

- (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.	366	Press	<i>Original</i>
B.P. No.	(Rly)	Mis.	
Dated	9-2-1955		

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
9th February 1875.*

No. 219. Read the following endorsement of the Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 20th January 1875, No. 50 —

From R. B. ELWIN, Esq, Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. M. SHAW-STEWART, R.E., Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 18th January 1875, No. 68.

In forwarding, for your information, copy of the Acting Locomotive Superintendent's letter, No. 29, of the 16th instant, I have the honor to inform you, with reference to the request made by you at the meeting of the Committee held in my Office on the 11th ultimo, that I have convened a meeting to be held here at 2 o'clock P.M. on Thursday the 21st instant for the purpose of investigating the collision that is reported to have occurred at Salem on the 10th instant, and I trust that it will be convenient to you to be present.

2. I have called the special attention of the Acting Locomotive Superintendent to the apparently unnecessary delay that has taken place in reporting this accident.

From E. C. BOODLE, Esq, Acting Locomotive Superintendent, to R. B. ELWIN, Esq, Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, dated Perambore Works, 16th January 1875, No. 29

I beg to inform you that engine No. 19, while shunting in the Salem yard on the 10th instant, came into collision with a Guard's brake van, the following damage being sustained —

To the engine — Right hand bottom feed-pipe and one wooden flap broken

Guard's brake van No. 31 — End of buffer head-stock broken, one footstep broken, and one footboard damaged.

2 The driver of the shunting engine states that, as instructed by the Head Porter, he was proceeding to the third line to attach some wagons, and as he was doing so the last brake van of the 3-30 P.M. special, which was standing on the fourth line, ran foul of his engine. The driver attributes the cause of the collision to the Head Porter having ordered the special to be backed without first ascertaining whether the line was clear, and he states that at the time of the collision there was no person in the brake van, and the brake was off.

3 The statement of the driver of the 3-30 P.M. special is to the effect that after being informed by the Guard that there were two wagons in excess of the load, he was instructed by the Head Porter to back his train clear of the cross over-line, and that as he was doing this the Head Porter without his knowledge unhooked a portion of the train, the consequence being that when the engine stopped, the unhooked portion of the train ran back and fouled the shunting engine. He also mentions that there was no person in either of the brake vans, and that, if the brake had been attended to, the accident might have been avoided.

From R. B. ELWIN, Esq, Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. M. SHAW-STEWART, R.E., Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 20th January 1875, No. 70

In continuation of my letter, No. 68, of the 18th instant, I have the honor to enclose you a copy of the Traffic Manager's letter No. C-92-A and M, dated the 19th idem, in which he states that the collision at Salem was entirely due to the inattention of the Head Porter who was in charge of the shunting, and that he has been suspended from pay and duty.

2 Under these circumstances I agree with Mr. Church in thinking that it will not be necessary to hold a formal inquiry, and with your concurrence I will therefore cancel the meeting proposed to be held to-morrow.

Proceedings of the Madras Government Public Works Department
9th February 1875

From H. E. CHURCH, Esq., Traffic Manager, to R. B. ELWIN, Esq., Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, dated Madras, 19th January 1875, No C-92-A and M.

There can be no doubt that the collision referred to in your letter, No 291, of the 18th instant, was entirely due to the inattention of the Head Porter who was in charge of the shunting, and he has been suspended from pay and duty.

2 Under these circumstances I shall be glad to know whether you consider it necessary to convene a meeting

SUBMITTED for the information of Government.

(Signed) J. H. M. SHAW-STEWART, Lieut.-Colonel, R.E.,
Consulting Engineer for Railways.

No 220

ORDER THEREON, 9th February 1875, No 366.

RAILWAY, No. 33.

ORDERED to be recorded. The accident having been clearly traced to carelessness on the part of the Head

Porter who directed the shunting, it has been considered unnecessary to convene a Committee of investigation.

(True Extract)

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

To the Consulting Engineer for Railways.

Exd A. Grubert
Spare Copies

Madras Railway
Locomotive Dept's Office
Perambore Works
16th January 1875

To

The Agent & Manager

Dear Sir,

I beg to inform you that Engine No. 19, while shunting in the Salem yard, on the 10th instant, came into collision with a Guards Brake Van, the following damage being sustained:

To the Engine — right hand bottom feed-pipe and one wooden flap broken.
Guards Brake Van No. 31 — end of buffer head-stock broken, one footstep broken and one footboard damaged.

2. The Driver of the shunting Engine states that, as instructed by the head porter, he was proceeding to the third line to attach some waggons, and as he was doing so, the last Brake Van of the 3.30 P.M. special, which was standing on the fourth line, ran foul of his Engine. The Driver attributes the cause of the Collision to the head porter having ordered the special to be backed without first ascertaining whether the line was clear, and he states that at the time of the Collision, there was no person in the Brake Van, and the brake was off.

3 The Statement of the Driver of the 3.30 P.M. special is to the effect that

after

after being informed by the guard that there were two waggon^s ^{Excess of} ice load, he was instructed by the head porter to back his train clear of the cross over-line, and that as he was doing this, the head porter without his knowledge, unhooked a portion of the train, the consequence being that, when the engine stopped, the unhooked portion of the train ran back, and fouled the shunting engine. He also mentions that there was no person in either of the Brake Vans, and that, if the brake had been attended to, the accident might have been avoided.

Yours faithfully,
 W. C. R. Bowie
 Asst. Loco. Supt.

/True copy/

J. H. Nellis;
 for the Agent & Manager

P. M. 391/75

No. 50

Submitted for the information of Government.

Menttwood

CONSULTING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
 Madras, 20 January 1875.

B. E.,
 Consng Engineer for Railways

To
 The Secretary to Government,
 Public Works Department,
 Fort Saint George.

P. M. 5

P. W. 1875 Dept
RAILWAY DEPARTMENT

No. of 50th for 7th July
No 391

From
The Consulting Engineer
for Railways,

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

Dated 20th June 1875

Received 21st

Encl. 4. No 50

Reporting on
Collision at Salene
Station yard on 10th
January 1875

With Order

Ordered (The Board). The accident having
been clearly traced to cars & no reason the part of the
Board Order who directed the shunting it was
deemed necessary to convene a
Committee of investigation.

5922

Wm.

Engl. for 11-2-95

Gr. 391.
Cobl. of 1187 & Andreas.
PUBLIC WORKS.

The Insurgency

1187

1187

9 Feb:

1187

1187

219-220:

(Accident Report int.
mitted by the Insurgency
for Rep. of a collection at
Lalmonchok on 10 Jan 195,
'recorded with remarks'