

(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.	<i>3451</i>	Press	<i>Original</i>
B.P. No.		Mis.	
Dated	<i>6. 12.</i>	195	<i>1875</i>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
6th December 1875.*

No. 72. Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. M. SHAW-STEWART, R.E., Consulting Engineer for Railways, to Major-General G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 27th November 1875, No. 644 :—

With reference to the Order of Government, dated 15th October 1875, No. 2,942, I have the honor to forward the enclosed letter from the Agent and Manager, Madras Railway, dated 25th November 1875, No. 1,187.

2. Mr. Elwin explains that the reason why the engine driver concerned in the accident at mileage 201-16 $\frac{1}{2}$, Bangalore branch, was not punished, was that he is believed to have observed the danger signal but could not pull up his train in time, as he had only the assistance of one brake besides his own, both of the guards being in the rear van.

3. The cause of the two guards being in the same van is also explained, and the only question for consideration is whether the chief guard, on finding that the under guard was not in the front van as supposed, should not have stopped the train in order to allow him to travel in his proper place.

From R. B. ELWIN, Esq., Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, to Lieut.-Colonel J. H. M. SHAW-STEWART, R.E., Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 25th November 1875, No. 1,187.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Proceedings* of Government forwarded with your letter No. 1,173, of the 30th ultimo, and to state that the special attention of heads of departments has been directed to the remarks of the Honorable the Governor in Council therein contained.

2. I beg to explain with reference to the 2nd paragraph of your letter that, in the case which occurred at the 201-16 $\frac{1}{2}$ miles, Bangalore branch, the engine driver was not considered blameable. It is true that the Resident Engineer in his report of the occurrence says, "I suppose the driver says there was no signal given." Such however was not the case, but the driver explained that he was not able to pull up his train in time as he had only the assistance of one brake besides his own, both of the guards being in the rear van.

3. The lightness of the punishment inflicted upon the under guard, and the reason why the chief guard was not punished at all, are thus explained by the Traffic Manager :—

"The chief guard did not appear to me deserving of punishment because, at the time he started the train, he was under the impression that the under guard was in his proper place, having seen him only a few minutes before standing by the side of the leading brake van. After the train was in motion the under guard was seen running from the station closest towards the train, and being unable to reach his own van jumped into the chief guard's van. His illness on that day having been established, a nominal fine seemed sufficient to meet his case."

No. 73. ORDER THEREON, 6th December 1875, No. 3,451.

RAILWAY, No. 15.

His Excellency the Governor in Council is clearly of opinion that it was the duty of the chief guard to stop the train when he found the under guard absent from his own post.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Consulting Engineer for Railways.
Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

No 1187

MADRAS RAILWAY

AGENT AND MANAGERS' OFFICE.

Madras, 25th November 1875.

From

The Agent and Manager, M. R. Co.

To

Mr J. H. Shaw Stewart, R.E.

Consulting Engineer for Railways.

Sir,

G.O. No 42
15th Oct 1875

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the Proceedings of Government forwarded with your letter of 1173 of the 30th ultimo and to state that those proceedings of Heads of Department has been directed to the members of the Honourable the Government Council therein contained.

I beg to explain with reference to the 2nd paragraph of your letter that in the case which occurred at the 20th miles Bangalore Branch, the Engine Driver was not considered blameable. It is true that the Resident Engineer in his report of the occurrence says "I suppose the driver says there was no signal given". Such however was not the case, but the Driver explained that he was not able to pull up his train in time as he had only the assistance of one brake besides his own, both of the coaches being in the rear row.

59
3. The lightness of the punishment
inflicted upon the Under Guard, and the
reason why the Chief Guard was not
punished at all, are thus explained
by the Traffic Manager:

"The Chief Guard did not appear to
me deserving of punishment, because,
at the time he started the Train, he was
under the impression that the Under Guard
was in his proper place, having seen him
only a few minutes before, standing by
the side of the leading Wrecked Car. After
the Train was in motion the Under
Guard was seen running from the
station close towards the Train, and
being unable to reach his own car,
jumped into the Chief Guard's car.
His illness on that day having been
established, a nominal fine seemed
sufficient to meet his case."

I have the honour to be
Sir,

Your most obedient servant

J. M. Nelson

for the Agent & Collector

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT

CONSULTING ENGINEER'S OFFICE.

MADRAS, 27th November 1875.

No. 544.

From

LIEUT.-COLONEL J. H. M. SHAW-STEWART, R.E.,

Consulting Engineer for Railways,

To

MAJOR-GENERAL G. W. WALKER, R.E.,

Secretary to Government,

Public Works Department,

Fort Saint George,

SIR,

With reference to the order of Government dated 15th October 1875 & No. 2942, I have the honour to forward the enclosed letter from the Agent and Manager Madras Railway, dated 25th November 1875, & No. 1187.

2. Mr. Elwin explains that the reason why the Engine Driver concerned in the accident at mileage $\frac{201}{16\frac{1}{2}}$ Bangalore Branch was not punished was that he is believed to have observed the danger signal but could not pull up his train

in

MADRAS RAILWAY.

From

The Agent and Manager

To

The Consulting Engineer

for Railways

Dated

28th Nov. 1875

No. 1187.

Nothing further
particular in regard
to the accident
between
the engine and the
train at Bangalore.

CC to Secy 72
in R 72

in time as he had only the assistance of one brake besides his own, both of the guards being in the rear van.

3. The cause of the two guards being in the same van is also explained, and the only question for consideration is whether the Chief Guard on finding that the Under Guard was not in the front van as supposed, should not have stopped the train in order to allow him to travel in his proper place.

I have the honour to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant

W. Conner R.E. Capt.

Genl. Engrs. for Railways.

985-200/50-236-235

P. 9. 1875 Dept

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT

No 7615

From
The Consulting Engineer
for Railways.

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

Dated 27th Nov 1875.
Recd 27th Nov

S. I. No. 644.

Submittal
letter from Agent M.R.
giving further particulars
in regard to collision
on the branch at
20 1/2 mile on 8 July/75

10/1

G.O. No 3451. 6.12.75

6.12.75

No 3451

Public Works Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Encl date the 6 Dec 75.
Read the following:—

From

The Consulting Engineer
for Railways.

(N. No 644 of 27th Nov 1875)

His Excellency the Governor
in Council is clearly of opinion
that it was the duty of
the Chief Guard to stop the
train when he found the
Under Guard absent from
his own post.

Agree.

Despatched: 11-12-75

Endng for the
X. O. T. D.

[Faint, illegible handwriting covering the left page]

1072/3

Print-12-76

[Faint, illegible handwriting covering the right page]

7615

Bill of 1879
PUBLIC WORKS

Coast. Reg. for
Reg.

Dec. 31 1871

72-73

21

Accidents Madras Reg.
Drawing orders on letter from
the Reg. Engineer, submitting
for their particular regard
the collisions on the Bangalore
Branch of the Madras R.