

- (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.	2942	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	15-10-195	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th October 1875.*

No. 234. Read the following endorsement of the Officiating Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 5th October 1875, No. 550:—

From B. ANDERSON, Esq., Chief Engineer, to R. B. ELWIN, Esq., Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, dated Madras, 16th July 1875, No. 511.

I BEG to enclose herewith an extract from a letter received from the Resident Engineer, 2nd Division, South-West Line, reporting that a ballast train came into collision with a trolley at the 201—16½ mile of the Bangalore branch on the 8th instant, and that the 7 A.M. train from Jollapett of 10th idem also came into collision with a trolley at 169—9 mile, Bangalore branch.

2. With regard to the ballast train, the evidence seems to me perfectly clear that the trolley was properly protected, and that no rule of the Company was violated by the person in charge. It is evident that the driver of the ballast train failed to observe the danger signal in proper time.

3. In the case of the 7 A.M. goods train coming into collision with a trolley at 169—9 mile, the section maistry plainly violated Rule No. 19, Section XVIII. of the Rules and Regulations in not having removed the trolley fifteen minutes before the train was due, and I have accordingly directed the Resident Engineer to prosecute him.

No. 756.

THE Consulting Engineer for Railways for information. The result of the prosecution of the section maistry will be communicated in due course.

MADRAS,
16th July 1875.

(Signed) R. B. ELWIN,
Agent and Manager.

Extract from a letter from the Resident Engineer, 2nd Division, South-West Line, No. 212, dated Bangalore, 14th July 1875.

I REGRET to have to report two cases of trains being stopped by trollies on the Bangalore branch last week. I have carefully investigated both cases, and the following is the result of my investigation. Thursday, 8th July, ballast train stopped at 201—16½ by Section Maistry Marsh. The section maistry knew that a ballast train was working and was therefore particularly careful, as it is clearly proved that he asked each watchman as he passed if the signals were taken up by the watchman in front; and that the signals were taken up and a red flag waved violently to the approaching train is very satisfactorily proved by a gang maistry, all the gang coolies, some coolies who were repairing the fence, and some villagers who were attracted by the watchman waving his red flag to the train and who asked him why he did so. I suppose the driver says there was no signal given, but all the evidence goes to prove that he was travelling at a very great speed; he left Malloor on the arrival of the 11-15 A.M. goods, due there at 1-12 P.M., and stopped at 202 (= 9½ miles) at 1-30, so his average speed for the 9½ miles was over 30 miles an hour; where the train was stopped (just having touched the trolley) was on a sharp curve, in a cutting, and on a down gradient; the driver could not have stopped his train there had he not been warned of danger, as he could not see the trolley more than three telegraph posts away, and from the evidence he must have sounded the danger whistle before he could have seen the trolley; the two guards were travelling in the break-van at the rear of the train, so the driver had the assistance of only one break to stop his train.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th October 1875.*

2. Section Maistry Marsh is a very steady and very attentive young man, and the watchman who showed the danger signal to the train has been ten years a watchman, and understands his duties thoroughly, having been examined both by Mr. Wilkinson and myself.

3. 7 A.M. goods train stopped at 169—9 on the 10th instant.

4. This is a much more serious case and one for which the Section Maistry Chensoo and the line watchman are both to blame; the section maistry had his trolley on the line when the train was due, although he was provided with a watch and time-table, and although the watchman says he showed a red flag. I am inclined to doubt it, as he is unable to produce any evidence in his favor. I have suspended both section maistry and watchman pending instructions from you.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) BERESFORD ANDERSON,
Chief Engineer.

SUBMITTED for the information of Government.

The enclosed papers refer to two collisions on the Bangalore branch of the Madras Railway; the first*, on the 8th July 1875, between a ballast train and trolley in which no damage was done; the second†, on the 10th idem, between a goods train and a trolley in which the trolley was slightly damaged and life guard bolts and sand pipe of engine broken.

* At 201—16½ mile.

† At 169—9 mile.

guard bolts and sand pipe of engine broken.

2. The evidence in the case of the first accident shows clearly that the trolley was properly protected, but that the driver of the ballast train failed to observe the signals. The Under Guard, however, who, in contravention of the rules of the Company was found in the Chief Guard's break-van, was fined Rupees 3.

3. In the second case the section maistry was prosecuted for violating Rule 19 of Section XVIII. of the Rules and Regulations in not having removed the trolley fifteen minutes before the train was due, and was fined Rupees 25 by the Assistant Commissioner of Colar.

4. These collisions not being of a serious nature, no special inquiry was made by this department into the circumstances attending them.

(Signed) W. H. COAKER, Captain, R.E.,
for Offg. Consulting Engineer for Railways.

No. 235.

ORDER THEREON, 15th October 1875, No. 2,912.

RAILWAY, No. 21.

THE Honorable the Governor in Council observes that in the collision between the ballast train and trolley on the 8th July blame is attributed to the driver, who was running at an excessive speed, and failed to keep a good look out. Extra precautions are the more necessary in the case of a ballast train which works at irregular intervals; and serious notice should therefore be taken of any dereliction of duty on the part of those in charge of such trains.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th October 1875.*

2. The Under Guard who deserted his post in the front van, and thereby reduced the brake power at command for stopping on an emergency, was fined Rupees 3, a punishment extremely light under the circumstances. No mention is made of any notice having been taken of the conduct of the driver and the Chief Guard who permitted a direct violation of the rules, by his subordinate, has also apparently been acquitted by the Company.

3. The Honorable the Governor in Council will be glad to be assured that, notwithstanding that no serious results occurred in connection with this collision, the gravity of the case is clearly apprehended, and adequate notice taken of derelictions of duty which might have terminated in consequences of a more serious nature.

4. In the second case the person in fault was prosecuted.

(True Extract.)

Major-General, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Consulting Engineer for Railways.
" Judicial Department.

Ed. W. J. Lewis.
Spare Copies

c 1511.

Atchafalpa Railway Co.

Chief Engineer's Office
Atchafalpa 16th July 1875

The Agent and Manager,

Dear Sir,

I beg to enclose herewith an extract from a letter received from the Resident Engineer, Division L. H. Rice, reporting that a Ballast train came into collision with a freight train at the 16th mile of the Atchafalpa Branch, on the 8th of July, and that the freight train from Gallatin of 10th also came into collision with a freight train at the 16th mile Atchafalpa Branch.

With regard to the Ballast train, the evidence seems to me perfectly clear that the train was properly protected, and that no rule of the Company was violated by the person in charge. It is evident that the driver of the Ballast train failed to observe the danger signal in proper time.

In the case of the freight train coming into collision with a freight train at the 16th mile, the Section Master, J. L. Smith, violated rule 109, Section XVIII of the Rules and Regulations in not having removed the train 15 minutes before the train was due, and I have accordingly directed the Resident Engineer to prosecute him.

Very truly,
J. L. Smith
Section Master

Yours faithfully,
Benjamin Anderson
Chief Engineer

c. 756

The Consulting Engineer for Railways
for information - The result of the
prosecution of this section also
will be communicated in due course.

Madras }
16th July 1875 }

MADRAS RAILWAY.

Letter No 1396/2/75
16th July 1875

Extract from a letter from the Resident Engineer 2^d Division S.W. Line No 212 dated Bangalore 15th July 1875

I regret to have to report two cases of trains being stopped by trolleys on the Bangalore Branch last week. I have carefully investigated both cases and the following is the result of my investigation. On Thursday 8th July, Ballast train stopped at 201 1/2 by Section Maistry March. The Section Maistry knew that a ballast train was working and was therefore particularly careful, as it is clearly proved that he asked each Watchman as he passed if the signals were taken up by the Watchman in front, and that the signals were taken up, and a red flag waved violently to the approaching train, is very satisfactorily proved by a Gang Maistry all the Gang Coolies, some Coolies who were repairing the fence, and some Villagers who were attracted by the Watchman waving his red flag to the train and who asked him why he did so. I suppose the Driver says there was no signal given, but all the evidence goes to prove that he was travelling at a very great speed, he left Malloos on the arrival of the 11-15 A.M. train, due there at 1-12 P.M. and stopped at 202 (= 9 1/2 miles) at 1-30 so his average speed for the 9 1/2 miles was over 30 miles per hour, where the train was stopped

To

The Consulting Engineer

for Railways

10 July 1875
No. 212

Referring that a trolley from Coonoor into Coonoor with a party of the 201 mile, from Coonoor, 10 1/2 miles, was that on the 8th instant, was that the 9.0 A.M. train from Malloos of 10.15 A.M. also came into Coonoor with a party of 100 miles from Coonoor.

1/10/75

stopped (just having touched the trolley) was on a sharp curve, in a cutting, and on a down gradient the Driver could not have stopped his train there; had he not been warned of danger, as he could not see the trolley more than three telegraph posts away, and from the evidence, he must have sounded his danger whistle before he could have seen the trolley. The two guards were travelling in the break-van at the rear of the train, so the Driver had the assistance of only one break to stop his train.

Section Maistry Marsh is a very steady and very attentive young man, and the Watchman who showed the danger signal to the train has been 10 years a Watchman, and understands his duties thoroughly having been examined both by Mr. Wilkinson and myself.

A.M. Goods train stopped at $\frac{169}{7}$ on the 10th instant.

This is a much more serious case, and one for which the Section Maistry & hence and the line Watchman are both to blame, the Section Maistry had his trolley on the line when the train was due, although he was provided with a watch and timetable; and although the watchman says he showed a red flag I am inclined to doubt it as he is unable to produce any evidence in his favor. I have suspended both Section Maistry and Watchman pending instructions from you.

[Signature]
Agent and Manager

(True Extract)
H. B. Anderson
Chief Engineer

SUBMITTED for the information OF GOVERNMENT.

Enclosure at No 756
dt. 6 July 75 with
enclosure.at $\frac{201}{16\frac{1}{2}}$ mileat $\frac{169}{9}$ mile

The enclosed papers refer to two collisions on the Bangalore branch of the Madras Railway, the first, on the 8th July 1875, between a ballast train and trolley in which no damage was done; the second, on the 10th idem, between a goods train and a trolley, in which the trolley was slightly damaged, and life guard bolts and sand pipe of engine broken.

2. The evidence in the case of the first accident shows clearly that the trolley was properly protected, but that the driver of the ballast train failed to observe the signals. The underguard, however, who in contravention of the rules of the Company was found in the Chief guard's break van, was fined Rs. 3.

3. In the second case the Section master was prosecuted for violating rule 19 of Section XVIII of the Rules and Regulations in not having removed

4. These collisions not being of a serious nature, no special inquiry was made by this Department into the circumstances attending them.

Wm. Coaker R. E; Captain
for offg. Cons. Engines for
Railways

W-11-0-38 D-8 15-9-70
N-13 10-24-6-10-75

Enclosures. 4-11
Depositing and
collections on the 13.
Amount of the Daily
on Dollar July 1898
at 201 and 169
15 1/2 9
mile respectively
G. L. No 2942. 15. 10. 75-

Dated *Jan* } *October* 1875.
 Received *6* }

No. 550

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

*From
The Consulting Engineer
for Railways,*

195-2212
R. W.
FARMY DEPARTMENT.
137 No. 6263

No 2942

Public Works Dept.

Proceedings of the Madras Govt.

Anders dat 15^{te} Oct. 1875.

Read the following

Chen

The Consulting Engineer
for Railways.

N. E. 2: 550 d/5th Oct: 1878

The Honorable the Governor
- nor in Council, observes,
that in the collision be-
- tween the bullet-train
and trolley on the 8th July
blame is attributed to the
driver, who was running
at an excessive speed, and
failed to keep a good
look out. Extra precautions
are the more necessary
in

in the case of a ballast train which works at ^{irregular} intervals; and serious notice should therefore be taken of any dereliction of duty on the part of those in charge of such trains.

The under guard, who deserted his post in the front van, and thereby reduced the brake power at command for stopping on an emergency was fined Rs 3, a punishment extremely light under the circumstances. No mention is made of any notice having been taken of the conduct of the driver, and the Chief guard who permitted a direct violation

violation of the rules, by his subordinate, has also apparently been acquitted by the Company.

The Honorable the Governor in Council will be glad to be assured that, notwithstanding that no serious results occurred in connection with this collision, the gravity of the case is clearly apprehended, and adequate notice taken of derelictions of duty which might have been imputed in consequences of a more serious nature.

In the second case the person in fault was prosecuted.

Expd - 29. 10. 75

C. E. for Rgo — 12
per Sept. 7 Office 17

6363

Gobt. of (1875) Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Consq: Engr: for
Ry. S.

Dated

Place

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. 15th July 1875. No. 2942..

No. 234-235

Accidents-M. Ry:--

Passing orders on
Endorsement of the
Consisting Engr: sub-
mitting reports of
two collisions on
the Bangalore Branch
of the M. Ry: on
the 8th & 10th July 1875
respectively.