M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 413, 414	2711	Press / Mis.
Dated	25-11-	18 92

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 413. Read the following letter from the Consulting Engineer for Railways, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 2nd November 1872, No. 592 :—

In continuation of this office endorsement, No. 525, dated 1st ultimo, I have the honour to submit the letters marginally noted,* from the Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway, giving further particulars concerning the accident which occurred to the 2 P.M. mail train of the 28th October on the Ballypully Ghaut.

* No. 709, dated 2nd October 1872.
" 719, " 7th " "
" 781, " 28th " "
" 790, " 31st " "

2. It appears that, on the day in question, the mail train, consisting of four high-sided goods wagons, one horse-box, one covered goods wagon, one third-class brake, two third-class carriages, one second-class mail carriage, one composite carriage, and one guard's brake, in the order named—twelve vehicles in all—hauled by one of the Railway Company's most powerful engines (No. 108), left Tirupetty Station at the proper time (5-35 P.M.) in charge of Chief Guard William Reid and Under Guard Alexander Divine. After leaving Tirupetty the train proceeded safely as far as the Ballypully incline, where it was met by a violent storm, against which it was unable to make way, and, after several ineffectual attempts to ascend the ghaut, it came to a stand at the 97th mile, 6th telegraph post.

3. The engine driver, John Young, then decided upon dividing the train, and the chief guard, after securing his brakes, ordered the under guard to unhook six wagons† and exhibit signals for the return engine. The train having been parted, the forepart, consisting of the engine and six goods vehicles,‡ proceeded up the incline in charge of the engine driver, the two guards remaining with the hinder part of the train, consisting of passenger carriages.

† 1 Third-class brake.
2 " " carriages.
1 Second " mail carriage.
1 Composite "
1 Guard's brake.

‡ 4 High-sided goods wagons.
1 Horse-box.
1 Covered goods wagon.

4. Arrived at the top of the ghaut the train was brought to a stand *upon the main line* on an incline of 1 in 204; the driver and the two firemen got off the engine; put down, *but omitted to pin down*, the brakes of the five goods wagons, and uncoupled the engine. Young then proceeded with his engine to run round the train, intending to descend the ghaut and bring up the other six vehicles; but he had scarcely left the main line and got into the siding, when the force of the wind started the train down the incline. The second fireman (Baulia) appears to have run some distance with the train, and to have succeeded in pinning down one of the brakes whilst the vehicles were in motion; but all attempts to stop the train were unavailing.

* * * *

5. The result of the collision was that, of the vehicles which had remained at the bottom of the ghaut, the five foremost were thrown off the line; the foremost of all, the third-class brake van, being almost knocked to pieces, the guard's brake van

at the tail of the train only receiving a very slight injury, and the other vehicles being more or less injured according to their position in the train. Of the unfortunate passengers nine were wounded—one so seriously that it has since been necessary to amputate his right leg. This man and three others are still in hospital, but are reported to be doing well; and Dr. vanSomeren hopes to be able to discharge, in the course of next week, all but the man who has undergone amputation of the leg.

6. In reviewing the circumstances of the accident the following points call for notice:—

(1.) The forepart of the train was allowed to proceed up the ghaut without any guard in charge and without a brake van, although there were two guards with the train, and the seventh vehicle was a third-class brake van.*

(2.) The driver left his train standing on the main line instead of placing it on the siding.

(3.) The brakes of the wagons were not *pinned* down before the engine was uncoupled.

* A third-class carriage with a brake compartment.

7. The chief guard excuses himself for not sending the under guard and the third-class brake van with the forepart of the train on the ground that he thought it necessary to retain the under guard to protect the passengers, and that he clung to the brake on account of the violence of the storm.

8. The driver states that he whistled to be put into the siding, but that the pointsman allowed him to run on the main line. He further states that the pointsman had no lantern, and that when he asked him why he did not put the train into the siding the pointsman complained of the absence of his mate. The evidence of the driver is corroborated by that of the two firemen; but is directly contradicted by that of the pointsmen, Butchamiah and Govindappah, who agree in stating that they were both at their posts on the night in question; and they account for having shown no light by the refusal of the station master at Codoor to supply them with oil. Mr. Fisher, the station master in question, says that he refused some days before the accident to give the Ballypully pointsmen any oil because the supply previously given to them ought not to have been exhausted.

9. The driver had no excuse to offer for not having *pinned* down the brakes of the wagons before uncoupling the engine.

10. The rules and regulations of the Company make no provision for such a contingency as arose in the case under consideration—the necessity for dividing the train in ascending a ghaut—and the most serious charge brought against any of the train staff is that of failure of judgment.

11. The Committee of the Railway† authorities, who investigated the circumstances of the accident, considering that the engine driver showed great want of judgment in not taking the wagons into the lay-bye and pinning down the brakes before uncoupling the engine, have reduced him to the rank of fireman. The Committee blame the chief guard for not sending forward the

† The Agent and Manager.
The Chief Engineer.
The Locomotive Superintendent.
The Traffic Manager.

under guard with the third-class brake attached to the forepart of the train, but they acquit him of serious responsibility. They exonerate the under guard on the ground that he acted under the orders of the chief guard. They think that Mr. Fisher would have shown greater discretion had he supplied the pointsmen with oil and reported the circumstances to the Traffic Manager; they consider that the second fireman, Baulia, deserves great credit for the manner in which he acted; and they have determined to dismiss the two pointsmen, Butchamiah and Govindappah, and to prosecute the latter for neglect of duty.

12. The Government will no doubt concur in the conclusion at which the Committee have arrived with regard to the conduct of the station master at Codoor, the fireman Baulia, and the under guard; and I trust the Government will consider that the engine driver, Young, has been sufficiently punished, seeing that he violated no rule; but I would submit that the Committee have taken too lenient a view of the conduct of the Chief Guard Reid. The general rules and regulations, made in conformity with Section 29 of Act XVIII. of 1854, and approved by the Governor-General in Council, make the chief guard responsible for the safety of the train; in this case the chief guard bestowed all his attention on one-half of the train; the timidity which induced him to retain *two brake vans* with the second half of the train should, I submit, have prevented him from allowing the first half of the train to proceed *without any brake van*; he should, at any rate, have given the engine driver definite instructions. The engine driver is punished for failure of judgment under a load of responsibility which should have devolved upon the guard of the train.

13. As the conduct of the pointsman Govindappah, and indirectly that of his mate Butchamiah, will be subjected to judicial investigation, it would be out of place to offer here any remarks upon the behaviour of these two men.

14. The circumstances of this accident, and the circumstances of the accident which occurred on the 16th April last at the 209th mile, 14th telegraph post, South-West Line, when a special engine came into collision with a ballast trolly, have brought prominently to notice several shortcomings in the existing rules; the subject is now under consideration, and a revised body of rules will shortly, I hope, be submitted for the approval of Government.

No. 414. ORDER THEREON, 25th November 1872, No. 2,771.

RAILWAY, No. 67.

AFTER a careful consideration of the evidence taken by the Committee of Railway Officers convened to inquire into the accident forming the subject of the above papers, His Excellency the Governor in Council concurs in the conclusions which have been arrived at in regard to the Engine Driver, Fireman, Under Guard, the Station Master of Coodoor, and the Pointsmen at Ballypully, but agrees with the Consulting Engineer that the conduct of the Chief Guard was deserving of more serious notice than it met with at the hands of the Committee. The Agent and Manager will, therefore, be requested to re-convene the Committee lately assembled to

inquire into the subject with a view to a re-consideration of the question as affecting the conduct of the Chief Guard.

2. His Excellency trusts that the revised Code of Regulations now in course of preparation will be submitted at an early date.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. W. WALKER, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govrnement.

To the Consulting Engineer for Railways.

Endd 93 to D.
24-11-72

My dear Mr Dyer,

As the letters referred to in general of the Lon Engineer letter Nº 592 of 22 instant has not been printed (as Nº 2991 of 25 Nov/72) Col Shaw Stewart has asked me to write and get them back - will you be good enough to

Return them - I suppose you won't want them again -

I trust you are quite well with

Kind regard

Yours truly

Thos Askwith

Railway Department.

CONSULTING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,

No. 592-

From Lieutt C. H. A. Christie R.E.
LIEUT.-COLONEL J. H. M. SHAW STEWART, R.E.,
Consulting Engineer for Railways,

To

COLONEL G. W. WALKER, R.E.,
Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department,
Fort Saint George.

SIR,

In continuation of this office endorsement No 525, dated 1st instant, I have the honour to submit the letter marginally noted, from the Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway, giving further particulars concerning the accident which occurred to the 2 p.m. mail train of the 28 October on the Ballapilly Ghaut.

2. It appears that on the day in question the mail train,

Continuing

consisting of 4 high sided goods wagons,
1 horse box, 1 covered goods wagon,
1 third class brake, 2 third class carriages,
1 second class mail carriage, 1 composite
carriage and 1 guards brake, in
the order named — twelve vehicles in
all — hauled by one of the Railway
Company's most powerful engines
(No 108), left Tirupetty station at
the proper time (5-35 p.m.), in charge
of Chief Guard William Reid and
under guard Alexander Divine.
After leaving Tirupetty the train
proceeded safely as far as the
Balapelly incline where it was
met by a violent storm, against
which it was unable to make way,

and, after several ineffectual attempts
to ascend the ghaut, it came to a stand
at the 97 mile 6 telegraph post.
3. The engine driver,
John Young, then decided upon
dividing the train and the chief guard,
after securing his brakes ordered the
under guard to unhook six wagons
and exhibit signals for the return
engine. The train having been parted,
the fore part, consisting of the Engine
and six goods vehicles, proceeded up
the incline in charge of the engine
driver, the two guards remaining with
the hinder part of the train, consisting
of passenger carriages.
4. Arrived at the top of
the Ghaut the train was brought to
a

1 third class brake
2 do do carriages
1 second do mail do
1 composite do
1 Guards brake

4 high sided goods wagons
1 horse box
1 covered goods wagon

a stand upon the main line on an incline of 1 in 209; the drivers and the two foremen got off the engine: put down, but omitted to pin down, the brakes of the five goods waggons, and uncoupled the engine. Young then proceeded with his engine to run round the train, intending to descend the ghaut and bring up the other seven vehicles; but he had scarcely left the main line and got into the siding, when the force of the wind started the train down the incline. The second foreman (Baulia) appears to have run some distance with the train, and to have succeeded in pinning down one of the brakes whilst the vehicles were in motion; but all attempts to stop the train were unavailing.

4-6

× × × × × × ×

5. The result of the collision was that of the vehicles which had remained at the bottom of the ghaut the five foremost were thrown off the line — the foremost of all, the third class brake van being almost knocked to pieces, the guards brake van at the tail of the train only receiving a very slight injury, and the other vehicles being more or less injured according to their position in the train. Of the unfortunate passengers nine were wounded, — one so seriously that

that it has since been necessary to amputate his right leg. This man and three others are still in hospital, but are reported to be doing well, and Doctor Van Someren hopes to be able to discharge in the course of next week all but the man who has undergone amputation of the leg.

6. In reviewing the circumstances of the accident the following points call for notice:—

i. The fore part of the train was allowed to proceed up the ghaut without any guard in charge and without a brake van, although there were two guards with the train and the seventh vehicle was a third class brake van.

* A third class carriages with a brake commences partments.

ii. The driver left his train standing on the main line instead of placing it on the siding.

iii. The brakes of the wagons were not pinned down before the engine was uncoupled.

7. The chief guard excuses himself for not sending the under guard and the third class brake van with the fore part of the train on the ground that he thought it necessary to retain the under guard to protect the passengers, and

and that he clung to the brake on account of the violence of the storm.

8. The driver states that he whistled to be put into the siding, but that the pointsman allowed him to run on the main line. He further states that the pointsman had no lantern, and that when he asked him why he did not put the train into the siding the pointsman complained of the absence of his mate. The evidence of the driver is corroborated by that of the two firemen; but is directly contradicted by that of the pointsman Batchamiah and Govind Appah, who agree in stating that they were both at

at their posts on the night in question, and they account for having shown no light by the refusal of the station master at Codoor to supply them with oil. Mr Fisher, the station master in question, says that he refused some days before the accident to give the Ballapilly pointsmen any oil because the supply previously given to them ought not to have been exhausted.

9. The driver had no excuse to offer for not having pinned down the brakes of the wagons before uncoupling the engine.

10. The Rules and Regulations of the Company make no provision for

for such a contingency as arose in the case under consideration — the necessity for dividing the train in ascending a gradient and the most serious charge brought against any of the train staff is that of failure of judgment.

11. The Committee of the Railway Authorities, who investigated the circumstances of the accident, considering that the enquiry showed a want of judgment, in not taking the wagons into the lay-bye and pinning down the brakes before uncoupling the engine, have reduced him to the rank of fireman. The Committee blame the chief guard for not sending

× The Agent and Manager
The Chief Engineer
The Locomotive Superintendent
The Traffic Manager

sending forward the under guard with the third class brake attached to the fore part of the train, but they acquit him of serious responsibility. They exonerate the under guard on the ground that he acted under the orders of the chief guard. They think that if Fraser would have shown greater discretion had he supplied the pointsmen with oil and reported the circumstances to the Traffic Manager. They consider that the second fireman, Bailiah, deserves great credit for the manner in which he acted; and they have determined to dismiss the two pointsmen, Buteharniah and Govindappah, and

and to prosecute the latter for neglect of duty.

12. The Government will no doubt, concur in the conclusion at which the Committee have arrived with regard to the conduct of the station master at Codoor, the fireman Baulia, and the underguard; and I trust the Government will consider that the engine driver, Young, has been sufficiently punished seeing that he violated no rule; but I would submit that the Committee have taken too lenient a view of the conduct of the chief guard Reid. The General Rules and Regulations made in conformity with section 29 of

Act XVIII of 1854, and approved by the Governor General in Council, make the chief guard responsible for the safety of the train; in this case the chief guard had turned all his attention on one half of the train; the timidity which induced him to retain two brake vans with the second half of the train should, I submit, have prevented him from allowing the first half of the train to proceed without any brakesman: he should, at any rate, have given the engine driver definite instructions. The engine driver is punished for failure of judgment under a load

load of responsibility which should have devolved upon the guard of the train.

13. As the conduct of the pointsman Govindasspah — and indirectly that of his mate Butchamiah, will be subjected to judicial investigation it would be out of place to offer here any remarks upon the behaviour of these two men.

14. The circumstances of this accident, and the circumstances of the accident which occurred on the 16th April last, at the 209th mile 14th telegraph post, South-West Line, when a special engine came into collision with a ballast trolly, have brought prominently to notice several shortcomings in the existing rules; the subject is now under consideration and a revised code of rules will shortly, I hope, be submitted for the approval of Government.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.

Madras
2nd November
1872

Charles Whish Lieutt R.E.
Acting Deputy Consulting
Engineer for Railways

Receiving Mr Madras Government
under date the Nov/72
Read the following
From the Consulting
for Railways -

Officer carefully considering the evidence taken by the Committee of Railway Officers appointed to inquire into the accident forming the subject of the above Letter Civil Station the Governor in Council the Governor in Council entering into the evidence which have been already laid before the Engineer in regard to the Engineer driver, fireman, midshipman the Station Master of the Carnatic and the Permanent Way Inspector at Pallipuliyur - from at Pallipuliyur - agree with the Committee's Conclusion

P.W. 1872 Report
Opinion of Govt Officers

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

1872.

From No. 5364.

The Consulting Engineer
for Railways,

To

The Secretary to Government,
P. W. Department,
Fort Saint George.

Dated 2nd
Recd. 4th } Nov 1872.

Con: G. 11/4

No. 592.

No 771 - 25 Nov/72
Submitting letter from the Agent and Manager of the Ry giving further particulars concerning the accident which occurred to the 2 P Ry train of the 28th October

Ro 27th Oct/72 Nos 360-362
the Pallipully
Shunt -

No 463

Engineer that the conduct
of the Chief Guard was
deserving of more serious
notice than it met with
at the hands of the Com-
mittee. The Agent and
Manager will therefore
be requested to reconvene the
Committee lately assembled
to enquire into the subject
with a view to a reconsideration
of the questions as effect-
ing the conduct of the
Chief Guard.

His Excellency
trusts that the revised Code
of Regulations now in
course of preparation will
be submitted at an
early date.

Genl

30
2

G

12 The Consulting Engineer
for Railways

Despd 27/11/72

he conduc
Guard in

C/S 5364

Govt. of [1872] Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To The Consulting Engr for Railways

Rotea

Read. Encl.

G. O. 25th Nov. No. 2771.

Nos. 4133 & 4134

Accident. Passing orders on letter from Engineer giving further particulars concerning the accident which occurred to the Mail Train of the 28th October on the Ballapilly Chord, Madras Railway.