to this
arrived
pointed
not on
progra
guaran
explai
1898,
succes
gauge
shall
railw

Doc
(1)
(2)

Ordy

Public Works (1898) Department.

RAILWAY BRANCH.

G.O., No. 1298 Ry

DATED 19th Octr 1898

proof 100/3 A.R. for approval

[Despatch Abstract.]

Conveyance of laterite gravel for the Tanjore Dist. Board

Passing orders on the ~~Communicating the decision of Govt.~~ on the question of the fairness or otherwise, of the charges made by the S. I. Ry Coy for the ——

Indexed.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

RAILWAY.

Government {1898} of Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Recd. } 1898. Enclosures
Regd. } Spare copies

G.O., No. 1298 Ry., 19th October 1898.

OCTOBER.

Conveyance of Laterite Gravel for the Tanjore District Board

Passing orders on the question of the fairness or otherwise, of the charges made by the South Indian Railway Company for the —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Railway.

Read the following papers :—

From—The Consulting Engineer for Railways, Madras.
To—The President, District Board, Tanjore.
Dated—Ootacamund, 3rd August 1898, No. 94/O.

With reference to Mr. Andrew's letter to Government, Local and Municipal Department, No. 158/D.B., dated 19th February 1898, I have the honour to request that you will furnish me with a copy of the agreement between Mr. Winterbotham and the Agent, South Indian Railway Company, which is referred to in the correspondence therewith forwarded.

From—The Consulting Engineer for Railways, Madras.
To—The Agent, South Indian Railway.
Dated—Ootacamund, 3rd August 1898, No. 95/O.

With reference to your letter No. 323, dated the 14th April 1898, I have the honour to request that you will reply to the following queries :—

(*a*) Have you any reason to urge why you should not refund to the District Board of Tanjore cooly fares levied over the Pillayarpatti siding before the date on which it was formally opened for passenger traffic ?

(*b*) In view of the results of the weighment of wagon loads of the ballast got from the quarry, are you prepared to raise the sides of the vehicles specially told off for this traffic so that they may carry the marked load when loaded level ?

(*c*) Are you prepared to revise the rate per truck on the basis of a comparison between marked load and actual weight carried in the unaltered trucks when loaded level, in view of the obvious misunderstanding on the District Board's part that in bargaining for a rate per wagon they were entitled to a load equal to the marked capacity.

2. You are of course perfectly entitled to charge cooly fares, now that the siding has been opened for passenger traffic. You are also entitled to charge as for 10 miles to Tanjore. You are also entitled to charge reasonable terminals as per clause 46 (1) (2) of the Railway Act. It is not incumbent on you to treat the District Board differently from any other of your customers.

3. I am not in possession of information to show whether the laterite traffic is sufficient in quantity or sufficiently steady for many weeks together to justify you in according to it exceptional treatment. But, if it should be so, I am strongly of opinion that you would be wise to encourage it. It occurs to me that you might very wisely give special rates for gravel intended specially for railway feeder roads.

4. What the District Board have got to consider is what they can afford to pay for the gravel, and I take it that the quantity that they will use will depend largely on what you charge them for carrying it, all told, including cooly fare and terminals. Apparently for the most unfavourable place, Ponneri, charges work out to over $\frac{1}{3}$ pie per maund-mile actually carried, and a little less for Tanjore. It seems to me that this is a high charge for stuff like gravel, of such low intrinsic value, and that it would probably pay you to lower the charges, to simplify them, to give facilities in the way of specially made up trains for settled periods, and to offer special reductions for freight of gravel for *bona fide* railway feeder road purposes.

From—The President, District Board, Tanjore.
To—The Consulting Engineer for Railways, Madras.
Dated—Vallam, 23rd August 1898, Dis. No. 808/D.B.

With reference to your letter No. 94/O., dated 3rd August 1898, I have the honour to enclose copies of the marginally-noted correspondence between Mr. Winterbotham and the Agent, South Indian Railway, Trichinopoly, regarding the rate at which gravel was to be carried from the Pillayarpatti siding terminus to the Tanjore South Indian Railway station.

1. Mr. Winterbotham's No. 34/D.B., dated 12th May 1894.
2. South Indian Railway Agent's No. 7488/1584, dated 6th June 1894.
3. Mr. Winterbotham's letter No. 34/D.B., dated 26th June 1894.
4. South Indian Railway Agent's No. 13249/2423, dated 27th August 1894.

Enclosure No. 1.

From—The President, District Board, Tanjore.
To—The Agent, South Indian Railway.
Dated—12th May 1894, No. 34/D.B.

[Your letter No. 3993/868, dated 24th March 1894.]

In forwarding herewith copy of the Local Fund Engineer's letter, No. 197 L.W., dated 21st April 1894, in reply to your letter under reference, I have the honour to inform you that your proposal to charge 6 *annas* per truck per mile was strongly opposed at the time by the Local Fund Engineer and was never assented to by me. I have, as you are aware, urged upon you my view that even the rate of 3 *annas* per truck per mile, which is that charged for the carriage of agricultural produce on the main line, is too high a rate to charge for gravel carried to metal roads which are railway feeders.

So strongly do I hold this view that, unless you can see your way to charging 12 *annas* per truck for the 4 miles covered by the tramway, I think the matter must be referred for the decision of Government.

I hope that you will yield to what appears to be a reasonable demand and thus render a reference unnecessary.

Enclosure No. 2.

From—The Agent, South Indian Railway.
To—The President, District Board, Tanjore.
Dated—6th June 1894, No. 7488/1584.

Your letter No. 34/D.B. of the 12th ultimo. No intimation was made to me that either the Local Fund Engineer or yourself objected to the rate quoted in November 1892; however, as I said in my letter of the 24th March last, I do not wish to charge more than the traffic will bear.

After the empty wagons have been conveyed to the quarry the engine and guards-van has to return to Tanjore and then, when the train of trucks has been loaded, the engine and van will have to run back to the quarry to work the trucks away. These are extra services which have not to be performed for laterite trains worked on the main line and a charge must be levied to cover the cost of such extra services.

Our actual locomotive expenses work out to 12 *annas* per mile. I am willing to charge this rate for the extra services alluded to; eight (miles) × 12 (annas) = Rs. 6 per trip *plus* the usual charge of *annas* 3 per truck per mile for working the loaded trucks from the quarry.

Enclosure No. 3.

From—The President, District Board, Tanjore.
To—The Agent, South Indian Railway.
Dated—26th June 1894, No. 34/D.B.

With reference to your letter No. 7488/1584, dated 6th June 1894, I have the honour to inform you that I accept your proposal to charge 3 *annas* per loaded truck per mile and Rs 6. for the engine for each train load. I understand that the ordinary load for an engine is 30 loaded trucks of gravel and that the engine fee of Rs. 6 is to be paid for each 30 loaded trucks. I shall be glad if early orders can be issued to carry gravel at the said rates.

2. I may note that the entry "Rs. 3" in the last line but one of your letter under reference is evidently a mistake for "*annas* 3".

Enclosure No. 4.

From—The Agent, South Indian Railway.
To—The President, District Board, Tanjore.
Dated—27th August 1894, No. 13249/2423.

Your current No. 34/D.B. of the 24th instant. Orders have been issued for the adoption of the rates accepted in paragraph 1 of your letter of the 26th June last.

From—The Agent, South Indian Railway.
To—The Consulting Engineer for Railways, Madras.
Dated—Trichinopoly, 31st August 1898, No. 811.

Your letter No. 95/O of 3rd August 1898.

I forward herewith a copy of the Traffic Manager's report on your letter under reply.

With reference to your query *(a)*, I do not think that we ought to refund to the District Board the amount levied for the carriage of coolies. We do not carry coolies free for other merchants and I fail to see why the District Board should receive exceptional treatment in this respect. There is no doubt that it was a distinct advantage to the Board to be able to send their coolies backwards and forwards by special trains and I think they may be reasonably called upon to pay for that advantage.

Your query (*b*): Mr. Davies is of opinion that there is no necessity to raise the sides of the ballast wagons, as he says by heaping up the ballast a full load can be put on them. I am doubtful of this myself, it may be possible to load a truck, at rest, up to its full capacity, but I am inclined to think that the motion of running would cause a large proportion of such material as laterite if loaded above the tops of the trucks to fall off in transit. If the Board can show that they can keep a certain number of trucks fairly continuously employed, I shall be prepared to apply for sanction to fit up sufficient special stock for the traffic.

I entirely disapprove of high sided trucks being used for gravel traffic. They have been used before and there was always some difficulty in preventing the trucks from being overloaded in spite of the load line painted on the inside of the vehicle: they take a long time to unload.

I do not think that the Board's representative was in any way misled when the original bargain was made. He knew what the carrying capacity in cubic feet was of the trucks, and the gravel is paid for by the cubic yard, the specific gravity of the material carried did not enter into his calculation at all. The trucks are marked with the carrying capacity to prevent overloading and when light materials are carried, of which the truck will not hold the full carrying capacity as in the case of cotton, the rates are adjusted accordingly. A merchant consigning cotton in a truck marked above the weight of cotton that could be put into it might, on the same grounds as put forth by the Tanjore Board, claim to pay only on the gross weight of the cotton loaded. The rate quoted for the carriage of gravel for the Tanjore Board is already lower than the ordinary rate quoted to the public, and I am not disposed to lower it any further.

With regard to a further reduction for gravel required for the special construction of railway feeder roads, I will, if application is made for the carriage of a sufficient quantity, reconsider the advisability of making further reductions.

Enclosure.

From—The Traffic Manager.
To—The Agent, South Indian Railway.
Dated—26th August 1898, No. 95 R. 1773.

[Your No. R. 1709/3/1476 of 12th August 1898.]

In reply to the remarks contained in the Consulting Engineer's letter, dated the 3rd of August, I would point out with regard to the question marked (*a*) that we carried the laterite coolies, gratuitously for a long period and it would be at least ungenerous to now take advantage of a technical omission to claim back charges made for services performed.

(*b*) As it has been proved that 6 tons of laterite can be loaded in a ballast wagon marked to carry that weight, if it is piled up to the extent of a foot in the centre, the load sloping to the sides and ends, I think it unnecessary to alter the rolling stock in the manner proposed in paragraph (*b*).

When travelling to Calcutta in February last I noticed coal trucks were loaded up in this way.

I shall be pleased to place high-sided trucks at the disposal of the Local Fund Engineer when they can be spared.

This is now done when possible at Cuddalore Old Town whence the Tanjore Local Fund Board procures gravel.

(*c*) If the trucks are loaded as suggested in paragraph (*a*) *supra*, there is no reason to alter the rate.

In paragraph 3 of the Consulting Engineer's letter under reply it is remarked "you might very wisely give special rates for gravel intended specially for railway feeder roads."

We do already give special rates. The ordinary rate for ballast is special class, or 4 annas 3 pies per 6 tons truck per mile.

Terminals amounting to 6 pies per maund are levied when the traffic is carried over a distance of 50 miles, but not otherwise.

We have quoted the Tanjore Local Fund Board a special rate of 3 annas per 6 tons truck per mile without terminals for distances under 50 miles, and over that distance 2 annas per truck per mile with the usual terminals.

We even went below the 2 annas rate in order to meet the Local Fund Board on their representations that they would send a very large quantity of laterite to Shiyali.

We then quoted them a rate of 1 anna 9 pies per truck per mile *plus* terminals, which made the cost of 6 tons laterite delivered at the latter station (a distance of 56 miles) come to Rs. 11-12-0, or less than Rs. 2 a ton.

These facts will go to show that we have treated the Tanjore Local Fund Board with much consideration.

The remark in paragraph 4 of the Consulting Engineer's letter that the charges to Ponneri work out to over ⅓ pie per maund is evidently based on the supposition that the rate is 3 annas per truck *plus* terminals, whereas it is *2 annas* per truck *plus* terminals, which works out to a fraction over ¼ of a pie per maund per mile.

It should also be borne in mind that there is no return load for these trucks which have to be hauled back empty to the siding.

I note the suggestion of the Consulting Engineer that further reduced rates might be given for gravel intended specially for railway feeder roads and am of opinion that such concession might be made provided the roads to be constructed are such as are likely to benefit our traffic.

Business is business, and the Local Fund Board may depend upon our giving them every consideration consistent with the interests of the railway.

Order—No. 1298 Ry., dated 19th October 1898.

The President, District Board, Tanjore, referred for the decision of Government the question of the fairness or otherwise of the charges made by the South Indian Railway Company for the conveyance of laterite gravel for district road repairs. The rates charged by the Company, not being in excess of the maximum permissible class rates sanctioned by Government, are within the Agent's competence to impose. The Agent is also within his rights in imposing the terminals which go towards making up the total charges of which the President complains. The Agent was also within his rights, up to the date of the opening of the siding for public traffic, but not subsequently, in making a separate charge for the use of an engine on the quarry siding. He however exceeded his powers in charging the District Board for the conveyance of coolies over the Pillayarpatti siding before the date (1st July 1898), when it was opened for public traffic, and if requested to do so by the Board he must refund the amount thus irregularly charged.

2. Government having perused the Agent's letter read above, No. 811, dated the 31st August 1898, is of opinion that it will form a satisfactory basis for future dealings between him and the District Board. A copy of that letter and of its enclosures, as well as of the Consulting Engineer's letter to which it is a reply, will be forwarded for information to the President, District Board, Tanjore.

3. Government is of opinion that the Agent, South Indian Railway Company, may wisely, and in the interests of the Railway, charge for the conveyance of gravel for road making, whether for districts or municipalities, the lowest rates that are consistent with reasonable profits.

4. By the use of the term "6 ton wagon," which is intended merely to define the maximum permissible load, the District Board were led into the misunderstanding that in quoting a rate "per 6 ton wagon," the Agent was thereby contracting to carry 6 tons.

(True Extract.)

Francis J. E. Spring,
Joint Secretary.

To the Agent, South Indian Railway.
" President, District Board, Tanjore,
through the Local and Municipal Department.
" Consulting Engineer for Railways.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

Local Fund Department.

Tanjore District Board President's Office.
Vallam 18th August 1896.

Disposal No. 708

From

G. Stokes Esquire
PRESIDENT DISTRICT BOARD
TANJORE.

To

The Consulting Engineer
to Government
Madras

Sir,

In forwarding herewith copy of the District Board Engineer's letter No. 197/L.W dated 22.7.96 for your favorable consideration and issue of necessary orders, I have the honor to state that the contention of the Engineer seems to be correct this demand equitable & moderate. The District Board does not trade in gravel & the major portion of the stuff is used in the improvement of Feeder Roads to the Railway Stations for the benefit of the Company.

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

for President

To CA for favour opinion 27/8

DESPATCHED
20 AUG. 96

3681
26/8/96

1896
Local Fund Department.

Enclo/1

From
The President District Board
TANJORE.

To
The Consulting Engineer
to Government
Madras

Dated 18th
Despatched 20th } August 1896.
Received

Disposal No. 708

Enclosures. 1

Subject.

Requesting that a concession may be given in the case of the gravel traffic of the board in regard to the terminal charges on gravel traffic

---

Copy of a Communication from the Local Fund Engineer, Tanjore to the President District Board
Tanjore No. 197/L.W dated 22.7.96.

As you are aware, I have been for some time in correspondence with the Traffic Manager of the South Indian Railway & have also seen him once personally on the subject of rates charged for our gravel traffic. Sometime ago, the Railway Company put on a terminal charge of 6 Pies per maund or Rs 5-1-0 per truck of 6 tons in addition to the usual rates for all gravel carried beyond a distance of 50 miles, and as this was considerably adding to the cost of gravelling road No 29 in Shiyali Taluk, the additional charge made the rate per maund per mile an unusually high one. I considered the Railway Company ought to make some concession. I asked that for distances beyond 50 miles the rate should be 2 as per truck per mile plus ½ terminals, while the Traffic Manager insists on a rate of 2 as per truck per mile plus full terminals. In his 95R/1773/8879 of 16th May 1896, he made a slight concession on this by agreeing to a rebate of a fixed percentage on quantities over 4000 tons railed in each year. The terms of this rebate are such that it could rarely ever be claimed & need hardly be considered in comparing the rates.

2. The following is a comparison of the above 2 rates as also the ordinary rate for distances not earning terminal charges. viz:—

Traffic Manager's rate

2 as per truck per mile plus full terminals = ·24 pies per maund per mile

My rate

2 as per truck per mile plus ½ terminals = ·20 pies per maund per mile

Tanjore to Shiyali 56 miles

ordinary rate

3 as per truck per mile = ·22 pies per maund per mile

3. It will thus be seen that while the Traffic Manager's rate is slightly over mine is equally under the ordinary rate & though the difference appears very small it amounts to Rs 60/- on each train load of 30 trucks carried to Shiyali Railway station. On the whole of the gravel required for Road No 29 it would add Rs 3900 to the amount of the estimate.

4. On returning from leave recently I had occasion to visit Ootacamund & while there thought it advisable to see the Consulting Engineer to Government for Railways on this subject & was given to understand by him that the usual rate for carriage of material such as this was 1/5 p per maund per mile, & that the S. I. Ry Company might very well be satisfied with such a rate. That is exactly the rate asked by me. In considering this subject it must be remembered that the District Board is not an ordinary trader working for profit but that the material is carried for the maintenance of feeder roads from which the Railway Company largely benefits. It is therefore entitled to the lowest possible rate at which such traffic is usually carried say for ballasting purposes.

5. The delivery of gravel to Road No 29 Shiyali Taluk has been stopped till this question of the rate to be paid has been settled, and though this particular work concerns the Kumbakonam Taluk Board, it is necessary to have fixed once for all, the rate for distances beyond 50 miles in the case of the Dt Board also. It is, therefore a question whether the special rate offered by the Railway Company is to be accepted or if you consider it worth while, to put the whole subject before the Consulting Engineer to Government for Railways & press for the lower rate I have asked. I may state

he informed me that if the subject was brought before him through you, he would endeavour to assist the Board in obtaining the best possible terms for this traffic.

6. The file of correspondence with the Traffic Manager on the subject is herewith sent for perusal & return & I have the honor to request there may be as little delay as possible in disposing of this subject.

F. 231 B

Rates & fares

[illegible]
For President
19.8.96

No. 3681 of 1896
Letter No. 708 d/ 18.8.96
President Dt. B.d.
Tanjore

FORM No. 21.
509—5-3-96.

OFFICE OF THE CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAYS,

Madras, 28th August 1896.

EXAMINER, RAILWAY ACCOUNTS, MADRAS.
Regr. No. 432
28 AUG. 96

C,

No. 2667

OFFICE NOTE.

Letter from the ~~Agent~~, President District Board Tanjore ~~Railway~~, No. 708 dated 18th August 1896, forwarded to the Examiner of Railway Accounts, for favor of remarks.

F. Fowler
for E. R.

EXAMINER'S REPLY.

So long as the Company keeps within the maxima & minima rates sanctioned by Govt, as they do in this case, they cannot be forced to reduce rates in favor of the District Board, but, if E R approves, the President's letter might be forwarded to the Agent for report, with an expression of a hope that the Agent may see his way to meet the wishes of the President by making some reduction in the present rates of the carriage of gravel for Feeder roads.

6/9

To A.
CMU 7/9

— For very short distances the ordinary fixed terminals raise the charges so high that it becomes cheaper to cart gravel by road, and to prevent this being done & to secure the traffic the Company forgo the terminals. For long distance traffic carriage by cart cannot compete with the Railway, and

t is very doubtful whether the Company when
y have not to meet competition will be willing
reduce either their terminals or wagon rates for
benefit of the District Board

C.R. 1/9

Form No. 10.

Railway Department.

Office of the Consulting Engineer for Railways,
Madras, 9th Septr 1896.

To
Agent S.I.Ry

No. 2839 Reply No. 899, dated 29/9

Sir.

x in original with enclos: to be retd. with reply.

Reminders.

I have the honor to forward herewith for report x a letter from the President Dt. Board Tanjore No 908 dt 18.8.96, ~~and to express a hope that you may see your way to meet the wishes of the President by making~~ in which he asks for some reduction in the present rates for the carriage of gravel for feeder roads.

8/9

Despatched on 9/9/96

9/9

8/9

No. 899 South Indian Railway Co., Ld.
AGENT'S OFFICE.
TRICHINOPOLY, 29th September 1896.

From
THE AGENT,
SOUTH INDIAN RAILWAY,

To
THE CONSULTING ENGINEER
FOR RAILWAYS,
MADRAS.

RECEIVED
30 SEP. 96

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 2839 dated 9th September 1896 (the accompaniments to which I herewith return) I have the honor to inform you that the Traffic Manager has agreed as a special case to quote a truck rate of 1 anna 9 pies per mile from Pulliarpatti Siding to Shiyali plus full terminals, which rate has I understand been accepted by Mr. Eyson. The request for a two annas rate plus half terminals would be a lower quotation than has ever been given, and I am not prepared to introduce it. The rate of 1/5th of a pie per maund per mile over this line is plus terminals, and is generally quoted for goods in the special and first Class for distances of 300 miles and above, and I do not understand on what grounds it could be reasonably given on short leads of from 16 to 61 miles. I do not think Local Fund Boards in the Tanjore District – where money is plentiful require even the low rate we are – now quoting.

30/9

96

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
A. W. G. Shelley
Captn. R.E.,
Agent

2 Enclosures herewith.

No. 4238
30/9/96

CN° 4238

No 3111
1-10-96

Copy forwarded to the President District Board Tanjore for information with reference to his letter No 708 of 18th August/96

X 2813
Rates & Fares
S.I.R.

30/9

for E.R.
30-9-96

Despatched on 1/10/96

G.D.R.
30/9

F231B

rates & fares

22 Ry

Public Works (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 10430

Order No 3658 of 18/11/96.

Copy forwarded to A for favour of report.

CAM 18/11. for SE.

Despatched on 18/11/96.

From The L & M Deptt.

No. 1323

Dated 16-11-96

Received 17-11-96

Enclosures 1

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Transferring letter from the C.M.C. Mayavaram request-ing that the Railway autho-rities may be required to mini-mise the Railway fare for transmitting gravel from one station to another.

AR

Wd 18/11

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Copy of letter from the Chairman Municipal Council Mayaveram to the Secretary to Government Local and Municipa Department Madras No ~~305/M~~ 1021 dated 9th November 1896.

I beg to bring to your notice t enormous cost demanded for and incurred in, paying the railway charge for transmitting parcel from one station to another. For instance the railway fare for a truck of gravel from Cuddalore (from which gravel is supplied to this Municipality) to this station is more than half- as much again as is paid to the cost.- Cost of a truck of gravel - Rs 5-11-" its Railway fare Rs 8-13-0) To render the expenditure on communications more fruitful and beneficial, I have the honour to request you will be good enough to move the Government to arrange wit the Railway Authorities for minimisin the charge in this direction, as the roads thus benefitted will not only serve the public but the Railway Co itself, in facilitating the path of the traffic and passengers.

Form No. 69.

Copy of a communication from the Agent South Indian Railway to the Consulting Engineer for Railways, Madras,

No. 1125, dated 7 December 1896.

With reference to your endorsement No 3658 dated 18th November 1896, I have the honour to inform you that our present rate for laterite from Cuddalore to Mayavaram is 3 annas per 6 tons truck per mile, and that as the distance does not exceed 50 miles, terminals are not charged. I am not prepared to reduce this already low rate.

No. 4784 C. of 10. 12. 96.

A's letter No. 1125 of 7th Decr

Transferred to the Local and Municipal Department with reference to its Endorsement No. 132 of 16 Novr. 1896, herewith returned with enclosure.

Desp. 11/12/96

8/12

1

12/12

P. W.

~~Local & Munl.~~ (189 8) Department.

Railway

CURRENT No. ~~584 L~~
434

UNDER SECY. TO GOVT.
28 FEB 98
PUBLIC W. D.

From The President
District Board
Tanjore

Spy.
No 369 of 25-3-98
~~**Order**~~

Transferred to the Public Works (Railway) Department.

H Tremenheere
Ag. Secretary to Government.

V. R.
23/3/98

Disposal **No.** 158/D.B. of 1898

Dated 19th February 1898

Received

Registered

Enclosures 5 as per list

Spare copies 11

Recd 28. 3. 98

SUBJECT.

Submitting copies of correspondence with the Agent S. I. R. Company regarding the very heavy railway charges incurred by the Local Boards & municipalities on account of the conveyance by rail of gravel from the Pullayarpatti siding and requesting to move Government in the Railway Department to use its good offices with the S. I. R. to convey gravel at a certain rate

10/3/98

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

List of enclosures to letter No 158/DB dated 19th February 1898 from the President district Board Tanjore to the Secretary to Government Local and municipal department Madras.

1. Letter from the President district Board Tanjore to the Agent of South Indian Railway dated 13th November 1897 No 2442/96 with the three accompanying statements as follows.

(a) Statement No 1. Statement showing the cost of conveying gravel for each train of 30 truck loads to Terminal stations prior and subsequent to the introduction of the terminal and cooly charges.

(b) Statement No 2 - Statement showing the cost of conveying gravel in train loads of 30 trucks to non-terminal stations prior and subsequent to the introduction of the terminal and cooly charges.

(c) Statement No 3 – statement showing the cost of conveying gravel in train loads of 30 trucks to terminal stations prior and subsequent to the introduction of the terminal and cooly charges.

2. South Indian Railway's Agent's reply No K 1709 $\frac{3}{45}$ dated 6th January 1898 with its one enclosure namely:–

(a) Statement showing the rates for gravel from the Pullayarpatti siding to the several stations on the South Indian Railway.

3. Extract from the Local Fund Engineer's letter No $\frac{76}{L.F.}$ of 1897 dated 9th February 1898 regarding weighment of gravel with copy of his statement showing the excess amount of tonnage to be recovered from the South Indian Railway.

4. Copies of Correspondence between the Traffic Manager South Indian Railway and the Local Fund Engineer ending with the latter's letter dated 17th October 1897 No $\frac{269}{L.F.}$

5. Statement showing the weight of gravel received at Negapatam from the Pullayarpatti siding signed by the Local Fund Engineer, Head Assistant Collector, and Assistant Traffic Manager.

President

Enclosure No 1 to dispatch 156/19.2.98

Local Fund Department

Tanjore District Board's Office.

~~Camp~~, 13th November 1897.

Current No. 2442/D. B. of 96

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT.
CURRENT No. 5842

From

J. Andrew ESQUIRE,
PRESIDENT DISTRICT BOARD,
TANJORE.

To

THE ~~HONORABLE MR.~~ Agent
~~CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT~~, South Indian
~~LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT~~, Railway
~~MADRAS~~. Trichinopoly

Sir,

I have the honor to invite your attention to the very heavy Railway charges incurred by the Local Boards and Municipalities of this district on account of the conveyance by rail of gravel from the Nalgamodu siding to the different Railway stations. I enclose letter No 454 dated 19th August 1897 addressed to you through me by the chairman of the Negapatam

1/584 M/98

Negapatam Municipality in connection therewith.

2 (a) The old rates were 3 as per loaded truck per mile and Engine power of Rs 6 for a train load of 30 trucks on account of the conveyance of empty trucks from Tanjore Railway station to the siding.

(b). This was succeeded by terminal charges which applied to distances exceeding 50 miles the charges being altered from 3 as per truck per mile and Rs 6 Engine power to 2 as per truck per mile + terminals at Rs 6-1-a per truck.

(c) The next charge that was made was the charge for conveying maistry and Coolies (for loading and unloading) who had previously been conveyed

Conveyed free of charge.

3. I enclose statements I, II, & III which show the financial results of these alterations for terminal and non-terminal stations. From statement I, you will see that the first of the above alterations (i.e. the introduction of terminals) added an increase to the trainage charges for a train of 30 trucks to each of the terminal stations of Rs 191-4-a (the former charge being Rs 1644-6-a) and the second alteration (i.e. the introduction of the charge for trainage of Coolies) added a further charge of Rs 179-6-a. Thus to a former charge of Rs 1644-6-a, you now levy an extra charge of Rs 370-10-a i.e. an increase of 22.54. per cent. As I presume

You made some profit even under the old rates this means - so far as I can see - that on gravel you now make a profit of 22·54 per cent + whatever profit you made before. If I am wrong in this conclusion I am of course open to correction.

4. The above conclusion applies to terminal stations but the cooly charges apply also to non-terminal stations and this extra charge for such stations on the quantity conveyed by train in 1895-96 would amount to something like Rs 1400 as will be seen from statement II. i.e. an increase of about 10 per cent.

5. From statement III, you will see that your total extra

extra charges as compared with the old rates on the gravel conveyed by rail in 1895-96 to terminal stations would amount to about Rs 1880, and your total excess charges for both terminal and non-terminal stations would amount to about Rs 3273. This - as above ~~mentioned~~ remarked - appears to mean a profit to the Railway in addition to what it obtained under the old rates. What rate of profit that was I cannot tell, but as $\frac{1}{6}$ pies per maund per mile is entered on page 89 of the South Indian Railway "Coaching guide" for January 1897 as the minimum charge and as this amounts to $2\frac{1}{4}$ as per truck of 6 tons per mile

I presume that even at this rate there would be at all events no loss and at 3 as per truck per mile – the old rate – there would have been a not inconsiderable profit.

6. I have further with reference to your letter No 1318/$\frac{4}{2593}$ dated 8th June 1897 to draw your attention to the fact that Mr Winterbotham agreed to your proposal to charge 3 as per loaded truck per mile + Rs 6 engine power for full train of 30 trucks. Now you charge trainage for 10 miles from Valgamodu quarry to Tanjore although the distance is only 4 08 miles and although such charge is not in consonance with Mr Winterbotham's agreement

agreement

agreement and you will recollect on referring to the correspondence that Mr Winterbothams' alternative was a reference to Government and that he did not go up to Government because you consented to the reduced charge. This extra charge I find the South Indian Railway has been levying without my having been informed that you had virtually cancelled the agreement entered into with Mr Winterbotham. It is quite clear that Mr Winterbotham did not contemplate a charge for 10 miles.

7. I am not clear as to the grounds on which you have considered yourself justified in raising the rates

rates. The Traffic Manager in his letter to the Local Fund Engineer No 96 R $\frac{2379}{19112}$ dated 29th October 1896 gave as his reason for imposing the new charge for coolies the fact that the rates for laterite from the quarry "had been revised and reduced" — a statement which was actually incorrect as the rates had been "raised" and not "reduced" — but on the Engineer's protest you appear to have disavowed the Traffic Manager's reason as you say that the charge for coolies "is quite independent of any question of raising or reducing freight charges on laterite".

8. In your letter to the Consulting Engineer for Railways No 899 dated 29th September 1896 you allude to the fact that in Tanjore "money is plenti*ful" being apparently under the impression that the district can afford to pay highly for its roads. As a matter of fact, Tanjore is one of the poorest districts I know of in respect of roads. It has but 2 quarries and owing to this fact and the heavy Railway charges, it has at present only 177 miles gravelled out of 1863 miles that are maintained. Of the 177 gravelled miles, no less than about 78 miles radiate from the Nalgamodu gravel quarry. In 1895-96 the value of the gravel at the quarries conveyed by rail only amounted to

*is another ground apparently for not conceding reasonable rates (Initialled) J.A. 19.2.98.

to Rs 3511 against a Railcharge of Rs 24502 which latter amounted to not less than 41.38 per cent of the total charge for the maintenance of the roads, and that percentage would be still greater now that charge for trainage for coolies has been added. Moreover great amount has to be spent on the upkeep of bridges owing to the numerous rivers and channels. Thus Tanjore district is very badly off for roads.

9. In your letter to the Chairman Negapatam Municipality No 7 1075 $\frac{4}{11342}$ dated 11th November 1896, You say with reference to the Cooly charges that there is no reason to justify the undue preference which would be given to

laterite

laterite contractors over other traders if the former's coolies only were carried free and the whole of the correspondence shows that in this matter of gravel the South Indian Railway is treating the Local Boards and Municipalities of Tanjore with no greater consideration than if they were traders working for profit. I would invite your attention to the following remarks of Mr Winterbotham in his letter to you No $\frac{34}{D.B.}$ dated 16th January 1894 "The gravel is almost exclusively used for the upkeep of railway feeder roads and I beg to represent that it is to the direct interest of the Railway to encourage and enable us to carry as much gravel as possible." In order to develop the district and benefit the Railway Government expects the district Board to do what it can to provide feeder roads to the Railways and yet the Railway by enhancing its rates does its best to hinder us in developing the district and in providing feeder roads or even in properly maintaining the existing roads.

10. I trust therefore that you will reconsider the whole question and charge a uniform rate of 3 as per loaded truck of 6 tons per mile irrespective of distance and forego all terminals and all charges for trainage or loading and unloading

unloading coolies allowing them to tranship the trucks or in carriages as you may find convenient. I also request that for the conveyance of gravel from the quarry to Tanjore station the correct distance may be charged and not 10 miles and I am willing to continue the charge of Rs 6 for Engine power.

11. In the event of your not seeing your way to comply with these requests, I shall feel myself obliged to place the matter before the district Board and to invite it to consider the propriety of using its resources in a manner which will benefit a greater number of miles of road and at the same time benefit

the Mayavaram-Muttupet Railway, thus bringing in increased receipts for the benefit of the whole district. To this end, I shall propose to it to spend any savings available for roads or feeders which will benefit the Mayavaram-Muttupet Railway and not the South Indian Railway, and on gravelling roads which will benefit the Railway extension to Avadayarcoil. At Arantanghi the district Board has purchased excellent quarries x from whence it will be able to gravel a large number of miles at a cost which will be very cheap as compared with the cost of maintaining roads which now feed the South Indian Railway. All parts of the district require better roads and it will be to the interest of the Board to spend its money for a good many years to come on roads which can be done cheaply and which will afford a return in Railway receipts from its own line.

x close to the proposed terminus of the Mayavaram Muttupet extension (Initialled) J.A. 19.2.98

12. In connection with this important question of what I consider to be unduly high charges for trainage I have the honor to invite your attention to the marginally noted correspondence between the

1 Local Fund Engineer's Current No. 269/L.F. of 1897 dated 4-8-97.
2 Do reference on Do - Do 20-9-97
3 Traffic manager's No. 9797869/26842 dated 18-9-97.

4 Local Fund Engineer's Reference on Current No. 269/ZW of 1897 dated 24-9-97.
5 Traffic Manager's No. 97 G.7869/27848 dated 29-9-97
6 Local Fund Engineer's Reference on Current No. 269/ZW of 1897 dated 1-10-97.
7 Traffic Manager's No. 97 G.7869/28391 dated 5-10-97
8 Local Fund Engineer's Reference on Current No. 269/ZW of 1897 dated 13-10-97
9 Traffic Manager's No. 97 G.7869/31070 dated 1-11-97

the Local Fund Engineer and the Traffic Manager from which you will see that the former raises the question as to whether you do not in fact charge us in excess of the weight of gravel the Railway actually carries. The Engineer writes to me that not a single* truck will carry 6 tons of gravel the rate at which we we are charged and that we are consequently being overcharged on every truck load. It seems to me that the Traffic Manager has disposed of the Engineer's objections in a very offhand manner and has not afforded him the information which he reasonably desired. If the Engineer is correct in his views we have been paying for years past considerably in excess of what the Railway has had any legal right to demand and I request that you will be so good as to take steps to have this excess ascertained on the quantity charged for during the past 5 official years and to let me know the amount

The

*His words were "single ballast truck" but through a slip of the pen I omitted "ballast". It makes no real difference however; "ballast" trucks are I believe used exclusively for Local Fund gravel and the other trucks are seldom used for such purpose. On this point I stand open to correction. The point however is not of sufficient importance to make it worth the subject of a separate reference —
(Initialled) J. A.
19. 2. 98.

The Traffic Manager writes to the Engineer on 12th Instant that he puts no restriction upon the loading of the laterite into the trucks (I believe as a fact that there is a line marked in each truck beyond which Contractors may not load, but of this I am not× sure) excepting that the weight must not exceed 6 tons which is the marked carrying capacity of the vehicles". With reference to the words I have underlined, I would remark that the District Board is not concerned

× I have since inspected a number of trucks and find that on the trucks generally used – viz ballast trucks – there is no line as the trucks are shallow and are intended to be loaded flush with the top. The recent weighing experiments show that the Traffic Manager was entirely in error as to the carrying capacity of the trucks.

(Initialled) J.A.
19.2.98.

Concerned with the marked carrying capacity of the trucks: the Railway was bound to convey the weight of gravel contracted for and if the trucks were incorrectly marked the District Board is not in law liable to any loss resulting from such incorrect marking by the Railway.

13. As to the future until a weigh bridge is constructed I think an arrangement should be made for the examination of the trucks in order to test their cubical capacity and as to the equivalent of 6 tons in cubic feet in case you are not prepared to accept the Engineer's proposal viz 140 cubic feet to 6 tons. I request the favor of a reply on this point also.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
(Signed) J. Andrew
President

(True copy) J Andrew
President

S/-

Enclosure No I (a) to despatch

No 158 / 19. 2. 98

2/584458

(1)

Statement showing the Cost of Conveying gravel for each train of 30 truck loads to terminal stations prior and subsequent to the introduction of Terminal and Cooly charges.

Stations	Distance in miles from siding	Cost prior to introduction of Terminal charges A							Cost after introduction of Terminal charges B									C Extra charge now added in the shape of cooly charges @ 1 cooly per truck			D Total present cost			Difference between Column 5 & 10 or excess over the old rate.		
		At 3 annas per truck per mile			Engine power	Total			At 2 annas per truck per mile			Terminal Charges			Total											
1	2	3			4	5			6			7			8			9			10			11		
		Rs	as	p	Rs	Rs	as	p	Rs	as	p	Rs	as	p	Rs	as	p	Rs	as	p	Rs	as	p	Rs	as	p
Negapatam	53	298	2	.	6	304	2	.	198	12	.	151	14	.	350	10	..	33	2	.	383	12	.	79	10	.
Ponnerai	51	286	14	.	6	292	14	.	191	4	.	151	14	.	343	2	.	31	14	.	375	.	.	82	2	.
Tiruthuraippundi	55	309	6	.	6	315	6	.	206	4	.	151	14	.	358	2	.	34	6	.	392	8	.	77	2	.
Shiyali	61	343	2	.	6	349	2	.	228	12	.	151	14	.	380	10	.	38	2	.	418	12	.	69	10	.
Coleroon	67	376	14	.	6	382	14	.	251	4	.	151	14	.	403	2	.	41	14	.	445	.	.	62	2	.
Total		1614	6	.	30	1644	6	.	1076	4	..	759	6	.	1835	10	.	179	6	.	2015	.	.	370	10	.

Stations	A	B	C	D
Negapatam	100	115.29	10.89	126.18
Ponnerai	100	117.15	10.88	128.03
Tiruthuraippundy	100	113.55	10.89	124.44
Shiyali	100	109.02	10.92	119.94
Coleroon	100	105.29	10.93	116.22
Total	100	111.63	10.91	122.54

(Signed) Robert C. Tyson C.E.
Local Fund Engineer.

(True copy)

President

Ccl.

Enclosure No. 1 (b) to disposal

No 156/19.2.98

3/584 4/98

(2)

Statement showing the cost of ~~gravel~~ conveying gravel in train loads of 30 trucks to Non terminal stations prior and subsequent to the introduction of Terminal and Cooly charges

Station	Distance from siding in miles	Quantity		Old rate A							Cooly Charge			D Present rate viz total of Columns 6 and 7			A	D	Remarks.
		in Cubic feet	in train loads	At 3 annas per truck per mile			Engine power	Total									old rate	Present rate	
1	2	3		4			5	6			7			8			9	10	11
				Rs	a	p	Rs	Rs	a	p	For 5 miles Rs	a	p	Rs	a	p			
Tanjore	x 10	91864	22 2/3	1275	„	„	138	1413	.	.	70	13	4	1483	13	4	100	104.95	Actual distance is only 5 miles but it is charged as 10 miles
Saliamangalam	15	11340	2 4/5	236	4	.	18	254	4	.	26	4	.	280	8	.	100	110.32	
Ammapet	18	1620	2/5	40	8	.	6	46	8	.	4	8	.	51	.	.	100	109.67	
Budalur	16	36045	8 9/10	801	.	.	54	855	.	.	89	.	.	944	.	.	100	110.40	
Ayampet	16	3645	9/10	81	.	.	6	87	.	.	9	.	.	96	.	.	100	110.34	
Papanasam	21	14310	3 8/15	417	6	.	24	441	6	.	46	6	.	487	12	.	100	110.50	
Kumbakonam	30	45661	11 4/15	1901	4	.	72	1973	4	.	211	4	.	2184	8	.	100	110.70	
Nidamangalam	24	82822	20 7/15	2763	.	.	126	2889	.	.	307	.	.	3196	.	.	100	110.62	
Koradacheri	29	38745	9 17/30	1560	9	.	60	1620	9	.	173	6	4	1793	15	4	100	110.69	
Tiruvalur	39	41445	10 7/30	2244	15	.	66	2310	15	.	249	7	.	2560	6	.	100	110.79	
Kivalur	46	2430	3/5	155	4	.	6	161	4	.	17	4	.	178	8	.	100	110.69	
Nannilam	48	14040	3 7/15	936	.	.	24	960	.	.	104	.	.	1064	.	.	100	110.83	
Tirunattiyathangudi	45	12285	3 1/30	767	13	.	24	791	13	.	85	5	.	877	2	.	100	110.77	
Total	.	396252	97 1/6	13179	15	.	624	13803	15	.	1393	9	8	15197	8	8	100	110.09	

(Signed) Robert C. Dyson E.E.
Local Fund Engineer.

(True copy)

Resident

Enclosure No 1 (C) to disposal

No $\frac{158}{19.2.98}$

4/584/98

Statement showing the cost of conveying gravel in train loads of 30 trucks to Terminal stations prior & subsequent to the introduction of Terminal & Cooly charges.

Station	Distance in miles from Pilliarpatti siding	Quantity		Cost prior to introduction of Terminal charges (A)			Cost after introducing Terminal Charges (B)			Extra cost now added in the shape of Cooly charges at 1 cooly per truck to & fro (C)	Total present cost viz Columns 9+10 (D)	Difference between columns 6+11 or excess over the old rate.
		in cubic feet	in train loads	At 3 as per truck per mile	Engine power	Total	At 2 as per truck per mile	Terminal charges	Total			
1	2	3		4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12.
Negapatam	53	14985	$3\frac{7}{10}$	1103 1 "	24	1127 1 "	635 6 "	561 15 "	1197 5 "	122 9 "	1319 14 "	192 13 "
Ponnerai	51	5940	$1\frac{7}{15}$	420 12 "	12	432 12 "	280 8 "	222 12 "	503 4 "	46 12 "	550 " "	117 4 "
Tiruturaipundi	55	36990	$9\frac{2}{15}$	2825 10 "	60	2885 10 "	1883 12 "	1387 2 "	3270 14 "	313 15 "	3584 13 "	699 3 "
Shiyali	61	49680	$12\frac{4}{15}$	4209 " "	78	4287 " "	2806 " "	1863 " "	4669 " "	467 10 "	5136 10 "	849 10 "
Coleroon	67	1620	$\frac{2}{5}$	150 12 "	6	156 12 "	100 8 "	60 12 "	161 4 "	16 12 "	178 " "	21 4 "
Total Terminal station		109215	$26\frac{29}{30}$	8709 3 "	180	8889 3 "	5706 2 "	4095 9 "	9801 11 "	967 10 "	10769 5 "	1880 2 "
Grand Total &c including non-Terminal		505467	$124\frac{4}{5}$	21889 2 "	804	22693 2 "	5706 2 "	4095 9 "	9801 11 "	2361 3 8	25966 13 8	3273 11 8

Station	A	B	C	D.
Negapatam	100	115·29	10·89	126·18
Ponnerai	100	117·15	10·88	128·03
Tiruturaipundi	100	113·55	10·89	124·44
Shiyali	100	109·02	10·92	119·94
Coleroon	100	105·29	10·93	116·22
Total Terminal Stations	100	111·63	10·91	122·54
Grand Total &c including non-Terminal Stations	100	.	.	114·42

(Signed) R. C. Sefton C E
Local Fund Engineer

(True copy)

President

E.C.

Enclosure No 2 to disposal No. 158/4.2.98

South Indian Railway Company Ld.

No. R 1709/3/45. Agent's Office Trichinopoly

6th January 1898.

From

The Agent

South Indian Railway

To

The Collector of

Tanjore

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 2442/DB dated 13th November 1897, I have the honor to offer the following remarks on the various statements made by you in regard to the charges levied by this Railway for the conveyance of gravel.

2. The Pulliyarpatti Siding has been pronounced by Government to be an extension of the South Indian Railway and not to be a mere siding. It was therefore correct to treat it as a portion of the open line and to levy mileage rates in place of the curious charge for Engine haulage. The minimum charge on this and Ikaline on all Indian Railways is for a distance of 10 miles and I can see no reason for departing from a universally recognized

practice

5/584 W/98

practice in the case of laterite conveyed from the quarries to Tanjore. A little reflection will I am sure convince you that with very short distance traffic, when the time during which stock is being loaded or unloaded is so long in comparison with the time it is earning revenue it is only fair to charge for a minimum distance. As regards the free conveyance of Coolies I can see no reason why any Railway should be expected to render such gratuitous service. If Municipalities or District Boards reciprocated by reduction in taxation or by doing anything free of cost in return there might be some grounds for your contention but this is not the case, for on the contrary every effort is made to saddle railways with the heaviest taxation permissible by law and without rendering adequate service in return.

But if you treat it as a portion of the open line, why continue to levy this admittedly curious charge for Engine power in addition to the minimum charge of 10 miles contrary to Mr. Winter-Botham's agreement (vide para 6 of my letter to Agent dated 13th November 1897 and para 8 of Engineer's letter dated 9th February 1898.)
(Initialled) J. A.
19-2-98

I do not consider it safe for Coolies to be carried in open trucks and as a carriage is now provided for them, the charge levied is perfectly legitimate. At the same time I am prepared to convey coolies at ¾ fare provided the maistry in charge can be held responsible for seeing that none but his own coolies make use of the carriage. If the charge for coolies is objected to, the simplest course will be to avoid taking them with the laterite trains.

I think the Railway coolies often go in open trucks. I am sure I have often seen them on different lines. (Initialled) J. A.
19.2.98

3. As regards terminal charges these are levied under orders of the Board of Directors and cannot be removed without its sanction. Until recently I had no power even to reduce the amount of the charge and in cases where it appeared that the combined terminal and freight charges were excessive it was necessary to reduce the rate. This course was adopted in the case of

I know not the powers of an Agent but I apprehend he has large powers (with or without sanction) in showing favour to classes of goods or places. For example I believe he has been reducing rates of goods from Tanjore and the north to Tuticorin, so as to come to terms with the B.I.S.N. Company and so far as he can to smash Tiruvalur, Muttupet, Adirampatnam and other ports and their traders and I dare say this will tend to injure the Mayavaram-Muttupet Railway by making it nearly as cheap to send goods from Mayavaram on the north to Tuticorin as to Muttupet. I say all this from more or less vague and general knowledge and it may not be quite correct. But I lay stress on it as showing that the S.I.R. does exercise a wide discretion and why not exercise a wide discretion in favour of the public efforts of the District Board to develope the District and indirectly benefit the railway. (Initialled) J. A.
19-2-98

of laterite and it will be seen from the accompanying tabular statement that the heaviest increase which has occurred since the imposition of terminals was only 17.2 per ×cent. These remarks do not refer to the increases due to fares having now to be paid for coolies.

× only 17 per cent increase + the existing profits (Initialled). J. A.

4. As regards the statement of the Local Fund Engineer that ~~the existing profits~~ ~~[illegible]~~ not a single truck will carry 6 tons of gravel I can only characterise it as erroneous. Cases have come to our notice where a greater weight than 6 tons has been loaded into our trucks and the acting Traffic Manager will be happy to convince you by actual experiment as to the carrying capacity of these trucks if you so wish. At the same time I think a weigh-bridge is required at Tanjore and one will be provided now that the restriction on our expenditure has been removed.

5. There seems no need for me to offer any remarks on your observations regarding the profit derived by this Railway from the carriage of laterite beyond stating that excluding empty return haulage, it costs between 15 and 16 pies to haul a six ton vehicle with its load one mile, a statement which I think conclusively disproves your contention in regard to exhorbitant rates. No useful purpose also will be served by referring to the threats conveyed in your letter under reply except to express my regret that you considered such action necessary in your dealings with this railway.

6. It now remains for me to state briefly the action I am prepared to take in the matter of these laterite rates and which I trust will meet your wishes. I can offer the following terms:—

(a) Coolies to be carried at ¾ the public rates no less charge being made than as for 16 persons.

(b) Full terminals at Rs 5-1-„ per six tons truck to be paid on distances exceeding 50 miles.

(c) The truck rate for distances exceeding

-ing 50 miles to be reduced to 1 anna 9 pies per mile generally.

(d) The distance between the Pulliyarpatty Quarries and Tanjore station to be taken in accordance with general practice at 10 miles.

I have &c.

(Signed) A. D. G. Shalley, Capt. R.E.
Agent

(True Copy)

President

Enclosure No. 2 (a) to disposal

No. 158 / 19.2.98.

South Indian Railway

Rates for gravel from the Pulleanpatte Siding to the under-mentioned Stations

Miles from the siding	Stations	Per 6 ton truck load per mile												Per 6 ton truck for the whole distance														
		Present rate			Terminal for distances over 50 miles			For Engine haulage over siding			Total freight per truck per mile, including haulage & terminal			Amount before Terminal was introduced			Amount after Terminal was introduced			Increase			Increase excluding Cooly-fare per cent	Fare for one Cooly per truck to and fro			Increase including fare for Cooly			Increase including Cooly fare per cent
1	2	3			4			5			6			7			8			9			10	11			12			13
		Rs	as	ps	Rs	as	ps	Rs	as	ps	Rs	as	ps	Rs	as	ps	Rs	as	ps	Rs	as	ps		Rs	as	ps	Rs	as	ps	
16	Budalur	〃	3	〃				〃	〃	2.40	〃	3	2.40	3	3	2.40	3	3	2.40	〃	〃	〃		〃	5	4	〃	5	4	10.4%
16	Ayyampet	〃	3	〃				〃	〃	2.40	〃	3	2.40	3	3	2.40	3	3	2.40	〃	〃	〃		〃	5	4	〃	5	4	10.4%
21	Papanasam	〃	3	〃				〃	〃	1.83	〃	3	1.83	4	2	2.40	4	2	2.40	〃	〃	〃		〃	7	〃	〃	7	〃	10.6%
30	Kumbakonam	〃	3	〃				〃	〃	1.28	〃	3	1.28	5	13	2.40	5	13	2.40	〃	〃	〃		〃	10	〃	〃	10	〃	10.5%
61	Shiyali	〃	1	9	〃	1	4	〃	〃	0.63	〃	3	1	11	10	2.40	11	12	〃	〃	1	9.6	1%	1	4	4	1	6	1.6	11.9%
15	Saliamangalam	〃	3	〃				〃	〃	2.56	〃	3	2.56	3	〃	2.40	3	〃	2.40	〃	〃	〃		〃	5	〃	〃	5	〃	10.4%
18	Ammapet	〃	3	〃				〃	〃	2.13	〃	3	2.13	3	9	2.40	3	9	2.40	〃	〃	〃		〃	6	〃	〃	6	〃	10.5%
24	Nidamangalam	〃	3	〃				〃	〃	1.60	〃	3	1.60	4	11	2.40	4	11	2.40	〃	〃	〃		〃	8	〃	〃	8	〃	10.7%
29	Koradacheri	〃	3	〃				〃	〃	1.32	〃	3	1.32	5	10	2.40	5	10	2.40	〃	〃	〃		〃	9	8	〃	9	8	10.7%
39	Tiruvalur junction	〃	3	〃				〃	〃	0.98	〃	3	0.98	7	8	2.40	7	8	2.40	〃	〃	〃		〃	13	〃	〃	13	〃	10.8%
46	Kivalur	〃	3	〃				〃	〃	0.83	〃	3	0.83	8	13	2.40	8	13	2.40	〃	〃	〃		〃	15	4	〃	15	4	10.8%
53	Negapatam	〃	2	〃	〃	1	6	〃	〃	0.72	〃	3	6	10	2	2.40	11	11	〃	1	8	9.6	15.3%	1	1	8	2	10	5.6	26.2%
48	Nannilam	〃	3	〃				〃	〃	0.80	〃	3	0.80	9	3	2.40	9	3	2.40	〃	〃	〃		1	〃	〃	1	〃	〃	10.8%
45	Tirunattiattangudi	〃	3	〃				〃	〃	0.85	〃	3	0.85	8	10	2.40	8	10	2.40	〃	〃	〃		〃	15	〃	〃	15	〃	10.8%
51	Ponnerai	〃	2	〃	〃	1	7	〃	〃	0.75	〃	3	7	9	12	2.40	11	7	〃	1	10	9.6	17.2%	1	1	〃	2	11	9.6	28%
55	Tiruturaipundi	〃	2	〃	〃	1	6	〃	〃	0.70	〃	3	6	10	8	2.40	11	15	〃	1	6	9.6	13.5%	1	2	4	2	9	1.6	24.5%

Agent's office
Trichinopoly
6th January 1898

Note The rate to Negapatam was reduced from 1st March 1896
The rate to Shiyali was reduced from 13th September 1896
The rate to Ponnerai and Tiruturaipundi was reduced from 1st May 1896
Coolies are charged from 1st November 1896

(Signed) J. H. Le. Mesurier
for Agent.

"Column 13 agrees almost exactly with figures supplied by me to the Agent (Statement nos 2 + 3 of enclosure no 1) except as to item "61. Shiyali, 11.9". The Agent's figure is correct. The South Indian Railway was levying a charge which brought the percentage up to 19.94 but on protest by Mr. Stokes he reduced it."

(Initialled) J. A.
19. 2. 98

(True copy)

President

Enclosure No 3 to disposal No 158/19-2-98

Copy of certificate referred to in this office Reference on Current No 76/27 dated 9-2-98.

Nos of gravel trucks despatched from Pullayarpatti siding on the 26th January 1898 viz

Nos 134, 26, 5, 57, 36, 32, 10, 48, 99, 43, 23, 40, 31, 67, 2, 13, 92, 15, 66 & 9.

I certify that the above 20 trucks of gravel railed from the Pullayarpatti siding by the 17 o'clock train on this date were loaded to the full level usually allowed for ballast.

(Signed) R Cobb
26-1-98

(True copy)

~~Tanjore~~
26-1-98 } (Signed) Robert C. Sypon C.E.
Local Fundengt

(True copy)

Andrew
President

7/584 F/98

Enclosure No. 3 to Dispatch No. 158/19.2.96

8/584/98

Statement showing the amount of excess trainage on account of freightage of gravel and aralai to be recovered from South Indian Railway Company.

No	Particulars of Station	1894 — 95 Total number of trucks despatched by the S.I.R at 6 tons per truck as given in the Railway account	1894 — 95 Total No of trucks for which trainage has been paid to the S.I.R in excess at 1 ton per truck less.	1894 — 95 Amount of trainage paid in excess to the South Indian Railway	1895 — 96 Total No of trucks despatched by the S.I.R at 6 tons per truck as given in the Railway account	1895 — 96 Total No of trucks for which trainage has been paid to the S.I.R in excess at 1 ton per truck less	1895 — 96 Amount of trainage paid in excess to the South Indian Railway	1896 — 97 Total No of trucks despatched by the S.I.R at 6 tons per truck as given in the Railway account.	1896 — 97 Total No of trucks for which trainage has been paid to the S.I.R in excess at 1 ton per truck less.	1896 — 97 Amount of trainage paid in excess to the South Indian Railway	1897 — 98 Total No of trucks despatched by the S.I.R at 6 tons per truck as given in the Railway account	1897 — 98 Total No of trucks for which trainage has been paid to the S.I.R in excess at 1 ton per truck less	1897 — 98 Amount of trainage paid in excess to the South Indian Railway	Total	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	Tanjore A	30	5	4 11 -	300	50	93 12 -	-	-	- . .	-	-	- . .	248 7 -	1 Col. 3, 6, 9, & 12 represents the
	B	480	80	150 - -											
2	Aiyampet	90	15	45 . .	54	9	27	67	11	33 . .	55	9	27 - .	132 .	number of trucks despatched
3	Papanasam	210	35	137 13 .	-	.	.. - -	-	-	- - -	-	-	- - -	137 13 -	to the several stations at 6
	Aralai	-	.	. . .	87	11	33 . .	.	.	. . .	.	.	. . .	33 .	tons per truck as given in the
4	Kumbakonam	480	80	450 . .	328	55	309 6 -	710	118	663 12 .	595	99	556 14 -	1980 . -	Railway accounts furnished
	Aralai	-	-	- . .	.	.	. . .	165	21	98 7 .	125	16	72 . .	170 7 .	to this office monthly.
5	Shiyali	-	-	- - -	368	61	697 11 .							697 11 -	2 Col: 4, 7, 10 & 13 represents the
6	Coleroon	-	-	- - -	12	2	25 2 -	-	-	. . .	-	-	. . .	25 2 -	number of trucks for which trai-
7	Saliamangalam	440	74	208 2 .	36	6	16 14 -	-	-	- . .	-	-	- . .	225 . .	-nage has been paid in
	Aralai	-	-	. . .	96	12	22 8 .							22 8 .	excess at the rate of 1 ton per
8	Ammapet	12	2	6 12 .	18	3	10 2 -	604	101	340 14 -	239	40	135 - -	492 12 -	truck calculating that each
9	Nidamangalam	492	82	369 . .	705	118	531 - -	356	59	265 8 ..	535	89	400 8 -	1566 . .	contains only 5 tons of gravel
	Aralai	70	9	32 1 .				132	16	57 .	20	3	10 11 .	99 12 .	3. Red ink entries show the
10	Koradacheri	175	29	163 2 .	155	26	146 4 -	177	30	168 12 -	195	33	185 10 .	663 12 -	number of trucks of Aralai despatch-
	Aralai	20	2½	11 4 .	.	-	. . .	.	.	. . .	.	.	. . -	11 4 .	-ed and the amount of excess
11	Tiruvalur	150	25	182 13	258	43	314 7 .	291	49	358 5 .	439	73	533 13 .	1389 6 -	claimed at ¾ ton per truck calcu-
	Aralai				54	7	44 10 .	-	.	. . .	.	.	. . .	44 10 .	lating that each truck contains
12	Kivalur	-	-	- . .	38	6	51 12 .	19	3	25 14 .	24	4	34 8 .	112 2 -	only 5¼ tons.
13	Negapatam	83	14	139 2 .	115	19	188 13 .	152	25	248 7 ..	38	6	59 10 .	636 .	4. The 30 trucks despatched to Tanjore
14	Nannilam	-	-	- . .	30	5	45 - -	917	153	1377 - -	146	24	216 . .	1638 .	station marked A has been
15	Tirunattyathangudi	-	-	- . .	12	2	16 14 .	-	-	. . .	184	31	261 9 .	278 7 .	charged by the S.I.R at the rate of
16	Ponnerai	.	.	. . .	74	12	112 8 .	128	21	196 14 -	100	17	159 6 .	468 12 .	5 miles (actual) distance at the
17	Tiruthuraippundi	-	-	- - .	160	27	278 7 .	67	11	113 7 .	80	13	134 1 -	525 15 -	beginning when the siding was
18	Budalur	280	47	141 . .	150	25	75 . .	320	53	159 . .	175	29	87 - .	462 .	opened and the remaining 480 trucks
															marked B has been charged at 10 miles
	Total (Gravel)	-	-	1997 7 .	-	.	2940 . .	-	-	3950 13 .	-	-	2790 15 .	11679 3 -	the minimum distance allowed
	Total (Aralai)	-	-	43 5 .	-	-	100 2 .	-	-	155 7 .	-	-	82 11 -	381 9 .	by S.I.R.
															5. All Aralai has been despatched
	Grand Total	-	-	2040 12 .	-	-	3040 2 .	-	-	4106 4 .	-	-	2873 10 .	12060 12 0	from Tanjore Station.

(Signed) Robert C. Syoow C.E.
Local Fund Engineer

(True copy)

President.

Enclosure No. 3 to disposal No $\frac{158}{1920}$

Tanjore Local Fund Engineer's Office
Camp - Orathanad 9th February
1898.

Ref: on current No. $\frac{76}{L.W.}$ of 1897.

From

The Local Fund Engineer
Tanjore

To

The President District Board
Tanjore

Sir,

I have the honor to make the following report regarding the 20 trucks of gravel sent to Nagapatam for test requirement as advised you in this office Reference on current No. $\frac{76}{L.W.}$ of 1897, dated 25th ultimo.

The trucks in question were loaded at Pulliarpatti siding terminus on the morning of the 26th ultimo with gravel taken from a large supply stacked there for next year, and dug from the usual quarry. Intimation of the despatch of the 20 trucks was made to the Agent in this office Reference on current No. $\frac{76}{L.W.}$ of 1897 dated 25th ultimo

and

9/584 8/98

and in the afternoon of the above date I went out to the terminus to see the trucks were full loaded before they were despatched. Except the men in charge of the train, none of the Railway Company's servants were present to whom this could be pointed out, but immediately on arrival at Tanjore station, while the trucks were being shunted, Mr Cobb the Company's Rolling Stock Inspector examined each of them carefully at my request and furnished me with the enclosed certificate, which you will see certifies they were fully loaded as allowed by the Railway Company. Mr Cobb is, I understand, the Company's officer responsible for seeing these gravel trains are properly loaded, and he has on several occasions within my knowledge stopped trucks at Tanjore station as being overloaded. The

2. The trucks arrived at Negapatam station on the forenoon of the 27th ultimo and by arrangement were weighed in the presence of Mr Shoolbridge Assistant Traffic Manager who had been deputed for the purpose by the Railway Company, Mr Edgington Head Assistant Collector, and myself. The delay of one day in weighing was due to the late arrival of Mr Shoolbridge who was on duty with the Government inspection party.

x Copy filed with this. (Initialled) J. A. 19-2-98.

3. The statement giving x the weight of each of the above trucks has I learn to day by telegram been sent to you direct by the Head Assistant Collector, duly signed by Mr Shoolbridge, and from which you will see that the 20 trucks contained 96 tons - 14 cwts of gravel as against 120 tons (that is 6 tons per truck) charged for by the Railway Company and that the average weight of gravel in each truck was 4 tons - 16 cwts - 2 qrs - 23.8 lbs, thereby more than justifying my contention in this office Reference on Current No

269/LW of 1897 dated 6th November 1897 that the Railway Company's ballast trucks do not carry 6 tons of gravel as charged for by it. It has further to be observed that the first 3 trucks in the statement were put under the water tank about 6 P.M. the previous evening by the Railway officials and that the gravel when weighed about 8.30 A.M. on next morning was thoroughly saturated with water as pointed out at the time to the Assistant Traffic Manager. This of course added considerably to the weight of these particular trucks and if it was done as a test of weight under such a condition, should at least not have been tried till the trucks had been weighed in the condition in which they were loaded and despatched from the siding terminus. But even under this severe and unfair test, you will see that none of these 3 trucks weighed much over 5 tons. I may add that while there may be cases of gravel loaded before

i.e. it is quite dry after rain, it is never sent so wet, as the above 3 trucks were when weighed, as the coolies will not work in loading gravel when it is in such a condition.

4. During the weighment of these trucks several of the Railway officials expressed a wish to similarly test the road material locally known as "Aralai" and of which a very small* quantity is annually railed. Accordingly 5 trucks were sent to Negapatam on the 30th ultimo and 2 of these were weighed in the presence of Mr. Shoobridge with the following result.

No of trucks	Gross	Tare	weight of Aralai	Average weight
	T. cwts qrs	T. cwts qrs	T. cwts qrs	T. cwts qrs lbs
150	8-10-"	3-"-"	5-10-"	5-4-2-14
112	8-1-"	3-"-3	4-19-1	

5. I did not see these 5 trucks before they were despatched from Tanjore on the 30th ultimo, but during the time they stood at Negapatam before weighment, there was fully 2 inches of rainfall and when Mr. Shoobridge and I examined them on the 1st instant, we both agreed they were not fully loaded, due no doubt

to

* Only 3 or 4 per cent of the total quantity of gravel Aralai.
Initialled J. A.
19-2-98.

to settlement by the shaking of the trucks in transit× and to the heavy rainfall. Mr. Shoobridge

× 52 miles by rail
(Initialled) J. A.
19-2-98

therefore considered they could not be accepted for test weighment. However for our mutual information, I agreed to have the above 2 trucks made up to full load, by taking the "aralai" required for this from one of the other trucks, and they were made up to what I certainly considered above the load usually allowed by the Company. But even when made up thus after settlement in being railed 48 miles and standing under 2 inches of rain, the average weight was only Tons cwt qrs lbs 5 - 4 - 2 - 14 or fully 15 cwts. under the weight charged for by the Railway Company.

6. Having now clearly demonstrated the fact that the Railway Company in levying rail charges on each truck as for 6 tons weight have been making a gross overcharge, the question arises as to how the overcharges of the past years are to be recovered and this I leave in your hands. From the test weights herein given, it is fair to take 5× tons as the full average weight of gravel carried in these trucks and 5¼⊗ tons as the weight of "aralai" and I attach herewith a statement× showing the amount of overcharges made by the Railway Company during the last 4 years, as between these weights and 6 tons weight which has been charged and paid for by this Department.

× the statement shows that the trucks do not contain even as much as 5 tons
(Initialled) J. A.
19-2-98

⊗ probably over the mark vide preceding para.
(Initialled) J. A.
19-2-98

× copy enclosed
(Initialled) J. A.
19-2-98

7. At the same time till the weighbridge promised by the Railway Company is erected at Tanjore, it is necessary that some definite agreement should be made with the Railway Company as to the weight to be charged for each truck of gravel and aralai from the 1st instant. In a short time this traffic will begin for next season and after the above tests we cannot go on paying rail charges for 6 ton trucks, except at least under protest. The above weights viz 5 tons and 5¼ tons respectively are the utmost× we can be expected to pay.

× Yes. the very utmost.
(Initialled) J. A.
19-2-98

There

8. There is another point that requires to be settled and that is the charge made for Engine power on the siding. From the Agent's letter R 1709/3/45 dated 6th January 1898 to you, it appears that some considerable time ago the Government of India× declared the siding to be part and parcel of the open line, and from that date therefore this special charge for Engine power should have been abolished. But no intimation was given to us of this decision of the Government of India, and the Railway Company have gone on making this special charge for Engine power which if not actually illegal, is at least an unfair charge as admitted by the Agent to me personally. We are therefore fairly entitled to the refund of all charges made for Engine power on the siding since it was declared by the Government of India to be part of the open line and when this date is ascertained and communicated to me, the necessary statement of the amount will be made up.

× Vide notifications (Nos 379 and 380) published in Fort Saint George Gazette dated 21-8-94 pages 984, 985. Also see para 2 of Agent's letter No R 1709/3/45 dated 6th January 1898 and of my marginal comments thereon. As the Railway convey "goods" in the shape of "gravel" (Notification 380) and as urged by the Agent himself in para 2 of his letter dated 6th January 1898 the Tanjore-Pulliapatti section of the South Indian Railway is part of the main line and not a mere siding and the charge for Engine power is "curious", I fail to see how the Railway Comp is to charge us for Engine power, minimum mileage of 10 miles. If (as appears to be the case admittedly) this section is legally part of the main line the charge for the Engine power seems to be illegal or contrary to the Railway Rules and rates; if it is not part of the main line the minimum charge of 10 miles for gravel conveyed from the siding to Tanjore (4 or 5 miles) has been made contrary to the agreement made with Mr Winterbotham and without ~~that~~ the President having ever been informed of this departure from the terms to which Mr Winterbotham consented (vide para 6 of my letter to Agent dated 13th November 1897.

From what the Engineer writes it seems that the Agent himself has admitted the unfairness of the charge. How much it amounts to each year I cannot say.

(Initialled) J. A.
19-2-98

9. * * *

I have &ca.

(Signed) R. C. Tyson C.E.
Local Fund Engineer

(True Extract)

President

Ele.

Enclosure No. 7 to disposal No. $\frac{158}{19.7.98}$
Tanjore Local Fund Engineer's Office.

Dated 2 — 8. 1897.

Current No. $\frac{269}{Lw}$ of 97

From

The Local Fund Engineer
Tanjore

To

The Traffic Manager
South Indian Railway
Trichinopoly.

Sir

I have the honor to request you will inform me how the weight of each six ton truck of gravel carried for this Department is ascertained.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
(Signed) R. C. Sy[illegible]
Local Fund Engineer

Ref: on Current No. $\frac{269}{Lw}$ of 97 dated 20 9. 1897

From
The Local Fund Engineer
Tanjore

To

$\frac{10}{584 L/98}$

To

The Traffic Manager
South Indian Railway
Trichinopoly

Reference: This Office Current No. 269/L.W. dated 4th August 1897.

Sir,

I beg to remind you that no reply has as yet been made to the above and request you will expedite the same.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
(Signed) R.C. Syson
Local Fund Engineer

Traffic Manager's Office
Trichinopoly 18th September 97.

No. 976/7869
26842

From

The Traffic Manager
South Indian Railway

To

Robert C. Syson Esquire
Local Fund Engineer
Tanjore

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 269/L.W. of the 4th instant. As each of the trucks you refer to is capable of carrying 6 tons that quantity of gravel only, of course, should be loaded upon it.

Experience, however, shows that at times this load is exceeded, or the weight may not be quite 6 tons. It all depends upon the loading being properly seen to.

I doubt it, for not a single truck that was tested contained or could contained much as 6 tons-
(Initialled) J.A.
19.2.98

Yours faithfully
(Signed) Davies
Ag. Traffic Manager

Reference on Current No. 269/L.W. dated 24. 9. 1897.

From The Local Fund Engineer Tanjore

To

The Traffic Manager
South Indian Railway
Trichinopoly

Sir

With reference to your letter No $\frac{97\ G.\ 7869}{26842}$ dated 18th September 1897, I have the honor to remark that it evades my question which was not what is the Carrying Capacity of the trucks but how it is ascertained that each truck of gravel contains the weight for which the Department is charged viz 6 tons. As there has been a great deal of delay in answering this simple question, I beg for an early and pointed reply.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
(Signed) R.C. Sypon
Local Fund Engineer

No. $\frac{97\ G.\ 7869}{27.848}$

Traffic Manager's Office
Trichinopoly 29th Sept 97

From
The Traffic Manager
South Indian Railway

To
Robert C. Sypon Esquire
Local Fund Engineer
Tanjore

Sir

Gravel traffic from Pulliarpatti Siding

In reply to your letter of the 24th instant. This gravel traffic has been carried for some years past, and you must be aware that the weight of it is not ascertained by means of ~~any~~ a weigh-bridge as there is no such machine at Tanjore Station.

The truck is therefore placed at your disposal to be loaded to its full carrying weight; at any rate our charge is for × 6 tons

× A merchant has no business to use short weights or measures.
(Initialed) J.A.
19.2.98.

⁑ Some trucks are, no doubt, under-loaded, but there are cases where

⁑ Every one that was tested
(Initialled) J.A
19.2.98

more than 6 tons have been loaded on a ballast truck*

* Not a single ballast truck will contain 6 tons
(Initialled) J.A. 14-2-98

May I ask you what has given rise to this question.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Obedient Servant.
(Signed) Davies
Actg Traffic Manager.

Reference on Current No. 269/Lw dated 1st October 1897.

From
The Local Fund Engineer
Tanjore
To
The Traffic Manager
South Indian Railway
Trichinopoly.

Sir,

Replying to your No. 9797869/27848 dated 29th Ultimo, I have the honor to inform you that the question regarding the weight of gravel carried in each truck has been raised because there are good grounds for concluding that with the restriction put on loading them by the Company's servants, they scarcely ever carry 6 tons, and that as a consequence we are being overcharged for carriage. I am perfectly aware there is no weigh-bridge at Tanjore Station but consider that having regard to the importance of this traffic, one should either be provided without delay or some arrangement made for fixing the cubical contents to be carried by each truck as the equivalent of 6 tons. The existence of a weigh-bridge would however, in my opinion be the most satisfactory solution of this question.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant
(Sgd) R. C. Lyson
Local Fund Engineer

Traffic Manager's Office
Trichinopoly 5th October 1897.

No. 97 G. 7869
28391

From
The Traffic Manager
South Indian Railway

To
Robert C. Lyson Esquire
Local Fund Engineer
Tanjore

Your letter No. 269/Lw dated the 1st instant has been received. I have already represented the necessity of a weigh-bridge at Tanjore Station, and Sanction has been accorded for the same, but owing to the recent* orders to restrict expenditure, the work is at present in abeyance.

I have the honour to be
Sd
Your obedient Servant.
(Signed) G. A. Cross
for Ag. Traffic Manager.

*It ought to have been erected long ago. The recent orders were only those of 1897 and I doubt if Sanction was accorded until the Local Fund Engr. raised this question. But it may be otherwise
(Initialled) J. A.
19.2.98.

Local Fund Engineer's
Tanjore Dated 13. 10. 97.

No. 269/Lw

From
The Local Fund Engineer
Tanjore

To
The Traffic Manager
South Indian Railway
Trichinopoly.

Sir:

In acknowledging receipt of your letter no 97 G 7869/28391 dated 5th instant, I have the honor to point out that the subject cannot remain longer in this indefinite state. The recent Government order restricting expenditure has reference to works which are not indispensably necessary and having regard to the important interests involved I consider that the construction of a weigh-bridge at Tanjore Station is absolutely essential, and that we should have been provided long ago. If you are not prepared to accept this view I request you will fix and inform me the cubical contents as the equivalent of 6 tons, that I may be able to check its accuracy relative to the charges made. I may add I am prepared to accept 140 cubic feet as the equivalent of 6 tons.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
(Signed) R. C. Lyson
Local Fund Engineer

Tanjore Local Fund Engineer's Office
Tanjore dated 17th October 97.

No. $\frac{269}{LW}$ of 97

From
The Local Fund Engineer
Tanjore.

To
The President
District Board
Tanjore.

Sir

In forwarding herewith for your information and return the marginally noted correspondence on the subject of the method by which the South Indian Railway Company ascertain the weight of gravel carried in their trucks, I have the honor to state that this question was raised because of objections made by their servants from time to time on a charge of our contractor overloading the trucks.

1) This Office No. $\frac{269}{LW}$ dated 4-8-1897.
2). Do. Do. Do. 20. 9. 1897
3). Traffic Managers No. $\frac{97G.7869}{26842}$ dated 18-9-97.
4). This Office Ref: on Current $\frac{269}{LW}$ dated 24-9-97
5) Traffic Managers No. $\frac{97G.7869}{27848}$ dated 29-9-97
6) This Office Ref: on Current No. $\frac{269}{LW}$ of 97 dated 1-10-97
7) Traffic Managers No. $\frac{97G.7869}{28391}$ dated 5-10-97
8) This Office Ref: on Current No. $\frac{269}{L.W.}$ dated 13 10 97

2. You will observe from the correspondence that the trucks cannot be weighed at the despatching station and that

while we are charged for 6 tons per truck-load, I have the strongest reasons for stating that there is not a single ballast truck on the Railway capable of carrying that weight as the Company permit it to be loaded. From tests — which I have made 137½ cubic feet are the equivalent of 6 tons, and in my final letter on the subject I have named 140 cubic feet as the capacity we would accept so as to be on the safe side, and as the Company's servants will, if it is accepted, be stricter than ever in keeping to the load line -

3. In my opinion the immediate erection of a weigh-bridge at Tanjore Station should be insisted on, and if the Company will not meantime accept my cubical capacity for the equivalent of 6 tons, this should at once be determined by a consultation between

one

one of their representatives and myself.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
(Signed) R. C. Lyson
Local Fund Engineer

(True Copy)

President.

Sd/

Enclosure No 5 to Disposal No $\frac{158}{19.2.98}$

Statement Shewing the weight of Gravel received at Negapatam from the Pillayarpatti Siding

No. of truck	Gross weight			Weight of empty truck						Weight of Gravel			Remarks
				Marked weight			Actual weight						
	Tons	cwt	qrs	Tons	cwt	qrs	Tons	cwt	qrs	Tons	cwt	qrs	
99	8	19	1	2	19	1	2	19	1	6	·	·	This truck was heaped up. The gravel was dry. Gravel was taken out of No. 48 to fill this up.
9	8	11	·	3	3	2	3	3	2	5	7	2	These 3 trucks are said to have been put under the water column last night. The gravel was wet this morning.
67	7	19	·	3	1	3	3	1	3	4	17	1	
2	8	·	3	3	·	3	3	·	3	5	·	·	
5	7	18	·	2	18	2	2	17	3	5	·	1	
26	7	18	·	2	19	1	2	19	1	4	18	3	
134	7	11	·	3	·	2	2	19	·	4	12	·	
66	7	17	1	2	19	·	2	18	1	4	19	·	
15	8	1	·	3	1	·	3	1	·	5	·	·	
92	7	15	2	3	1	·	3	1	·	4	14	2	
13	7	14	2	3	·	3	3	1	2	4	13	·	
123	7	18	·	3	5	·	3	3	·	4	15	·	
43	7	13	1	3	5	1	3	1	2	4	11	3	
48	6	7	2	3	1	2	3	1	·	3	6	2	gravel was taken out of this truck in order to fill up No 99.
10	7	13	2	2	18	2	2	18	·	4	15	2	
32	8	2	·	3	3	·	3	3	3	4	18	1	
36	7	15	3	3	·	3	3	·	3	4	15	·	
57	7	16	·	3	2	·	3	·	1	4	15	3	
31	7	15	·	3	1	1	2	18	1	4	16	3	
40	7	16	·	2	19	1	2	18	2	4	17	2	
							Total			96	14	1	
							Average			4	16	2	23·8 lbs.

A Edgington
Ag Head Asstt Clerk
28.2.98

Robt J. [illegible]
Local Fund Engineer

11/584 L/98

E. Shoobridge
Asstt: Traffic Manager

As to Trucks nos. ~~[illegible]~~ 99. 9. 67, 2 & 48 vide para 3 of L F Engineers letter No 76 N 9.2.98 [illegible] 19.2.98

to the South Indian Railway and myself have not been able to agree as to the charges that should be made, I am obliged to place the matter before Government. I have the honour therefore to enclose copies of the correspondence mentioned in the enclosed list.

2 To my letter to the Agent No. 2442 dated 13th November 1897 (Enclosure No. 1.) I have fully set forth the history and the subject of debate and as it would be useless to repeat it all over again, I beg that that letter may be read here as part and parcel of this letter. The other papers contain the further correspondence and as they must speak for themselves, I refrain from repeating the purport here.

3. I am at a loss to understand the grounds on which the Railway Company considers itself entitled to treat the district Board with such scant consideration just as if we were Komaties sending out goods by train with the object of realizing large profits; nor does the Railway itself seem to be very consistent in the successive reasons its officers give for refusing to treat us with consideration. Thus (vide para 7 of my letter dated 13th November 1897 Enclosure No. 1.) the Traffic manager gave as his reason for imposing a new charge the fact the rates "had been revised and reduced" (absolutely the reverse of the truth), which reason was disowned by the Agent who stated that this extra charge was "quite independent of raising or reducing freight

charges on laterite". In another letter the Agent justifies his charges on the ground that "money is plentiful" in Tanjore (*Vide* para 8 of my letter, Enclosure No 1) and elsewhere in the correspondence the Railway Department flatly states that it sees no reason why the District Board should be treated differently from other merchants and contractors. Lastly the Agent in his letter No R 1709 $\frac{3}{45}$ dated 6th January 1898 (Enclosure 2) by implication assigns another reason when he writes – "If municipalities or District Boards reciprocated by reduction in taxation or by doing any thing free of cost in return, there might be some grounds for your contention, but this is not the case for on the contrary every effort is

made

made to saddle railways with the heaviest taxation permissible by law and without rendering adequate service in return." So the final upshot is this – that because we will not treat the Railway with consideration the Railway will return the compliment and spite us. This reason – coupled with the others – at least clears the ground and gives me hope that this reference to Government may not be unavailing, since on its own admissions the Railway Department has not in its dealings with the District Board been proceeding on fixed principles which cannot be violated.

4. The Agent has shown however in the above remarks that he is laboring under a

most remarkable delusion in thinking that the district (or even the Taluk) Board can tax the Railway less heavily than it does or that it "makes every effort to saddle Railways with the heaviest taxation permissible by law." The Agent will probably be somewhat startled when he learns that the district Board does not tax the Railway even to the extent of a single rupee. As to his statement that the district Board renders the Railway no adequate service in return, I most emphatically dissent. It is within my own personal knowledge that both here and in Trichinopoly the district Board has gratuitously incurred expenditure which chiefly benefitted the Railway, without asking the Railway

Mannargudi?
? T.M.

Railway — as it might reasonably have done — to bear any of the cost. The district Board is also anxious in so far as it can to facilitate the construction and maintenance of roads which feed the Railway. And I may mention as one of the most recent instances within my personal knowledge that in preparing the last district Board Budget, I deliberately struck out a proposal of a Taluk Board President to gravel a certain short section of road (in the middle) as it ran alongside the Railway (main line) and I did not wish to damage the Railway, though the completion of this particular portion of road would have connected 3 large towns (Mannargudi, Nidamangalam – Tanjore) with a good metalled road thus especially benefitting Mannargudi which is 9 miles off the line of rail and enabling it to send its carts along a good road the whole way to Tanjore without any need to tranship the goods to the Railway. As to municipalities, with them I have no concern as President, District Board but I may presume that they only tax the Railway to the extent the law permits or orders.

5. In connection with this question of excessive rates, there is the very important one of excess charges already improperly and illegally levied by the Railway (Vide para 12 of my letter dated 13th November 1897 Enclosure No 1), and para 4 of the Agent's reply (enclosure 2) and

and Engineer's reply and the Statement (Enclosure No 3) which conclusively prove my contention. I confess that when I read the Agent's reply, I began to fear that my Engineer must have been sadly laboring under an erroneous impression as to the capacity of the trucks to carry the weight of gravel alleged. I did not - and I do not - think that the Agent could have laid stress on the word "single" as that would have been but a quibble unworthy of the occasion. I cannot doubt but that the Agent was led to believe that the Engineer's statement was substantially incorrect and that the trucks did ordinarily carry the weight charged for viz 6 tons. However I had 20 trucks of gravel (as well as 2 of "Aralai" under Conditions most unfavorable to the district Board) weighed and the result went far beyond what even the Local Fund Engineer had ever anticipated. It showed that his statement was — so far as these 22 trucks selected not by the Engineer, but supplied by the Railway in the Course of ordinary business — liberally Correct: not a single truck Contained 6 tons and the average weight of the gravel trucks for which we pay for 6 tons was just a shade above 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ tons i.e. a loss of almost 1$\frac{1}{4}$ out of 6 tons. As to the "Aralai" under the *exceptionally unfavorable* Conditions

Conditions

Conditions as stated by the Engineer, the average weight per truck is just a shade over 5$\frac{1}{8}$ tons instead of 6 on which the district Board has been charged. The Engineer has made a calculation of the amount which the South Indian Railway *illegally overcharged* in this manner during the past 4 years. It amounts to Rs 12060. This is allowing at the rates of 5 tons and 5$\frac{1}{4}$ tons for gravel and Aralai respectively. But as just shown the trucks do not Contain as much as the Engineer allows, and the actual amount illegally levied would amount to something like Rs 13700, or an average illegal overcharge of something like Rs 3425 per annum.

With

6. With reference to the last sentence of para 5 of the Agent's letter, I can only say that — call them threats or not — my alternatives were fully justified by the action of the South Indian Railway which treated the district Board as if it were a merchant trading for profit and not as a Public Body disinterestedly working for the development of the district which includes the development of the Railway. I must also invite attention to the fact that my "threats" did not in any way partake of the nature of a threat to cut the Boards' own nose to spite the Railway. !!! It was an ordinary business-like intimation that if the Agent could

Could

could not or would not comply with my reasonable demand I would consider the desirability of moving the Board to consider its position with a view to its spending its money and developing the district in a manner less ruinous to its resources but *equally* beneficial to the district *than* has been the practice.

7. As to para 6 of the Agent's letter, I cannot think of entertaining his proposals or of advising the district Board to *do* so. My proposals to the Agent were *most* moderate as I was anxious to dispose of the matter as amicably as possible. Since I wrote that letter however I have gone into the matter

still more fully and I have deliberately come to the conclusion that I would not be justified in now offering or accepting the terms I offered in my letter dated 13th November 1897 and I now proceed to state my wishes.

8. In the South Indian Railway "coaching guide" for January 1897, I see that the minimum rate per maund per mile is 1/6 pie. This works up to about 2¼ annas per truck of 6 tons (not of the trucks that they call 6 ton trucks — Vide para 5 of my letter dated 13th November 1897). I presume that at this rate there will be a margin of profit to the Railway and certainly no loss. I now

beg

beg to ask Government in the Local Fund Department to move Government in the Railway Department to use its good offices with the South Indian Railway to convey gravel at the above rate. If the Railway Department consents I propose to move the District Board to refrain from demanding from the Railway Department a refund of all the excess charges on account of incorrect weighment amounting to about Rs 3425 per annum. In the event of the Railway not complying with my reasonable request, I shall feel it incumbent on me as representing the interest of the District Board to advise the Board on the lines already indicated and to move them to sue in a civil court for the refund of all such excess charges as may not be barred by limitation.

9. Lastly I would observe that in the foregoing paras, I have been urging the cause of the District Board. Here I would also urge that the Railway department be moved to adopt the same charges for gravel conveyed to municipalities. If any municipality does overtax the Railway or render inadequate services, it will, I have no doubt do its best to undo or remedy the evil on the same being pointed out to them by the Agent.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

D/ 12 President

Form No. 34.

end of para 5 also p[illegible]
19-2-38

P. W. D., RAILWAY BRANCH.

CONSULTING ENGINEER'S OFFICE.

Madras, ____________ 189 .

OFFICE NOTE.

To
~~From~~ E. R.

To

Briefly the leading features of this case are as follows.

One of the few and I think the only accessible laterite ballast quarry in the Tanjore District is at Puliaket.

An ~~Siding~~ Extension was constructed by the SIR in 1894 from Tanjore to the quarry, length 5 miles.

This Extension has been inspected by the Govt Inspector & passed for goods traffic. (Passenger?)

Prior to the introduction of Terminal charges on the SIR the Rates charged to the District Board of Tanjore for Ballast were

3 annas per truck per mile + Rs 6 for conveying the train of 30 trucks empty from Tanjore to the quarry

On the introduction of Terminals in 1895 .. the Rates were recast as follows.

(a) 2 annas per truck per mile for distances over 50 miles + Rs 5 Terminals.

2) 3 annas per truck per mile for distances under 50 miles, no terminals

Besides these charges the SIR insists on the coolies who were engaged at Tanjore to work in the quarries travelling in a 3rd class carriage, attached to the ballast train, at ordinary 3rd class fares.

The President District Board alleges that the charges are unduly high and that the Railway is benefitted by the metalling of the District Roads.

The Agent — that the Rly is a Commercial Concern and that he is justified in charging the rates which are in Force. ~~and~~ offers certain reductions which are not accepted.

The President District Board refers the whole case to Govt asking that the PWD Railway Branch will use its ~~good~~ offices in endeavouring to persuade the SIR to reduce its charges & rates.

The President D.B. raises the following points.

(1) That for ballast destined for Tanjore the Railway charge as for 10 miles the actual distance being 5.

(2) The Equity of charging the Coolies for trainage to and from the quarry.

(3) That the trucks, which are labelled "to Carry 6 tons" and described in the Goods classification "sent in 6 ton wagon loads" are incapable to being loaded with more than 5 tons — 4¾ tons being an average load from actual experiment.

(4) That the District board is entitled to receive better treatment than that usually given to traders & merchants

The President concludes by saying that he will accept an all round rate of 2¼ annas per truck, failing which he threatens to lodge a Civil Suit to recover 13,700 Rs alleged overcharge on account of the trucks not having carried their full marked capacity.

As Regards Rates

Ballast is (vide page 92 SIR Goods classification) a first Class Commodity
max rate $\frac{1}{3}$ pie per md per mile
min " $\frac{1}{6}$ " " " "

This works out to
max { annas $4\frac{1}{2}$ per truck per mile (6 t)
" $3\frac{27}{48}$ " " " " ($4\frac{3}{4}$ ton)
min { " $2\frac{1}{4}$ " (6 ton) truck " "
" $1\frac{37}{48}$ " ($4\frac{3}{4}$ ton) " " "

If charged as Special the charges would be (minimum)
~~max~~ { annas 1.35 per ~~6~~ 6 ton truck per mile
1-07 " 4¾ " " " "
~~min~~ { ~~per 6 ton truck per mile~~
min { ~~" 4¾ " " "~~

Terminals (vide page 93 SIR Guide) ½ anna per md
= Rs. 5-1-0 for a 6 ton truck
= 4-0-0 for a 4¾ " "

On page 96 of the Guide it is stated
Ballast or Gravel when sent in 6 ton wagon loads will be charged at a special Rate of annas 3 per truck per mile.

On page 147 - The Rate is reduced to 2 annas per 5¾ or 6 ton truck per mile between the ~~quarry~~ quarry & certain stations over 50 miles distant which come under the terminal clause

CMS. 31/3

3 The President Dist Board intends to base his claim for overcharge on the question of Carrying Capacity of the truck vide latter part of para 5, also para 8 of his letter dated 19.2.98.

N P

The Reference in his letter of the 13.11.97 para 6 to an agreement between Mr Winterbotham & the Rly is vague but as he does not base his claim on this agreement, I think it may be assumed that, in the ordinary course of business, it was annulled by the introduction of Terminals charges — However we can ask the President District Board for a copy of it, if you think it necessary.

The Rates quoted appear to be in all cases truck Rates and the main question at issue is whether a truck Rate implies that the truck shall carry its marked capacity of the material for which the Rate is quoted I take it that a 6 ton truck say is quoted to distinguish it from a 12 ton truck for which the rate would of course be higher.

(From Correspondence between the Local Fund Engineer & the Traffic Manager SIR: one is led to infer that ~~the~~ it was possible to load the trucks, provided for carrying the ballast, up to 6 tons. but the Traffic Manager also adds "At any Rate our charge is as for 6 tons" (letter dated 29.9.97))

But the SIR I think ~~[illegible]~~ might be held liable in the for overcharging the D. Board the case of Terminal — The Terminal charges ~~for~~ leviable is ½ anna per maund so that this charge can only be made on the actual maundage carried. At the same time on page 93 of the Guide there is a clause which covers this point; the legality of which I suppose is unquestionable

The charge for the Minimum distance of 10 Miles is of course in conformity with Rly practice

(4) I doubt if the charge for Coolie fares is legal — as it is not quite clear that the Extension has ever been opened for passenger traffic — I have looked all through the Correspondence & cannot find it clearly stated.

CMcl. 31/3

Form No. 10.

Railw. Department.

Office of the Consulting Engineer for Railways,

Madras, 4 April 1898.

To

A

No. 967 Reply Nos 323 325, dated 14.4.98

Reminders.

Sir.

The President District Board, Tanjore, having referred to Govt. the question of alleged overcharge and exorbitant rates charged ~~on~~ to this Board for the carriage of laterite by the S.I.R. Co to Government, I have to request that you will give me full information on the following points.

(1). Has the Puliapet Extension been opened for passenger traffic. If so please refer me to any letter authorizing the carriage of passengers.

if not how do you justify your taking payment for the Dist Board's Coolies

② ~~Are~~ Have you satisfied ~~that~~ yourself whether it is not impossible to load the class of truck usually supplied for the carriage of ballast up to its marked carrying capacity of 6 tons with Puliapet Laterite.

and if so with what result

③ When quoting & arranging Rates with the District board, was any

nderstanding implied that
tons of laterite would be
nveyed in each truck
In this connection
have see Traffic Manager
tter to the Local Fund
gineer dated 18 Sept 97
r which it can be inferred
d, if properly loaded, the
ucks ~~will~~ were expected to carry 6 tons of
aterite.

CMH 31/3.

How do you ~~[illegible]~~ reconcile the statement, contained
for of the Collector, that "the District Board
make every effort to saddle railways with the
recurrent taxation permanently for time", with the
Collector's assertion that "the District Board
of Tanjore" does not even tax the railway
to the extent of a single rupee".

F.W.S.
1/4/98

CMH 1/4

Despatched on 4/4/98

Form No. 10.

Railway Department.

Office of the Consulting Engineer for Railways,
Madras, 8 April 1898.

To

The Agent
S. I. Ry

No. 1004 Reply No. , dated

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No. 967 dated the 4th instant, I have the honour to forward herewith an original (to be kindly returned) letter No. 158/DB of 19.2.98 with its enclosures, from the President, District Board, Tanjore, therein referred to.

CMH 6/4

Reminders.

With Encs
A file of papers.

Despatched on 8/4/98

6 Feb 98

implied that

No. 323

South Indian Railway Co., Ld.
AGENT'S OFFICE,

TRICHINOPOLY, 14th April 1898

C. No. 1777
Recd. 15.4.98

CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAYS
RECEIVED
15 APR 1898
MADRAS.

From

THE AGENT.
SOUTH INDIAN RAILWAY,

To

THE CONSULTING ENGINEER
FOR RAILWAYS,
MADRAS.

Sir,

ER
Flags D & L

With reference to your letters No. 967 and 1004 dated 4th and 8th April 1898 respectively, I have the honor to offer the following remarks.

put up

2. The question of the opening of the Pillayarpatti siding for passenger traffic will be dealt with in a separate letter.

3. I had an opportunity recently of seeing the weighment at Negapatam of a few trucks loaded with Pillayarpatti laterite. The gravel was loaded in ballast trucks and in no case was the freight even as much as five tons. The wagons were however obviously underloaded, and I therefore had more laterite placed in one of the wagons until its contents weighed six tons. With this load the laterite had to be piled up until its height in the centre was about a foot above the sides of the truck. The Traffic Manager considers that a truck so loaded could be run in safety, and it undoubtedly could if the larger pieces of laterite were packed round the sides, a practice which the Station Master at Negapatam tells me is frequently adopted. I think however that unless our staff were instructed to pass laterite so stacked, the trucks would have been stopped as overloaded. Occasionally high-side stock is used for carrying laterite

TM   for distances under 50 miles (no terminals) laterite when loads over six tons have been carried. I was much surprised that laterite proved so light and fully expected that six tons could have easily been loaded in a ballast truck. The cubical capacity of the wagons usually supplied to the District Board is about 138 cubic feet, and as ordinary gravel weighs from 112 to 120 lbs per cubic foot, it was not unnatural to conclude that with flush loading at least 6·9 tons could be carried.

4. I can trace no assurance having been given to the District Board that six tons of laterite would be conveyed in each six-tons truck. I have seen a copy of the Traffic Manager's letter No. 97 G/$\frac{7869}{26842}$ dated 18th September 1897 to which you refer. I presume that he only intended to state that the wagons could carry six tons of ordinary gravel X which they undoubtedly can. However the impression this letter gives you was evidently not that conveyed to the Local Fund Engineer, who in answering it writes:— "With reference to your No. 97-G/$\frac{7869}{26842}$ dated "18th instant, I have the honor to remark that it evades "my question, which is not, what is the carrying capacity "of the trucks, but how it is ascertained that each truck "of gravel contains the weight for which the Department "is charged, viz 6 tons." The District Board officials seem to be under the impression that when a truck rate is quoted, the railway is bound to guarantee the full marked load of the vehicle being carried. It is perhaps unnecessary to point out that this is a fallacy and that it is customary on Indian lines to quote truck rates quite irrespective of whether the cubic capacity of the truck is sufficient or insufficient to contain such weight of the commodity carried as corresponds to the advertised

Vlag S

X laterite from the Palashet quarry (?)

advertised load of the truck. As no two commodities have probably the same specific gravity, it would be quite impossible to quote truck rates if the marked load of a wagon had to be guaranteed.

5. In regard to my remarks regarding railway taxation by District Boards, I did not mean to imply that District Boards directly imposed taxation on railways. It is a fact however that the Unions of Nidamangalam, Tiruturaipundi, Mutupet and Shiyali under the Tanjore District Board have attempted to do so, and for such action I presume the District Board is not altogether free of responsibility. This however is a matter of no consequence as far as I can see.

6. I do not think any good will result from replying to the somewhat intemperate remarks of the President of the Tanjore District Board. It is of course utter nonsense to think that this administration is actuated by feelings of spite towards the Board and it is perhaps unnecessary to state that the treatment of the Board by this railway has not differed from that accorded to any other large consignor. All that has been done is to resist the efforts made for very exceptional treatment. Government has fixed certain limits between which charges may be levied for the conveyance of laterite, and so long as these limits are not infringed, I do not think the rates levied can be considered unreasonable.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
A. D. G. Shelley
Capt R.E.
Agent

No. 335

South Indian Railway Co., Ld.,
AGENT'S OFFICE,
TRICHINOPOLY, 15th April 1898.

O. No. 1797
Recd. 16.4.98

From
The AGENT,
SOUTH INDIAN RAILWAY,

To
The CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAYS,
MADRAS.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No. 323 of 14th April 1898, I have the honor to herewith return you, in original, letter No. $\frac{158}{D.B}$ dated 19th February 1898 (with its enclosures) from the President, District Board, Tanjore, which you forwarded with your letter No. 1004 of the 8th April 1898.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
A.D.G. Shelley.
Captain R.E.
Agent

Enclosure – A file of papers

From
The Agent,
South Indian Railway,
Trichinopoly.
To
The Consulting Engineer for
Railways,
Madras.
Dated } 189
Received }
No.
Enclosure.

10 TM for distances under 50 miles (No terminals)

From
The Agent,
South Indian Railway,
Trichinopoly,
To
The Consulting Engineer for Railways,
Madras.
Dated }
Received } 189
No.
Enclosure.

Form No. 34.

P. W. D., RAILWAY BRANCH.

OFFICE OF THE CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAY.

Madras, 189 .

OFFICE NOTE.

From ~~E. R.~~ D2

To E. R.

F No action appears to have been taken on this case except that sanction has been ~~obtained~~ asked for opening the Tanjore – Puliarpetta quarry siding for the carriage of passengers.

The President District Board Tanjore asks ~~for~~ us to move in the matter of inducing the S. I. R to reduce their rates for the carriage of road material for the district roads.

The rates now charged are
(i) 2 annas per 6 ton truck per mile for distances over 50 miles + Rs 5-1-0 terminal charge.
(ii) 3 annas per 6 ton truck per mile for distances under 50 miles (no terminals)

This has hung fire so long that it may as well await E R's return to Madras now
JB 9/7

A.R
Put up all necessary references & enable D2 to complete this Note for my comment on margin.
FM 12/7

D2
Yes. But see the Company's contract and note please what exactly is our control in such a matter.

Contract put up flag C. maximum & minimum Sanctioned rates flag S

What do these rates work out to per maund per mile including coolie & everything. See if this information is to be obtained from the figures
FM

(iii) a 3rd class fare for each cooly who travels from Tanjore to the quarry.

(iv) a charge for the use of the Engine for taking the train from Tanjore to the quarry at Rs 6 per train which apparently is only levied when no terminals are charged.

What is the law about the 10 mile limit, or the custom on all railways. Look up and refer to me.

The President D.B contends

(a) that the S.I.R should not enforce the 10 mile limit on this traffic as it does when carrying it only 5 miles to Tanjore

But this siding is now open for passenger traffic.

b ~~(ii)~~ that it is not fair to charge a 3rd class fare for each cooly who goes to the quarry to work the train.

D.

Please go carefully through the papers again and ascertain accurately what it was that Mr Winterbottom and the Agent contracted about. Was it about a 6 ton waggon load, or about 6 tons?

FM

c ~~(iii)~~ That the trucks being marked of 6 ton capacity must carry this load of laterite & that he is only bound to pay for the weight they do carry which he puts (from actual trial) at 4¾ tons.

With regard to ~~(i)~~ a I think the President D.B is wrong in asking that the 10 mile limit should not be enforced, there must be a limit of some sort & 10 miles has been fixed & is always enforced.

Papers. FM

As to (b) It appears to me that the S.I.R have been exacting illegal fares from the coolies

Yes. until we sanction the opening for passenger traffic FM

Form No. 34.

P. W. D., RAILWAY BRANCH.

OFFICE OF THE CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAY.

Madras, 189 .

OFFICE NOTE.

From E. R.

To

who travelled & that they had no right to charge them.

The question here comes in - is it necessary to put a 3rd class carriage on for the coolies? - why should they not travel in the trucks as the Rys ballast coolies & all construction coolies do.

They are not railway servants, or the servants of railway contractors. The Agent is right to refuse to carry them except under proper precautions.

As to (c) with regard to which the President D.B. threatens a lawsuit I cannot find that the S.I.Ry anywhere guaranteed that the trucks would carry 6 tons of laterite although it is evident that they were under the impression that the trucks did do so & undoubtedly they do carry 6 tons of average metal but this particular laterite appears very light. As the District Board were paying a wagon

See my note above. I want a reference. What did they contract about as a matter of fact?

FM

rate & appear to have made no complaint that they were prevented from loading the wagons as full as they would hold I think they have no cause to complain.

This I think is right. But make it clear by a reference
FM

The question of terminals is different as the charge is quoted as 6 pies per maund & they apparently are not legally entitled to charge on more than is actually carried.

One rate not touched on by the President, apparently because it formed part of the old rate to which he would like to return, is the Rs 6/- for Engine power for taking the train to the quarry. I do not think they have the smallest right to charge this. They might as well charge a Madras Merchant for whose goods they had to run an empty or half empty train from Negapatam the cost of hauling the empty wagons.

I would suggest as fair rates

(1) 2 annas per 6 ton truck per mile for distances over 50 miles + terminals at 4 Rs per truck

(2) 3 annas per truck per mile for distances under 50 miles (no terminals)

The 10 mile limit to be adhered to but no charge made for carriage of coolies or haulage of empty trains.

JLK 9/7/98.

D.

I would agree if the words in circle were cut out. But the Note is not complete at all. See back.

FMS 12/7/98

Over.

ER

Form No. 34.

P. W. D., RAILWAY BRANCH.

OFFICE OF THE CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAY.

Madras, 189 .

OFFICE NOTE.

From D2

~~From~~ To E. R.

Charges for laterite carried by S. I. Ry for District Board

To ~~Madras~~. Tanjore.

Query 1.

Our only control is apparently

(a) to see that maximum & minimum rates are not infringed &

(b) to see that "no undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to or in favour of any particular person, company or Railway administration or any particular description of traffic in any respect whatsoever shall be made or given by the company . . . ." & vice versa.

Ilay C

Sections 31 & 32 of the Contract.

Query 2. This, of course, varies with the lead taking the most unfavourable stations for the ~~ton~~ board 1st to Pounevai distance 51 miles, the rate including coolies & terminals works out to 0.29 pies per maund per mile against a maximum of $\frac{33\frac{1}{3}}{100}$ 0.333 & a minimum of $\frac{16\frac{2}{3}}{100}$ 0.10 a

Ballast & road metal being carried at special rate if at owners risk see pages 96 & 91 of Classification.

& for Tanjore (real distance 5 miles) but taken as being 10 miles the rate works out to approx 0.25 or $\frac{1}{4}$ pie per maund per mile against the same maximum & minimum viz $\frac{1}{3}$ & $\frac{1}{10}$. It must be remembered that the Company charge terminals in addition to the rates quoted so it is beyond our power apparently to enforce a rate calculated by including terminals. Of course the Railway would object to our including the coolie's fares.

N.B. It must be remembered that these rates are worked out on the supposition that the wagons are loaded to their carrying capacity of 6 tons

JLK.

Query 3. The 10 mile limit was agreed upon at the Indian Railway Conference of 1893 & is embodied in the rules drawn up by that conference Rule 44(c) I presume these rules have been approved by Govt.

Flag X

4. Agreement with Mr. Winterbotham. We shall have to ask for a copy of this, I cannot gather from the papers what agreement, if any, was actually made, or if the S.I.Ry. guaranteed that their wagons would carry 6 tons of laterite.

Taking the Chairman's contention that the wagons actually carry only $4\frac{3}{4}$ tons as an average load, the rates

---

2

Form No. 34.

P. W. D., RAILWAY BRANCH.

OFFICE OF THE CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAY.

Madras, 189 .

OFFICE NOTE.

~~From E. R.~~

~~To~~

for Ponneri over 0.36 pies per maund per mile or above the maximum & for Tanjore (10 miles) over 0.32 or approximating very close to the maximum of $\frac{1}{3}$.

but this includes terminals, which should not be included in the maund per mile rate

JLK.

5. The maximum & minimum rates above quoted are given at page 91 of "S. I. R coaching guide & Goods Classification" but referring to pages 146 & 147 of the same I find their rate for this road metal at owners risk is specially quoted at 2 annas per $5\frac{3}{4}$ or 6 ton truck to certain stations only, ~~though owners have the option~~ of + terminals but these stations are all over 50 miles distant & for these

put up

& all special rates the Company's rule see page 146 last para is "... terminals must be charged on the carrying capacity of the wagon used"

Summing up the above notes, we find that road metal can be carried at the owners risk

The whole question of rates is very confusing & it must be almost impossible for a casual customer to gather what it will pay him best to do.

Take the present case.

If the District Board elect to pay the special rates for the wagons, which (though capable of carrying a weight of 6 tons) only actually carry an average load of $4\frac{3}{4}$ tons of this special commodity they pay :-

(i) for a distance of 51 miles

2 annas per $4\frac{3}{4}$ tons per mile + terminals (on 6 tons) i.e 5-1-0.

(ii) for a distance of under 50 miles

3 annas per $4\frac{3}{4}$ tons per mile (no terminals) (but in this case an extra charge of 6 Rs. a trip for Engine hire is added this of course adds a different rate per wagon, or per maund, according to the distance run) I object to this invidious charge.

If the local board object to these rates, they can apparently bargain with the Railway who have the power of granting them any rate between

(i) $3\frac{27}{48}$ annas per $4\frac{3}{4}$ tons per mile + terminals which would be 4 Rs. (maximum)

and

(ii) 1.07 annas per $4\frac{3}{4}$ tons per mile + terminals (4 Rs.) (minimum)

Terminals being charged on both over & under 50 miles.

Form No. 29.

Letter from
No.
Dated

To E. R.

You will see then that 1st the District Board could bargain for a rate per maund per mile between maximum & minimum, having settled this, they would have to work out which was the more favourable rate for them, the rate per maund per mile agreed upon or the rate per truck per mile specially quoted. They could only arrive at a decision after calculating the cost of carriage of stone ~~to every~~ the amount of stone required at every station at its varying distance.

The only point I am now doubtful about is — the right of the S. I. Rs. to charge for Engine power for taking wagons to a place where they have contracted to do work —

The Rs. are entitled to levy terminals on the full carrying capacity of trucks hired & not only on the load carried i.e if their classification is ~~correct~~ authoritative

28/7/98.

Form No. 1.

No. 94/O

Print

~~Madras~~ Ooty, the 3rd Aug 1898.

From

The CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAYS,

MADRAS,

Reminders.

Mr President

To Chairman District Board. Tanjore

~~THE AGENT AND MANAGER, M. RY.~~
~~" " S. I. RY.~~
~~" " H. H. THE N. G. S. RY.~~
~~" " AND CHIEF ENGR., N. RY.~~
~~" " S. M. RY.~~
~~" ENGR.-IN-CHIEF, B. M. RY.~~
~~" MANAGER, E. C. RY.~~

Reply No.

dated

SIR,

With reference to Mr Andrews letter to Govt. Local & Municipal Dept. No. 158/D.B. dated 19th Feb. 98. I have the honour to request that you will furnish me with a copy of the agreement ~~therein referred to~~ between Mr Winterbotham and the Agent S.I.R. Co. which is referred to in the correspondence therewith forwarded.

I have &

2/8/98

Despatched on 3/8/98

Form No. 1.

No. 95/O

6 8

~~Madras~~, Ooty the 3rd Augt 1898

Reminders. to A

Despd 27/8/98

From

THE CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAYS,

MADRAS,

To

THE AGENT ~~AND MANAGER, M. RY.~~
" " S. I. RY.
~~" " H. H. THE N. G. S. RY.~~
~~" " AND CHIEF ENGR., N. RY.~~
~~" " S. M. RY.~~
~~" ENGR.-IN-CHIEF, B. M. RY.~~
~~" MANAGER, E. C. RY.~~

Reply No.

dated

SIR,

With reference to your letter No-323 dated the 14th April 98 I have the honour to request that you will reply to the following queries.

(a) Have you any reason to urge why you should not refund to the District Board of Tanjore cooly fares levied on the Pillayanpet siding before the date on which it was formally opened for passenger traffic.

(b) In view of the results of the weighment of waggon loads of the ballast got from the quarry, are you prepared [illegible] to raise the sides of the vehicles specially [illegible] told off for this traffic so that they may carry the marked load when loaded level.

(c) Are you prepared to revise the rate per truck on the basis of a comparison between marked load and actual weight carried in the unaltered trucks when loaded level, in view of the obvious misunderstanding on the District Board's part that in bargaining for a rate per waggon they were entitled to a load equal to the marked capacity.

2. You are of course perfectly entitled to charge cooly fares now that the siding has been opened for passenger traffic. You are also entitled to charge as for ten miles to Tanjore. You are also entitled to charge reasonable terminals under clause 46 (1)(2) of the Railway Act. [redacted]. It is not incumbent on you to treat the District Board differently from any other of your customers.

3. I am not in possession of information to show whether the laterite traffic is sufficient in quantity or sufficiently steady for many weeks together to justify you in according to it exceptional treatment. But, if it should be so, I am strongly of opinion that you would be wise to encourage it. It seems to me that you might very wisely give special rates for gravel intended specially for railway feeder roads.

4. What the District Board have got to consider is what they can afford to pay for the gravel, and I take it that the quantity that they will use will depend largely on what you charge them for carrying it, all told, including cooly fares and terminals. Apparently for the most unfavourable place, Pommaii, charges work out to over 1/3rd pie per ~~maund per mile~~ maund-mile actually carried, and a little less for Tanjore. It seems to me that this is a high charge for stuff like gravel, of such low intrinsic value, and that it would probably pay you to lower the charges, to simplify them, to give ~~the~~ facilities in the way of specially made up trains for settled periods, and to offer special reductions for freight of gravel for bona fide railway feeder road purposes.

I have &c FJS 2/8/98

Documents accompanying:-

—Nil—

Despatched on 3/8/98

10

9

LOCAL FUND DEPARTMENT

Tanjore District Board's Office.

Camp, Vallam Dated 23-8-1898.

Disposal No. 808

No. D. B.

From

J. Twigg Esqre

~~THE~~ PRESIDENT, DISTRICT BOARD,

TANJORE.

3982

26.8.98

To

The Consulting Engineer for Railways Madras.

CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAYS
RECEIVED
26 AUG 1898
MADRAS.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No 94/6 dated 3rd August 1898, I have the honour to enclose copies of the marginally noted correspondence between Mr Winterbotham and the Agent South Indian Railway

flag E

Mr Winterbotham's No 34/DB dated 12-5-94.

2. South Indian Railway Agents No 7488/1584 dated 6-6-94.

3. Mr Winterbotham's letter No 34/DB dated 26.6.94

4. South Indian Railway Agents No 13249/2423 dated 27-6-94

To Secy

Circuit reply to our 95 of 3rd to A. O. C. reminder should issue JH 29.8.98.

Recd [illegible] 2.9.98.

Railway Trichinopoly regarding the rate at which gravel was to be carried from Pillayarpatti siding Terminus to the Tanjore South Indian Railway Station.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servt

Thiruvapranam Pillai
8898
For President

DESPATCHED
24th AUG. 98

Local Fund Department

From the President
District Board
Tanjore

To

The Consulting Engineer
For Railways
Madras

Dated 23d
Despd 24th } August 1898
Recd

Disposal No. 808

enclo: 4

subject

Forwarding copies of Corres-pondence between Mr Winterbatham and the Agent S.I.R re rate for the carriage of gravel from Pilliarpatti Siding Terminus to the Tanjore South Indian Railway station.

Copy of a Communication from the ———
~~to the~~ President District Board
Tanjore ~~No.~~ to the Agent South Indian Railway Trichinopoly No. 34/DB dated 12th May 1894.

Your letter No. 3993/868 dated 24th March 1894.

In forwarding herewith copy of the Local Fund Engineer's letter No. 197 L.W. 21-4-94 in reply to your letter under reference, I have the honor to inform you that your proposal to charge 6 as per truck per mile was strongly opposed at the time by the Local Fund Engineer and was never assented to by me. I have, as you are aware, have not to be performed for laterite trains worked on the main line and a charge must be levied to cover the cost of such extra services.

Our actual locomotive expenses work out to 12 as per mile. I am willing to charge this rate for the extra services alluded to; eight (miles) x 12 (annas) = Rs 6 per trip plus the usual charge of as 3 per truck per mile for working the loaded trucks from the quarry.

3 To E Roc No 3982/98
s08 dt 23. 8 98
P. Dt Bd Tanjore

23 8 98
For President

Sd/-

Copy of a Communication from the ——
—— ~~to~~ the President District
Board Tanjore ~~No.~~ to the Agent South Indian Railway Trichinopoly No 34/DB dated 26th June 1894

With reference to your letter No 7488/1584 dated 6-6-94 I have the honor to inform you that I accept your proposal to charge as 3 per loaded truck per mile and Rs 6 for the Engine for each train load. I understand that the ordinary load for an Engine is 30 loaded trucks of gravel and that the Engine fee of Rs 6 is to be paid for each 30 loaded trucks. I shall be glad if early orders can be issued to carry

Gravel at the said rates.

2. I may note that the entry "Rs 3" in the last line but one of your letter under reference is evidently a mistake for "annas 3."

M. Sivagnanam Pillai
28/8
For President

&c.

2 3982 8
808 23.8.98
P. Dt. Bd. Tanjore

5
48

Copy of a Communication from the Agent South Indian Railway to the President, District Board, Tanjore.

No. 13249/2423 dated 27th August 1894.

Your Current No. 34/D.B of the 24th Instant, orders have been issued for the adoption of the rates accepted in para 1 of your letter of the 26th June last.

M. Sivagnanam Pillai
28/8
For President

&c.

1 ERs e No 3982/98
808 dt 23-8-98
President Dt Board
Tanjore

11

E.R.E 4096 Called for
3/9/1898

Precis

No. 871 **South Indian Railway Co., Ld.**
AGENT'S OFFICE,
TRICHINOPOLY, 31st August 1898

From

Offg:
THE AGENT,
SOUTH INDIAN RAILWAY,

To

THE CONSULTING ENGINEER
FOR RAILWAYS,
~~MADRAS.~~
Ootacamund.

Sir,

flag M

Your letter No 95/0 of 3rd August 1898.
Conveyance of gravel from the Pillayarpatti siding
Arrangements with Tanjore District Board.

I forward herewith a copy of the Traffic Manager's report on your letter under reply.

With reference to your query a. I do not think that we ought to refund to the District Board the amount levied for the carriage of coolies. We do not carry coolies free for other merchants and I fail to see why the District Board should receive exceptional treatment in this respect. There is no doubt that it was a distinct advantage to the Board to be able to send their coolies backwards and forwards by special trains and I think they may be reasonably called upon to pay for that advantage.

Your query b. Mr Davies is of opinion that there is no necessity to raise the sides of the ballast waggons as he says by heaping up the ballast a full load can be put on them. I am doubtful of this myself, it may be possible to load a truck, at rest, up to its full capacity but I am inclined to think that the motion of running would cause a large proportion of such material as laterite if loaded above the tops of the trucks to fall off in transit. If the

Board

12

Board can shew that they can keep a certain number of truck fairly continuously employed I shall be prepared to apply for sanction to fit up sufficient special stock for the traffic.

I entirely disapprove of High Sided trucks being used for gravel traffic. They have been used before and there was always some difficulty in preventing the trucks from being overloaded in spite of the load line painted on the inside of the Vehicle: they take a long time to unload.

I do not think that the Board's representative was in any way misled when the original bargain was made. He knew what the carrying capacity in cubic feet was of the trucks, and the gravel is paid for by the cubic yard, the specific gravity of the material carried did not enter into his calculation at all. The trucks are marked with the carrying capacity to prevent over loading and when light materials are carried of which the truck will not hold the full carrying capacity as in the case of cotton the rates are adjusted accordingly. A merchant consigning cotton in a truck marked above the weight of cotton that could be put into it might on the same grounds as put forth by the Tanjore Board, claim to pay only on the gross weight of the cotton loaded. The rates quoted for the carriage of gravel for the Tanjore Board is already lower than the ordinary rate quoted to the public and I am not disposed to lower it any further.

With regard to a further reduction for gravel required for the special construction of Railway feeder roads. I will, if application is made for the carriage of a sufficient quantity, reconsider the advisability of making further reductions.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant,

Francis J. Smith
Offg: Agent.

1 Enclosure.

From
The Agent,
South Indian Railway,
Trichinopoly.
To
The Consulting Engineer for
Railways,
Madras.
Dated }
Received } 189
No.
Enclosure.

---

78 81

South Indian Railway.

Copy of a letter, No. 95.R.1773, dated 26th August 1898
from the Traffic Manager
to the Offg: Agent, South Indian Railway.

Conveyance of gravel from the Pillayarpatti Siding
Arrangements with the Tanjore District Board.
Your No. R.1709/3/1476 of 12th August 1898.

In reply to the remarks contained in the Consulting Engineer's letter dated the 3rd of August, I would point out with regard to the question marked A that we carried the laterite coolies, gratuitously for a long period and it would be at least ungenerous to now take advantage of a technical omission to claim back charges made for services performed.

(b) As it has been proved that 6 tons of laterite can be loaded in a Ballast wagon marked to carry that weight, if it is piled up to the extent of a foot in the centre, the load sloping to the sides and ends. I think it unnecessary to alter the rolling stock in the manner proposed in para (b)

When travelling to Calcutta in February last I noticed coal trucks were loaded up in this way.

I shall be pleased to place high-sided trucks at the disposal of the Local Fund Engineer when they can be spared. This is now done when possible at Cuddalore Old Town whence the Tanjore Local Fund Board procures gravel.

(C) If the trucks are loaded as suggested in para (a) Supra, there

AGENT'S OFFICE,
TRICHINOPOLY,
31st August 1898.

Accompaniment to the Agent's letter
No. 8U of 31-8-1898.

1a

True copy.
W Le Mesurier
for Offg: Agent.

Copy continued.

there is no reason to alter the rate.

In para 3 of the Consulting Engineer's letter under reply it is remarked "you might very wisely give special rates for gravel intended specially for railway feeder roads".

We do already give special rates. The ordinary rate for Ballast is Special class or 4 annas 3 pies per 6 tons truck per mile.

Terminals amounting to 6 pies per maund are levied when the traffic is carried over a distance of 50 miles, but not otherwise.

We have quoted the Tanjore Local Fund Board a special rate of 3 annas per 6 tons truck per mile without terminals for distances under 50 miles, and over that distance 2 annas per truck per mile with the usual terminals.

We even went below the 2 annas rate in order to meet the Local Fund Board on their representations that they would send a very large quantity of laterite to Shiyali.

We then quoted them a rate of 1 anna 9 pies per truck per mile, plus terminals, which made the cost of 6 tons laterite delivered at the latter Station (a distance of 56 miles) come to Rs 11-12-0, or less than Rs 2 a ton

These facts will go to show that we have treated the Tanjore Local Fund Board with much consideration.

The remark in para 4 of the Consulting Engineer's letter that the charges to Ponneri work out to over 1/3rd pie per maund is

AGENT'S OFFICE,
TRICHINOPOLY,
31st August 1898.

True copy.
M Le Mesurier
for Offg: Agent.

Accompaniment to the Agent's letter
No. 8U of 31-8-1898.

Form No

South Indian Railway.

Copy continued.

is evidently based on the Supposition that the rate is 3 annas per truck plus terminals, whereas it is 2 annas per truck plus terminals, which works out to a fraction over 1/4th of a pie per maund per mile.

It should also be borne in mind that there is no return load for these trucks which have to be hauled back empty to the siding.

I note the Suggestion of the Consulting Engineer that further reduced rates might be given for gravel intended specially for Railway Feeder roads and am of opinion that such concession might be made provided the roads to be constructed are such as are likely to benefit our traffic.

Business is business, and the Local Fund Board may depend upon our giving them every consideration consistent with the interests of the Railway.

AGENT'S OFFICE,
TRICHINOPOLY,
31st August 1898.

True copy.
W. Le Mesurier
for Offg: Agent.

Accompaniment to the Agent's letter
No. 811 of 31- 8- 1898.

Form No. 2.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

RAILWAY BRANCH.

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. 434 of 1898, dated , from President Dist. Board Tanjore.

" " " 189 , " , "

" " " 189 , " , "

Letter No. 94/o dated 3rd Aug. 98 from Con. Eng. to Chairman Dist Board Tanjore

" " 808 " 23rd Aug 98 Chairman Dist Board Tanjore to Con. Eng.

" " 95/a dated 3rd Aug 98 from Con. Eng. to Agent S.I.R.

" " 811 dated 31st Aug 98 " Agent S.I.R. to Con. Eng.

ORDER.

The President District Board Tanjore referred for decision of Government the question of the fairness or otherwise of the charges made by the S.I.R. Co. for the conveyance of ballast gravel for District Road repairs. The rates charged by the Company, not being in excess of the maximum permissible class rates sanctioned by Government, are within the Agent's competence to impose. The Agent is also within his right in imposing the terminals which go towards making up the total charges of which the President complains. It is also in accordance with the agreement made by the President with the Agent, in the correspondence read above, that a separate charge should be made for the use of an engine on the quarry siding. The Agent had no power to charge the District Board for the conveyance of ballast over the Palingpatti siding before the date, 1st July 98, when it was opened for public traffic, and if requested to do so by the Board he must refund the amount thus irregularly charged.

Government having perused the Agent's letter read above, No. 811. dated the 31st Aug 98. is of opinion that it will form a satisfactory basis for future dealings between the Agent and the President of the District Board. A copy of that letter and of its enclosures as well as of the Consulting Engineer's letter to which it is a reply, will be forwarded for information to the President, District Board Tanjore.

Government is of opinion that the Agent S.I.Ry.Co. ~~[illegible]~~ may wisely, and in the interest of the railway, charge for the conveyance of ~~[illegible]~~ gravel for road making, whether for Districts or Municipalities, the lowest rates that are consistent with reasonable profits.

7/ By the use of the term 6 ton waggon which is intended merely to define maximum permissible load, ~~[illegible]~~ the District Board were led into the misunderstanding ~~[illegible]~~ that in quoting a rate "per 6-ton-wagon" the Agent was thereby contracting to carry six tons.

FKS
2/9/98

7. L & M. Dept. for favour of c.i.

FKS
7/9

I I

Public Works Department,

Railway Branch.

Letter No. 94/0 d/	3rd August '98 from Consulting Engineer to Chairman, District Board, Tanjore.
,, ,, 808 d/	23rd August '98 from Chairman, Dt. Bd. Tanjore to Consulting Engineer.
,, ,, 95/0 d/	3rd August '98 from Con. Engr. to Agent S.I.R.
,, ,, 811 d/	31st August '98 from the Agent S.I.R. to Con. Engr.

Order

The President, District Board, Tanjore referred for a decision of Government the question of the fairness or otherwise of the charges made by the S. I. Ry.Co. for the conveyance of laterite gravel for District ~~[illegible]~~ road repairs. The rates charged by the Company, not being in excess of the maximum permissible class rates sanctioned by Government, are within the Agent's competence to impose. The Agent is also within his right in imposing the terminals which go towards making up the total charges of ~~t~~ which the President ~~[illegible]~~ complains. ~~It is also~~ The Agent was also within his right, up to the date of the opening of the siding for public traffic, but not subsequently, in making a separate charge ~~in accordance with the agreement made by the President with the Agent, in the correspondence read above, that a separate charge should be made~~ for the use of an Engine on the quarry siding. ~~The Agent had no~~ He however exceeded his powers ~~to~~ in charging the District Board for the conveyance of coolies over the Palaipatti siding before the date, 1st July 1898, when it was opened for public traffic; and if requested to do so by the Board he must refund the amount thus irregularly charged.

Sec. L. & M.

See clean draft

FKS
3/10

Government having perused the Agent's letter read above, No.811 dated the 31st August 1898, is of opinion that it will form a satisfactory **basis** for future dealings between ~~the Agent~~ him and the ~~President~~ ~~of~~ the District Board. A copy of that letter and of its enclosures as well as of the Consulting Engineer's letter to which it is a reply, will be forwarded for information to the President, District Board Tanjore.

Flag R.

Government is of opinion that the Agent South Indian Railway Company may wisely, and in the interest of the Railway, charge for the conveyance of gravel for road making, whether for Districts or municipalities, the lowest rates that are **consistent** with reasonable profits.

By the use of the term 6 ton wagon, which is intended merely to define maximum permissible load, the District Board were led into the misunderstanding ~~There would appear to have been no real basis for the delusion under which the District Board were labouring~~ that in quoting a rate " per 6 ton wagon" the Agent was thereby contracting to carry six tons.

To P.W. Dept., u.o. FJS 28/9/98

I take it that the agreement between the Pres. & the Agent was annulled by the imposition of terminals, & that therefore the separate charge for the use of an Engine on the quarry siding will not stand. Further, that siding I understand has been opened for public traffic; it is therefore the duty of the Ry. to bring up the empty trains without charge.

H.T. 27.9.98.

Whenever it is convenient to him to place waggons in the sidings he will doubtless do so if it pays him to do so. The siding is being run on commercial principles. The Agent [is] not likely to refuse paying traffic. FJS

I understand that there is no agreement whatever, beyond the implied acceptance by the Board every time they book a train load, of the S.I.R. Co.'s goods rates and classification. We are not now dealing with the future which must be left to the haggling of the market, but with the past transactions between the Board and the Company.

It is open for the Board to make the best bargain they can with the Agent, and so far as he works within his maximum rates, and does nothing illegal, Govt. cannot interfere.

FJS 28/9/98

To

The Local and Municipal Deptt.
for favour of C. 1.

[G./74.]

NOTE FOR THE ~~CHIEF~~ SECRETARY.

The papers that have been typed are :-

I - Mr. Sprnig's order.

II - Office note by Mr. Scovell.

III - Office note by Mr. Lyle.

AK 23/9/98 1298R

1.

Note for the Secy.

II

1. Please see the note of the Consulting Engineer, which gives shortly the facts of the case.

2. The Pres. District Board Tanjore complains of the very heavy railway charges incurred by the Local Boards & municipalities on account of the conveyance of gravel from the Valgamodu (Pallayarpalti) siding to the various railway stations in the following respects:-

(1) the imposition of terminal charges which were introduced in 1895:

(2) the charge of ordinary 3rd class fares for the maistries & coolies who were engaged at Tanjore to work in the quarry, & who had previously been conveyed free of charge:

(3) the charge of haulage for 10 miles from the Valgamodu

quarry to Tanjore tho' the distance is only 5 miles:

(4) that the trucks, which are marked with a carrying capacity of 6 tons, do not in fact – as was proved by experiment – carry more than 5 tons, 4$\frac{3}{4}$ tons being an average load:

(5) that the District Board is entitled to receive better treatment than that given to traders & merchants, & that considering that the gravel conveyed is almost exclusively used for the upkeep of railway feeder roads, the S.I.R. should reduce its charges for the conveyance of this gravel.

3. The ultimatum of the Presᵗ. District Board is a rate of 2$\frac{1}{4}$ annas per truck, failing which he threatens to bring a civil suit to recover the alleged over-charges.

4 With regard to (1) Mr. Spring
states in the order that the
Agent is within his right
in imposing the terminals
which go to make up
the total charges of
which the Prest. complains
This seems to be correct.
It was pointed out by the
Agent of the South Indian
Flag Y Railway in his letter* to
the Prest. District Board
that the terminal charges
are levied under the orders
of the Board of Directors
& cannot be removed
without its sanction.
The Consulting Engineer
in his note, already referred
Flag Z to, seemed to think that
the S.I.R. might be held
liable for overcharging
the District Board in the
case of terminals. He pointed
out that the terminal
charge leviable is 6 pies
per maund, so that the
charge can only be

made on the actual maundage carried," but he also pointed out that on page 93 of the S.I.R Coaching Guide there was a clause which covers this point. The clause he seems to refer~~s~~ to is as follows :- "In all cases where special reduced rates are quoted for traffic in truck loads (except loose cotton), tonnage must be charged on the carrying capacity of the wagon used." In the case of ~~this~~ ballast or gravel there is a special rate of annas 8 per truck per mile when it is sent in 6 ton wagon loads (v. note (C). at the foot of p96 of the S.I.R. Coaching Guide). Flag $.

5. The separate charge of Rs6 for the use of the engine on the quarry siding is also correct, as is pointed out in the order (v. letter of the Presᵗ. District Board) W Flag ✗

5.

6. As to (2) – the charge for the conveyance of coolies – the order shows that this is incorrect, the siding not having been opened for passenger traffic till 1st July 1898.

7. The question (3) of the charge of trainage for 10 miles instead of 5, ~~(3)~~ is not specifically dealt with in the order, but 10 miles seems to be the minimum distance charged for. (v. notes at Flag Z + U)

8. The question of the trucks (4) is dealt with in the last para. of the order, & this seems to me to be the most unsatisfactory part of it. The point at issue is whether a truck rate implies that the truck shall carry its marked capacity of the material for which the rate is quoted. The S. I. R. authorities say that no such thing is implied, & that the District Board

authorities are labouring
under a delusion,
(v. letter of the Agent for the
Flag T. S.I.R). They also point out
that no agreement was
made by the railway people
to carry six tons of laterite
in six-ton trucks. This
seems to be the case, & it is
very doubtful whether
the District Board would
be able to recover by law
the alleged excess charges
in the absence of any specific
agreement. It may also
be noted that the Local
Fund Engineer stated
that he was prepared
Flag A. to accept 140 cubic feet
as the equivalent of 6 tons,
& the agent of the S.I.R. states
that the cubical capacity
of the wagons usually
supplied to the District
Board is about 138 cubic
feet - ie only two feet less
than the capacity which the
L.F. Engineer is willing to
accept

But, tho' the District Board may have no legal claim on the railway, it seems to me that the rates might reasonably be lowered, whereas in the case of laterite, six-ton trucks ordinarily hold considerably less than six actual tons. The Agent says that the trucks can hold six tons of laterite, but he admits that the trucks which he loaded with laterite, until their contents weighed six tons,x would have been stopped by the railway staff as overloaded. In the letter of the officiating Agent d. 3rd August 1898 it is stated_ "The trucks are marked with the carrying capacity to prevent over overloading & when light materials of which the truck will not hold the full carrying capacity as in the case of cotton the rates are adjusted accordingly." This may be so, but

x I saw 20 trucks weighed, & we had one of them heaped up till the contents weighed 6 tons. As far as my recollection goes, Mr. Shoobridge, the Asst. Traffic Manager, thought that, though it was possible to load a truck like this when it was at rest, ~~as large~~ the truck was really overloaded & that a lot of the laterite would fall off in transit. This is what the officiating Agent thinks (v. his letter at Flag R).

Flag T.

Flag R.

AL.

Flag V. (1) it is admitted by the Agent that in some cases the trucks are loaded with ~~carry~~ more than 6 tons, &

(2) may not the District Board reasonably ask that the rates should be adjusted in the case of laterite as in the case of cotton?

The Agent says that the rates quoted for the carriage of gravel for the Tanjore Board ~~are~~ already lower than the ordinary rates quoted to the public & that ~~are~~ he is not disposed to lower ~~it~~ them any further. But what the Pres^t. District Board insisted on was that the Railway people are making unreasonable profits.

9. I venture to suggest that in order to prevent any future misunderstandings as to the meaning of a 6 ton wagon, it would be a good thing to define it more clearly in the

S.I.R. Coaching Guide. By the uninitiated a six ton wagon load would certainly I think, be expected to weigh six tons, but such is evidently not the case.

10. The last point raised by the Presᵗ. District Board is (5) in para 2 of the note.

Flag C. Section 32 of the Contract says that "no undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to or in favor of any particular person, company or railway administration, or any particular ~~person~~ description of traffic in any respect whatsoever shall be made or given by the Company." It does not seem an unreasonable preference for the Company to reduce its rates for the conveyance of gravel for the special construction of Railway feeder roads

Flag R. & the Agent states in his letter^x

10.

that he is willing to re-consider the advisability of making further reductions

11. The rate asked for by the Presy. District Board is $2\frac{1}{4}$ annas per truck, & this is the minimum charge for a 6 ton truck. The last para. but one of the order seems to deal with this point.

Flag Z

a.e.
8/9/98

II

Public Works Department, Ry. Br.

Consulting Engineer's Office.

Original note at Flag X.
a.k.

Office Note.

To

E. R.

Briefly the leading features of this case are as follows:-

One of the few and, I think, the only accessible laterite ballast quarry in the Tanjore District is at Puliapet.

An extension was constructed by the South Indian Railway in 1894 from Tanjore to the quarry, length 5 miles. This extension has been inspected by the Government Inspector and passed for goods traffic (passenger?).

Prior to the introduction of terminal charges x on the South Indian Railway the rates charged to the District Board of Tanjore for ballast were:-

x i.e. charges at the stations where the goods are unloaded.
a.k.

3 annas per truck per mile + Rs 6 for conveying the train of 30 trucks empty from Tanjore to the quarry.

On the introduction of terminals in 1895 the rates were recast as follows:-

(a) 2 annas per truck per mile for distances over 50 miles + Rs 5-1-0 Terminals.

(b) 3 annas per truck per mile for distances under 50 miles, no terminals.

Besides these charges the South Indian Railway insisted on the coolies who were engaged at Tanjore to work in the quarries travelling in a 3rd class carriage attached to the ballast train, at ordinary 3rd class fares.

The President, District Board, alleges that the charges are unduly high and that the Railway is benefitted by the metalling of the District roads.

The Agent -- that the Railway is a commercial concern and that he is justified in charging the rates which are in force and offers certain reductions which are not accepted.

The President, District Board refers the whole case to Government asking that the Public Works Department Railway Branch will use its good offices in endeavouring to pursuade the South Indian Railway to reduce its charges and rates.

The President, District Board raises the following points.

(1) That for ballast destined for Tanjore the Railway charges as per 10 miles the actual distance being 5.

(2) The equity of charging the coolies for trainage to and from the quarry.

(3) That the trucks, which are labelled " to carry 6 tons" and described in the goods classification " sent in 6 ton wagon loads", are incapable to being loaded with more than 5 tons - $4\frac{1}{4}$ tons being an average load from actual experiment.

(4) That the District Board is entitled to receive better treatment than that usually given to traders and merchants.

The President concludes by saying that

he

he will accept on all round rate of $2\frac{1}{4}$ annas per truck failing which he threaten to lodge a civil suit to recover 13,700 R alleged over charge on account of the trucks not having carried their full marked capacity.

As regards rates.

Ballast is (vide page 92 S.I.R goods classification) a first class commodity

Max. rate 1/3 pie per Md. per mile
Min. ,, 1/6 ,, ,, ,,

This works out to

Max. { annas $4\frac{1}{2}$ per truck per mile (6 ton)
,, $3\frac{27}{48}$,, ,, ,, (4 3/4 ton)

Min. { ,, $2\frac{1}{4}$,, (6 ton) truck per mile.
,, $1\frac{37}{48}$,, (4 3/4 ton) ,, ,,

If charged as special the charges would be (minimum)

✓ 1.35 annas per 6 ton truck per mile.
1.07 ,, ,, $4\frac{3}{4}$ ton ,, ,, ,,

Terminals:-

(vide page 93 S.I.R. guide) $\frac{1}{2}$ anna per maund

Rs
= 5-1-0 for a 6 ton truck.
= 4-0-0 for a $4\frac{3}{4}$,, ,,

On page 96 of the guide it is stated,

Ballast or gravel when sent in 6 ton wagon loads will be charged at a special rate of annas 3 per truck per mile.

On page 147 -- The rate is reduced to 2 annas per $5\frac{3}{4}$ or 6 ton truck per mile between the quarry and certain stations over 50 miles distant which come under the terminal clause.

The President, District Board intends to base his claim for overcharge on the question of carrying capacity of the truck vide latter part of para 5, also para 8 of his letter dated 19th February 1898.

The reference in his letter of the 13th November 1897 para. 6 -- to an agreement between Mr. Winterbotham and the Railway is vague but as he does not base his claim on this agreement I think it may be assumed that, in the ordinary course of business it was annulled by the introduction of terminal charges. However we can ask the President District Board for a copy of it, if you think it necessary.

The rates quoted appear to be in all cases truck rates and the main question at issue is whether a truck rate implies that the truck shall carry its marked capacity of the material for which the rate is quoted I take it that a 6 ton truck say is quoted to distinguish it from a 12 ton truck for which the rate would of course be higher.

From correspondence between the Local Fund Engineer and the Traffic Manager S.I.R one is led to infer that it was possible to load the trucks provided for carrying the ballast up to 6 tons, but the Traffic Manager also adds " at any rate ~~over~~ Our charge is as for 6 tons" (letter dated 29th September 1897.)

But the South Indian Railway I think might be held liable for overcharging the District Board in the case of terminals. The terminal charges leviable is ½ anna per maund so that this charge can only be made on the actual maundage carried. At the same time on page 93 of the Guide there is a clause x which covers this point; the legality of which I suppose is unquestionable. The charge for the minimum distance of 10 miles is of course in conformity with Railway practice.

I doubt if the charge for coolie-fares is legal as it is not quite clea that the extension has ever been opened for passenger traffic. I have looked all through the correspondence and cannot find it clearly stated.

(Id) C.T.R.S
31.3.98

x "In all cases where special reduced rates are quoted for traffic in truck loads (except loose cotton) terminals must be charged on the carrying capacity of the wagon used."

ak

Form No. 6.

III

Public Works Department,
Railway Branch.

Original note at Flag V.
a.e.

OFFICE NOTE No.______

Dated______________189 .

From

THE ~~JOINT SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, P. W. D. (RAILWAY BRANCH),~~ Dy. Consulting Engineer for Rys:

To

THE Consulting Engineer for Rys:

No action appears to have been taken on this case except that sanction has been asked for opening the Tanjore-Puliahpetta quarry siding for the carriage of passengers.

The President, District Board, Tanjore asks us to move in the matter of inducing the S.I.R. to reduce their rates for the carriage of road material for the district roads.

The rates now charged are:-

(i) 2 annas per 6 ton truck per mile for distances over 50 miles + Rs.5-1-0 terminal charge.

(ii) 3 annas per 6 ton truck per mile for distances under 50 miles (no terminals).

(iii) A 3rd class fare for each cooly who travels from Tanjore to the quarry.

(iv) A charge for the use of the engine for taking the train from Tanjore to the quarry at Rs.6 per train which apparently is only levied

D₂

Yes. But see the company's contract and note please what exactly is our control in such a matter.

What do these rates work out to per maund per mile including coolies and everything. See in the information to be estimated from the papers.

(Id.) F.J.E.S.

when no terminals are charged.

The President, District Board, contends

(a) that the S.I.R. should not enforce the 10 mile limit on this traffic as it does when carrying it only 5 miles to Tanjore,

(b) that it is not fair to charge a 3rd class fare for each cooly who goes to the quarry to work the train,

(c) that the trucks being marked of 6 ton capacity must carry this load of laterite and that he is only bound to pay for the weight they do carry which he puts (from actual trial) at 4¾ tons.

With regard to (a) I think the President, District Board, is wrong in asking that the 10 mile limit should not be enforced, there must be a limit of some ~~Govt.~~ sort and 10 miles has been fixed and is always enforced.

As to (b) It appears to me that the S.I.R. have been exacting illegal fares from the coolies who travelled and that they had no right to charge them.

The question here comes in - is it necessary to put a 3rd class carriage on for the coolies? Why should they not travel in the trucks as the Railway ballast coolies and all construction coolies do.

As to (C) with regard to which the President, District Board, threatens a lawsuit. I cannot find a that the S.I.R. anywhere guaranteed that the trucks would carry 6 tons of laterite although it is evident that they were under the impression that the trucks did do so and undoubtedly they do carry 6 tons of average metal but this particular laterite appears very light. As the District Board were paying a wagon rate and appear to have made no complaint that they were prevented from loading the wagons as full as they would hold I think they have no cause to complain.

The question of terminals is different as the charge is quoted as 6 pies per maund and they apparently are not legally entitled to charge on more than is actually carried. One rate not touched on by the President, apparently because it formed part of the old rate to which he would like to return, is the Rs.6/- for engine power for taking the train to the quarry. I do not think ~~thy~~ they have the smallest right to charge this. They might as well charge a Madras Merchant for whose goods they had to run an empty on half empty train from Negapatam the cost of hauling the empty wagons.

I would suggest as fair rates

(1) 2 annas per 6 ton truck per mile for distances over 50 miles + terminals at 4 Rs. per truck.

(2) 3 annas per truck per mile for distances under 50 miles (no terminals)

The 10 mile limit to be adhered to, but no charge made for carriage of coolies on haulage of empty trains.

(Id.) J.C.L.
9-7-98.

What is the law about the 10 mile limit, or the custom on all railways. Look up and refer me.

But the siding is now open for passengers traffic.

D_2
Please go carefully through the papers again and ascertain accurately what it was that Mr. Winterbotham and the Agent constructed about. Was it about a 6 ton waggon load, or about 6 tons ?

(Id.) F.J.E.S.

Papers.

(Id.) F.J.E.S.

Yes. Until we sanctioned the opening for passengers traffic.

(Id.) F.J.E.S.

They are not railway servants, or the servants of railway construction The Agent is right to refuse to carry them except under proper precaution.

See my note above. I want a reference. What did they contract as a matter of fact?

(Id.) F.J.E.S.

This I think is right, but make it clear by a reference.

(Id.) F.J.E.S.

D_2
I would agree if the words in circle were cut out. But the note is not complete at all. See back.

(Id.) F.J.E.S.
12-7-98.

Form No. 6.

Public Works Department,
Railway Branch.

OFFICE NOTE No.

Dated 189 .

From

Dy. Consulting Engineer for Rys.

THE ~~JOINT SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, P. W. D. (RAILWAY BRANCH)~~,

To

THE Consulting Engineer for Rys.

Charges for laterite carried by S.I.R. for District Board, Tanjore.

Query 1.

(a) Our only control is apparently to see that maximum and minimum rates are not infringed &

(b) to see that "no undue on unreasonable preference or advantage to or in favour of any particular person company or Railway administration or any particular description of traffic in any respect whatsoever shall be made on given by the company . . . ." and vice versa.

Sections 31 and 32 of the contract.

Query 2. This of course, varies with the lead taking the most unfavourable stations for the board 1st to Ponnerai distance 51 miles, the rate including coolies and terminals works out to 0.29 pies per maund per mile against a maximum of 0.333 and a minimum of 0.10-Ballast and road metal being carried at special rate if at owners

N.B. It must be remembered that these rates are worked out on the supposition that the waggons are loaded to their carrying capacity of 6 tons.
(Id.) J.C.L.

risk see pages 96 & 91 of classification and for Tanjore (real distance 5 miles), but taken as being 10 miles the rate works out to approx. 0.25 or ¼ pie per maund per mile against the same maximum and minimum viz. 1/3 and 1/10 It must be remembered that the company charge terminals in addition to the rates quoted so it is beyond our power apparently to enforce a rate calculated by including terminals. Of course the Railway would object to our including the coolies fares.

Query 3. The 10 mile limit was agreed upon at the Indian Railway Conference of 1893 and is embodied in the rules ~~as~~ drawn up by that conference Rule 44 (c) I presume these rules have been approved by Govt.

4. Agreement with Mr.Winterbotham.

We shall have to ask for a copy of this, I cannot gather from the papers what agreement, if any, was actually made, ~~as~~ or if the S.I.R.guaranteed that their wagons would carry 6 tons of laterite.

Taking the chairman's contention that the wagons actually carry only 4¾ tons as an average load, the rates ~~wour~~ work out to for Ponnerai over 0.36 pies per maund per mile or above the maximum and for Tanjore (10 miles) over 0.32 or approximating very clos~~s~~e to the maximum of 1/3.

but this includes terminals, which should not be included in the maund per mile rate.

(Id.) J.C.L.

5. The maximum and minimum rates above ~~as~~ quoted are given at page 91 of "S.I.R. coaching guide and goods classification" but referring to pages 146 and 147 of the same I find their rate for this road metal is specially quoted if at owners risk at 2 annas per 5¾ or 6 ton truck to certain stations only, + terminals but these stations are all over 50 miles distant and for these and all special rates the Company's rule see page 146 last para. is ".... terminals must be charged on the carrying capacity of the wagon used".

The whole question of rates is very confusing and it must be almost impossible for a casual customer to gather what it will pay him best to do.

Take the present case.

If the District Board elect to pay the special rates for the wagons, which (though capable of carrying a weight of 6 tons) only actually carry an average load of 4¾ tons of this special commodity they pay

(i) for a distance of 51 miles

2 annas per 4¾ tons per mile + Terminals (on 6 tons) i.e. 5-1-0.

(ii) for a distance of under 50 miles

3 annas per 4¾ tons per mile ~~+~~ (no terminals) (but in this case an extra charge of 6 Rs. a trip for engine hire is added this of course adds a different rate per wagon, or per maund, according to the distance run), I object to this invidious charge.

If the local board object to these rates, they can apparently bargain with the Railway who have the power of granting them any rate between

(i) $3\frac{27}{48}$ annas per $4\frac{3}{4}$ tons per mile + terminals which would be 4 Rs. (maximum) and

(ii) 1.07 annas per $4\frac{3}{4}$ tons per mile + terminals (4 Rs. minimum) Terminals being charged on both over and under 50 miles. You will see then that 1st the District Board would bargain for a rate per maund per mile between maximum and minimum having settled this, they would have to work out which was the more favourable rate for them, the rate per maund per mile agreed upon, or the rate per truck per mile specially quoted. They could only arrive at a decision after calculating the cost of carriage of the amount of stone required at every station at its varying distance. The only point I am now doubtful about is - the right of the S.I.R. to charge for engine power for taking wagons to a place where they have contracted to do work - The Railway are entitled to levy terminals on the full carrying capacity of trucks hired and not only on the load carried i.e. if their classification is authoritative.

(Id.) J.C.L.

28-7-98.

---

149 + Hand[illegible]
5/10/98.

R 11/10/98

Charges made by the S.I. Rly for the conveyance of laterite gravel for Tanjore Dist Road repairs

9

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Railway Branch.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

ET

Letter No. 94/0, dated 3rd August 1898, from the Consulting Engineer for Railways, to the Chairman, District Board, Tanjore.

W

Letter No. 308, dated 23rd August 1898, from Chairman, District Board, Tanjore, to the Consulting Engineer for Railways.

M

Letter No. 95/0, dated 3rd August 1898, from the Consulting Engineer for Railways, to the Agent, South Indian Railway.

R

Letter No. 811, dated 31st August 1898 from the Agent, South Indian Railway, to the Consulting Engineer for Railways.

13

Order thereon:-No. 1298. Ry. dated 19th October 1898.

To H.E. and the Hon Sir H. Bliss.

Draft for approval. agreed to by Mr. Trevelyan and me.

FKS
5/10/98

Appd.
A.H.
9.10.98

BS
10/10/98

Not a very satisfactory Conclusion.

0
5.10.98

The President, District Board, Tanjore, referred for decision of Government the question of the fairness or otherwise of the charges made by the South Indian Railway Company for the conveyance of laterite gravel for District road repairs. The rates charged by the Company, not being in excess of the maximum permissible class rates sanctioned by Government, are within the Agent's competence to impose. The Agent is also within his rights in imposing the terminals which go towards making up the total charges of which the President com-

(40—4,000—2-11-95.)

-plains. The Agent was also within his rights, up to the date of the opening of the siding for public traffic, but not subsequently, in making a separate charge for the use of an Engine on the quarry siding. He however exceeded his powers in charging the District Board for the conveyance of coolies over the Pillayarpatti siding before the date, 1st July 1898, when it was opened for public traffic, and if requested to do so by the Board he must refund the amount thus irregularly charged.

2. Government having perused the Agent's letter read above, No. 811 dated the 31st August 1898, is of opinion that it will form a satisfactory basis for future dealings ~~bet~~ between him and the District Board. A copy of that letter and of its enclosures as well as of the Consulting Engineer's letter to which it is a reply, will be forwarded for information to the President, District Board Tanjore.

R

M

3. Government is of opinion that the Agent, South Indian Railway Company may wisely, and in the interest of the Railway, charge for the conveyance of gravel for road making, whether for Districts or Municipalities, the lowest rates that are consistent with reasonable profits.

14P

4. By the use of the term "6 ton wagon," which is intended merely to define maximum permissible load, the District Board were led into the misunderstanding that in quoting a rate "per 6 ton wagon" the Agent was thereby contracting to carry six tons.

7 Rs

R.

H.T. 3.10.98

3/10/98

To the Agent S.I.Ry

" Presdt. Dt Board Tanjore through the Local and Municipal Depts.

" Consulting Engr for Rys.

Ins copy obtd sent

S.C. Depd 17.11.98

S 20/10/98

To,

The Local and Municipal Department,

for favour of counter-initials.

15

an

for

whe