, and as this is the first complaint of the kind brought to notice, I hope you will agree with me in think-

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department
10th February 1871.

ing that it would be very unwise to disturb a system which has hitherto been attended with such good results

From the Traffic Manager, to the Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, dated Madras, 9th January 1871, No. C/6-9

Complaint of Postmaster General

WITH reference to the Postmaster General's letter, No. 5,032-2,992, of the 5th instant, I may venture to state most positively that the Guard of the train did not ascertain that the mail compartment was "all right" before the train was put in motion, nor can I admit that it is any part of his duty

2 I have always understood that the time allowed in the Company's Time-tables has been sufficient for the purposes of the Postal Department, and that in all cases where extra time is required the onus of making this known rests with the Mail Guard.

3 To require the Guard of the train to ascertain whether all was right would not only lead to delay, but would also relieve the Mail Guard from a proper share of his responsibilities in the performance of his own legitimate duties, and give him an opportunity of excusing himself for any omission of those duties.

4 The Train Guard has already enough of responsibility, and I am of opinion that the public service will be much better performed by making every servant sensible of his own responsibilities

5 It may be as well to add that we have now been working for 14½ years, that it has never been the practice to ascertain whether the Mail Guard has performed his work or not, and this is the first complaint of the kind brought to my notice

From the Postmaster General, to the Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, dated Madras, 17th January 1871, No 5,443-2,992.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No 125, dated 10th instant, from which I learn that you do not consider it the duty of the Train Guard to see that the mail compartment is all right before he starts the train

2 I regret that I cannot agree with you, and as I think the question one of serious importance, I purpose submitting it for the opinion and orders of Government

From the Acting Consulting Engineer for Railways, to the Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, dated Madras, 23rd January 1871, No 43.

THE Postmaster General has referred, for the orders of the Government, the question raised by him, in his letter to you, No 5,443, of the 17th instant, and previous correspondence. But before submitting the papers, I have the honour to request you will be so good as to explain to me the precise meaning of paragraph 2 of your Traffic Manager's letter to you, No 6-9, of the 9th instant, "that in all cases where extra time is required the onus of making this known rests with the Guard"

2 Does Mr Church mean that the Mail Guard should represent that the time of stopping at any particular station is not sufficient, or does he mean that in any special instance, when the mail packets are not delivered, the Mail Guard should make known to the Train Guard that he requires a minute or two more time before the train is started?

3. I presume the latter is the case, but there appears to me to be a practical difficulty, that the Mail Guard will often be busy with his packets just about the moment when the train should start, and he cannot possibly communicate with the Train Guard, so that I do not see how it can be known to the Train Guard that the mail compartment is all right unless the Train Guard ascertains himself

4. The question might be of great seriousness, for the runner who jumped out of the carriage at Cuddapah on the 29th October might have fallen between the carriage and platform and been killed, and responsibility to prevent such a casualty ought to be clearly fixed.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
10th February 1871.*

From the Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, to the Acting Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 26th January 1871, No 62

In reference to your letter, No 43, dated the 23rd instant, I have the honour to enclose you a copy of the Traffic Manager's letter No. 6-39, of the 25th instant, in which he explains his precise meaning in stating "that in all cases where extra time is required the onus of making this known rests with the Guard"

From the Traffic Manager, to the Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, dated Madras, 25th January 1871, No 6-39

Complaint from Postmaster General

CONSULTING Engineer's letter No 43, dated 23rd instant.

The Consulting Engineer has clearly defined my meaning in saying "that in any special instance, when the mail packets are not delivered, the Mail Guard should make known to the Train Guard that he requires a minute or two more time before the train is started"

2. With reference to the last paragraph of the Consulting Engineer's letter, I would again observe that we have now been at work for more than 14½ years, and I believe I am correct in saying that no inconvenience, except in the case now brought to notice, has ever been experienced by the Post Office, and I will only now add that if the Post Office servants at Cuddapah, on the particular occasion referred to, had been attending to their business instead of gossiping in the van over the accident at the Cheyaur river, there would not have been any necessity for the runner to jump out of the carriage, though of this fact I was not aware at the time, and I was standing on the Cuddaph platform, or I should most unquestionably have given the runner into custody for violating the Company's bye-laws

No. 264. ORDER THEREON, 10th February 1871, No. 427.

RAILWAY, No. 34.

WITH this letter the Acting Consulting Engineer for Railways, submits copies of correspondence with the Post-

master General, in which that officer brings to notice that, in consequence of the train having been started from the Cuddapah station on the 29th October last before the mail packets had been delivered by the postal servants, a runner of that department, who was engaged in the mail van, had to jump out of the train after it was put in motion. Colonel Pears now requests that the matter be laid before Government with a view to it being decided whether the Railway officials in immediate charge of the train should not be required to ascertain before starting that the mail compartment is ready.

2. The Company's officers assert that the Mail Guard should, when he finds the time allowed for stopping at stations insufficient for the performance of his work, communicate with the Guard of the train, but His Excellency the Governor in Council agrees with Captain Prendergast that in most cases it will be found impracticable to adopt this course. His Excellency in Council is therefore of opinion that the Train Guard should be required to satisfy himself before giving the signal to start the train that the postal carriage is ready, and as this precaution forms part of his duty as respects all the other conveyances in the train, the Government cannot think that it will add materially to his responsibilities. At the same time it should be distinctly understood that the Post Office will be held respon-

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
10th February 1871.*

sible for any delay to a train that may be caused by the negligence or wilful dilatoriness of the Mail Guard.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R. E.,

Secretary to Government.

To the Acting Consulting Engineer for Railways.
" Public Department.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

GPO

16 Jan 71

71 74

My dear President.

There are some circumstances bearing on the subject of the accompanying letter which I could not explain in it without extending it to an inconvenient length, but which I think is very necessary you should know.

The Mail-guards who travel in charge of mails on the Railway have usually from 100 to 200 bags & packets in their charge: depositing some and taking in others at the various stations as they pass -

It is of course absolutely necessary that they should keep some record of the bags & packets which they

lessee and deliver - But in order that trains might not be delayed I have ordered these Registers to be kept in the simplest possible printed form. Thus

	Received			Delivered			Signature of S.O. in receipt
	By	Pass	Stamp	By	Pass	Stamp	
Tollanpette	10	15	2				
Enpatam	2	4	1	3	2		
Salma				9	17	3	
	12	19	3	12	19	3	

Now Elvins says that the system has worked 14 years without complaint. There may have been no complaints because I never make a complaint against the Railway if I can possibly avoid it - But it has not worked without inconvenience.

Two or three months ago a mail guard was tried before the

9th
Sipping Court at Salma for losing a packet and on the evidence of these Registers was convicted & sentenced to 7 years penal servitude!

He urged in his defence and brought three other guards to support his plea - that the Registers were not trustworthy - that the guards had no time to fill them up at the stations & that they were in the habit of filling them in and balancing them afterwards as well as they could.

And I myself have more than once when travelling by a train that was behind time seen the guard start the train (when he himself had nothing to deliver or take in) absolutely without giving the S.O. people any time at all (and according to Elvins view he

was right - I leave, as I
have said, been very unwilling to
make any complaint & have con-
tented myself with issuing orders to
the Mail guards to do their duty as
quickly as possible. But now that
the Agent & Manager distinctly declares
that the train guard has no responsibility
in the matter - that a Postmaster or
P.O. Person is liable to be carried on
the train station or jump out at
the risk of his neck - I feel that I
must protest. If the Govt
appears & confirms Glavin's view
well & good - we must do our best.
I shall then have to ask the Director
General whether our Mail guards are
to be liable to years of personal dereliction
if they lose a package which (under
the system) it is impossible to prove
they ever received. Yours sincerely
Glavin

GPO 2
21 Jan 7/11

My dear Pendry
Kindly let me know

whether you have forwarded my
letter to Govt. & if so whether you
have sent over the note which
accompanied it.

The question as to the train
guards responsibility that the
Mail is "all right" before starting
the train is closely connected
with another question viz. the
time the allowed at stations for
the Post to be received & receive and
deliver mails - and it will be
much better that the whole

Subject should be considered
and decided at the same time.

Because if this is not done
if the first question only is
decided, it is most probable
that I shall have to trouble the
Gov. again with the second.

The Order of the Govt. of India
P. W. Dep^t. Railways: 6 July 1866
lays down the law clearly enough
upon most doubtful questions
of this kind - but says nothing
about the time to be allowed at
stations: probably it was taken
for granted that sufficient time
would always be allowed.

But I have no hesitation in
saying that this cannot be

13 ✓
assured with safety -

There are as it seems to me
only two ways of ensuring it.
First by insisting that trains shall
stop a certain fixed time (at least)
at each station - or secondly
by making the train guard see
that the mail compartment is
all right before he starts -

The latter would be best for
both parties -

It may be well that I should
speak to Gov. - or perhaps it
may be sufficient if you forward
this to him.

Yrs sincerely
R. P.
enclosed accompanying
with mail letter
H. P.

No. 5442
2992

50 15 2
Postmaster General's Office,
MADRAS, 17 Jan'y 1871

To

The Consulting Engineer
for Railways, Madras.

Sir,

Have the honor to request that
you will be good enough to submit the
following question for the consideration
and orders of Government.

On the 29th of October last,
the Train was put in motion to leave
the Cuddalore station before the runner
who brought the Mails had finished
his duty of delivering & receiving packets.
The runner consequently jumped out of
the Mail compartment while the Train
was in motion and part of the mail
which

which should have been despatched, was kept back.

I wrote to the Agent & Manager forwarding a copy of the Inspe Postmaster's report of the occurrence, for such notice as he might think necessary.

Mr Elsom in reply sent me a copy of a letter from the Traffic Manager who characterizes the complaint as "frivolous and unfounded" and shews that the Post Office Servants had ample time to complete all they had to do before the Train moved off.

I annex a copy of the correspondence which followed, the result of which is that the Agent & Manager refuses to admit that it is the duty of
the

the Train Guard to see that the Mail ^{17/5} Compartment is "all right" before he starts the Train. He also thinks that it would be unwise to disturb a system which has worked for 14 1/2 Years without giving rise to complaints.

It appears to me on the contrary unwise to defer a reform until some serious accident proves its necessity. And I submit that if it is not none the duty, it ought to be made the duty of the Train Guard to ascertain that the Mail Compartment (as well as all others) is ready to start before he moves off.

It is scarcely necessary for me to say that I have no wish to relieve the servants of the Post Office from any
responsibility

responsibility. If they should ever
delay the Train unnecessarily, they
would be severely punished. But I
think it highly expedient that this
should in any way affect the duty
of the Train Guard or his responsibility
for the safety of all travelling under
his charge.

I have the honor to

Sr,
Your most obedt. Servt

R. Evans
Postmaster General

Rec^d 21/18th Jan 1871
JAN 27/71

20/1/71

N^o 5132
2992.

Postmaster's Office
Madras 5 January 1871

To
The Agent & Manager
Madras Railway Compy
Madras.

Sr,
I have the honor to acknowledge
the receipt of your letter N^o 4586 of 10 ult.
enclosing copy of letter from the Traffic
Manager of the same date N^o 533
768.

From Mr Church's statement I have
no doubt that it was the fault of one or
other of the servants of the Postal Departt
that their duties were not performed in
time on the occasion in question. Of this
due notice will be taken.

At the same time I cannot admit
that the complaint was either frivolous
or unfounded as Mr Church describes it.
It is clear that the Guard of the Train
did

did not ascertain that the Mail compartment was "all right" before he put the Train in motion

This I think ought invariably to be done. And as it is a point of some importance upon which there ought to be a clear understanding, I beg the favor of your informing me whether you agree with me.

I have &c.
Sgt. A. C. Pears
P. M. Genl.

Madras By post
Sgt & Manager's office
Madras 10 Jan'y/71

No 125

From Robt. B. Elwin Esq.
Agent & Manager M.R.L.
To Col. A. C. Pears
Postus General Madras

Sir,
With reference to your letter of the 5 instant No 5032
2992, I have the honor to submit
your

your attention to the enclosed copy of communication from the Traffic Manager in whose conclusions I entirely concur.

We have as stated by Mr Church been working with your Deptt for 14 1/2 years and as this is the first complaint of the kind brought to notice, I hope you will agree with me in thinking that it would be very unwise to disturb a system which has hitherto been attended with such good results.

I have &c.
Sgt Robt B. Elwin
Agent & Manager.

Madras By Traffic Manager's office
Madras 9 Jan'y/71

C/6
9

To
The Agent & Manager
M.R.L.

Dear Sir, Complaint of Postus Genl

With reference to the Postus Genl's letter No 5032
2992 of the 5 instant, I may
venture

venture to state most positively, that the
guard of the train did not ascertain that
the mail compartment was "all right" be-
fore the train was put in motion, nor
can I admit that it is any part of his
duty!

I have always understood that
the time allowed in the Compy's Time-table
has been sufficient for the purposes of the
Postal Department, and that in all
cases where extra time is required the
onus of making this known rests with
the Mail Guard.

To require the Guard of the
train to ascertain whether all was right
would not only lead to delay, but would
also relieve the Mail Guard from a proper
share of his responsibilities in the performance

of

of his own legitimate duties and give him
an opportunity of excusing himself for any
neglect of those duties.

The train guard has already enough
of responsibility, and I am of opinion that
the public service will be much better
performed by making every man responsible
of his own responsibilities.

It may be as well to add that
we have now been working for 14 1/2 years,
that it has never been the practice to
ascertain whether the Mail Guard has
performed his work or not, and this
is the first complaint of the kind brought
to my notice.

Yours faithfully
Edw. H. Church
Office Manager

(true copy)
Edw. Taylor
Chief Clerk

No 5443
2992

Postmaster General's Office
Madras 17/1/11

To The Agent & Manager
In R. Co., Madras

Have the honor to acknowledge
the receipt of your letter N: 125 dated
10th instant, from which I learn that you
do not consider it the duty of the Train
Inspector to see that the mail compart-
ment is all right before he starts the
Train.

I regret that I cannot agree
with you, and as I think the question
one of serious importance, I purpose
submitting it for the opinion and
orders of Govt.

I have &c
(5 one Copies)
By Lt Col
Postmaster General
R. Co.
Postmaster General

Madras Railway Department

Cochin: 17/1/11

No.

The Agent and Manager
Madras Railway Company
Madras

Sir,

The Postmaster General
has referred for the orders of the
Government, the question raised
by him, in his letter to you,
N: 5443 of the 17th instant, and
previous correspondence. But before
submitting the papers, I have
the honor to request you will
be so good as to explain to me,
the precise meaning of para 2 of
your Traffic Manager's letter
to you N: 6 of the 9th instant,
"that in all cases where extra time
is

17/1/11

is required the one of making
the known facts with the Guard.

2 Does Mr. Lechman mean
that the Mail guard should
represent that the time of stopping
at any particular station is not
sufficient, or does he mean that
in any special instance, when the
Mail packets are not delivered,
the Mail guard should make
known to the Train guard, that
he requires a minute or two more
time, before the Train is started?

3 I presume the latter is
the case; but there appears to
me to be a practical difficulty,
that the Mail guard will often
be busy with his packets just
about

27
about the moment when the Train
should start, and he cannot
possibly communicate with the
Train guard; so that I do not
see how it can be known to the
Train guard, that the Mail com-
partment is all right, unless the
Train guard ascertains himself.

4 The question might be
of great seriousness, for the
runner who jumped out of the
carriage at Gaddapa on the 29th
October, might have fallen
between the carriage and platform
and been killed; and responsibility
to prevent such a casualty
ought to be clearly fixed.

Madras
23rd January
1851

I have per-
signed / H. J. Pendergast Capt. R.
S. G. Bone: Asst. Surg. Major
True

Washington Capital: D.C.
 Reg: Cons: Eggs for Railways

Oct 4 27/71

Madras, 26 January 1871.

A. B. Clevin Esq
Agent and Manager of the M. & N. R.

Captain H. L. Prendergast N.B.
Acting Consulting Engineer for Railways

In reference to your letter
No 43 dated the 23rd instant, I
have the honour to enclose you a
Copy of the Major's Manager's letter
No ⁶ 39 of the 26th instant in which
he explains his precise meaning
in stating "that in all cases where
extra time is required the ans. of
making this known rests with the
Guard."

I have the honor to
 your most effectual
 Wm. J. Miller
 Agent & Manager.

Madras Railway
Traffic Manager's Office
Madras 25th Jan'y 1871

No 6
39.

The Agent and Manager, M. R.
Dear Sir,

Complaint from Postmaster General
Consulting Engineer's letter of 4th of 23rd instant

The Consulting Engineer has clearly defined my meaning in saying, "that in any special instance when the mail packets are not delivered, the mail Guard should make known to the Train Guard that he requires a minute or two more time before the Train is started."

With reference to the last para of the Consulting Engineer's letter I would again observe that we have now been at work for more than 14½ years, and I believe I am correct in saying that no inconvenience except in the case now brought to notice, has ever been experienced by the Post Office, and I will only now add that if the Post Office servants at Cuddalore, on the particular occasion referred to, had been attending to their business instead of gossiping in the Row over the accident at the Cheyzer River, there would not have been any necessity for the runner to jump out of the carriage, tho' of this fact I was not aware at the time and I was standing on the Cuddalore Platform, or I should most unquestionably have given the runner into custody for violating the Company's Bye Laws.

20923

MADRAS RAILWAY

From

The Agent and Manager,

To

The Consulting Engineer

for Railways.

Jan'y 4 23/71

Dated 26th January 1871
Recd 27th

No. 62.

Enclosing Copy of
letter from the Traffic
Manager in reference
to the complaint of the
Postmaster General,
that from one of the
agents the Mail Guard
has furnished the mail.

Lawrence's letter
with the original letter
17/1/71

Yours faithfully
H. B. Church
Traffic Manager

Green Copy

[Signature]
Agent & Manager

10/427/71

CONSULTING ENGINEER'S OFFICE

Railway Department

No 45-

From

Captain J. B. L. Prendergast R.E.,
Consulting Engineer for Railways,

To

Colonel C. A. Orr R.E.,
Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department,
Fort Saint George

SIR,

10/427/71
17/1/71

I have the honour to submit a letter from the Postmaster General, with enclosures, asking for the orders of the Government on the question whether it should not be the duty of the Guard in charge of a Railway train, to ascertain that the mail compartment is ready to start before the train moves.

2 The Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway, supports the opinion of the Traffic Manager, that such duty does not at all belong to the Guard of the train, and deprecates any change.

change in a system which has worked well for a number of years. In answer to further enquiry as to the precise meaning of the expression that the onus of making known the need of extra time rests with the mail guard, the Traffic Manager states that he considers, that on any occasion when the mail guard has not done his work of receiving and delivering packets at the moment when the train should start, it is incumbent on him to make known to the train guard that he requires a little more time.

3 I do not find any orders that bear upon this question, and none are given in the Rules of the Government of India of the 6th July 1866. The mail guard is held entirely responsible for the mails in his charge; but the guard of the train, has the control of the train when in motion, and is responsible for the safety and regularity of the whole, -
the

G.O. No. 2461
dated 4th Aug
1866.

35
the train guard sees that every passenger carriage has its door shut, and is ready to start, therefore he gives the signal for the train to move, and I certainly think he should be required also to ascertain that the mail carriage is ready
4. The Traffic Manager represents that if the train guard has to perform this duty, he will be adding to his own responsibility; in ascertaining whether the mail guard has performed his work, or not. But the mail guard is held responsible in ^{the} Postal Department, for the performance of his duties; he would be severely punished for causing unnecessary delay, and would be answerable to the train guard, not as to the manner in which he has done his duty, but only so far as to say whether, at that instant, his carriage was ready to go on, or not.

5 The point to be determined is simply

simply is, whether the mail guard shall signify to the train guard that he is prepared to start, or whether the train guard must ask the mail guard

It is, I believe, impossible, that the former course should be followed; if from any cause, the mail compartment is not all right, at the time when the starting bell would ring, the mail guard cannot leave his packets, for the safety of which he is so heavily responsible; and if the train guard should be at a distance on a crowded platform, the mail guard will be perfectly helpless as to communicating that he requires more time

On the other hand, the train guard is obliged to see that the whole of the train is in order, before starting, including the remainder of the carriage which contains the mail compartment; and I do not think
the

37 3
the slight additional duty imposed on the guard of the train, is of any consequence, or will add appreciably to his legitimate responsibility.

I have the honour to be
Sir

Your most obedient servant
Wm. Rendel Esq. Captain R.B.
Sg. Genl. Engrs. for Railways

Madras
27th January
1871

221
 No. 427 P. W. D. 1871
 Proceedings of the Madras Government

Read the following
 From
 The Acting Engineer
 for Railways (14. E. 2. 45) 27. Jan'y/71

With this letter the
 Acting Engineer for
 Railways submits copies
 of correspondence with the
 Post-Master General in
 which that officer brings
 to notice that in con-
 -sequence of the train
 having been started
 from the Cuddalore
 station on the 29. October
 last before the mail
 packets had been delivered
 by the postal servants
 a runner of that Department
 who

N.
 A.
 J.C.

that the mail consignment
 must be ready to start
 before the train moves.

1871, Dec 1st
 J. G. Gordon for Secretary

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.
 From
 The Consulting Engineer
 for Railways,
 No. 427

To
 The Secretary to Government,
 P. W. Department,
 Fort St. George

Dated 27. Jan'y 1871
 Received 30.5

No. 45.
 1871-1872
 Letter from the Post
 Master General, asking
 for the order of the
 the question whether it
 should not be the duty of
 the General in charge of a
 Railway, train, to ascertain

Ch 263

who was engaged in the
mailbag, had to jump
out of the Train after it
was put in motion.

Col. Pearo now requests
that the matter be laid
before Govt. with a view
to it being decided whether
the Railway officials in
immediate charge of the
Train should not be
required to ascertain
before starting that the
mail compartment is
ready.

The Company's officers
assert that the mail guard
should, when he finds the
time allowed for stopping
at stations insufficient
for the performance of
his work, communicate
with

41/41
with the Guard of the Train
but His Excellency the
Governor in Council
agrees with Captain
Prendergast that in
most cases it will be
found impracticable to
adopt this course. His
Excellency in Council
is therefore of opinion
that the Train guard
should be required to
satisfy himself before
giving the signal to start
the Train that the Postal
Carriage is ready, and
as this precaution forms
part of his duty as respects
all the other conveyances
in the Train, the Govt.
cannot think that
it

it will add materially
to his responsibilities. at
the same time it should
be distinctly understood
that the Post office will
be held responsible for
any delay to a Train
that may be caused
by the negligence or wil-
ful dilatoriness of the
Mail Guard.

W. E.

45-
3

To
19 The Com. Gen. for Railways
11. Public Dept.

Decr 13/2/71

Pro 25 August/66 ch 88-89.

N^o 427

Govt. of 1871 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To The Ag. Consulting Engrs
for Railways

Date

Recd

Per 5

G O. 10 Feb 71, N^o 427.

Nos. 263 & 264

Mail tickets. In reply orders on the
letter from the Engrs for Rail-
ways submitting correspondence
into the Dist Master General
regarding the time allowed
for the receipt & delivery
of mail packets.