

(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.	2452	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
93-94		
Dated	6-10.	195/8.73

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
6th October 1873.*

No. 93. Read the following letter from Lieutenant-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, dated Madras, 21st August 1873, No. 444:—

IN acknowledging receipt of the Order of Government, dated the 9th instant, No. 1,983, I have the honour to respectfully observe, with reference to the 3rd paragraph that the places at which the wagons left the rails on the 11th and 14th April were not practically identical with that at which the engine was derailed on the 9th January. The engine (or rather its tender, for it was being shunted tender foremost) mounted the rail at the points when in the act of entering them; and I am satisfied that, as reported at the time by the driver, the accident was altogether caused by carelessness on the part of the pointsman. Upon the other hand, the two wagons left the rails at some distance from the points in question, and no possible connection can be traced between the accident in January and those in April. I inspected the sites of both accidents within a few days after the occurrence of the last; and I have no reason to doubt that it was due to the causes assigned by the Chief Engineer, viz., that the axles of the wagons were bent, and the width between rails slightly too great.

2. In the 4th paragraph of the order under acknowledgment it is stated that the subject appears not to have attracted the notice of the Consulting Engineer until his attention was pointedly called to it by Government. With all due respect I beg to submit that this is not the case. Since the occurrence of the first accident, I have been in constant communication on the subject with the Railway authorities. The points at which it occurred were inspected by the Deputy Consulting Engineer at least once, and by myself twice, in April and June. On the first of those occasions I satisfied myself that the Assistant Traffic Manager was altogether mistaken in his explanation of the accident; that the points, though situated on an 18 chain curve, were attended with no unusual difficulty in working, and that, with proper care on the part of the pointsmen, there should be no possibility of an accident.

3. When I inspected the points in June, the Resident Engineer pointed out to me that the super-elevation given to the outer rail on the curve was that due to a speed of twenty or twenty-five miles an hour, which in this case was unnecessary, inasmuch as, owing to its position, the curve is always passed over at a slow pace. I mentioned this in my letter, No. 353, dated the 7th July, and stated that the unnecessary elevation of the outer rail was then being reduced; but I respectfully submit that the inference drawn in the order of Government is incorrect. The elevation given to the outer rail upon the curve was that due to a high speed; and with that elevation, trains might safely have passed over the curve at a speed of twenty-five miles an hour. I also mentioned in that letter that the points seemed to be a good deal worn, and would soon be replaced, I did not however consider them in any degree unsafe. Had I so considered them, I should of course have insisted upon their being at once removed.

4. The delay of four months in reporting the accident to Government is commented upon in the 2nd paragraph of their order under acknowledgment. I have already stated that during the whole of that time I was in communication

with the Railway authorities upon the subject. By an oversight the Chief Engineer's report as to the state of the points, which reached this Office on the 26th April, was not forwarded with the other papers on the 1st May. The Proceedings of Government, dated the 21st May, No. 1,401, were received in this office upon the 31st May. The 1st June fell on a Sunday, and on the following day the Chief Engineer's report was laid before Government. Upon that day I was personally engaged upon duty elsewhere; or, in forwarding Mr. Going's report, I should have endorsed his opinion as to the condition of the points.

5. I trust that, with this explanation before him, His Excellency in Council will be able to relieve the officers of the Consulting Engineer's Department from the charge of neglect of duty, which is brought against them in the order of Government under acknowledgment. I also beg most respectfully to convey to His Excellency my assurance that, even in the case of such trifling accidents as the derailment of an engine within a station yard, the matter is not allowed by the officers of this department to rest until they have satisfied themselves as to the cause of the accident, and that every necessary precaution has been taken to prevent its recurrence.

No. 94.

ORDER THEREON, 6th October 1873, No. 2,452.

RAILWAY, No. 19.

HIS EXCELLENCY the Governor in Council observes that on the survey of the Jollapett Station arrangements submitted for his information, the accidents of the 11th and 14th April are marked as having occurred at exactly the same spot, within 100 feet of the points at which the accident of the 9th January occurred. These are "practically identical" (however the causes of the accidents may differ) for the purpose which His Excellency in Council had in view, viz., to call the attention of the Consulting Engineer to the fact that reports of three accidents at the Jollapett Railway Station had been submitted by him for the information of Government, without note or comment, from which the Government might be satisfied that remedial action was taken.

2. With these remarks the Consulting Engineer's explanation is accepted, in reliance on the assurances contained in the closing paragraph of his letter.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,

Secretary to Government.

To the Consulting Engineer for Railways.

Exd. E. C. Shunker.

Spare Copies.

Railway Department.

CONSULTING ENGINEER'S OFFICE.

No. 4444

From

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 acknowledging receipt
of the order of Government
dated the 9th instant, A.D. 1873,
I have the honour to respectfully
observe, with reference to the
third paragraph, that the
places at which the wagons
left the rails on the 11th and
14th April were not practically
identical with that at which the
engine*

engine was derailed on the 9th
January. The engine (or rather
its tender, for it was being shunted
tender foremost) mounted the
rail at the points, when in
the act of entering them, and
I am satisfied that, as reported
at the time by the driver, the
accident was altogether caused
by carelessness on the part of
the pointsman. Upon the other
hand, the two wagons left the
rails at some distance from
the points in question; and no
possible connection can be
traced between the accident in
January and those in April.
I inspected the sites of both
accidents



accidents within a few days after
the occurrence of the last; and
I have no reason to doubt that
it was due to the causes assigned
by the Chief Engineer, namely,
that the axles of the wagons
were bent, and the width
between rails slightly too great.
In the fourth para-
graph of the order under acknow-
ledgment it is stated that the
Subject appears not to have at-
tracted the notice of the Con-
sulting Engineer until his atten-
tion was pointedly called to it
by Government. With all due
respect I beg to submit that this
is not the case. Since the
occurrence

occurrence of the first accident I
have been in constant communi-
cation on the subject with the
Railway authorities. The points
at which it occurred were inspected
by the Deputy Consulting Engineer
at least once, and by myself
twice, in April and June. On
the first of those occasions I
satisfied myself that the Assistant
Traffic Manager was altogether
mistaken in his explanation of
the accident; that the points
though situated on an 18-chain
curve, were attended with no
unusual difficulty in working;
and that, with proper care on
the part of the pointsman, there
should

be no possibility of an
accident.

3 When I inspected the
points in June, the Resident
Engineer pointed out to me that
the super-elevation given to
the outer rail on the curve
was that due to a speed of
20 or 25 miles an hour, which
in this case was unnecessary,
inasmuch as, owing to its posi-
tion, the curve is always passed
over at a slow pace. I men-
tioned this in my letter dated
the 7th July, and stated that
the unnecessary elevation of
the outer rail was then being
reduced: but I respectfully
submit

* No 353.

submit that the inference drawn
in the order of Government is
incorrect. The elevation given
to the outer rail upon the
curve was that due to a high
speed; and with that elevation
trains might safely have passed
over the curve at a speed of 25
miles an hour. I also mentioned
in that letter that the points
seemed to be in good deal worn,
and would soon be replaced.
I did not, however, consider them
in any degree unsafe. Had I
so considered them, I should
of course have insisted upon
their being at once removed.

4. The delay of four
months

1401.

months in reporting the accident
to Government is commented
upon in the second paragraph
of their order under acknow-
ledgment. I have already
stated that during the whole
of that time I was in
communication with the
Railway authorities upon the
subject. By an oversight the
Chief Engineer's report as to the
state of the points, which reached
this office on the 26th April, was
not forwarded with the other
papers on the 1st May. The
Proceedings of Government dated
the 21st May were received in
this office upon the 31st May.
The

The 1st June fell on a Sunday;
and on the following day the
Chief Engineer's report was laid
before Government. Upon that
day I was personally engaged
upon duty elsewhere; so, in for-
warding Mr. Goings' report, I
should have endorsed his opinion
as to the condition of the points.

I trust that, with this
explanation before him, His Excellency
in Council will be able to relieve
the officers of the Consulting En-
gineer's Department from the charge
of neglect of duty, which is brought
against them in the order of ex-
Government under acknowledgment.
I also beg most respectfully to
convey

convey to His Excellency my as-
surance that, even in the case
of such trifling accidents as the
derailment of an engine within
a station yard, the matter is not
allowed by the officers of this
Department to rest, until they
have satisfied themselves as to
the cause of the accident, and
that every necessary precaution
has been taken to prevent its
recurrence.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,

Your most Obedt Servant,
Wm. Stewart

Wm. Stewart
21 Aug 1893
Per 12004

Per 12004
Supt. Genl. R.C.
Chas. P. S. for Railways

No. 2452 P. W. D.

Pro. of the Madras Govt.

Read the following:-

From the Joint Inspr. Rys (R.E. No. 44 of 21 Aug 73)

His Excellency the Governor in Council observes that on the Survey of the Jollabpett Station arrangements submitted for his information the accidents of the 10th and 14th April are marked as having occurred at exactly the same spot, within

MD
1873

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

1873.

From

No. 4455.

The Consulting Engineer
for Railways.

To

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

Dated

21st Aug 1873.

Recd.

No. 4444

Relinquish T.

21st 1903 of 9

due to, regarding

the maintenance of

the road, and the following

station yards.

No. 2452. 6th Aug 73

10/10/73

100 feet of the points
at which the accident
of the 9th January oc-
curred. These are
"practically identical"
(however the causes
of the accidents may
differ) for the pur-
poses which His Ex-
cellency in Council
had in view, viz to
call the attention of
the Consulting Engineer
to the fact that reports
of three accidents at
the Gallarpet Railway
Station had been
submitted by him
for the information
of Government, &c.

Is not the English
language so tedious
already? My
Dictionary is very
bulky.

With these remarks
The Consulting
Engineer's expla-
nation is accep-
ted, in reliance
on the assur-
ances contained
in the closing
para of his let-
ter.

M
1899

G.M.

Ed.

without note or com-
ment, from which
the Government might
be satisfied that
remedial action was
taken.

†
The derailment
of an Engine is now
spoken of by the
Consulting Engineer
as a trifling acci-
dent, attributable
to the carelessness
of a pointman,
and so he would
appear to have
treated it practi-
cally, by not having
inspected the locality

till after the occur-
rence of the other tri-
-fling accidents more
than 3 months later.
His Excellency the
Governor in Council
does not consider
that an accident
which involved de-
-tention of a train
for nearly two hours
the cause of which
was a matter of
dispute among the
Railway Authorities,
and which had been
preceded by a simi-
-lar unaccountable
accident at the same
place, was so trivial

a circumstance as
not to justify him
in the remarks he
has made on it
and the two other
Station Yard ac-
-cidents, and which
he sees no occasion
to modify.

G.W.

To
The Chief Engineer
for Railways.

S.C. sub 11/10/73

Ch 4635 *
Govt. of 1873 Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

The Committee
for Railways

Date

Recd.

Recd.

G. O. No. 21378. No. 2452

No. 93 & 94

Jallapett Station,
Madras Railway.

Paying orders in letter
from the Comr. Insp.

Submitting observation
with reference to G
O No 1983 of 1873 regarding
the accidents at
the Station.