

Public Works (1894) Department.

RAILWAY BRANCH.

G.O., No. 360-1R

DATED 20th June

[Despatch Abstract.]

Nanjangode-Erode line.—The resident in Mysore to be informed that the Madras Government has urged upon the Govt of India the advisableness of postponing the construction of the — until the completion of other more important lines.

The Govt of India addressed.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Extract from R. Number.
 & ling book

№ 360. R 2/20/6/94.

Ordered that the President
in person be informed
thru: Political Department,
that his Excellency the
Governor in Council has
voted upon Govt's recommenda-
tion of postponing the
construction of the Mangalore
grade line until the
completion of other
& more important lines.

No. 361 R d 20/10/94.

Letter to India fding
results of reconnaissance
of the above named
line.

21.6.94

2020

(1) The Hon. Mr. H. W. Bliss C. S.
(2) - - - - - J. Groce

For perusal.

J. Russell

Joint Secy to Govt. P. W. D. by Secy

This is the first I have heard of these Railway projects, save that from time to time I have seen some vague notices in the newspapers. I think it is at least open to doubt whether it will be to the benefit of the country generally, to inflict a probably considerable loss on the Madras Railway, a guaranteed line which does not earn its guarantee, in order to open a new route between West Mysore & ~~the~~ the Southern districts of the Madras Presy, the greater part of which will have to be traversed through a tract so sparsely inhabited that remunerative traffic is most unlikely for many years to come.

I have no knowledge of the grounds on which this project was supported by the then Govt of Madras, in the letter of March 23 & may be referred to in letter No 4419 C of Decr 20, 1893, from the Joint Secretary in the P. W. D., Railway Branch, to the Govt of India (printed in pp. 7 & 8 of this proof). But I do not write with confidence being here colleagues that it is not advisable that this Govt should be

Papers circulated
D. E. the former 3
Hon W. Bliss 2
Hon W. Groce 1

Let me now first state what we have approved of the Magazine - At present - are a few lines the other lines, that is to say my own & Mysore (already connected with Mysore) to Erode were proposed by - forwarded by the Mysore Govt on the ground that they would shorten the communication with the Southern districts & give them 2 ports on the West coast. The Madras Govt agreed (Letter for C. S. dated 17 of 9 May 93 819) but at that time Govt had not before it the letter from the Manager of the Madras Railway dated 22 Feb 94 77 97/114 & the various strong arguments of which the letter from Mysore to Govt (for Mysore Govt) to Erode & I said when this was discussed more fully than they are discussed in the C. S. note now before us. At present all I can say is that I am surprised as to the expediency of the Magazine - At present - are a few lines. We have nothing to do with the Mysore Mysore line. At present the Mysore Mysore Mysore - Erode

Committed to the support, with
addl. support, of a project of
such large dimensions and of such
questionable advantage, until all
the members of Govt. have had an
opportunity of expressing an
opinion upon it. I regret that
the former papers may be sent
me for my perusal.

RS

10/3/94

Circ -

I share my own colleagues'
doubt, & should like to see the
papers he refers to.

RS 11/3

I see that the approval expressed
in the letter of March 23, 1893, was
confined to the Assikere-Mangalore
scheme. The other schemes were not
mentioned. I agree that the
first scheme is very worthy of support.
As to the Mangalore-Rode scheme,
the letter of May 6, 1893, does not show
that it had received any such compl.
I am sure as it deserves. It is not shown
that it is exceedingly unlikely, & I say
that it is exceedingly likely to be
most injurious to the Madras Railway,
a line which does not earn its main
return & which therefore the Govt. is
annually a good deal out of pocket.
No doubt direct communication be-
tween West Mysore & the District South
of Rode and Talur would be ben-
eficial. The same might be said of any
railway that could be constructed in
any part of India, & indeed of the
world. The construction of a new railway
cannot but be advantageous to the
people of the parts of country connected
and traversed. But when this advan-
tage has to be compared at the cost of
the general taxpayer, as would in this
instance be the case, the question arises

Ever I am in doubt, RS
15/3

* What sum is it justifiable that
the general taxpayer should be called
on to contribute for the benefit of the
particular tract, & to be connected
and traversed? It is evident that the
general taxpayer of British India can-
not be legitimately called on to make
any sacrifice for the benefit of any part
of the population of Mysore. Whatever
sacrifice he makes in regard to this scheme
should be for the benefit of the people of
(say) Salem, Coimbatore, Malabar, Trichy,
Madras & Tanjore, & all the outside.
I cannot see however that I am
justified in including in the list the
two last named districts, which have
a good & convenient part of their own
(interior), and but an infinitesimal
part of the population of which can
have any benefits or social connection
with West Mysore or with the parts of
the Bombay Presidency north of West
Mysore or with S. Canara. The same
might be said of Malabar & Trichy, the
latter of which districts have the bulk
of people (and others) at its door. All
things considered, therefore, the interest
in Southern India & reserved by the
Mangalore-Rode line seems to be
to be small. But the line is to be paid
for them is enormous. The agent &
Manager of the Madras Railway
estimated at 10 lakhs, the 1/2 which
his execution of this scheme will cause
his company & says that this est.
note has been passed without objec-
tion. Whether this estimate is a
justifiable one or not, I do not
know - No inquiry has been made
& no opinion has been offered by the
Const. Supd. & whom we look for
assistance in this matter. All I
do know is that Mr. Moss has the
reputation of being a capable &
trustworthy man of business, and
that his estimate of an annual
cost of 10 lakhs is the only one
I have before me. In the absence

of any other estimate or information,
we must take Mr. Moss'. In order
to see the real bearing of his estimate,
let us capitalize his figures.
Ten lakhs annually is the chance
presentment or $2\frac{1}{2}$ crores of rupees.
At the present rate
of exchange ($1\frac{1}{2}$) $2\frac{1}{2}$ crores =
£ 1,458,333. Now (v. p. 5
of the draft P.O.) the capital of
the new company to be formed
by Messrs. Kirby & Lonsdale is to
be $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions sterling, of which
two millions is to be raised
at once. Take the larger sum.
It will then appear that, by
the virtual grant of £ 1,458,333,
the general taxpayer will
be providing a bonus to
the new company of no less
than 58.3 per cent on its total
capital, and of (probably)
less than double the sum that the
construction of the Mangalore-
Rode portion of the Company's
lines will cost. Is such a
bonus justifiable? I am
decidedly of opinion that
it is not.

This is, of course, on the
basis assumption of the
accuracy of Mr. Moss' estimate.
His estimate may be quite wrong,
but I do not think that, in

the project without further searching
Enquiry, we are justified in ^{giving any amount of attention to} ~~opposing~~
the Bangalore - Erode scheme. On the
contrary, I think we should oppose it
if Mr. Moss can justify his estimate,
which he should be asked to do in detail,
and on which the Eng. Supr. should then
give us his careful opinion.

Cire

WS

16/3/97

It would be convenient if the Railway Branch
could put up files in the same manner as the
branches of the Secretariat, and, in important
cases like this, would put up, with the F.O.,
the notes on which they are based.

WS

By all means let us have a definite
& detailed statement from Moss as to
how he arrives at his supposed loss of
10 lakhs - & the consulting Engineer's
remarks thereon.

Our recommendation as to Bangalore
Erode railway was given on purely general
grounds, as likely to benefit the inhabitants
of S. India generally. I think there is no
doubt it would do this if made - but I
hardly think it is our business to insist
on passengers & goods going 100 miles or
more on their way, because there is
already a line constructed, wh. w. eventually
get them to their destination. If this
argument were allowed to prevail, there
would be no railway extension at all.

I think Moss is right to stand up for his
own line, though his arguments are purely
selfish - but I fancy he has exaggerated
his possible losses - as Bangalore appears
to me as near (if not nearer) to Erode by
his railway, than it would be by the
new line when made.

But I believe Kistley & Condale's schemes
have gone a'ple.

If the subject is revived, I am quite
prepared to urge on the Govt. of India
the far greater importance we attach to
the early construction of the Madras -
Bengal - the Palghat Dindigul - or
the Madras - Pambas railways - over
the Mysore - Erode line.

W

17 Mar

- 3 His Excellency
the Governor.
2 Hon W. Bliss
1 Hon W. Fox.



Proposed Railway Mumpinide to Erode

Mr. Moss' justification
of his estimate of an
annual loss of 10
lakhs of rupees. This
Ry is put up - as
called for by Hon W.
Bliss -

It will be noticed that
Mr. Moss admits no
per capita statement -
it is reasonable to
assume that traffic
will spring up between
Pulicat & Coimbatore
to Mysore which does
not now exist &
which would discount
Mr. Moss' figures -

Probably if a line
from Pulicat to Dindigul
on the Standard
Gauge were put forward
the Madras Ry would
not oppose the present
line -

The Madras Ry has
had much to contend
with in competition of

We now come home to
make out his case. I don't
think the per capita point
would be great. It follows
that we cannot support
the Mangalore - Erode
line.

JG
6/4

There is nothing to show whether
G.O. 152 R has yet been
sent to the Govt. of India - If
it has been sent, I should like
to see the letter with which it
was forwarded; if not, I should
like to see the letter with which
it is to be forwarded before it
issues -

I observe that the Govt. order
in question is dated the same date
day as that on which I wrote my first
note. But I have no recollection of
seeing either it, or the letter by the
Consulting Engr. which is printed
at pp. 36 & 37 of the S.O. - Were
they with the papers before sent
to me?

WJ
9/4/99

intersecting metre gauge
lines but the present in-
crease of gross revenue
and decrease of working
expenses may be attributed
as much to the opening
of new lines as to the
present good management,
and large local traffic.

FM. 5/4 94

SERIAL

No. 7

See -

My complaint was and is
that before the issue of papers
of such importance as the
letter of Dec 20, 1893, No 4419 C,
to India, and the J. O. of March
10, 1894, the ^{Joint} Secy should have
circulated the papers to all
the members of Council under
the provisions of para 3 (6)
of the Rules for the conduct
of business made by H.E. the
Gov. under the Indian Councils
Act, 1861.

I also thought & think
that Mr. Cross' arguments
should have been fully examined
by the Comtee before the
issue of the order of March 10.

RM

2/5/94.

Ask Chief Secy for copy
of Rules referred to above
in the FM.

3/5/94

E.R.

Memorandum No. 197
9 January 1894. Public.

RM

4/5

In reply to the remarks
of the Hon. members
I have put up a short
resume of the whole
case from its com-
mencement -

The J. O 152 R of 10 March
was prepared in Feb
and was sent to Sir
Rescinding my - I have
sent in the original papers
to fix the exact date
but to the best of my
recollection the final
proofs were initially for
me about 5 March -
I left orders for the
papers (proofs the cir-
culated) & fair copies
I think - I was absent
from March till 11 March.

The remarks of the
Hon. members reached
me about 12 March -
And at that time the
J. O had issued - It
was actually despatched
on 10 March - and the
forwarding order was
printed at the foot
of one copy only - I
regret exceedingly that
it issued as it did
in which I am en-
tirely responsible - but

I would point out
that the results of the
reconnaissance of
the 2 lines between
Mungimode & Erode
have not yet come
from Mr. Jones &
therefore the reservation
in J.O. No. 6 of 6 May
still remains -

I have wired Jones
to know when it may
be expected - & the
papers will then circulate.

With reference to the
Hon. Members remark
that I had not care-
fully gone into Mr.
Jones' figures - I have
asked him to give them
in detail & to put up
a note on the effect
of the line from Villupuram
to Olanavarum cross-
ing his line at Rathadi
as a parallel case -
but I again say that
in my opinion he is
wrong not to allow
that there are any
advantages from this
proposed line and I
think the Rathadi

Statistics will show
this -

With regard to the
Hon. Members remark
that Railway papers
are not sufficiently
elaborated - with the
exception of Mr. Jones
proposal to make a
line from Calicut to
Cannanore and then
on to Cochin - ^{which}
I am keeping & back
till I can send it &
round with statistics
and Mr. Jones remark
the papers on the pro-
posed line to Beypada
from Madras - as well
as that to Erumore -
the Madras - Colombo
and Funchal - Railways
have all been sent to
the Hon. Members