

(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.	3057	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	15-11	26
		195

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th November 1876. No. 3,057.*

Read the following papers :—

No. 255. Endorsement of the Secretary to Government, Military Department, dated Ootacamund, 23rd June 1876, No. 3,153.

From Colonel J. W. RIDEOUT, Officiating Controller of Military Accounts, to Colonel J. MICHAEL, c.s.i., Secretary to Government, Military Department, dated Fort St. George, 21st June 1876, C.

I HAVE the honor to forward memorandum from the Quartermaster-General, No. 3,926, dated 7th June 1876, with correspondence, relative to a charge made by the Railway Company for the conveyance of the baggage of Her Majesty's 48th Regiment while proceeding from Bellary to Beypore in December 1875, which should apparently have been carried free.

2. The Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General, Ceded Districts, and the Quartermaster-General have entered so fully into the subject, that this office has no further remarks to offer, beyond stating that, under the circumstances set forth, the Railway Authorities appear to be clearly liable for the refund of the overcharge.

3. I may mention that a precisely similar instance of overcharge occurred in December 1874, on a requisition prepared by Colonel Bolton, Assistant Quartermaster-General, but on a representation made by the Examiner to the Chief Auditor, Madras Railway, the amount overcharged was refunded.

4. The above two cases apparently point to a want of co-operation between the railway subordinates and despatching officers in respect to the proper and most economical stowage of baggage, to which it may seem advisable to invite the attention of the authorities concerned.

No. 3,926.

FORWARDED for the information and orders of Government.

2. The case is clearly stated by the Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General, Ceded Districts.

3. There is no doubt but that Major Swanston was in error when he included wagons for "free baggage" in his Warrant although such free baggage was only that which was in excess of the allotment of two brake vans; but he was under the impression at the time that he was acting in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 103 of the Transport Regulations, Part II.

4. The fact remains however that the cost of four wagons (Rupees 1,254) is due to the Government by the Railway Company.

5. The Traffic Manager himself admits the accuracy of the principle upon which the claim is made; he only questions the capacity of a brake van; but that being clearly laid down at 45 maunds his argument that greater weight should have been put into them will not hold.

6. It is true that the ruling which established 45 maunds as the capacity of a brake van was only introduced as a temporary measure, but it has never been cancelled, and still forms part of the Railway Transport Regulations.

7. The following documents are enclosed for reference :—

1. Letter No. 395, dated 22nd March 1876, from the Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General, Ceded Districts, to the Traffic Manager, Madras Railway.

2. Letter No. A-^{68,340}_{15,173}, dated 5th May 1876, from the Traffic Manager, Madras Railway, to the Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General, Ceded Districts, with one enclosure.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th November 1876. No. 3,057.*

3. Letter No. 596, dated 10th May 1876, from the Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General, Ceded Districts to the Traffic Manager, Madras Railway
4. Letter No. A-^{68,340}_{15,173}, dated 22nd May 1876, from the Traffic Manager, Madras Railway, to the Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General, Ceded Districts.
5. Letter No. 653, dated 27th May 1876, from the Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General, Ceded Districts, to the Quartermaster-General, Fort St. George.

(By order,)

(Signed) D. SCOTT, Lieutenant-Colonel,
Offg. Dy. Quartermaster-General.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
7th June 1876.

From Major N. SWANSTON, Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General, Ceded Districts, to Brigadier-General A. HOWLETT, c.s., Quartermaster-General, Fort St. George, dated Bellary, 27th May 1876, No. 652.

I HAVE the honor to submit for consideration the following matter.

2. On the 10th, 12th, and 13th of December last, extra troop trains were despatched hence to Beypore, conveying upon each occasion portions of the 48th Regiment.
3. The troop trains despatched conveyed the number of passengers and the quantity of personal baggage to which they were entitled as follows:—

Train despatched.	Adults.	CHILDREN		Personal Baggage as per Regulation.
		Over 12.	Between 12 & 3.	
December 10th	361	42	63	319½ maunds.
" 12th	320	1	99	342 "
" 13th	323	2	134	355½ "
Total personal baggage...				1,017 maunds.

4. In taking up conveyance by rail it was assumed that under paragraph 103, Part II, Transport Regulations, the two brake vans attached to each train were alone allowed for the conveyance of the authorized quantity of free baggage of the troops; and their capacity for this purpose was calculated under paragraph 24 of the same Regulations as being 45 maunds each.

5. In each case, therefore, 90 maunds was deducted as the free allowance, and carriage for the balance was included in the body of the requisitions (Form D) for the troop trains and charged to Government.

In other words the three trains conveyed 270 maunds of personal baggage free of charge, and 747 maunds charged to Government.

6. The Examiner of Commissariat Accounts, in auditing the charges connected with the three trains in question, has disallowed the mode of calculation as above noted, stating, that the Madras Railway Company is bound by its own traffic rules to convey 41½ lbs. of personal baggage free for each adult travelling, and should provide free of charge carriage for all such beyond the capacity of the brake vans.

7. By this ruling, the Company should have conveyed at the time in question free of charge 646½ maunds, consequently payment has been made for the transport of 376½ maunds in excess, being the difference between 747 maunds paid for, and 370½ maunds for which payment only should have been made.

This amount of baggage is under paragraph 24 of the Regulations, equivalent to about four wagon loads, and for the distance travelled Rupees 1,254 have been paid.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th November 1876. No. 3,057.*

8. The Railway Company having therefore absolutely received Rupees 1,254 from Government in excess of that, to which, by the ruling of the Commissariat Examiner, it was entitled, I addressed the Traffic Manager on the subject on the 22nd March last (copy of my letter attached), putting the case before him, and requesting that the sum thus overpaid might be refunded to Government.

* No. 395, dated 22nd March 1876.

9. The Traffic Manager's reply, dated 5th May, with enclosure (original attached), divested of that which is irrelevant to the point at issue, whilst acknowledging the liability of the Company to convey the amount of personal baggage per adult passenger free as set forth by the Examiner demurs to the amount stated to have been overpaid on this account, stating, that has the two brake vans attached to the troop train on the 10th December had been loaded with 157 maunds 38½ seers, say, 158 maunds of luggage, the brakes attached to the other two trains, having been vehicles of equal capacity, should have been equally well weighted, and consequently the Company should be credited with having conveyed $158 \times 3 = 474$ maunds, leaving a balance of 172½ maunds for the charge, for the conveyance of which alone a refund can be claimed, if a claim at all can be put forth.

10. In reply to this (copy of my letter,† dated 10th May, attached) I pointed out that which appeared to be a weak point in the Traffic

† No. 696, dated 10th May 1876.

Manager's argument (*vide* paragraphs 4 to 7 of my letter), the substance of which is, that the weights he gives per brake (2½ tons) would be about the greatest dead weight load a vehicle of that kind would carry, and it is most improbable that the description of baggage usually put into a brake van attached to a troop train, consisting as it does of bundles, bedding, and so forth, bulky rather than weighty kit, could weight the vehicle to that extent, however well packed; and in support of my views I quoted paragraph 24, Part II of the Transport Regulations, which, when being framed, the nature of the baggage likely to be loaded in a brake van must have been had in view, otherwise so great a difference as exists between 45 maunds, the capacity there given for guidance, and 77 maunds that claimed by the Traffic Manager would hardly have been allowed.

I further pointed out that, as a matter of fact, the two brake vans, upon which the Traffic Manager bases his calculation, were loaded with heavy baggage the evening previous to departure of the train, the fatigue party, so far as I was able to ascertain on inquiry, having erroneously supposed them to be "covered wagons;" consequently on the morning of departure, the light baggage that accompanied the troops from barracks was loaded in ordinary wagons; hence the difference between the weight of baggage said to have been conveyed in these two brakes, and that in the brakes attached to the trains on the 12th and 13th of December, and which were used as intended by regulation, is at once accounted for.

† A 68,340
15,173

The Traffic Manager's reply,‡ dated 22nd instant, is attached in original, paragraph 3 alone of which appears to bear upon the subject.

11. I have the honor to solicit that the foregoing may be submitted for the favorable consideration of the Commander-in-Chief, and that His Excellency may be pleased to obtain the views and orders of Government upon the point at issue, and which I trust has been clearly set forth, and as succinctly as the same would admit of.

From Major N. SWANTON, Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General, Ceded Districts, to H. E. CHURCH, Esq., Traffic Manager, Madras Railway Company, dated Bellary, 22nd March 1876, No. 395.

I HAVE the honor to submit, for your consideration and action, the following matter connected with the despatch of certain troop trains hence to Beypoor in December last.

2. The trains to which reference is now made, together with the several ranks conveyed by them, are as follows, viz. :—

Ranks conveyed.	TRAINS LEFT BELLARY.		
	10-12-75.	12-12-75.	13-12-75.
British Officers ...	MDS. 6	MDS. 5	MDS. 5
Do. do. wives...	...	3	3
Do. do. children ...	...	(c) 3	(f) 5
2nd-class Warrant Officers ...	...	4	6
British Troops ...	200	186	152
Do. do. wives...	11	27	35
Do. do. children ...	(a) 33	(d) 47	(g) 81
Native followers ...	58	55	72
Do. do. wives...	44	40	50
Do. do. children ...	(b) 72	(e) 50	(h) 50
Personal baggage allowed ...	319½	342	355½

(a.) Between 3 and 12.

(b.) Forty-two over 12; 30 between 3 and 12.

(c.) Between 3 and 12.

(d.) One over 12; 46 between 3 and 12.

(e.) Between 3 and 12.

(f.) One over 12; 4 between 3 and 12.

(g.) One over 12; 80 between 3 and 12.

(h.) Between 3 and 12.

3. In calculating the amount of carriage required to convey the personal baggage noted on each occasion, 90 maunds only was deducted as "free," that being the capacity of the two brake vans attached to each train, and which in accordance with paragraph 103, Part II, Transport Regulations, this office assumed was all that the Railway Company was called upon to convey free of charge.

4. The Examiner of Commissariat Accounts at Madras has, however, objected to this, and states that under paragraph VI, Section "Conveyance of Troops," "Madras Railway Local Traffic," the Railway Company should have conveyed baggage to the extent of 44½ lbs. for each adult travelling, providing free of charge the necessary vehicles for this purpose for the quantity exceeding the carrying capacity of the two brake vans.

5. Under this ruling the Railway Company has received payment for the conveyance of 376½ maunds of baggage more than it was entitled to, and for which it should have provided carriage free of charge.

6. The following statement sets forth the case more clearly, viz. :—

Calculation as made by this office—

	Maunds.
Total amount of personal baggage allowed by regulations for the three trains ...	1,017
Amount deducted as free at 90 maunds per train ...	270
Balance of conveyance of which the Company has received payment.	747
By the Examiner's ruling—	
Total amount of baggage allowed as above ...	1,017
Amount which the Company should have conveyed free at 44½ per adult	646½
Balance for conveyance of which the Company should have been paid.	370½

7. Hence calculating the capacity of a wagon at 90 maunds, payment has been made for four wagons in excess, amounting at Rs. 313-8-0 per wagon to an aggregate of Rupees 1,254.

8. On this statement being examined and found correct, I beg leave to request that the above amount may be paid into the Madras Bank to the credit of Government under the head of

"Excess Railway Fares" and the Bank's simple receipt (the duplicate) transmitted to this office at early convenience.

To simplify reference, I herewith enclose copies of the Warrants upon which the troop trains in question were furnished.

From H. E. CHURCH, Esq., Traffic Manager, Madras Railway Company, to Major N. SWANSTON, Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General, Ceded Districts, Bellary, dated Madras, 5th May 1876, No. A-^{89,310}_{15,173}.

I HAVE the honor to enclose, for your information, copy of a letter to my address from the Assistant Traffic Manager of Gooty, reporting the arrangements made by the regiment for loading the baggage sent by the troop trains from Bellary to Beypore on the 10th, 12th, and 13th December last.

2. It is admitted that an unnecessary number of wagons were indented for and consequently supplied, but in justice to the Company I do not see how your claim for a refund can be admitted as it stands.

3. It will be seen that the two brake vans of the first train contained 158 maunds of baggage, and as the vans of the other two trains were of the same description, there can be no doubt that the same weight of luggage might and would have been loaded in them if the Railway Company could have exercised any control in the matter. Mr. Darke states that the division between "free" and "chargeable" baggage was made by the regiment, and that the Railway Company had no option with regard to the loads to be placed in the brake vans.

4. Under these circumstances and for the reason stated in Mr. Darke's letter, that a private carriage (of itself a very bulky article) was placed in one of the wagons, it appears to me that if any claim can be sustained against the Company, for it must be remembered that the indents of the Quartermaster-General's Department were strictly complied with, it can only be for the number of wagons absolutely necessary for the conveyance of the "free allowance" which could not have been placed in the brake vans, and this is estimated at two wagons as follows :—

	Maunds.
Railway allowance for 1,155 adults ...	631
Less quantity which could have been placed in six brake vans ...	474
Difference ...	157

or less than two wagon loads.

From A. W. DARKE, Esq., Assistant Traffic Manager, to H. E. CHURCH, Esq., Traffic Manager, Madras Railway Company, dated Gooty, 2nd May 1876, No. 9,336.

Troop Extra Trains overcharged.

I HAVE made further inquiry with reference to the above subject, and the particulars ascertained are as follows :—

The five baggage wagons run in each train were on each occasion loaded by the troops a day or two in advance. The wagons in the troop train of the 10th December were fully loaded with baggage. Some of the wagons in the troop trains of 12th and 13th December were not fully loaded, and one of the wagons in the last-named train was loaded with a private carriage, the property of one of the officers. This explains why the total weight of baggage loaded in the baggage wagons of the troop train of 13th December was so much less than that in the other trains. All the wagons were supplied as per the indent of the Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General, and were therefore charged at the mileage rate. The baggage carried free as railway allowance was that portion not loaded in the baggage wagons and brought to the station by the troops on the days the respective trains ran. It was then loaded in the brake vans. The brake vans of

the troop train of 10th December were fully loaded with 157 maunds 38½ seers of free baggage. The brake vans of the troop train of 12th December contained only 64 maunds 25 seers and the brake vans of the troop train of 13th carried 95 maunds 30 seers. Total baggage carried free in the six brake vans as railway allowance 318 maunds 13½ seers. This quantity of baggage only was carried free as the railway allowance, because it was all that was brought to the station to be loaded in the brake vans on the days the train ran. Had the Military Authorities in loading the wagons reserved sufficient baggage for the brake vans to make up the proper railway allowance of 44½ lbs. per man, that allowance would have been made.

The actual division of baggage consisted in this, that the Military Authorities loaded the quantity of baggage they thought proper in the wagons a day or two before the trains ran and reserved what they thought proper to be loaded in the brake vans on the day of starting, and this was considered and taken to be all the baggage they wished to send under the head of railway allowance.

The Quartermaster-General indented for more wagons than were actually necessary probably through a misconception of the quantity of baggage he was entitled to send free as the railway allowance.

From Major N. SWANSTON, Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General, Ceded Districts, to
H. E. CHURCH, Esq., Traffic Manager, Madras Railway Company, dated Bellary,
10th May 1876, No. 596.

In acknowledging the receipt of your No. A ^{68,340}_{15,173} dated the 5th instant, with its enclosure, I beg leave to invite your attention more particularly to the point at issue, and which is connected entirely with the amount of carriage taken up for the conveyance of the free allotment of personal baggage of the troops despatched hence by extra trains on the 10th, 12th, and 13th December last. No question whatever has been raised relative to the amount of carriage indented for and supplied for the transport of regimental stores, and so forth, on those occasions, and which was in accordance with the amount sanctioned by regulation, much therefore that the Assistant Traffic Manager at Gooty places before you is irrelevant.

2. Divested of that which in no way bears upon it, the question now for consideration is how far the assumption is correct, that the brake vans attached to each of the trains could have conveyed 158 maunds of free baggage, or 474 maunds in all, as put forward in the concluding paragraph of your letter under reply as a *per contra* to that which is set forth in my No. 395, dated the 22nd March last.

3. Your calculation is framed upon the information given by the Assistant Traffic Manager, that the two brake vans attached to the troop-extra on the 10th December were weighted with 157 maunds 38½ seers, whilst those on the 12th conveyed but 64 maunds 25 seers, and on the 13th, 95 maunds 30 seers, and you claim that, as the vehicles were all of the same capacity, the heavier weight should have been conveyed equally on the two latter as on the first occasion.

4. One hundred and fifty-seven maunds 38½ seers, say, 158 maunds would give to each brake a load of 2 tons 16½ cwt. nearly which would be I assume about the greatest dead weight load.

5. The description of baggage usually put into brake vans consists of bundles and such like bulky rather than weighty articles; therefore it presents itself as being highly improbable that a brake van, though packed to the full with baggage of this description, even allowing a few heavy items to be amongst it, could be weighted to the above extent by it.

6. That my views are not misconceived is, I think, borne out by the fact that the Transport Regulations lay down that the capacity of a brake van for soldiers' baggage is to be calculated at 45 maunds, or very little over half the weight capacity you claim, clearly showing that the nature of the baggage which would be loaded in this description of vehicle had not been lost sight of when this ruling was sanctioned by Government.

7. As a matter of fact, however, the two brakes, which were attached to the train on the 10th December, had, through some misconception of the regimental authorities, been loaded overnight with heavy freight, and on the morrow the baggage, which accompanied the troops to the station and which under ordinary circumstances would have been loaded in the brakes, was loaded in a wagon. Had the brakes been available in the morning, as but for the error committed they would have been, the weights then loaded in them would undoubtedly have been more in accordance with those carried in the brakes of the two subsequent trains, whilst the wagon would have shown a load of 158 maunds in lieu of possibly one between 90 and 100 maunds.

8. How far the custom adopted of striking an average, and thus obtaining hypothetically the weight load in a brake, can be trusted when dealing with freight such as that now under consideration, I am not in a position to state, but that the brake vans despatched on the 12th and 13th December were equally well filled, I have no hesitation in asserting, though their weight appears to have differed by 31 maunds.

9. The Commissariat Examiner rules that for the number of adults conveyed by the three troop trains in question, the Railway Company should have conveyed free of charge 646½ maunds of personal baggage.

10. On behalf of the Company you claim that 474 maunds have been, or could have been so conveyed in the brake vans, and that if any refund is to be made it can be but for the difference, or somewhat less than two wagon loads, or Rupees 627.

11. For the reasons assigned, I am unable to view the question from your stand-point.

Should you, on reconsidering the subject as again brought before you in the foregoing remarks, still adhere to the opinion that the brake vans could and should have conveyed the weight of baggage stated, as the whole question now hangs on the correctness of this assumption, I have the honor to solicit a reply to that effect at your earliest convenience in order that the point at issue may be submitted for the consideration and final disposal of Government.

From H. E. CHURCH, Esq., Traffic Manager, Madras Railway Company, to Major N. SWANSTON, Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General, Ceded Districts, dated Madras,
22nd May 1876, No. A ^{68,340}_{15,173}.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 613, of 13th instant, and with reference to the first paragraph of your letter, No. 576, of the 10th inst., beg to inform you that I cannot agree with you in thinking that the particulars contained in the letter of the Assistant Traffic Manager at Gooty are irrelevant to the question at issue, as Government are as much interested in the economical working of the railway as in the economical transport of troops.

2. I understand by the order to which you refer that the capacity of brake vans is merely an estimate, and is furnished simply as a guide to despatching officers, as I cannot suppose that the Government would require the Railway Companies to run additional vehicles, at additional cost to the State, for the free allowance of baggage, when probably the brake vans attached to the train, if properly loaded, would suffice for its conveyance.

3. Nor can I agree with you in thinking that it was the intention of the Government that the railway allowance should consist of *light* baggage only. Indeed, in framing paragraph 103 of the Transport Regulations, it was evidently contemplated that two brake vans would carry all the "authorized quantity of free baggage," and in eight cases out of ten I have no doubt this could be effected.

4. With respect to the *free* or *railway* allowance of baggage, I am of opinion that it should be weighed out to the Railway Company, who should provide for its conveyance, and, if this were done, questions of the kind under reference could not arise.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th November 1876. No. 3,057.*

5. The papers should, in my opinion, be submitted to the Government, as the interests of the Government and of the Railway Company are identical on the point at issue.

From Major N. SWANSTON, Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General, Ceded Districts, to Brigadier-General A. HOWLETT, C.B., Quartermaster-General, Fort St. George, dated Bellary, 27th May 1876, No. 653.

ADVERTING to the remark made by the Assistant Traffic Manager, Gooty, in his No. 9,336,* dated 2nd May 1876, to the Traffic Manager, Madras Railway, Madras,
* Forwarded with this office No. 652 of this date.

mentioning that a private carriage was loaded in one of the wagons attached to the troop train despatched from this on the 13th December, I have the honor to explain that a wagon was taken up privately by certain officers of the 48th Regiment, in which the carriage in question was loaded. Shortly after the departure of the train on the morning of the 13th December, the Station Master intimated to me that the wagon left behind for despatch was unequally loaded, and he wished to make some redistribution of its contents. As it had been sealed by the regimental authorities, I went over to the station, and the wagon was opened in my presence, when it was found that it contained boxes of books, the property of the soldiers' library, and other regimental stores; the wagon taken up by the officers having, in making up the train, evidently been attached to it in lieu of this one. This wagon was however despatched by goods train and consigned to the Officer Commanding the 48th Regiment to Beypoor, "to be paid for," so that neither did Government on the one hand nor the Railway Company on the other in any way suffer loss.

2. This explanation I consider necessary to prevent a misconception which might otherwise arise from perusal of the Assistant Traffic Manager's remarks alone.

3. I did not refer to this subject in my No. 652 of this date, as I desired to confine my remarks therein entirely to that which I deem the point at issue; and to which the matter now touched upon is irrelevant.

No. 255-A. 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, 2nd October 1876, No. 474.

I HAVE the honor to forward correspondence as per margin on the subject of the claims preferred for the conveyance of the baggage of Her Majesty's 48th Regiment in December 1875, referred to in your memorandum, No. 1,006, dated 29th June 1876.

2. It would appear that the Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General of the Ceded Districts, misinterpreting a section on the Transport Regulations, authorized an overpayment to the Railway Company. The Traffic Manager, in the course of his investigation into this claim for refund, found that a large quantity of private baggage, for which the Commanding Officer ought to have paid before the train left the station, had been carried free. He accordingly advanced a counter claim.

3. There appears to be no doubt but that the private baggage was carried; and the Transport Regulations lay down clearly that the Military Authorities should have

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th November 1876. No. 3,057.*

ascertained the quantity, made special arrangements for its carriage, and tendered payment to the Railway Authorities, before the train started.

4. Mr. Church disputes the amount of the original claim on the ground that a brake van, perfectly packed, can and did hold more than 45 maunds, the load assumed by the Transport Regulations for purposes of calculation. This objection does not seem tenable; and it appears to me that, while the Railway Company owes to the Government a refund of Rupees 1,254, the Commanding Officer of the 48th Regiment owes to the Railway Company Rupees 1,649-2-0.

5. The Traffic Manager suggests that "baggage to be carried free" should be handed over to the Railway Company, and that the loading of it should be left entirely to them. The Officiating Controller of Military Accounts endorses the suggestion. It appears to this office that some such arrangement is called for; but from the correspondence enclosed it would seem that, besides so-called Government baggage and camp equipage, there is personal baggage, payment for which is adjusted under three heads:—

- (1.) The allowance carried free by the Railway Company.
- (2.) The allowance paid for by Government.
- (3.) The excess to be paid for before the train starts by Commanding Officers and to be specially arranged for.

It is thought that, in fact, all personal baggage forms, so far as transport is concerned, one consignment, and should come under one regulation as regards its despatch. The whole consignment could be handed over to the station authorities to pack; and the payment for the excess, which would be the difference between the gross weight as ascertained at the station and that entered in Column 2 of Form C, would be paid for, by or through the officer on duty, as "additional private baggage."

6. Paragraph 103 of the Transport Regulation seems likely to lead to misconception, as it is doubtful whether two brake vans per train can carry the allowance in weight of the bulky articles for which this rule is intended to provide; and as the Railway Company is bound to furnish the space required there seems no advantage to be gained by specifying that two brake vans will be supplied.

7. The original papers which accompanied your memorandum No. 1,006 are returned.

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. 814.

In returning the original correspondence forwarded with your letter of the 3rd ultimo, No. 701, I have the honor to invite your attention to the enclosed copy of the Traffic Manager's letter, No. A $\frac{A. \& M. 68,240}{1,852}$, dated the 24th idem, from which it appears that the baggage in respect to which an overcharge is claimed by the Controller of Military Accounts was actually undercharged.

2. I shall be glad to learn, after the Controller has had an opportunity of perusing Mr. Church's letter, whether the Company's claim is admitted.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th November 1876. No. 3,057.*

From H. E. CHURCH, Esq., Traffic Manager, to R. B. ELWIN, Esq., Agent and Manager
of the Madras Railway Company, dated Madras, 24th July 1876, No. A $\frac{A \& M. 68,340}{1,852}$.

Claim for overcharge on Troop Extra Train.

CONSULTING Engineer's letter No. 701, dated 3rd instant.

I have to thank you for affording me an opportunity of perusing the papers which accompanied this letter, as it would appear that I have been led into error, and that instead of the Deputy Quartermaster-General having a claim for an *overcharge*, the Railway Company has a claim for an *undercharge*, on the baggage conveyed by the trains referred to.

2. Admitting that, according to Major Swanston's figures, the Railway Company has been paid for a part of the baggage which the Company is required to carry "free of charge," it will be seen from figures which I will give, and which I believe have been furnished to Major Swanston since his first application for a refund was made, that the Company has not been paid by the regiment, as required by regulation, for the "additional private baggage" conveyed in the three trains, the charge for which amounts to much more than Major Swanston's claim.

3. The regiment was entitled, according to the copies of Warrants courteously furnished to me by Major Swanston, to carry at the expense of Government—

Personal baggage...	...	...	1,018 maunds.
Government do. ...	...	...	394 ..

Total ... 1,412

but the actual weight of baggage carried in the three trains was 1,917 maunds, so that the difference (505 maunds) was "additional private baggage," and under Clause 102 of Part II of the Transport Regulations, amended by General Order by his Ills Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, printed with Madras G.O., No. 2,555, dated 9th September 1874, should have been made over to the Railway Company and paid for on the spot by the Commanding Officer, and entered in Form D for the guidance of the Account Department when settling the bill of the Railway Company. The charge in this case for 505 maunds of baggage is Rupees 1,649-2-0, and, as no payment was made by the regiment for this additional baggage, we now claim this amount.

4. The claim should unquestionably have been made at the time, and the reason why it was not demanded is explained in the following extract from a letter to my address from the Divisional Officer of this department:—

"As the wagons were supplied in accordance with the Quartermaster-General's requisition, the Station Master considered that the Military Authorities had the option of loading therein any quantity of baggage they thought proper so long as the wagons were not overloaded; therefore he did not think it necessary to specially advise the Quartermaster-General of the fact that more than the Government allowance was loaded in them, especially as an officer of the regiment was present when the wagons were loaded and when the weight was taken, and it was considered that it rested with the Military Authorities to decide whether the Government allowance might be exceeded in completing the loading of the wagons ordered."

It is true that Clause 8 of the Transport Regulations requires the extra train, according to requisition, to be made over by the railway to the military despatching authority under whose orders the vehicles will be filled, and further that no interference is allowed so long as the vehicles are not overloaded, but, in respect of baggage, Clause 101 of the Transport Regulations, Part II, prescribes that the baggage shall be weighed before it is taken to the Railway Station, in order that the "excess baggage" may be correctly ascertained, and Clause 102 prescribes how and when it is to be paid for. Again, Clause 106 prescribes that the actual weight of the baggage shall be correctly ascertained at the Railway Station and entered in the reverse of Form D.

5. The actual weight of the baggage was correctly ascertained at the Railway Station, but the gross weight is more by 505 maunds than the weight entered on the back of Form D. The actual weight of the baggage loaded in each wagon of each train was as follows.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th November 1876. No. 3,057.*

December 10th.	December 12th.	December 13th.
Ton. Ct. Q. Lbs.	Ton. Ct. Q. Lbs.	Ton. Ct. Q. Lbs.
3 15 1 12	2 10 2 0	2 3 3 0
3 14 2 0	3 9 1 0	4 6 1 0
3 14 3 0	4 19 2 0	2 18 2 0
6 0 1 0	5 6 1 0	3 6 1 0
6 1 1 0	5 1 0 0	1 7 1 0
23 6 0 0	21 6 2 0	14 2 0 0

Total for 15 wagons	...	...	...	...	Tons	58 14 2
Equivalent to	...	...	...	...	Maunds	1,598 30
Add baggage loaded in vans	...	...	...	...		318 13
					Gross weight	1,917 3

and there is no doubt in my opinion that the Railway Company is entitled to payment for the 505 maunds of excess baggage.

6. My objection to the claim preferred for a refund of the charges on four wagons is, that some of the wagons were not properly loaded, and, in support of this objection, I would refer to the figures in paragraph 5, and to the following figures, showing the average load of each wagon and brake in each train.

	December 10th.	December 12th.	December 13th.
	Maunds.	Maunds.	Maunds.
Brake	...	...	...
Wagon	...	...	...

It will be seen that while the wagons and brakes in the first train give an average weight of 127 and 78 maunds respectively, the wagons and brakes in the last train only give 77 and 47 respectively, clearly showing that the wagons in the last train and the brakes in the second and third trains were not loaded to their fullest capacity, and that a smaller number of wagons would have been sufficient if the baggage had been properly stowed. The responsibility for this duty is clearly defined in Clause 107 of the Transport Regulations.

7. The Railway Company was required to find conveyance, free of cost to the Government, for 628 maunds of baggage. All the vans in the three trains were of equal capacity, and all should have been loaded to the same extent as the vans of the first train, viz., with 78 maunds each.

The 78 maunds $\times$ 6 vans = 468 maunds, or 160 maunds less than the railway allowance, equivalent to, say, two wagon loads, and this was my reason for offering to refund the charges on two wagons only, but this offer must now be contingent on the payment to the Company of Rupees 1,649-2-0 for additional private baggage, and for which we may fairly, in my opinion, look to the Quartermaster-General's department.

8. It may be as well to state that the Railway Company has incurred the cost of hauling these wagons 627 miles.

9. I would suggest, as one mode of obviating applications of this kind, that the "free allowance" of baggage should be handed over to the Railway Company, and that the loading of it should be left entirely to the Company, and if this were done questions of the kind under reference could not be raised.

From Colonel J. W. RIDEOUT, Officiating Controller of Military Accounts, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. SHAW-STEWART, R.E., Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Fort St. George, 12th September 1876, No. 1,459.

In returning the enclosures of your letter No. 1,096, dated 21st August 1876, I have the honor to state that of the baggage carried by the detachments of Her Majesty's 48th Regiment,

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th November 1876. No. 3,057.*

while proceeding from Bellary to Bypore in December 1875, free conveyance was admissible for 646½ maunds. Major Swanston, the Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General, Ceded Districts, deducted only 270 maunds, or 45 maunds for each of the six brake vans, two to each train, and entered in the Warrant the remainder 376½ maunds, or four wagon loads, for which the railway authorities charged Rupees 1,254, and to which this department took exception.

2. If any baggage was carried in excess of the above regulated quantity, it was the duty of the Officer Commanding each detachment to have paid for its carriage before starting. The omission to do so is apparently owing to no demand for the same having been made by the Railway Company, in consequence of Major Swanston having indented for the four extra wagons.

3. Ordinarily the claim of the Railway Company to payment for the conveyance of private baggage is settled with the despatching officer before starting; but as in this instance wagons in excess of the regulated number had been indented for, which afforded accommodation for the private baggage in question, it is for Government to decide on whom the responsibility of payment for the excess charge lies.

4. The suggestion of the Traffic Manager, that in future the "free allowance of baggage should be handed over to the Railway Company, and that the loading of it should be left entirely with them," would, if adopted, obviate in a great measure the many retrenchments now issued on this account. The Company, in their own interests, would supply the exact number of wagons required; and indenting officers would also be relieved of a certain amount of responsibility, as they would include in their Warrants only such number of wagons as are necessary for the conveyance of the baggage at Government expense.

REFERRED with the Quartermaster-General's letter to the Public Works Department, (Railway).

(By order,)

(Signed) J. MICHAEL, Colonel,
Secretary to Government, M.D.

No. 256.

ORDER THEREON, 15th November 1876, No. 3,057.

RAILWAY, No. 41.

HIS GRACE the Governor in Council is of opinion that the Railway Company are only entitled to charge for the excess baggage found after deducting the railway allowance of 628 maunds. The gross weight of the baggage carried was 1,917 maunds; of this the Government allowance was 1,412 maunds, leaving 505 maunds to be paid for by the troops and 1,412 — 628, or 784 maunds to be paid for by Government. The charge on the excess private baggage is calculated at Rupees 1,649-2-0, and this sum should be adjusted under instructions in the Military Department. On the other hand the Company have overcharged to an extent calculated by the Quartermaster-General at Rupees 1,254. The necessary adjustment on this account should also be made.

2. In separate Proceedings* the Military Department have been requested to consider whether the arrangements for the adjustment of charges for carriage of baggage can be simplified. This correspondence strongly points to the necessity for some

* No. 3,056, dated 15th November 1876.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th November 1876. No. 3,057.*

change being also made in the existing procedure as regards the delivery and loading of baggage. The matter will be referred to the Quartermaster-General in the Military Department.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Military Department.

„ Consulting Engineer for Railways.
„ Examiner of Railway Accounts.

Exd. A. Grubert.
Spare Copies

misinterpreted

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

CONSULTING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,

Madras, 2nd Oct. 1876.

No.

474.

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,

I have the honour to forward correspondence as per margin on the subject of the claims preferred for the conveyance of the baggage of Her Majesty's 48th Regiment in Decr 1875, referred to in your memorandum No 1006, dated 29th June 1876.

2. It would appear that the Dy. Asst. Quarter Master General of the Ceded Districts, misinterpreting

Letter from the Agent, Madras Ry. No 814 dated 9. Aug 1876 with enclosure

Controller of Military Accounts No 1459, dated 12. Sept. 1876.

misinterpreting a section on the Transport Regulations, —, authorised an overpayment to the Railway Company. The Traffic Manager, in the course of his investigation into this claim for refund, found that a large quantity of private baggage, for which the Commanding Officer ought to have paid before the train left the station, had been carried free. He accordingly advanced a counter claim.

3. There appears to be no doubt but that the private baggage was carried; and the Transport Regulations

9 2
Regulations lay down clearly that the Military Authorities should have ascertained the quantity, made special arrangements for its carriage, and tendered payment to the Railway Authorities before the train started.

4. Mr Church disputes the amount of the original claim, on the ground that a brake van, perfectly packed, can and did hold more than 45 man, the load assumed by the Transport Regulations for purposes of calculation. This objection does not

not seem tenable; and it appears to me that, while the Railway Company owes to the Government a refund of Rs. 1254, the commanding officer of the 48th Regiment owes to the Railway Company Rs. 1649.2.0.

5. The Traffic Manager suggests that baggage to be carried free should be handed over to the Railway Company, and that the loading of it should be left entirely to them. The Officiating Controller of Military Accounts endorses the suggestion. It appears to this Office that some such

10 3
such arrangement is called for; but from the correspondence enclosed it would seem that, besides so-called Government baggage and camp equipage, there is personal baggage, payment for which is adjusted under three heads:-

(1). The allowance carried free by the Railway Company.

(2). The allowance paid for by Government.

(3). The excess to be paid for before the train

train starts by Com-
manding Officers and
the specially arrang-
ed for.

It is thought that, in fact,
all personal baggage forms,
so far as Transport is con-
cerned, one consignment, and
should come under one re-
gulation as regards its
despatch. The whole consign-
ment could be handed over
to the Station Authorities to
pack; and the payment for
the excess, which would be
the difference between the
gross weight as ascertained

at the station and that
entered in column 2 of Form
C, would be paid for, by
or through the Officer on
duty, as "additional private
baggage."

6. Paragraph 103 of the
Transport Regulation seems likely
to lead to misconception, as it
is doubtful whether two brake
vans per train can carry the
allowance in weight of the
bulky articles for which this
rule is intended to provide;
and as the Railway Company
is bound to furnish the space
required, there seems no advan-
tage

advantage to be gained by specifying that two brake valves will be supplied.

7. The original papers
It is which accompanied your memo.
all random N: 1006, are returned.

so far as I have the honour to be,
Yours truly, Sir,

Yours Most Obedt. Servant,

gular

despa
Crescent Railway

[Handwritten signature]

10/11/20
"kacko"

the

the a

gros

Q 15-1-75 No 125.
D. 1.75. 153
9-9-74 - 2838

P.W.D.
300170
7080

No. 814

MADRAS RAILWAY.

AGENT AND MANAGER'S OFFICE.

Madras, 9th August 1876

From

Robert B. Elwin, Esq.

Agent and Manager of the M.R. Co.

To

Lieut. Col. J. H. M. Shaw, Stewart R.E.

Consulting Engineer for Railways.

Sir,

In returning the original correspondence forwarded with your letter of the 3rd ultimo. No. 701, I have the honour to invite your attention to the enclosed copy of the Traffic Manager's letter No. A ⁶⁸³⁴⁰/₁₈₅₂ dated the 24th idem from which it appears that the Baggage in respect to which an overcharge is claimed by the Controller of Military Accounts, was actually undercharged.

I shall be glad to learn, after the Controller has had an opportunity of perusing Mr. Church's letter, whether the Company's claim is admitted.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,
Your most obedient servant

R. B. Elwin

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT

From

The Consulting Engineer

for Railways,

To

The Secretary to Government,

P. W. Department,

Fort Saint George.

Dated

2nd Sept 1876

1876

Received

No. 1474

Respecting the

the claims for

for the conveyance

the baggage of the

48th Regiment

December 1875

Cir - 7-10-76 R 14-11-76.
Depts to Oct 4-10-76.

No 253

P.W.D.
200170
No 7080

11

From
The Agent and Manager.

MADRAS RAILWAY.

To
The Consulting Engineer
for Railways.

Recd
10. 11. 1876
No. 814

Residing at
the end of
of the
in the
claim for
on the

OFFICE OF CONTROLLER OF MILITARY ACCOUNTS,
Fort Saint George, 12 September 1876

No. 1459

From
The Controller of Military Accounts,
Fort Saint George

To
The Consulting Engineer
for Railways

Sir,
In returning the enclosure
of your letter No. 1096 dated 21 August
1876, I have the honor to state that
of the baggage carried by the Detach-
ments of Her Majesty's 48 Regiment,
while proceeding from Bellary to
Deylore in December 1875, free con-
veyance was admissible for 646 1/2
brands. Major Swanton the
Deputy Assistant Quarter Master
General, Ceded Districts, deducted
only 270 brands, or 45 brands for each
of the 6 Brake Vans, two to each
train, and entered in the Warrant.
The remainder 376 1/2 brands, or 4 Wagon
loads, for which the Railway authorities

charged

P.W.D.
7080

From
The Controller of Military Accounts,
Fort Saint George.

To
The Consulting Engineer,
Fort Saint George.

No. 1459
Dated 12 September 1876
Received

Enclosures 2

Handwritten notes:
The above is a statement of the baggage of the 48th Regiment of Foot Guards, which was carried by the Railway Company, and is submitted for the consideration of the Consulting Engineer.

Dr General's Office
Ceded District
Bellary, 27 May 1876.

No 652

From

The D. A. Dr General
Ceded District

No. 1117
Office of Controller of Military Accounts,
Fort Saint George, 21 June 1876

General
George.

FROM

THE CONTROLLER OF MILITARY ACCOUNTS,

TO

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
MILITARY DEPARTMENT.

Coloanund

to submit
Following

I have the honor to forward
Memorandum from the Quarter Master December
General N 3926, dated 7 June 1876, with correspondence relative to the charge made by the Railway Company upon the consequence of the baggage of the 48th Regiment of Foot Guards while proceeding from Bellary to Deppore in December 1875, which should apparently have been carried free.

The Deputy Assistant Quarter Master General, Ceded District, and the Quarter Master General have

		Entered	per regulation
December 10	361	42	63
" 12	320	1	99
" 13	323	2	134

Total personal baggage 1017 Mounds

P.W.D.

7080

No 652

Dr General's Office
Ceded District
Bellary, 27 May 1876

From

The D. A. Dr General
Ceded District

Stowage of baggage, to which it
may seem advisable to invite the general
attention of the Authorities concerned. George.

I have the honor to be,

Your Obedient Servant, Howing

W. D. M. & W. G. Colwell,

Off. Controller of Public Works

December
despatched
upon
the 48
patched
passengers
and baggage
as follows:

				Personal baggage per regulation
December 10	361	42	63	319 1/4 Mounds
12	320	1	99	342 1/2 " "
13	323	2	134	355 1/4 " "
Total personal baggage				1017 Mounds

entered so fully into the subject
that this Office has no further re-
marks to offer, beyond stating
that under the circumstances abo-
ve, the Railway Authorities ap-
pear to be clearly liable for the
refund of the overcharge.

I may mention that, a
precisely similar instance of over-
charge occurred in December 1874
on a requisition prepared by Colonel
Dillon, Assistant Quarter Master
General, but on a representation
made by the Government to the Chief
Auditor, Madras Railway, the
amount overcharged was refunded.

The above two cases appa-
rently point to a want of cooperation
between the Railway Subordinates
and Despatching Officers in respect
to the proper and most economical
Stowage

Received
Inclosures 2
Endorsement
H. G. M. & W. G. Colwell
to be sent to the
Office of the
Dr General's Office
for the
Dr General's Office
for the
Dr General's Office
for the

Total personal baggage	1017 Mounds
------------------------	-------------

4. In taking up conveyance by Rail it was assumed, that under Para 103, part II, Transport Regulations, the two Break Vans attached to each train were alone allowed for the conveyance of the authorized quantity of free baggage of the Troops - and their capacity for this purpose, was calculated under para 24 of the same Regulations, as being 45 Maunds each -

5. In each case therefore, 90 Maunds was deducted as the free allowance, and carriage for the balance was included in the body of the Requisitions (Form D) for the Troop trains, and charged to Government -

In other words the 3 trains conveyed 270 Maunds of personal baggage free of charge, and 747 Maunds charged to Government -

6. The Examiner of Commissariat accounts, in auditing the charges connected with the three trains in question, has disallowed the mode of calculation as above noted, stating that the Madras Railway Company is bound by its own Traffic rules to convey 44 1/2% of personal baggage free for each adult travelling, and should

Domest 7104 10/10/1876 provided

17
provide free of charge carriage for all such beyond the capacity of the break vans -

7. By this ruling the Company should have conveyed at the time in question free of charge 646 1/2 Maunds, consequently payment has been made for the transport of 376 1/2 Maunds in excess - being the difference between 747 Maunds paid for, and 370 1/2 Maunds for which payment only should have been made -

This amount of baggage is under para 24 of the Regulations, equivalent to about four wagon loads, and for the distance travelled Rupees 1254-0-0 have been paid -

8. The Railway Company having therefore absolutely received Rs. 1254-0-0 from Government in excess of that, to which, by the ruling of the Commissariat Examiner, it was entitled, I addressed the Traffic Manager on the subject on the 22nd March last - Copy of my letter attached - putting the case before him, and requesting that the sum thus overpaid might be refunded to Government -

9. The Traffic Manager's reply, dated 5th Mar

395, dated 22nd March 1876 -

5th May with enclosure - original attached -
directed of that which is relevant
to the point at issue - whilst acknowledging
the liability of the Company to convey
the amount of personal baggage per
adult passenger free as set forth by
the Gammon's demurs to the amount
stated to have been overpaid on
this account, stating that as the two
break vans attached to this Troop train
on the 10th December, had been loaded with
157 Maunds $38\frac{1}{2}$ Seers - say 158 Maunds
of luggage - the breaks attached to
the other two trains, having been
vehicles of equal capacity, should
have been equally well weighted,
and consequently the Company should
be credited with having conveyed
 $158 \times 3 = 474$ Maunds leaving a balance
of $172\frac{1}{2}$ Maunds for the charge for the
conveyance of which alone, a refund
can be claimed - if a claim at all can
be put forth.

10. In reply to this - Copy of my letter
dated 10th May attached - I pointed out
that which appeared to be a weak point
in the Traffic Manager's argument - vide
para 4 to 7 of my letter - the substance
of which is, that the weights he gives
per break ($2\frac{3}{4}$ tons) would be about
the greatest dead weight load a vehicle
of

of that kind would carry, and it is
most improbable that the description
of baggage usually put into a break
van attached to a Troop train, consisting
as it does of bundles - bedding &c
folds - bulky rather than weighty kit
could weigh the vehicle to that extent
however well packed, and in support
of my views I quoted Para 42, part II of
the Transport Regulations, which,
when being framed, the nature of the
baggage likely to be loaded in a
Break van must have been had in
view otherwise so great a difference
as exists between 45 Maunds the
Capacity then given for guidance,
and 77 Maunds that claimed by the
Traffic Manager, would hardly have
been allowed.

I further pointed out that as a
matter of fact, the two Break Vans,
upon which the Traffic Manager
bases his calculation, were loaded
with heavy baggage the evening pre-
-vious to departure of the train, the
fatigue party - so far as I was able
to ascertain on enquiry - having erroneously
supposed them to be "Covered Wagons",
consequently on the morning of departure
the light baggage that accompanied
the troops from Barracks, was loaded
in

in ordinary wagons - hence the difference between the weight of baggage said to have been conveyed in these two breaks, and that in the breaks attached to the trains on the 12th and 13th of December, and which were used as intended by regulation - is at once accounted for.

The Traffic Manager's reply dated 22nd instant is attached in original. Para 3 alone of which appears to bear upon the subject.

11. I have the honor to solicit, that the foregoing may be submitted for the favorable consideration of the Commander-in-Chief, and that His Excellency may be pleased to obtain the views and orders of Government upon the point at issue, and which I trust has been clearly set forth, and as succinctly as the same would admit of.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your obedient servant

/Signed/ H. Swanston, Major
D.A.M.S., C.D.

3rd Contd. of Military Accounts

No. 3926 - 7 June 76

True copy - Forwarded for the information and orders of Government.

The case is clearly stated by the Deputy Assistant Quarter Master General Ceded District.

3. There is no doubt, but that Major Swanston was in error when he included wagons for "free baggage" in his Warrant, although such free baggage was only that, which was in excess of the allotment of 2 brake vans, but he was under the impression at the time, that he was acting in accordance with the provisions of Para 103 of the Transport Regulations Part II.

4. The fact remains however that the cost of 4 wagons (Rs 1254) is due to the Government by the railway Company.

5. The Traffic Manager himself admits the accuracy of the principle, upon which the claim is made; he only questions the capacity of a brake van, but that being clearly laid down at 45 Maunds, his argument that greater weight should have

have been put into them will not hold -
It is true, that the ruling, which
established 45 Maunds, as the capacity
of a brake van, was introduced, as a
temporary measure, but it has never
been cancelled, and still forms part
of the railway transport regulations -

The following documents are
enclosed for reference -

1. Letter No 395, dated 22nd March 1876, from
the Darnuff Ceded Districts to the
Traffic Manager, M. A.

2. Letter No. a/68340, dated 5th May 1876
from the Traffic Manager, M. A., to the
Darnuff Ceded Districts - with one
enclosure -

3. Letter No 596, dated 10th May 1876 from
the Darnuff Ceded Districts to the
Traffic Manager, Madras A.

4. Letter No. a/68340, dated 22nd May
1876, from the Traffic Manager, M. A.,
to the Darnuff Ceded Districts -

5. Letter No 653, dated 27th May 1876 from
the Darnuff Ceded Districts to the Darnuff
District -

By Order/
H. H. L. L. L.
Off. Dy. Secy General
To The Secretary to Govt. M. A.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 15th Nov 1876

Read the following:—

From The Comd. Eng. for Railways } (No. 474 of 2nd Oct 1876)

His Grace the Governor in Council is of opinion that the Railway Company are only entitled to charge for the excess baggage found after deducting the Railway allowance of 628 mounds. The gross weight of the Baggage carried was 1917 mounds, of this the Government allowance was 1412 mounds, leaving 505 mounds to be paid for by the Troops, and

P. 474 of 2nd Oct 1876

1876.
Military No. 2029
From the Comd. Eng. for Railways
to the Secretary of the
Military Dept.

Recd 7th 3 June
No. 3926-66

Enclosed for the
information of the
Govt. Secy of the
Military Dept. is
a copy of the
order of the
Comd. Eng. for
Railways, dated
the 15th Nov 1876,
relative to the
baggage of the
Troops, and the
consequence of
the same.

and 1412-688 or 784
maunds to be paid for
by Government. The charge
in the excess private baggage
is calculated at Rs 1649-
2-0 and this sum should
be adjusted under instructions
in the Military Department.

On the other hand the
Company have overcharged
to an extent calculated
by the Quarter Master
General at Rs 1254. The
necessary adjustment on
this account should also
be made.

In separate proceedings
the Military Department
have been requested to
consider whether the arrange-
ments for the adjustment
of charges for carriage
of baggage can be sim-
plified. This correspondence
strongly points to the necessity
for

for some change being
also made in the existing
procedure as regards
the delivery and loading
of baggage. The matter
will be referred to the
Quarter Master General
in the Military Depart-
ment.

* No 3056 of 15th Nov 1876

The Bank of India

Military Dept. 15 ✓
Comd Eng. for Rys ✓
Ex. Rys Accts. ✓

Recd 13-11-76

7/10/76
Govt. of 1876 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

The Military Department

Date

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. 15 Nov 1876, No. 3057

Nos. 253/56

1. Claim referred to the
Military P.W. for the survey
since the survey of the
is 48th Regt. in Decr/75 -
Putting orders on correction
since regarding the

N^o 253/56