

(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.	3291	(Ry)	Press
B.P. No.			Mis.
Dated	5-12		1876

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following papers —

No 114 Endorsement of the Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras,
4th November 1876, No 535

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, 2nd November 1876, No 1,102.

I HAVE the honor to report, for the information of Government, that a collision
occurred this morning on the South-west Line, about 2 miles west of the Vaniembady
Station

2 I learn that the 7-30 P M goods train of yesterday from Madras overtook
and ran into a special goods train which left Madras at 6-30 P M, and that the engine,
four wagons, and two brake-vans were very much damaged.

3 The Acting Chief Engineer, the Traffic Manager, and the Locomotive Super-
intendent have gone up to the scene of the accident by special train, and further
particulars will be reported to you as soon as possible.

SUBMITTED for the information of Government;

Particulars will follow on receipt of the Proceedings of the Committee that sat
the following day to inquire into the cause of the accident.

(Signed) C. J. SMITH, Major, R E,
for Consulting Engineer for Railways

No 114-A From Lieutenant-Colonel J H M SHAW-STEWART, R E, Consult-
ing Engineer for Railways, to Major-General G W WALKER, R E,
Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 24th
November 1876, No 576.

In continuation of No 535, dated the 4th instant, I have the honor to lay before
Government three letters, with enclosures,
from the Agent of the Madras Railway,
No 1,151, 14th November 1876 regarding the collision which took place
" 1,181, 20th " " between Vaniembady and Jollarepett Sta-
" 1,205, 23rd " " tions on the morning of the 2nd instant

2 An inquiry into the circumstances connected with the collision was held at
Jollarepett on the day after the accident occurred This inquiry was conducted by the
heads of the Engineering, Locomotive, and Traffic Departments, with whom was
associated Major Smith, Deputy Consulting Engineer. The evidence taken during
that inquiry is given at full length in the enclosed papers Reports upon the subject
from the Locomotive Superintendent and from the Traffic Manager are also enclosed

3 The facts connected with the accident do not admit of much doubt; and the following summary, given by the Traffic Manager in his letter to the Agent, can hardly be challenged —

"(1)—That immediately after the train stopped the first fireman and subsequently the driver came to the chief guard's brake-van, which was the last vehicle in the train, and informed the guard that the train could not proceed for want of water. The fireman states that he told the guard to show signal to protect the train, while the guard states that both the fireman and the driver said the train must be put back to Vaniembady, which the guard objected to

"(2)—That signals were sent out by the guard to protect the train on the Vaniembady side.

"(3)—That within a few minutes after this order had been given and the driver had returned to his engine, the train began to move backwards, and continued to move from the Nacoondy gate about 125th mile 17th telegraph post until the 7-30 P.M. train ran into it at 124th mile 16th telegraph post.

"(4)—That the 7-30 P.M. train, which is not timed to stop at Vaniembady, was on this occasion stopped by signal, and left that station fifteen minutes after the 6-30 P.M. special goods train.

"(5)—That at the time of the accident the watchman, sent out by the guard to exhibit signals, was only one telegraph post from the rear of the 6-30 P.M. train, which in moving backwards had almost overtaken him."

4. The opinion arrived at by the officers who conducted the inquiry, and endorsed by the Agent, was to the effect that the collision was solely due to culpable rashness on the part of Bowell, the driver of the 6-30 P.M. special train. In that opinion I entirely concur

5 Mr. Elwin states that Bowell violated no rule of the Company in putting back his train, and that he could not therefore be successfully prosecuted, but that he has been dismissed from the service, in order to mark the Company's serious displeasure at his prevarication and utter disregard of truth

6 I agree with Mr Elwin that, by the act of backing his train, driver Bowell violated none of the Company's rules, and I am of opinion that it would be a matter of great difficulty to frame a rule which would meet the special circumstances, and that action in all such cases must be left

Section XIII, Rule 19 to the discretion of those in charge of the train. It seems to me doubtful whether the rule quoted by the Locomotive Superintendent was not violated. It runs as follows:—

"An engineman is never to leave an engine in steam without putting the regulator, putting the slides out of gear, and screwing up the tender brake, and he must on no account leave his engine or train on the main line, except in charge of the fireman or some competent person."

According to the evidence, even that of the driver and fireman, the engine was left for some time in charge of the second fireman, the driver and first fireman

having both left it. And if the driver's statement, as to the train moving backwards of its own accord, is to be accepted, there can be no moral doubt that the brakes had not been properly applied. This is in fact admitted by the driver, who states, "Before I could return to the engine, the train commenced to move backwards. I jumped on the foot-plate, applied the brake, and stopped the train." It is however explained in Mr Elwin's letter that Bowell afterwards abandoned that statement, and admitted that he did put back the train, and there might therefore have been difficulty in securing a conviction against him under the Railway Act

7 However that may be, I am of opinion that the provisions of the Penal Code were sufficient to meet the case. Chapter XVI, Section 336, runs as follows —

"Whoever does any act so rashly or negligently as to endanger human life or the personal safety of others, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to three months, or with fine which may extend to 250 Rupees, or with both."

As to the rashness of Bowell's action in backing his train there can be little doubt. He admits that the 7-30 P.M. goods train arrived at Gooriattum, about twelve minutes after his train, and that he was subsequently losing time, owing to his engine being out of order. After passing Vaniembady "the engine began to prime

very much, the pressure fell to 60 lbs.,* so that there can be no doubt that the train travelled slowly up to the point where it was stopped, $2\frac{3}{4}$ miles from Vaniembady station. There was then an interval of at least† five minutes before the train

began to move backwards. It was therefore almost certain that the 7-30 P.M. train, which would probably leave the Vaniembady station fifteen minutes after the 6-30 P.M. train had passed it, would run into the latter train before it could regain the station

8. I am aware that the proposal to prosecute Bowell under the section of the Penal Code quoted above was carefully considered by the Railway Officers, and rejected, doubtless for strong reasons, but it seems to me a matter for regret that the prosecution was not instituted.

From R. B. ELWIN, Esq., Agent and Manager, Madras Railway Company, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. M. SHAW-STEWART, R.E., Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 14th November 1876, No. 1,151

In continuation of my letter of the 2nd instant, No. 1,102, I have the honor to submit, for the information of His Grace the Governor in Council, the copy of a letter* from the Traffic Manager, together with a copy of the depositions of the several witnesses who were examined at Jollapett on the morning of the 3rd instant, by the Committee appointed to inquire into the circumstances connected with the unfortunate collision near Vaniembady on the 2nd instant, when the 7-30 P.M. ordinary goods train from Madras to Beypoor ran into the 6-30 P.M. special train from Madras to Bangalore

2 I also submit a copy of the Locomotive Superintendent's letter of the 11th instant, No. 594

3 The result of the inquiry conclusively demonstrates that Bowell, the driver of the 6-30 P.M. special train, is solely responsible for the accident

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th December 1876. No. 3,291.*

4. The facts which were elicited by the Committee are very simple, and are as follow —
The special train left Madras at 6-30 P.M. on the 1st November and consisted of Engine No 78, twenty-one wagons laden with grain, and two brake-vans.

The train lost time up to Arcot, owing to traffic and other detentions, at which station twelve additional wagons were attached to make up the proper load, and it left Arcot at 10-30 P.M., or one hour late.

The train stopped for water at Arcot and Vellore, and at Goornattum to meet the 10-15 A.M. mail from Beypore of the previous day. It again stopped at Mailputty for water and then continued its journey passing the Amboor and Vaniembady stations.

Soon after passing Vaniembady the driver asserts that the engine began to "jume" very much, and that the pressure in his gauge-glass fell to 60 lbs. He stopped his train and a "crane" that he sent his first fireman back to tell the chief guard to protect his train. From this point however the evidence of driver Powell conflicts directly with that of the other witnesses.

Bowell asserts that he got off his engine to go to the gate man to tell him to exhibit a danger signal, and that before he could return to his engine the train had commenced to move backwards. Powell further states that he got back on to his engine as quickly as possible, that he then applied his brake and whistled for the guard's brakes, that immediately afterwards he saw the lights of the 7-30 P.M. goods train as it came round the curve, and the collision followed.

The evidence of the guard of the special train is to the effect that when the train first stopped, he put down his brake, and soon afterwards the driver and the fireman came up to his van, when Powell explained that he was short of water and must put back to Vaniembady. The guard at once objected to this course, and reminded the driver that the 7-30 P.M. train was following, and that if he was really short of water he should run on to Jollapett while he, the guard, protected the train.

Signals were then sent out by the guard to protect the train on the Vaniembady side, and within a few minutes of this being done the train began to move backwards, and continued to do so from the Nacoondy gate at the 125th mile 17th telegraph post to the 124th mile 16th telegraph post, where it was run into by the 7-30 P.M. goods train.

5. The evidence of the chief guard is corroborated in all essential points by the other witnesses, while the statement of the driver stands almost entirely unsupported.

6. I sent for driver Powell yesterday and afforded him an opportunity of offering any explanation for his conduct. He admitted that he did put back his train, not however with the intention of returning to Vaniembady, but to enable him to get upon an easier gradient and thus obtain a fresh start.

7. Powell has been in the service of the Company for the last six years, two as a fireman and the last four as a driver, and the Locomotive Superintendent reports that he has always borne an excellent character for steadiness, attention to duty, and competence.

8. Powell violated no rule of the Company in putting back his train, and he cannot therefore be successfully prosecuted, but to mark the serious displeasure of the Company at his prevarication and utter disregard of truth, I have dismissed him from the service of the Company.

9. In the course of a few days I shall hope to have the honor to send you a statement showing the damage which the rolling stock has sustained by this untoward accident.

From H. E. CHURCH, Esq., Traffic Manager, Madras,
and Manager of the Madras Railway Co., Ltd.,
No. 63, 778, 2, 1923.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th December 1876. No. 3,291.*

presence of Major Smith, the Deputy Consulting Engineer, the Acting Chief Engineer, the Locomotive Superintendent and myself, when the following witnesses were examined, viz —

- | | | | |
|------|---|----|----|
| No 1 | Charles Powell, driver of 6-30 P.M. special goods train | | |
| " 2 | Mulhon, 1st fireman, | do | do |
| " 3 | Abdool Ezack, 2nd fireman, | do | do |
| " 4 | Alexander Devine, chief guard, | do | do |
| " 5 | William Reid, driver of 7-30 P.M. goods train | | |
| " 6 | Iyasawmy, brakesman of 6-30 P.M. special goods train | | |
| " 7 | Imenan, line watchman | | |
| " 8 | Payen, bridge watchman | | |
| " 9 | Nagapen, gateman of Nacoondy gate | | |
| " 10 | Abdul Cawder, do do | | |
| " 11 | Chensooramiah, Assistant Station Master of Vaniembady | | |
| " 12 | James Barefoot, Locomotive Foreman | | |

2. The special goods train was working under the following notice —

"This day Wednesday the 1st November a special goods train will run from Madras to Jollapett as under —

	P M
Leave Madras	6-30
" Goods shed junction	6-50
Perambore, wait arrival of	6-15 A M
" Trivellore	8-20
" Arcot	9-20
" Arcot	10-40
Vellore, meet	8-45 A M
" Goornattum	12-50
Mailputty, meet	10-15 A M
" Amboor	2-0
Arrive Jollapett	3-10
A M { The 4-30 A M special and 5-40 A M of 2nd instant to wait arrival "	

3. It will be seen from the depositions of the driver and guard of the 6-30 P.M., that the train lost time throughout the journey, and passed through the Vaniembady station at 4-49 A.M. on the 2nd November, or about two hours and thirteen minutes after time, and at 125½ miles, or 2½ miles west of the Vaniembady station, the train was stopped.

4. There will scarcely be any doubt, after a perusal of the whole of the evidence, on the following points, viz —

1st — That immediately after the train stopped, the first fireman and subsequently the driver came to the chief guard's brake-van, which was the last vehicle in the train, and informed the guard that the train could not proceed for want of water. The fireman states that he told the guard to show signal to protect the train, while the guard states that both the fireman and driver said the train must be put back to Vaniembady, which the guard objected to.

2nd — That signals were sent out by the guard to protect the train on the Vaniembady side.

3rd — That within a few minutes after this order had been given and the driver had returned to his engine, the train began to move backwards, and continued to move from the Nacoondy gate about 125th mile 17th telegraph post, until the 7-30 P.M. train ran into it at 124th mile 16th telegraph post.

4th — That the 7-30 P.M. train, which is not timed to stop at Vaniembady, was on this occasion stopped by signal, and left that station 15 minutes after the 6-30 P.M. special goods train.

5th — That at the time of the accident the watchman sent, out by the guard to exhibit signals, was only one telegraph post from the rear of the 6-30 P.M. train, which, in moving backwards, had almost overtaken him.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th December 1876 No 3,291.*

5 The statement of the chief guard is corroborated on all essential points by the other witnesses, while the driver's statement stands almost entirely unsupported.

6 It is difficult to say whether the driver intended to put back to Vaniembady or not but I believe I am correct in saying that the Committee, being of opinion that the brake-power on the train was amply sufficient to hold the train, which was standing partly on an incline of 1 in 1,200 and partly on an incline of 1 in 225, falling towards Vaniembady, and that the brakes of both vans were screwed down, could not resist coming to the conclusion, that the train could not have been put in motion without steam

7 The depositions of the several witnesses are herewith enclosed

From F H TREVITHICK, Esq, Locomotive Superintendent, to R B ELWIN, Esq, Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, dated Perambore Works, Madras, 11th November 1876, No 594

Collision near Vaniembady

Yours No 3,937 of the 10th instant

I have not reported formally upon this occurrence, because I believe that some steps would be taken in the matter by the Consulting Engineer, who is in possession of the same evidence in the case as I am, and I was aware that you were acquainted with the main facts of the case

I have requested driver Bowell to be present at your office at noon on Monday next, and I will make a point of attending at the same time

I annex for your information a return of the time made by both drivers concerned for the three days previous to the accident This return has been furnished to Major Smith, at his request, to show that the men had not been overworked

Concisely stated, the circumstances under which the accident happened are these —

The 6-30 P M train from Madras left on time with a "big engine" just turned out of the shops, the engine's boiler was greasy, as the boilers of engines just turned out of the shops generally are Greasy boilers are apt to prime, and this boiler was expected to prime, and the driver was quite aware of the condition of the engine under his charge There was nothing, however, in the condition of the engine which rendered her unfit to take a train, and it is customary to send new engines from Perambore with trains wherever possible in order to avoid empty mileage

The driver of this train lost time from the commencement of his journey, not however so much from the condition of his engine as from traffic delays.

Some time was, however, lost by the engine further on, owing to the heating of the connecting rod bearings, but no difficulty of any consequence seems to have been experienced till after the train had passed Vaniembady The train left Vaniembady at a little better speed than she had been making for some miles back, when the boiler seems to have started priming suddenly, and to have so reduced the pressure of steam that the train was unable to proceed.

At this point the evidence becomes very conflicting, but I am of opinion that for some reason the driver did certainly back the train deliberately, even in spite of the remonstrance and prohibition of the guard, and that the accident is due entirely to this action on the part of the driver

The usual precaution to protect the train in rear by sending out danger signals appears to have been taken, but the action of the driver in backing his train entirely nullified their effect. The driver stated that the train ran back of itself while he was some distance in front of it, instructing the gateman to send danger signals in front, and while his head fireman was at the back of the train requesting the guard to protect the train in rear This statement was contradicted by the evidence of several witnesses, and I am of opinion that it is not true; but even if it were true, the driver is guilty of very culpable negligence in allowing his train to stand on an incline so steep that he had been unable to surmount it, while he left his engine and went one way and directed his fireman to go on another, without even seeing that his brakes were screwed down before he left his engine and train to take care of itself

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th December 1876. No 3,291*

There is a Rule, No, 19, page 41, of the Rule Book, which directs "that an engineman is never to leave an engine in steam without putting her out of gear and screwing on the brakes, and that he must on no account leave his engine or train on the main line except in charge of the fireman or some competent person"

There is no accusation of drunkenness or incompetence

Driver Bowell has been in the service of the Company six years, as a fireman two years and as driver four years, and has always borne an excellent character for steadiness, attention to duty and competence

In my opinion the accident is the consequence of over-confidence, and an unreasoning instinct that things would come right somehow That in fact the accident was not the result of incompetence, but of recklessness

As you have directed that Bowell should be brought before you, I refrain from making any suggestions as to the manner in which he should be dealt with

Driver Reid, who was in charge of the 7-30 P M from Madras which collided with Bowell's train as the latter was backing, also bears an excellent character He has been four years in the Company's service, as a fireman three years and driver one year He gave his evidence in a clear and straightforward manner, and I do not think any blame is to be attributed to him I have therefore allowed him to resume his duty

Driver Bowell has been suspended since the accident

Statement showing the time on duty of Drivers Bowell and Reid for the three days preceding the collision at the 12th mile

		Driver Bowell		Hours		Minutes.	
October 30th, Madras on duty	6-45 P M	Hours on duty	10	15			
Do departure	7-30 P M						
" 31st, Jollarepett, arrival	4-35 A M	Late arrival, 30 minutes					
Do off duty	5- 0 A M	Hours off duty		14	45		
		Hs Mts					
October 31st, Jollarepett on duty	7-45 P M	Late starting	3	40			
November 1st, do departure	12-10 A M						
Madras, arrival	7-45 A M	Hours on duty	12	30			
Do off duty	8-15 A M						
		Late arrival		2	25		
		Hours off duty		9	15		
November 1st—Madras, on duty	5-30 P M	, on duty	10	40			
Do, departure	6-30 P M						
" 2nd—125th mile, arrival	4-10 A M						
		H M					
				9	15		
		Hs Mts					
October 30th—Wash out	7 to 9 A M	Hours on duty	11	0			
Madras, on duty	1 P M						
Do departure	1-45 P M	Late arrival	1	30			
Tirupetty, arrival	9-30 P M						
Do, off duty	10 P M	Hours off duty		6	30		
October 31st—Tirupetty, on duty	4-30 A M	Late departure	0	30			
Do, departure	6-30 A M						
Madras, arrival	12 noon	Hours on duty	8	0			
Do, off duty	12-30 P M						
		Late arrival		0	5		
		Hours off duty		18	30		
November 1st—Wash out	7 to 9 A M	" on duty	2	0			
Madras, on duty	7 P M						
Do, departure	7-30 P M	" off duty	10	0			
" 2nd—125th mile, arrival	4-10 A M						
		" on duty		9	10		

(Signed) F. H TREVITHICK,
Locomotive Superintendent.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th December 1876. No 3,291.*

PROCEEDINGS of a Committee assembled at Jollarett at 9-30 A.M. on Friday the 3rd November 1876, to inquire into the cause of the collision which occurred at 124th mile 10th telegraph post South-west Line, on the morning of the 2nd idem, between the 7-30 P.M. goods train which left Madras on the 1st November, and the 6-30 P.M. special train which left Madras on the same date.

PRESENT

Major C J SMITH, Deputy Consulting Engineer for Railways
W R ROBINSON, Esq., Acting Chief Engineer, Madras Railway
F H TREVITHICK, Esq., Locomotive Superintendent, do
H E CHURCH, Esq., Traffic Manager, do

The following witnesses were examined —

No 1 CHARLES BOWELI — I am at present an engine-driver in the service of the Company, and have been so employed about seven years. I was the driver of the 6-30 P.M. special goods train which left Madras on the 1st November. I left the Central Station at the appointed time with twenty-three loaded goods vehicles and engine No 78. I was delayed at Avady about twenty minutes, waiting for 6.15 A.M. train from Erode. I stopped at Travellers for water. Stopped again at Arcunum about twenty minutes, shunting and watering at Arcunum. I made up my load to thirty-five loaded vehicles, the proper load for an engine of the class I was driving. I left Arcunum at 10-20 P.M., or one hour late. I was running slow from Madras, owing to the engine beating. I stopped at Arcot for water about six minutes, and think I left Arcot about one hour after time. The 7-30 P.M. goods from Madras was running behind me, and was standing at the points of the Arcot station when I was taking water. I stopped again at Vellore for water and to receive instructions about meeting the 10-15 A.M. mail train, as I was running late. I received orders to proceed to Gornattum instead of to Mailputty to meet the 10-15 mail. I proceeded to Gornattum and met the mail. The 7-30 P.M. followed me to Gornattum and arrived at that station about twelve minutes after my train. I was detained at Gornattum about fifteen minutes, but cannot say how much I was late leaving that station. I stopped at Mailputty for water about five minutes. I did not see the 7-30 P.M. I passed Ambour and Vaniembady stations without stopping. After passing the Vaniembady station the engine began to prime very much, the pressure fell to 60 lbs., and I had to stop at the traffic gate situated in the 12th mile. As soon as I stopped, I sent back first fireman Mullion "to tell the guard to protect my train in the rear, as I could not go any further." I left the footplate and ran on in front to the gateman, and told him to put a red signal out in front to protect my train. Before I could return to the engine, the train commenced to move backwards. I jumped on the footplate, applied the brake, and stopped the train, I whistled for the guard's brake, and he showed me a red signal. I whistled for the guard's brake before I stopped the train, and when I saw the guard's red signal I saw the 7-30 P.M. goods train coming round the curve. Directly I saw the 7-30 P.M. I gave steam to try to get out of the way, but could not start the train, and immediately afterwards the 7-30 P.M. train ran into my train. I was thrown off the engine by the shock and fell on my back. At the time I was thrown off, the regulator was open, and the brake was "on." I jumped up again directly and shut the regulator.

Cross Examined — I had to go from 20 to 30 yards from my engine to speak to the gateman, and after I had given him instructions I looked towards the train and saw it was moving backwards. I ran as fast as I could to the engine which was about the distance of one telegraph post, and I applied the engine brake, the tender brake was being applied by the second fireman (a Mussulman), I do not know his name. After I applied the engine brake, the train continued to move backwards about five telegraph posts. First fireman Mullion jumped on the engine at the same time as I did and helped the second fireman with the tender brake.

There was an interval of five minutes between my leaving the engine to speak to the gateman and my seeing the train moving.

I did not inquire of Mullion whether he had conveyed my orders to the guard. I had no conversation with him.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th December 1876 No. 3,291.*

The train could only move about 8 or 9 miles an hour after leaving Vaniembady. I did not hear the 7-30 P.M. whistle after leaving Vaniembady.

I think that I lost time between Mailputty and Vaniembady.

When I stopped at 125th mile I had something less than half tender of water.

I had no conversation with the guard of my train after leaving Gornattum until after the accident.

When I left my engine to speak to the gateman, the second fireman was breaking coal on the engine, and at the time I returned he was applying the tender brake.

When I gave the engine steam to go forward I saw both the firemen on the engine at the tender brake. The engine and tender brakes were both "on."

The train had hardly come to a standstill when the collision took place. I knew the train was on an incline when I left the engine to go and speak to the gateman. The tender brake was put on, I believe, by the second fireman, the engine brake was not "on." I did not think it was necessary to put the engine brake on.

Re-examined — I do not know if the witness (Nagapen) is the man I spoke to. He was coming at the time I spoke to him from the end of the train from the Vaniembady side. I went forward to look for some one, and looking back I saw the watchman or gateman coming from the direction of the guard's van.

No 2 MULLION OR MULLIAPPEN — I am a fireman in the service of the Madras Railway Company. I was first fireman of the 6-30 P.M. special train from Madras of the 1st November. On the Jollarett side of Vaniembady the engine commenced to prime very much, the steam fell very much, and the train stopped between a bridge and gate. I did not see the telegraph post. After the train stopped, the driver ordered me to tell the guard that the engine was priming very badly and could not make steam, that he (guard) must show danger signal, and that as soon as the driver had got steam he would go on again. I went to the guard and told him in English that he must send a watchman to protect the train. The guard sent a watchman, and I left him to go back to my engine. When I was five wagons distance from the guard's van the train began to pull the engine backwards. The driver was off the engine in front. I ran towards the engine and got on the engine, and put on a little more fire. The train was then standing still, because the engineman and second fireman had put the brakes on. I got on the engine after the train stopped. The engineman said to me, "did you go to the guard," and I said "yes, I did go." After I got on the engine the driver left the engine and went towards the guard's van, and I saw the driver speaking to the guard about half-way between the engine and the guard's van. The guard then went to the rear of the train, and the driver came back to the engine and got on the foot plate and did nothing. Immediately afterwards the 7-30 train ran into us. The driver whistled after he heard the noise of the 7-30 P.M., for danger, not for brakes. The train moved backwards five or six telegraph posts before it was stopped.

No 3 ABDULL EZZACK — I was second fireman of the 6-30 P.M. special train which left Madras on Wednesday last. After leaving Vaniembady I was breaking coals on the tender. The train was running slowly. The train stopped near a gate. The engine was stopped at the gate. I heard the driver tell the first fireman "Mullappen" to inform the guard that 7-30 P.M. was following and to show danger signal. The driver went to look after a watchman. When the driver was returning to the engine, the train began to move backwards. As soon as the driver came to the engine he told me to put on tender brake, and the driver put on the engine brake himself. After applying brakes and within three or four minutes, the collision took place. The driver said "train is coming." When the collision took place, the driver and I were on the engine. The collision threw me off the engine on the ballast. When I was on the ground, I saw the driver on the engine. I cannot say whether the engineman was thrown off the engine or not. I jumped up at once and got on the engine. The train ran backwards about four or five telegraph posts. After I had applied the tender brake and the driver had applied the engine brake, the train stopped about five minutes. After the train stopped, the collision took place. During that five minutes I was breaking coal. The driver was on the engine all the time. When the train was going backwards the driver whistled for brakes as well as to warn following trains. He whistled with the small whistle. I did not hear the 7-30 P.M. whistle. After the train was stopped, t.c.

driver did not leave the engine until the collision occurred. I was on the foot plate when the collision occurred and so were the driver and first fireman

No 4 ALEXANDER DEVINE—I was the guard of the 6-30 P.M. special train which left Madras on the 1st November last. I left the Central Station with one brake-van at the proper time, and stopped at the goods-shed junction, where I attached twenty-one loaded wagons, and left at right time. I stopped at Avady thirty-five minutes waiting for 6-15 A.M. I stopped again at Trivellore five minutes for water, and left that station forty minutes late. I stopped at Arconum for water and attached laden wagons making up the load to thirty-five, the proper load of the engine. I was detained at Arconum thirty minutes, and left sixty-five minutes late. The 7-30 P.M. goods train from Madras arrived at Arconum before I left. I stopped at Arcot eleven minutes and left eighty-four minutes late. Stopped at Tiruvellum four minutes for driver to oil engine. Proceeded to Vellore, where I stopped twenty-two minutes, and left at 1-30 A.M. We stopped at Gornattum to meet the mail twenty minutes, and left that station 120 minutes late. Before we started from Gornattum the 7-30 P.M. had arrived, and was standing in the station. At Arcot and Gornattum I spoke to the driver about the late running of the train, and he said the engine was running hot and priming. The driver stopped the train at Malputty for water. We passed Amboor Station at 4-10 A.M., or 130 minutes late. We also passed Vanimbady Station. The train travelled faster between Amboor and Vanimbady than between Gornattum and Amboor. We passed Vanimbady, according to my watch, at 4-50 A.M., but I did not look the time, because I was not booked to stop at that station. We ran through the facing points at Vanimbady a little faster than ten miles an hour, and the speed increased immediately afterwards. We passed the public road level crossing gate at 123-13 at a speed of twenty miles an hour. In the 125th mile we slackened speed, and the train pulled up at a stone marked "125½" at 4-57 A.M. by my watch. Immediately after the train stopped, I screwed down my brake, and first fireman "Mullappen" came to my van and said in English, "Master want to go back to Vanimbady for water." Immediately after the driver came to my van, and I asked what is the matter. The driver said he was running short of water, and could not get to Jollapett, and wanted to go back to Vanimbady. I said we are two hours and odd late and cannot think of backing the train as the 7-30 P.M. goods is following us. The driver said "he will not come up yet, we can reach Vanimbady before the 7-30 P.M. arrives." I said I would not allow it, and told the driver to go on to Jollapett for water. I meant that he should take his engine for water. He turned and went away, and I thought he was going to take his engine to Jollapett for water. The gateman in charge of 125½ mile was coming towards my van, and I told him to carry out signals. He said, I cannot go out, and called to a watchman, who was standing on the Vanimbady side of the train. I heard the watchman answer the gateman, and heard the gateman say in Tamil "go and stop the other train." I said "go quickly to stop the train coming." He went away running. He had a lamp in his hand showing a red signal. I could see the reflection of this signal on the ground. I was standing at this time about four yards in rear of my brake-van, when I saw the train moving backwards. I jumped into the van and screwed my brake down tighter. I turned my signal lamp to danger, and was holding it towards the engineman. The train continued to go backwards until it reached 124th mile sixteenth telegraph post, when I jumped out as the 7-30 P.M. train was running into me.

Cross Examined—When I left the van the train was in motion. Just before the accident happened, I heard the driver of my train whistling. I did not hear the engine of the 7-30 P.M. whistle. I believe the motion of the train backwards was caused by steam being put on. I have always been on good terms with Bowell, the driver. He said nothing to me when I objected to the train being backed to Vanimbady. The driver came all the way to my van to speak to me. He must have left the engine before it had stopped. The train was standing still five or six minutes before it commenced to move backwards. The train moved backwards at a fast walking pace and slackened towards the end. I jumped out easily, and did not fall. I do not know the exact time of the collision. In my judgment the speed of the 7-30 P.M. at the time of the collision was fifteen or twenty miles per hour. I first sighted the 7-30 P.M. train at the telegraph post from my van. I did not hear the engine of the 7-30 P.M. train at the telegraph post.

two side lamps showing red on my van, and they were all burning brightly. I trimmed and filled the lamps with oil at Vellore between one and a half past one o'clock in the morning. I noticed the whole of the lamps at Arcot, and they were burning very brightly. I did not particularly notice them before they were trimmed at Vellore, but they were burning very brightly before I left Vellore.

Question by Bowell—How can you prove that I had steam on when the train was running back?

Answer—I felt the pushing motion which I think could not have been caused by any other means. The motion that I felt was different from one which, in my opinion, would be felt in a train running back without steam.

Question—How can you prove that I had no water?

Answer—To the best of my recollection you told the guard and driver of the 7-30 P.M. train that you stopped for want of water.

No 5 WILLIAM REID—I was driver of the 7-30 P.M. goods train which left Madras on Wednesday the 1st November. I reached Arconum before the 6-30 P.M. had left that station.

Bowell told me after the collision occurred that he stopped on the road because he ran short of water. I do not think any one was present. I left Madras at 7-30 P.M. punctually with 22 vehicles, stopped at Perambore for 6-15 A.M. and left 25 minutes late. Stopped at Trivellore for water, and left 23 minutes late. Stopped outside of Arconum and subsequently took on two wagons to make up load, and left 30 minutes late. Arrived at Arcot 11-53 and was stopped 2 minutes by 6-30 P.M. special. Left Vellore one hour and three minutes late, met the mail train at Gornattum and left 70 minutes late. At Vellore I was informed by Bowell that his engine was not in good order, and that he could not keep time. I stopped at Amboor and left 93 minutes late. At Vanimbady I was stopped by signal, and told by Station-master that we must wait eight minutes, as the 6-30 P.M. had left only seven minutes previously. Leaving Vanimbady I had plenty of steam, but soon after it dropped down in consequence of dirty fuel and fire of 90 lbs. I first sighted the lamps on rear van of the 6-30 special about two or three telegraph posts from the scene of the collision. I shut off steam, ordered the brakes to be screwed up, reversed the lever, and gave steam again. Was on the look-out, and do not think it would have been possible to see the lamps sooner than I have already stated. When I struck the 6-30 special the speed was about 18 or 20 miles per hour. I cannot say whether the 6-30 special was in motion or not when I struck it. My attention was devoted to stopping the train. I was not thrown off the engine, I held on to the reversing lever.

No 6 IYASAWMY—I am a shunting porter at the Central Station, and accompanied the 6-30 P.M. special on Wednesday the 1st November as brakesman.

On the Jollapett side of Vanimbady the train stopped. The driver and fireman passed my brake running towards the guard's brake-van in the rear, they passed on the right side as you face Jollapett. I do not know whether the fireman was a Mussulman or a Pariah. I do not know whether they spoke to the guard. They returned immediately, and directly afterwards the train began to move backwards. I looked out of the window of the brake and saw the guard in the rear van showing a danger signal towards Jollapett, and I put on my brake. I put it on tight. The train continued to move backwards. My brake had no effect. I was looking out of the door when the collision occurred, and was thrown out of the van and have been suffering from breast pain since.

No 7 IMENAN—I am a line watchman (No 63) employed in the Engineer's Department at 124th mile. About three days ago, about 5 o'clock in the morning, I was exchanging the staff at 125th mile 5th telegraph post and gave "all right" signal to the 6-30 special at a gate close to the 125th mile, the train stopped. The gateman and bridge watchman were at the gate, they called me and said "exhibit your danger signal and go to Vanimbady," they said so because the special was out of order. I was running towards Vanimbady, the special was coming after me, but did not overtake me because I was running faster; there is a sharp curve at this point of the line. At the time of the collision I was half a telegraph post on the Vanimbady side of the 6-30 special train. I showed a danger signal to the 6-30 train and then showed a similar signal to the 7-30 train. I bawled out to the guard of the 6-30 to stop the train, but it continued in motion.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th December 1876 No. 3,291.*

and it appeared to me to run into the 7-30 train, which seemed to me to have stopped. When I was told to go and show a danger signal the train was standing still. I did not see the driver. I cannot account for the train moving backwards.

No 8 PATEL — I am bridge watchman in charge of bridge No 125 between Vaniembady and Jollarett, close to the Nacoondy gate crossing. Two or three days ago about 3 o'clock in the morning, I gave "all right" signal to the 6-30 special. The special stopped at the Nacoondy gate. I was standing on telegraph post on the Vaniembady side of the gate, and this is half a mile from my bridge. When the train stopped I was close to the rear van of the train. The guard told me to tell the line watchman to exhibit a danger signal to the 7-30 P.M. goods train. The line watchman was standing about four telegraph posts on the Vaniembady side of the 6-30 P.M. train. I went to the line watchman, told him to show the danger signal, and I saw him showing it. I then came towards the train which began to move backwards. I walked to the Nacoondy gate, and then I heard a noise like a cannon shot. The driver whistled three times and the train moved backwards faster than I could run. I had some conversation with the driver, it was at the time he was standing with the guard close to the brake-van, when both of them told me to go and tell the line watchman to show a danger signal on the Vaniembady side of the train. I had no conversation with the driver alone. My orders were given to me by the guard and driver when they were standing together at the guard's van.

No 9 NAGAPEN OR NAGAN — I am a gateman employed in the traffic department at the Nacoondy gate at 125th mile 17th telegraph post. I live at the gate and perform night and day duty every alternate week. I remember the 6-30 special arriving yesterday morning. It stopped at the gate, ten vehicles and engines being on the Jollarett side of the gate. The night gateman told me to go and ask the guard if a danger signal was to be exhibited. I went to the last brake of the train and asked him if I should do so, and he said, "yes, do so quickly." I came back to the gate and I turned the gate signal lamp to "danger." I stopped quite close to the gate. I had no conversation with the driver. About ten minutes afterwards the train commenced to move towards Vaniembady, and the driver whistled. The ten vehicles and the engine passed me, and the train went about three-quarters of a mile towards Vaniembady.

No 10 ABDUL CADEER — I am a gateman in the traffic department employed at the Nacoondy gate situated at 125th mile 17th telegraph post (late measurement), new numbers not yet given. I remember a train coming and stopping at my gate between 4-30 and 5 o'clock yesterday morning. The engine passed seven or eight rail joints beyond the gate. I do not know the driver. I did not speak to him nor he to me. I saw a man coming from the engine (of a gentleman muster) and go to the end of the train, and I saw the same man come back from the end of the train and go towards the engine. I do not know whether this man was the driver, but I think he must have been, as he came from, and went back to, the engine. I did not see any native man go from the engine to the brake-van and back again to the engine. A man may have gone on the other side of the train without my seeing him.

No 11 S CHENSOORAMIAH — I am Assistant Station-master of Vaniembady, and was on duty from 6 P.M. of the 1st to 7 A.M. of the 2nd instant. I remember that a special train was booked to leave Madras at 6-30 P.M. on the 1st November, it was not booked to stop at my station, and did not stop. The special passed the Vaniembady station at 4-40 A.M. on the 2nd instant. The 7-30 P.M. goods train which is not booked to stop at my station was stopped by me by signal. I stopped the 7-30, because the 6-30 special passed at 4-40 A.M., or 8 minutes only before the 7-30 arrived. I allowed the 7-30 P.M. to start at 5-4 A.M., which allowed the prescribed interval of 15 minutes between trains. The 6-30 passed through the station at the same speed as other trains observed in passing through the station.

No 12 JAMES BARFOOT — I am Locomotive Foreman in charge of Jollarett Division. I visited the scene of the accident at 124th mile 16th telegraph post, South-west Lane, on the morning of the 2nd instant at 8-10 o'clock. I told "Bowell" that he had to take his train into Jollarett, and he replied that he had been standing by the engine, and that his train had not sufficient water. He said, "I had to take my train into Jollarett, and he replied that he had been standing by the engine, and that his train had not sufficient water."

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th December 1876 No. 3,291*

out replenishing his tender. After his arrival at Jollarett he performed some shunting, and when he returned to shed he had still sufficient water left to carry him for 3 or 4 miles.

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 November 1876, No 1,184.

In continuation of my letter of the 14th instant, No 1,151, I have the honor to send you herewith a report* from the Traffic Manager, furnishing particulars of the damage done to the rolling stock in the unfortunate collision

which took place near Vaniembady on the 2nd instant.

2 I have authorized the Traffic Manager to settle with the owners of the goods which were lost and damaged with as little delay as possible.

From H E CHURCH, Esq, Traffic Manager, to R B ELWIN, Esq, Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, dated Madras, 17th November 1876, No G 81,220 2,276.

Accident at 124th mile 16th telegraph post, South-west Lane

In continuation of my letter No C 83,778 2,233 of 10th instant, and in reply to your No 3,985, of the 14th idem, I beg to enclose a copy of report received from Mr Craik for your information. I am endeavoring to effect an early settlement of the claims for the goods damaged by the accident.

From J CRAIK, Esq, Assistant Traffic Manager, to H E CHURCH, Esq, Traffic Manager, Madras Railway Company, dated Madras, 15th November 1876, No T M 25 430 27,004.

Accident near Vaniembady

Guard's brake-van No 9, high-sided open goods No 1,160 and high sided No 644 were actually destroyed.

High-sided No 1,160, piece goods, Salt Cotours to Beypore.

High-sided No 644, Cuddapah to Bangalore, 100 bags rice.

The accompanying list shows the damages sustained by other wagons, and which were marked sick at Jollarett.

List of Wagons damaged at 124th mile 16th telegraph post, South-west Lane, Madras Railway, and marked "Sick" at Jollarett.

WAGON.		Damages
Description	No	
H SOG	998	2 Buffer castings broken, head stock and back plank broken, centre chain missing
Do	1,658	1 Buffer casting broken
	242	1 Do do do.
	1,118	1 Do do do.
	639	1 Do do do.
	920	1 Do do do.
	1,446	2 Do do do.
	249	2 Do and head stock broken
	691	1 Do do do.
	35	1 Do do do.
Coke	275	Head stock broken
H SOG	1,384	1 Link of centre chain missing
Coke	130	Entirely shattered (is being broken up by Locomotive Department)

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th December 1876. No. 3,291.*

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, 23rd November 1876, No 1,205

In continuation of my letter of the 14th instant, No 1,151, I have the honor to send you herewith, for the information of His Grace the Governor in Council, the copy of a letter from the Locomotive Superintendent and of the statement which accompanied it, in which is furnished a detailed list of the damage sustained by the rolling stock in the unfortunate collision near Vanembady on the 2nd instant

From F H TREVITHICK, Esq., Locomotive Superintendent, to R B ELWIN, Esq., Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, dated Perambore, 22nd November 1876, No 625

Damage to Rolling Stock caused by the accident at Vanembady

Your No 3,987 of the 14th instant
The engine of the following train appears to have forced its way through the brake-van and one open goods wagon at the back of the train with which it collided, and to have crushed both these vehicles into small pieces, their wheels then became entangled with the engine wheels, and the engine was thrown over upon its side across the line
The engine was a good deal damaged superficially, but not seriously injured. Three vehicles, viz., one brake-van and two open goods vans, were completely broken up by the crush, and another open goods wagon was split and shaken that it could not be repaired. Five open goods wagons were badly shaken, each with one head stock split, and six other open goods wagons had each one or more buffer castings broken, in all, one engine and eleven vehicles were injured and four vehicles destroyed

I annex on a separate sheet a detailed statement of the damage to the engine and each of the fifteen vehicles

DETAILED list of Damage to Rolling Stock caused by the collision near Vanembady on the 2nd November 1876

Passenger Engine No 66

Destroyed, and to be replaced.	Buffer beam and buffers
	Awning over foot plate
	Two brackets and shaft for compensating beams
	Coupling block between engine and tender
	Two feed pipes and one delivery pipe.
	One pump and one bottom clack
	Two screens for spring balances
	Gib and cotter for big end of connecting rod
	Five cylinder cocks.
	Ashpan
Damaged but can be repaired.	Chimney and dome casing
	Two compensating beams bent
	Brake shaft hangers and screw bent.
	Foot plate and foot steps bent

Spring hangers bent

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th December 1876. No 3,291.*

Tender.

Destroyed to be replaced.	Drag box complete
	Coupling block.
	One back plate and one side plate of tank
	Six angle iron stays
	Two tool boxes
	One foot step
	One feed pipe and one connecting pipe between engine and tender
	(Feed pipe stays to be repaired)

Rolling Stock

Goods brake-van	No 9,	wood work completely destroyed
Open goods wagon	No 644,	do do
Do do	No 1,160,	do do
Coke wagon	No 130,	damaged beyond repair subsequently broken up
Open goods wagon	No 988,	head stock and two buffer castings broken
Do do	No 691,	do do do
Do do	No 35,	do do do
Do do	No 249,	do do do
Coke wagon	No 275,	one head stock broken
Do	No 242,	two buffer castings broken
Do	No 1,118,	two do do
Do	No 639,	two do do
Do	No 920,	one do do
Do	No 1,658,	one do do
Do	No 1,446,	two do do

(Signed) F H TREVITHICK
Locomotive Superintendent.

No 115 ORDER THEREON, 5th December 1876, No 3,291.

RAILWAY, No 9-A

HIS GRACE the Governor in Council agrees with the opinion expressed in this correspondence that the collision was undoubtedly caused by the rashness of Driver Bowell in putting back his train in the direction from which was approaching the 7-30 P M goods train from Madras. Driver Bowell was aware that the 7-30 P M train was following with a short interval behind him, it having reached Gornattum only twelve minutes later than his own train. This circumstance, and the fact that he was himself losing time, should have rendered him more than ordinarily cautious

2 His attempt therefore to put back to Vanembady under the circumstances was an act of most culpable rashness.

3 Bowell has been dismissed the service; but it is to be regretted that a criminal prosecution was not instituted. As the Company's Regulations at present stand, however, the prospect of a conviction is doubtful. His Grace in Council is of opinion that steps should be taken for so altering the rules as to provide against the recurrence

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th December 1876 No. 3,291

of a similar accident. It seems a grave omission that there should be no rule prohibiting a driver running in the opposite direction to that prescribed by the time-table

(True Extract)

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

To the Consulting Engineer for Railways

No. 1102

MADRAS RAILWAY.

AGENT AND MANAGER'S OFFICE,

Madras, 2nd November 1876

From Robert B. Elwin Esq.
Agent and Manager. M R Co.

To Lieut Colonel F. M. Shaw Stewart R.E.
Consulting Engineer for Railways.

Sir,

I have the honour to report for the information of Government that a collision occurred this morning on the South West Line about 2 miles West of the Vamernbaddy Station.

2 I learn that the 7.30 p.m. goods train of yesterday from Madras overtook and ran into a special goods train which left Madras at 6.30 p.m. and that the engine, waggons and two brake vans were very much damaged.

3 The Acting Chief Engineer, the Traffic Manager and the Locomotive Superintendent have gone up to the scene of the accident by special train, and further particulars will be reported to you as soon as possible.

I have the honour to be
Sir,

Your most obedient servant
R. B. Elwin
Agent and Manager

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

Consulting Engineer's Office,
Madras, 4th November 1876.

No 535

SUBMITTED for the information OF GOVERNMENT.

Particulars will follow on receipt of the proceedings of the Committee that sat the following day to enquire into the cause of the accident.

C. Smith Major, D. E.
Gov. Gen. Engr. for Railways

To

The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Fort St. George.

10-10-76

MADRAS RAILWAY.

From

The Agent and Manager

To

The Consulting Engineer

for Railways

Mad - 33/11/76
and 11/11/76

No 1112

Regarding the removal of a platform on the 11th Nov. about 11.15 AM. The platform was removed from the station and the rails were laid down.

11/11/76

No 1151

S P 117 9
MADRAS RAILWAY.

AGENT AND MANAGER'S OFFICE.

Madras, 14th November 1876.

From

Robert B Elom, Esq.
Agent and Manager. M.R.C.

To

Lieut. Col. J. H. M. Shaw Stewart, R.E.
Consulting Engineer for Railways.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter of the 2nd Instant No. 1102 I have the honour to submit for the information of His Grace the Governor in Council the copy of a letter from the Traffic Manager, together with a copy of the dispositions of the several witnesses who were examined at Jollapett on the morning of the 3rd Instant, by the Committee appointed to enquire into the circumstances connected with the unfortunate collision near Vanimboddy on the 2nd Instant when the 7-30 P.M. ordinary goods train from Madras to Beypoor, ran into the 6-30 P.M. special train from Madras to Bangalore.

I also submit a copy of the Locomotive Superintendent's

10th Nov 1876
J.C. 83778
2233

From

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT
1876.

The Consulting Engineer
for Railways

The Secretary to Government

P. W. Department

For St. George

Dated 14th

Received

November 15th

No. 535

Enclosure (1)

Submitting a letter from
the Agent Mr. Elom regarding
the collision occurred
on 2nd instant on the S.W.
line near Vanimboddy
Station

On 27-11-76

9
letter of the 11th Instant. 1st 594.

3. The result of the inquiry conclusively demonstrates that Bowell the Driver of the 6.30 P.M. special train is solely responsible for the accident.

4. The facts which were elicited by the Committee, are very simple, and are as follows—

The special train left Madras at 6.30 P.M. on the 1st Feb. 1904 and consisted of engine No. 78, twenty one 21 Wagons laden with grain, and two Brake Vans.

The train lost time up to Arcot—owing to traffic and other detentions—at which station 12 additional wagons were attached to make up the proper load, and it left Arcot at 10.20 P.M. or one hour late.

The train stopped for water at Arcot and Tallo, and afterwards to meet the 10-15 A.M. mail from Bangalore of the previous day. It again stopped at Mailputty for water and then continued its journey passing the Ambur and Vannambary Stations.

10
Soon after passing Vannambary the Driver asserts that the engine began to "prime" very much, and that the pressure in his gauge glass fell to 40 lbs. He stopped his train and affirms that he sent his first fireman back to tell the Chief Guard to protect his train. From this point however the evidence of Driver Bowell conflicts directly with that of the other witnesses.

Bowell asserts that he got off his engine to go to the gateman to tell him to exhibit a danger signal and that before he could return to his engine the train had commenced to move backwards.

Bowell further states that he got back on to his engine as quickly as possible, that he then applied his brake and whistled for the Guard Brakes, that immediately afterwards he saw the lights of the 7-30 P.M. goods train as it came round the curve, and the collision followed.

The evidence of the guard of the special train is to the effect that when the train first stopped, he put

11
down his brake, and soon afterwards the Driver and the Fireman came up to his Van when Powell explained that he was short of water and must put back to Vanimbady. The Guard at once objected to this course and reminded the Driver that the 7-30 P.M. Train was following, and that if he was really short of water he should run on the Jollarpett while he - the Guard - protected the train.

Signals were then sent out by the Guard to protect the train on the Vanimbady side, and within a few minutes of this being done the train began to move backwards and continued to do so from the Maccondy Gate at the 125th mile 17th telegraph post to the 124th mile 16th telegraph post where it was run into by the 7-30 P.M. Goods Train.

5 The evidence of the Chief Guard is corroborated on all essential points by the other witnesses, while the statement of the Driver stands almost entirely unsupported.

6 I sent for Driver Powell yesterday and afforded him an

MAHARAJA'S
From

The Agent and Manager

To

11 (under) 10, 10

10, 10, 10

10, 10, 10

10, 10, 10

12

opportunity of offering any explanation for his conduct. He admitted that he did put back his train, not however with the intention of returning to Vancouver, but to enable him to get upon an earlier train and thus obtain a fresh start.

7. Bowell has been in the service of the company for the last 14 years two as a fireman and the last four as a Driver, and the General Superintendent reports that he has always borne an excellent character for steadiness, attention to duty, and competence.

8. Bowell violated no rule of the Company or put up with his hand and he cannot therefore be successfully prosecuted but to mark the serious displeasure of the company at his prevarication, and utter disregard of truth, I have dismissed him from the service of the company.

9. In the course of a few days I shall hope to have the honour to send you a statement showing the damage which the

Rolling Stock has sustained by this untoward accident

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

W. H. Fisher
Agent and Manager

75,176
8575

Prod 14^a Dec. ad - 1876
Locd 5001 do 1151

Public Health

二

the Agency and January 1977

MAINTAINING RAILWAY

From

۱۵

When it was in time on duty, Drivers Powell
and Reid were there days preceding the collision.
at the 17th Mile.

11. 11. 1901

[illegible][illegible]

1897. L. H. - President
Promotive Superintendent

L. A. Brown

P. 1151-14
No. 8575

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

CONSULTING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,

Madras, 21st November 1876.

No. 576

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,

In continuation of the
No. 35 dated the 11th instant, I have the
honour to lay before Government three
letters, with enclosures, from the
of the Madras Railway, regarding the
collision which took place between
Chembady and Sallarpett stations
on the morning of the 2nd instant.
An inquiry into the
circumstances connected with the
collision was held at Sallarpett on
the day after the accident occurred.
This inquiry was conducted by the
Members of the Engineering, Locomotive,
and

P. 1151-14
November 1876.
No. 1164-20
November 1876.
No. 1205-23
Nov. 1876.

and Traffic Departments, with whom
was associated Major Smith, Deputy
Consulting Engineer. The evidence
taken during that inquiry is given
at full length in the enclosed
papers. Reports upon the sub-
ject from the Reconniter Super-
intendent and from the Traffic
Manager were also enclosed.

3. The facts connected
with the accident do not admit
of much doubt; and the following
summary, given by the Traffic
Manager in his letter to the Board,
can hardly be challenged:—

(1) that immediately after the
train stopped the 1st Engineer
and subsequently the Driver came
to the Chief Guard's (Parake) Tank,
which was the last vehicle in
the train, and informed the guard
that the train could not proceed
for want of water. The Engineer
stated

states that he told the guard to show
signal to protect the train, while the
guard states that both the Fireman
and Driver said the train must be
put back to Vanimbady, which the
guard objected to.

(2) that signals were sent out by
the guard to protect the train on
the Vanimbady side.

(3) that within a few minutes after
this order had been given and the
Driver had returned to his Engine,
the train began to move backwards,
and continued to move from the
Naccandy gate about 125-17, until the
7-30 p.m. train ran into it at 124-46.

(4) that the 7-30 p.m. train, which
is not timed to stop at Vanim-
bady, was on this occasion
stopped by signal, and left that
station 15 minutes after the 6-30 p.m.
Special Goods Train.

(5) that at the time of the accident
the watchman, sent out by the
guard

guard to exhibit signals, was only
one telegraphic post from the rear
of the 6-30 p.m. train, which in
moving backwards had almost over-
taken him.

4. The opinion arrived at
by the Officers who conducted the
inquiry, and endorsed by the Agent,
was to the effect that the collision
was solely due to culpable negligence
on the part of Powell, the driver
of the 6-30 p.m. special train. On
that opinion, I entirely concur.

5. Mr. Edwin states that
Powell violated no rule of the Com-
pany in putting back his train,
and that he could not therefore be
successfully prosecuted; but that
he has been dismissed from the
service, in order to mark the Company's
serious displeasure at his premari-
cation, and utter disregard of truth.

I agree with Mr. Edwin
that,

Section III.
Rule 19

5
that, by the act of backing his train,
Driver Powell violated none of the
Company's rules; and, I am of opi-
-nion that it would be a matter
of great difficulty to frame a rule
which would meet the special cir-
-cumstances, and that action in all
such cases must be left to the dis-
-cretion of those in charge of the
train. It seems to me doubtful
whether the rule quoted by the Lo-
-comotive Superintendent was not vi-
-olated. It runs as follows:

"An engine man is never to leave
an engine in steam without
shutting the Regulator, putting the
slides out of gear, and screwing
up the Tender Brake; and he
must on no account leave his
engine or train in the main
line, except in charge of the En-
-gineer or some competent person.
According to the evidence, even that

of the Driver and Fireman, the engine was left for some time in charge of the second Fireman, the Driver and first Fireman having both left it. And if the Driver's statement, as to the train is moving backwards of its own accord, is to be accepted, there can be no moral doubt that the brakes had not been properly applied. This is in fact admitted by the Driver, who states, "Before I could return to the engine, the train commenced to move backwards. I jumped on the foot plate, applied the Brake, and stopped the train." It is, however explained in Mr. Glavin's letter that Powell afterwards abandoned that statement, and admitted that he did put back the train; and there might therefore have been difficulty in securing a conviction against him under the

Railway

6
Railway Act.
7. However, that may be, I am of opinion that the provisions of the Penal Code were sufficient to meet the case. Chapter III, section 936, runs as follows:-

"Whoever does any act so rashly or negligently as to endanger human life or the personal safety of others, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to three months, or with fine which may extend to two hundred and fifty Rupees, or with both."

As to the rashness of Powell's action in backing his train, there can be little doubt. He admits that the 7-30 p.m. goods train arrived at Goddard about 13 minutes after his return, and that he was subsequently seeing time, owing to his engine being out of order. After passing Van-embady

3812-2-76 h: 383
 " 29-2-76 - 556
 " 16-8-76 - 2122

P.W.D.
 26 NOV 76
 No 8575

71140

E. 121

27-11-76

submitting
 further report
 upon the
 collection of
 revenue

Dated 24th Nov 1876
 Received

No. 576

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

To

The Consulting Engineer
 for Railways,

From

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Letter from the Consulting Engineer for
 Railways, No 535, dated 1st November
 1876.
 do do No 576 of 24th do

FOR ORDERS.

Ch. M. Mather Major Genl R.E.
 Secretary to Government
 R.P.B.

M

FOR ORDERS.

Public Works Department
No 3291
PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 5 Dec 76

Read the following —

From

The Consulting Engineer
for Railways

Ch. No 535 dt 12 Dec 1876

— To — No — 576 — 24 —

His Grace the Governor
in Council, agrees with
opinion expressed in the
correspondence that the
collision was undoubtedly
caused by the rashness
of Driver Powell in putting
back his train in the
direction from which was
approaching the 7.30 P.M.
Goods Train from Madras.
Driver Powell was aware
that the 7.30 P.M. train
was following with a
short interval behind him
it

it having reached Gorn-
attain only 12 minutes
later than his own train.
His circumstance, and
the fact that he was
himself losing time,
~~after leaving Vanimbadu,~~
should have rendered
him ^{than ordinarily} more cautious.
His attempt therefore to
put back to Vanimbadu
under the circumstances
was an act of most cal-
culable rashness.

Bavell has been dis-
missed the service; but
it is to be regretted that
a criminal prosecution
was not instituted. As
the Company's Regulations
at present stand, however,
the prospect of a conviction
is doubtful. His Grace
in Council is of opinion
that

38
that steps should be
taken for so altering
the rules as to provide
against the recurrence
of a similar accident.
It seems a grave omission
that there should be no
rule prohibiting a driver
running in the opposite
direction to that prescribed
by the same Table.

C. W.

C. W. Bay ✓

W. H.

Dec 20-12-76

870/45
Govt. of 1876 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

The Commr. of P.W.

Dated

Issued

Recd

Encl

G.O. S. No. 327

Nos. 114-115

Collision between the
Tannimbad & Tollymore
Bridges Madras Ry. —

Putting orders on papers
showing the recurrence
—

N 114/15

11/15