

(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. 2292 (Ry) Press  
-B.P.- No. Mis.

Dated 30-8-1876.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,  
30th August 1876. No. 2,292.*

No 655 Read the following endorsement of the Consulting Engineer for Railways,  
dated Madras, 12th August 1876, No 399 —

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, 9th August 1876, No 816

In acknowledging the receipt of your letter of the 4th instant, No 828, which  
gave cover to O G, No 1,638, dated the 28th of June, I have the honor to express  
my regret that His Grace the Governor in Council should have considered it necessary  
to blame the officers of the Railway for the manner in which they dealt with the case  
of derailment upon the Bangalore Branch on the 27th of February last, in which case  
His Grace considers that the Driver and Guards cannot be held acquitted of culpable  
neglect of duty.

2 The inquiry which was instituted at the time of the accident satisfied the  
officers of the Company that an error in judgment had been committed by the Driver  
in not pulling up his train to satisfy himself whether or not a wagon-brake had  
accidentally got down, but it appeared to me then, as it does now, on further consider-  
ation, that all that the Driver could be blamed for, was, committing an error in  
judgment

3 The Guards as it appears to me are in no way to blame; the night was very  
dark and they could discover nothing to be wrong with the train, except that it was  
running at an unusually slow rate of speed

4 I would venture to remind His Grace the Governor that as a rule the staff  
by which Railways are worked in this country does not possess the intelligence (the  
greater number of the men being East Indians) which is to be met with at the hands  
of Drivers and Guards in England, and this being the case I trust that shortcomings  
on the part of our staff will not be judged too severely

SUBMITTED for the consideration of His Grace the Governor in Council, with  
reference to the Proceedings of Government, under dated the 28th June 1876,  
No 1,638.

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

No 656 ORDER THEREON, 30th August 1876, No 2,292

RAILWAY, No 71

THE Governor in Council does not  
see reason to modify the order referred  
to.

(True Extract)

Colonel,

Offg Under Secy to Govt, P W D

To the Consulting Engineer for Railways  
Exd W H French  
Sd are Copies

*by the Driver in not pulling up his*

Madras, 9<sup>th</sup> August 1876.

From

Robert B Elwin Esq.

Agent and Manager. M R C.

To

Lieut Colonel J H Shaw Stewart Esq.

Consulting Engineer for Railways.

Sir,

In acknowledging the receipt of your letter of the 11<sup>th</sup> instant, N<sup>o</sup> 828, which gave cover to Order of Government N<sup>o</sup> 1638 dated the 28<sup>th</sup> of June, I have the honour to express my regret that His Grace the Governor in Council should have considered it necessary to blame the officers of the Railway for the manner in which they dealt with the case of derailment upon the Bangalore Branch on the 27<sup>th</sup> of February last, in which case His Grace considers that the Driver and Guards cannot be held acquitted of culpable neglect of duty.

2 The enquiry which was instituted at the time of the accident satisfied the officers of the Company that an error in judgment had been committed by the Driver in not pulling up his

No 397

SUBMITTED FOR THE *Consideration* OF GOVERNMENT.  
*His Grace the Governor in Council,*  
*with reference to the Proceedings of*  
*Government under dated the 28 June*  
*1876, No 1630*

*W. M. M. M. M.*

CONSULTING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,  
Madras, *12 Aug* 1876.

*Leif R. E.,*  
Consgr. Engineer for Railways.

To

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

*W. M. M. M. M.*

5818-6-76-1-1628

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT

137

The Consulting Engineer  
for R.M.S.

The Secretary to Government  
P. W. Department  
F. A. St. George

Dated 12<sup>th</sup> Aug 1876  
Received

No. 399

Enclosures

Submitting  
in further to the  
the R.M.S. by me  
as that I must  
with the R.M.S.  
in any way  
with order

In Eng. for R.M.S.  
Dated 12-8-76

By order of the  
Secy to Govt  
12-8-76

*Prescribed*

Public Works Department

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 12<sup>th</sup> July 1876

Read the following -

From the Consulting Engineer for  
Railways } N.R. No 399 of 12<sup>th</sup> Aug 76

Recorded with the  
remark that His Grace  
the Governor in Council  
cannot acquiesce in the  
opinion that the Driver  
was guilty of a simple  
error of judgment. The  
Rules and Regulations pre-  
scribe that one of the  
methods of attracting the  
attention of the Driver  
when any thing is wrong  
in the train is the  
application by the  
front of his brakes  
the Driver feeling a  
heavy drag on his

+ Para 13 of Section XII  
" 15 " XIII

which see rule 10. driver

Train assumed that a  
brake had been applied.

Holding this impression  
he was in duty bound  
to stop his train to  
enquire into the cause.

The disregard of these  
orders on his part en-  
dangered the whole train.  
Had a wider bridge been  
passed the most serious  
and fatal consequences  
would almost certainly  
have happened.

It is inconceivable  
how the guards, had they  
been on the alert, could  
have failed to hear  
the sound like the  
noise of a brake  
which attracted the  
attention of the Driver,  
who was five wagons

ahead, while the under-  
guard was only five  
wagons behind the de-  
railed vehicle. The  
guards also failed to  
notice the red lights  
of the watchmen who  
at two places endeavoured  
to attract the attention  
of those in charge of  
the train. One of the  
lights was exhibited  
at a level crossing,  
to which the particular  
attention of the guards  
and Driver should  
have been directed  
in accordance with  
Rule 10 of Section VIII  
of the Regulations.

These considerations  
lead His Grace the  
Governor in Council

And to believe that neither  
 for the Driver nor the  
 H. Guards were attending  
 he properly to their duty  
 No explanation  
 has been offered in  
 respect to the time  
 or lost by the train  
 which is not accounted  
 for by the reduction  
 of speed phases that  
 have occurred.

G.M.W.

*Long Bay*

Memorandum

From the Consulting Engineer  
 for Railways No 39 of 12<sup>th</sup> Dec 1876

The Order on these  
 papers has been drafted  
 as far as practicable in  
 accordance with the  
 remarks of His Grace  
 the Governor, who says  
 particular stress is  
 what he considers a  
 direct infringement of the  
 Regulations by the Driver  
 being that he failed to  
 stop his train when he  
 heard something like  
 the noise of a wagon  
 brake being drawn  
 were this a violation of  
 the Rules of the Company  
 it would seem strange  
 that the report of the  
 Station Master at  
 Bangalore

The Driver of the  
 train No 39 of 12<sup>th</sup> Dec 1876  
 was heard to say  
 that he did not  
 stop his train  
 when he heard  
 something like  
 the noise of a wagon  
 brake being drawn  
 because this was a violation  
 of the Rules of the Company  
 it would seem strange  
 that the report of the  
 Station Master at  
 Bangalore

which see rule 10. 5000

Bangalore in which the  
passage seems should  
have been raised on  
by the Officers of the  
Company without com-  
ment. The fact is that  
a wagon brake being  
down is a common  
occurrence in actual  
practice, and is not held  
to justify the stopping of  
a train between stations.  
The noise produced by a  
wagon brake being down  
and the effect of the appli-  
cation of the Guards brake  
designed as a signal to the  
Driver is easily distinguish-  
able by any Driver. The  
Guards brake in these  
cases is always applied  
in sudden jerks which  
the Driver cannot fail  
to understand. On looking  
back the Driver would  
at

train to satisfy himself whether or  
not a Wagon brake had accidentally got  
down. but it appeared to me then, as it  
does now, on further consideration that  
all that the Driver could be blamed  
for, was, committing an error in judg-  
ment.

3. The Guards as it appears to me  
are in no way to blame - the night was  
very dark, and they could discover nothing  
to be wrong with the train, except that  
it was running at an unusually slow  
rate of speed.

4. I would venture to remind His  
Grace the Governor that as a rule the  
staff by which Railways are worked  
in this country does not possess the  
intelligence (the greater number of the  
men being East Indians) which is to  
be met with at the hands of Drivers  
and Guards in England, and this  
being the case I trust that shortcoming  
on the part of our staff will not be  
judged too severely.

I have the honour to be

Dear Sir,  
I am so much  
obliged to you for the  
information you have  
given me of the signals so made  
as was put at the end of the  
line which see rule 10. Drivers

Yours most Obedt Servant  
J. H. [Signature]

P.W.D.  
14/10/76  
N. 5. 8. 32

Regarding the details of a telegram of the 18th July from Madras to the Madras Railway Office a letter on the 26th last.

MADEAS RAILWAY  
The Agent and Manager,  
The Consulting Engineer  
for Railways  
Dated 11.11.76  
Recd 20/11/76

It is not worth while to waste time in discussing a matter which has been settled by - but it may be pointed out that the driver detecting a brake down in the train - is equivalent to receiving signal from ahead. See General rule 13 - & Division rule 15 -

Besides committing an error of judgment - he disregarded the order in last part of rule 15. That rule is a very important one - in the case of <sup>anything very important</sup> ~~accidents~~ the brake is probably the quickest means of attracting a driver's attention - The driver in question failed to attend to what he supposed was a letter on - he thereby endangered

the whole train - as pointed out by the Manager. As they had crossed a girder bridge - the most serious failure would almost certainly have happened - The driver heard the sound of something like a brake on - The guards ought to have heard it. The driver was running 5 wagons ahead. The head guard was 5 wagons back from the derailed wagon -

The timing of the train is not accounted for - by the reduction of speed stated -

The guards failed to notice the red light of the watchman - at 2 places who understood & attracted the attention of those in charge

at the same time see the guard's light being waved in a violent manner - Not noticing any of these signals the driver continued his career

C. M. Walker Major-General R.E.  
Secretary to Govt. D. T. M.

Ootacamund  
August 18/76.

W. A. S.

N<sup>o</sup> 2292 Public Works Department

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT

Under date the 30<sup>th</sup> Aug<sup>r</sup> 1876.  
Read the following —

*From*  
The Cong. Engineer } (L.C. N<sup>o</sup> 399d/12<sup>th</sup> Aug<sup>r</sup> 1876)  
for Railways

The Engineer in  
Council does not see  
any reason to modify  
the order referred to.

11/6  
24/1

Cong. Engr for Railways  
1876

72-  
 537  
 Subt. of 1876 Madras.  
 PUBLIC WORKS.

To the Com<sup>r</sup> Engr<sup>s</sup> for Railways

Dated

Issued

Recd

Encl

U O 20<sup>th</sup> Sept 1876, No 2292

Nos. 655-656

being  
 Bill run over on the 29<sup>th</sup>  
 Feb. 1876 on the Bangalore  
 Branch. For the. Intimating  
 that Engrs see no reason  
 to modify their order of the  
 28<sup>th</sup> June relating to the  
 accident caused by a —

Engrs  
 19-9-76