

RAILWAY INVIGORATION SOCIETY

for the retention and modernisation of railway services

39 MARSHAM COURT, MARSHAM STREET, LONDON S.W.1. (Tel. 01-834 1335)

Chairman: M. P. L. CATON, Ph.D.

Vice-Presidents:

John Betjeman Esq., C.B.E., Lord Kinross, Lord Popplewell, C.B.E. J.P., Prof. C. L. Mowat, M.A., Ph.D.
The Very Rev. J. H. S. Wild, M.A., (Dean of Durham)
Torquil Nicholson Esq., B.Sc., A.M.I.E.E.,

PROGRESS REPORT No. 79.

JUNE 1969

A DISASTROUS POLICY

(Copy of the Chairman's address delivered at the annual general meeting of the Society, held in the Central Hall, Manchester, on 26th April, 1969)

✓✗ When a policy has been consistently applied for a number of years, it would not seem unreasonable to expect at least some attempt to examine whether the desired objectives had been achieved, and, should matters not be going as well as expected, an alternative approach would be considered. In the early 1960s, Mr. Marples and Lord Beeching launched their programme of mass closures to play a major part in reducing the railway deficit which we were told would be eliminated by 1970. The fact that at the end of 1968, when over 85% of the closures had been carried out, the deficit was larger than when the Beeching Plan was launched is, to say the least, strong evidence that the policy had failed. This Society said this at the time, but, in the eyes of many who ought to know better, Beeching could do no wrong. The reason for the failure is not hard to find; closures led to erosion of traffic from the better paying parts of the system which in turn made more routes unprofitable and ripe for the axe and so the process continues. ✗

The failure of a policy is one matter, but to blatantly ignore the results and continue along the same lines is downright irresponsible and yet, despite the fairer deal given to the railways under the new Transport Act, this is precisely what is happening at the present time. Moreover, in one important respect, the matter has taken a turn for the worse, since, although the principle of subsidy for unprofitable but socially necessary lines is now recognised and is a most welcome step in the right direction, the Ministry costing formula used in calculating the amount of subsidy to be paid to a service requires sums many times in excess of the amount BR would save if it is closed. A totally distorted impression of the losses is given and as a result lines are being approved for closure when there is no financial justification for so doing. Thus, when BR know they can run a line for a track cost of £1,000 per mile, this Ministry formula places the cost at 2-3 times this figure and, at the end of the calculation, the absurdly high figure of 12½% of the cost is added in for administration which assumes that on an average branch line some 20 clerks are at work administering it! Moreover, the method of costing used loads each line with a portion of central overheads, including, no doubt, a portion of Sir Henry Johnson's salary, but

he does not take a cut in pay every time a closure takes place!

Not only are some aspects of this costing procedure dishonest, but every effort seems to be made to prevent the public from knowing what is going on. Thus details of the costing formula are shrouded in secrecy and the Ministry has refused to publish it. Objections to closures on financial grounds are officially disallowed at public hearings of the Transport Users' Consultative Committees. "Silence the opposition and do precisely what we like" seems to be the present attitude amongst those who control the future of our railways. If these people are not afraid of criticism, why the secrecy? The railways are a vital National asset and the public have a right to know what is going on behind these closed doors.

I am firmly of the belief that the time has come when we must take a tougher line over this disastrous policy. If it is allowed to continue, not only will most of the lines for which subsidy has been refused close within the next few months, but the subsidies for many other routes, most of which have only been granted for a period of 1 or 2 years, will be rejected when they come up for renewal on the false assumption that the Nation cannot afford the sums involved.

What is called for is simply a change in the method by which the railways are financed and this must be introduced as an urgent amendment to the recent Transport Act. Subsidies for individual lines, instead of being overloaded with many costs which properly belong to and are inseparable from the system as a whole, should just be sufficient to make good the amount BR would save from the closure of each individual line by itself. This would mean that, instead of some £62 million being paid out in total as individual line subsidies as at present, only about £20-£30 million would be involved. The remaining £40 m. or so would then be paid in some other way, perhaps as a central subsidy to BR as a whole. The tendency to close lines to produce what are largely only paper savings would then be avoided.

If only this outstanding matter can be put right, I believe the railways face a more promising future than for some years past. I say this, because the success of railway modernisation schemes such as the LMR electrification from London to the North-West is slowly but steadily changing the attitude towards railways in Britain. A few years ago railways tended to be regarded as a dying industry and that all that was needed was to dispose of them as decently as possible. The tide is beginning to turn, as it must eventually, if the face of Britain is not to become a mass of concrete. This is not an exaggeration - 50% of the area of Los Angeles is now roads or car parks and London built on this scale would stretch northwards almost to Manchester!

The danger, however, is that this will not be realised quickly enough before it is too late and irreparable damage is done to town and countryside and the railway system cut back to a point when it is of little use. It is far better to realise now that the motor car - whereas it is obviously excellent for many purposes, will ruin much of what we value most if it is not severely controlled, than to try to fit a quart into a pint pot by spending vast sums on new roads only to find that the increased traffic so generated leaves the roads as congested as they were before. Whereas many road schemes are obviously necessary, more funds should be diverted to improve rail travel to provide better services at lower cost, which can carry far more people more quickly and in greater safety and without in the process destroying the places they are built to serve.

Whilst we call for this urgent change of thinking at the top, there is a very important job for all who believe in railways to do at local level. A very welcome sign in the last year has been the greater willingness of railway management to work together with local authorities and other organisations and individuals to develop local lines. In a few areas, working groups have been set up and as a result of their efforts traffic has greatly increased. This should be encouraged everywhere. I do not believe the majority of railway management really want to see many more closures: the real factors responsible for the railways' destruction lie elsewhere. Public and management should be encouraged to get together and see what can be done; for example, clubs and societies can be encouraged to plan their outings by rail, local bus operators urged to provide connections with the railway, council notice boards can be used to inform the public of what the railway has to offer, interested individuals may like to write booklets and articles on the possibilities of travel by rail in the area. Positive action can and has gone a long way towards not just securing the retention of but developing of many parts of the railway system, but only if such efforts are not thwarted by unreasonable action from above. This will achieve much more than waiting until closure proposals are announced before taking any action which is then usually too late.

BROADCAST BY SOCIETY'S CHAIRMAN

Dr. Caton, the Society's Chairman, was interviewed by the BBC during the course of our annual general meeting in Manchester on 26th April. The interview was broadcast in Radio newsreel on Radio 4 that evening.

BRITISH RAIL ACCOUNTANCY CHALLENGED

✓ The Society continues to issue memoranda which examine the financial information published by British Rail in its attempts to justify closure proposals. We give below summaries of four recent such memoranda.

Cambridge-St. Ives

British Rail claims that costs are £81,200 per annum and that earnings are £10,500 per annum, thus producing a deficit of £70,700. Both British Rail and the Ministry of Transport have been unable to give any breakdown of these figures or to supply any information about the revenue which the line contributes to the rest of the railway system.

In December, 1963, British Rail proposed the closure of the Cambridge-St. Ives-March line (the St. Ives-March section has since been closed, after Ministerial approval). The official costs for the whole line then given work out at £1,305 per mile. Since 1963, British Rail have reduced the costs of operating the Cambridge-St. Ives section by converting its stations to un-staffed halts. Thus, if one applies the 1963 cost figure to the $14\frac{3}{4}$ mile Cambridge-St. Ives sections, the total cost amounts to only £19,250 per year. Deducting the present revenue figure of £10,500, the deficit is only £8,750.

However, the Society believes that, if the amount of revenue which the line contributes to other railway services is taken into account, it is in fact operating at a profit.

Kidderminster Junction-Hartlebury Junction via Bewdley and Stourport-on-Severn

The train service operating on this line is not only inefficient, but also unattractive and too infrequent to generate a sizeable usage. Thus the figures given in the "Heads of information" cannot be a true reflection of this line's potential traffic.

The Society's memoranda includes a proposed timetable for the line. This gives a vastly improved service at a lower cost compared with British Rail's piecemeal provision. We have suggested that more main line trains on the Birmingham New Street-Worcester service should stop at Hartlebury Junction, so as to provide more connections with our proposed timetable, and that it would be to the advantage of British Rail to introduce a Sunday service on the branch line.

British Rail claims that movement costs are £18,290 per annum, based on the use of a single car DMU and through trains. The estimated cost of the Society's proposed service is: - single car DMU - less than £12,000 per year; through trains - not more than £1,200 per year. These figures are based on costings given in G.F. Fiennes' book "I tried to run a railway."

The timetable we propose would give a 229% increase in train service at 28% less movement cost. Moreover, we believe that the introduction of our service would gradually increase passenger patronage to a point where it would become financially viable.

Paignton-Kingswear

British Rail claim that direct costs are £54,500 per annum and earnings are £17,100 per annum. Our costings, based on figures given in Mr. Fiennes' book are, however, only £26,730 per annum. If one accepts the official revenue figure, the annual deficit is, therefore, only £9,630, as compared with £37,400 claimed by British Rail. However, when contributory revenue is taken into account, we believe that the line is in fact operating at a profit.

The service has been run down by the withdrawal, a few years ago, of regular through trains from Kingswear to and from Newton Abbot, Exeter, London and the Midlands. Therefore, the figures given in the "Heads of information" cannot be a true reflection of potential traffic. However, British Rail has run the service down still more by withdrawing summer Sunday services from the 1969-70 timetable.

Cowdenbeath-Perth

British Rail claims that costs are £138,490 per annum and that receipts are £55,300 per annum. Our costs, based on information supplied by the National Council on Inland Transport and checked by expert consultants, amount to £60,000. However, from this figure must be deducted the extra movement costs which the closure would cause. These would amount to £34,500, because the inter-city journey between Edinburgh and Perth would be increased by about 25 miles. Thus, net costs are only £25,500 per year. The alleged receipts exclude contributory revenue, i.e., that between Perth, Inverness and the North, etc., and between Cowdenbeath and the South, etc.

We believe that this proposal if carried out would prove to be one of the most financially

disastrous ever conceived in Scotland and that on the line's existence depends the future of the railway network in the north of Scotland. ✕

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

The sixteenth annual general meeting of the Society took place at the Central Hall, Oldham Street, Manchester, 1, on Saturday, 26th April. It was attended by 26 people.

Reports

A booklet containing copies of the various reports presented to the meeting is enclosed to members with this progress report.

Resolutions

Among resolutions passed were the following: -

(1) This meeting requests the National Committee to explore all means of ensuring that, when a British Rail service has been withdrawn, any responsible private body which is prepared to operate the service will be given an opportunity of doing so.

(2) The Society should seek more publicity at a national level regarding the lack of investment in this country on rapid transit rail services, in contrast to what is happening on the Continent and in the USA.

Officers and National Committee, 1969-70

The following were elected: -

Six vice-presidents as shown at the head of this report.

(The National Committee was empowered to appoint additional vice-presidents)

Chairman: M. P. L. Caton, Esq., PhD. * General Secretary: Mr. J. M. Stanley
Treasurer: Mr. R. E. Burroughs.

National Committee:

Mrs. R. Colyer *, Messrs. R. V. Banks *, J. W. Barfield *,
D. J. Bradbury *, J. M. Firth *, L. G. Hipperson, P. I. Lighton, D. J. Martins,
R. Macqueen *, G. F. Manley *, H. R. Purser *, B. R. Sageman *,
A. W. Sharp, R. H. Whittaker *.

* re-election.

In addition, all branch secretaries and area representatives are ex-officio members of the National Committee. Since the annual general meeting, Mr. H. G. M. Rogers has been co-opted to the National Committee.

REVIVAL OF PASSENGER TRAIN ACTIVITIES AND TRACK RESTORATION?

The above heading which appeared over an article on p. 3 of our last issue should have been followed by a question mark, as the article referred to consideration and planning of revival and restoration of railway facilities and not to the carrying out of such schemes.

We understand that consideration has been given to the re-opening of stations in many parts of the country, including: -

Blunsdon, Brighton Road (Birmingham), Broadway, Camp Hill, Cannock, Cheltenham Race Course, Cheltenham St. James, Cirencester Town, Coaley Junction, Colnbrook, Corby, Cricklade, Glastonbury & Street, Hagley Road, Harborne, Haverhill, Hazelwell, Icknield Port Road, Islip, King's Heath, Lifford, Longbridge, Lydford, Moseley, Newstead, Portishead, Rotten Park Road, Rugeley Town, South Cerney, Tewkesbury, Wells Priory Road, Weston-Super-Mare Terminus, Winterbourne, Wyre Piddle and Yate.

THE FORCE OF PUBLIC OPINION

A leading article in the Daily Telegraph of 5th March on the rejection of Stansted as the site of London's third airport stated that "it will be, and has been portrayed, as the victory of the Stansted Preservation Society over the forces of bureaucracy, and, certainly, the democratically splendid agitations of that body deserve a footnote in history... The plain truth of the matter was that the public was ahead of both the politicians and the civil servants on this question."

The Stansted affair is an excellent example of the way in which it is still possible for the strength of public opinion to change the course of events in this country even when such opinion radically differs from the official viewpoint.

The victory in this matter should be a lesson to this Society and to all who share our views. The forces of reaction have been repelled in one field of public transport. Can they not also be driven back in another, our railways? We appeal to all our members to redouble their efforts in standing up for the principles in which we believe and to spread the gospel.

CO-OPERATION

Mr. R. V. Banks, the Society's Public Relations Officer, has spoken, by invitation, to the No. 1 Brighton Branch of the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen on the work of the Railway Invigoration Society. He dealt with ways in which it might be possible for the two societies to co-operate. Appreciation of our activities was expressed by those present at the meeting.

THE GREAT ISLE OF WIGHT TRAIN ROBBERY

As mentioned in the Chairman's report, 1968-9 (enclosed to members), the Society's book "The great Isle of Wight train robbery" has been reprinted. We urge our members to give us all the help they can in promoting the sale of the book. It may be ordered through any bookseller, or, in case of difficulty, from our Isle of Wight representative, Mr. R. E. Burroughs, Spring Vale, The Grove, Ventnor, Isle of Wight, price 7s. 6d. (by post 8s. 6d.).

RAILWAY REVIEW

The attention of our readers is directed to the Railway Review, the official newspaper of the National Union of Railwaymen. It is published weekly and usually contains several items of general interest to RIS members, as well as frequently giving valuable publicity to our views.

The newspaper costs only 6d. per issue and may be obtained through any newsagent.

NEW MEMBERS

We welcome the following new corporate member: -

Seaham Urban District Council (County Durham).

The South Dorset Branch Lines Society has become affiliated to this Society.

REPORTS FROM BRANCHES and AREA REPRESENTATIVES

Readers seeking further information on particular items should write to the appropriate representatives.

BRANCHES

London and Home Counties (Middlesex, Essex, Surrey, Kent, Sussex, Herts, Bucks, and Berks.)

Chairman: Mr. R. V. Banks, 121, Ashford Road,
Bearsted, Maidstone, Kent.

Progress has been slow recently, with both the Secretary and the Secretary - Designate being involved in exam. work.

✓✗ There has been no decision yet by the TUGC on whether or not the Wembley Stadium branch should close. If any reader has been to Wembley recently, he is invited to submit constructive criticism to the Branch Committee.

Ideas for the invigoration of the South London line are being collected, but, despite excellent publicity for the North London line (financed by local authorities), Kentish Town West and South Acton stations may be threatened with closure. ✗

With the introduction of the new timetable on 5th May, Princes Risborough now has a much improved service of express trains, with all but one of the weekday Paddington-Birmingham trains in each direction stopping there.

✓✗ At a meeting of the Branch on 16th April, Dr. Caton gave a talk on the formulae for costing unremunerative rail services and calculating social grants under the Transport Act, 1968.

The Uckfield-Lewes line was closed to passenger traffic from 5th May. The Minister has consented to the closure of Mountfield Halt (Hastings-Tunbridge Wells line). ✗

In Kent the following have been unstaffed: - Chilham and Chartham stations (Ashford-Canterbury line); Bekesbourne station and Snowdown & Nonington halt (Canterbury-Dover line).
East Suffolk/East Norfolk

Secretary: Mrs. O. E. Awty, 28, Field Stile Road,
Southwold, Suffolk.

...

The East Suffolk line - Ipswich to Lowestoft - has been allocated a government subsidy of £246,000 for this year as the railway is known to be essential on social grounds. As the line was said to be losing £90,000 per annum prior to threatened closure, it is encouraging to see this generous grant being used to good effect. Two road bridges are now being completely rebuilt and gates, signal boxes and halts are resplendent in new paint. The line runs through very fine country, the staff have a standard second to none and nowadays it is frequently standing room only on the journey.

News of the fate of the Yarmouth-Lowestoft line is still awaited.

Merseyside

Secretary: Mr. P. T. Byrne, 13-15, Kilmorey Park,
Hoole, Chester, CH2 3QS.

✕ The Branch has objected on behalf of the Society to the proposed closure to passenger traffic of the Bolton-Rochdale (via Bury) line and one of its members will represent the Society at the TUGC public inquiry to be held on 6th June. ✕

✕ Passenger services (stopping) between Manchester Exchange and Liverpool Lime Street (via Tyldesley and via Patricroft) were discontinued with effect from 5th May. Leigh, Tyldesley, Worsley and Monton Green stations were closed to passenger traffic from the same date. ✕

Conductor-guards have been introduced on the New Brighton-Wrexham line. In the near future, certain stations on this line will be unmanned.

British Rail has offered for sale old station buildings on the Preston-Hesketh Bank section of the disused Preston-Southport line.

The second annual general meeting of the Branch will be held in Liverpool on 14th June.

Northern England

Secretary: Mr. R. K. Mains, 114, Manor House Road,
Jesmond, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, NE2 2LY.

✕ The Branch held its annual general meeting in Newcastle on 29th March and a number of resolutions were passed. It was agreed to fully support efforts of a recently-formed company to re-open and develop the Carlisle-Hawick-Edinburgh main line (See also p. 12. - Ed.) It was felt that the withdrawal of the through trains linking Sunderland, Hartlepool and Stockton with London was unjustified and that it would be more advisable to adopt a policy of improvement. The importance of future possibilities of the advanced passenger train was mentioned and such development could probably result in the Newcastle-London rail journey time being reduced to 2½ hours from the present minimum of 3 hours 50 minutes. The meeting also expressed the hope that under the Tyneside Passenger Transport Authority the best possible use would be made of rail transport. ✕

On 12th April, a meeting of the Branch was held in Darlington Town Hall at which it was decided to urge British Rail to abandon their plans to convert Seaham and Billingham stations to

unstaffed halts. At Seaham, it was until recently British Rail's intention to modernize the station and the Branch considers that modernization would be fully justified. With regard to Billingham, a new station was provided in 1966. This has resulted in much extra traffic. A reduction to an unstaffed halt is likely to deter existing and potential users. Such a move is hardly likely to improve the image of rail transport at Billingham. The meeting expressed the hope that the new halt at Middleton St. George to serve Teesside Airport would be built by the end of the year and would result in considerably greater usage of the Darlington-Saltburn passenger service.

At the end of April, the Branch issued a statement welcoming the Minister of Transport's decision authorizing British Rail's proposals for resignalling and rationalization of the west coast main line between Weaver Junction (north of Crewe) and Glasgow, but regretted that no definite announcement had yet been made concerning electrification of this route. The Branch is anxious that the Minister should make an early and favourable decision concerning electrification. This would bring immense benefit to, amongst other areas, Cumberland and Westmorland.

AREAS

Devon and Cornwall

Representative: Mr. A. E. Wilkinson, 13, Richmond Green,
Churchill Way, Appledore,
Bideford, Devon.

When severe storms damaged the main line between Dawlish and Teignmouth earlier this year, there were hopes that the Okehampton-Bere Alston line would be reopened so that an alternative route could be established between Exeter and Plymouth. Such a service would also have been of great benefit to those living on the northern edge of Dartmoor who were marooned by snow-blocked roads. In the event, however, the only traffic to use this route was a snow-plough and, later, a freight train. British Rail stated that passenger services could not be resumed, as the signalling system had deteriorated too much since closure of the line.

We understand that it is proposed to close Falmouth station and to open a smaller, less convenient, halt about half a mile away.

✓x The TUC hearing for the Paignton-Kingswear line took place at Dartmouth on 6th March. A last minute announcement was made that the Devon General Bus Co. would be prepared to run a direct bus service from Paignton to Kingswear all the year round if the line were closed. The TUC has reported to the Minister that the additional bus service would largely alleviate hardship, subject to safeguards for certain school children. x

The Exeter railway guard's enterprising idea of running cheap rail trips to London, mentioned in our last report, has received an unfortunate setback, because British Rail wants to increase the cost of hire for his next train by £150 and, at the same time, to reduce its seating capacity. As this would mean increasing the charge to passengers, Mr. Hutchings has decided to cancel the train. A similar incident has occurred at Barnstaple, where an extra

£80 has been slapped on the hire of a train from there to London following an earlier successful venture with a similar train, when a charge of £2 a head return was made, profits going to local charities.

A local attempt may be made to get Sidmouth Junction station reopened as a halt in view of the inadequate local bus services. A new estate of 287 houses and bungalows is being developed alongside the closed station.

After many delays, the Dart Valley Light Railway opened at Easter. At present, it is operating only between Totnes and Buckfastleigh, as the Minister of Transport has refused to grant an order to the Buckfastleigh-Ashburton section.

Mid-Hampshire

Representative: Mr. M. F. Lockyer, 55, Lipscombe Rise,
Alton, Hampshire.

✓
✗ British Rail announced that the direct line between Eastleigh and Romsey (with only one intermediate station, Chandlers Ford) would be closed to passenger traffic from 5th May. ✗

Norfolk (North and West)

Representative: Mr. M. R. Thomas, 16, King's Lynn Road,
Hunstanton, Norfolk.

✓
✗ We very much regret that the passenger train service on the King's Lynn-Hunstanton line ceased to operate after the last train on Saturday, 3rd May. Our Area Representative laid a wreath on front of the train at Hunstanton.

However, there is a ray of hope for this line in that Mr. Derek Page, MP for King's Lynn, has referred the case to the Ombudsman, who has agreed to investigate it. The Minister has decided that the track and equipment must be retained until the Ombudsman has reached a decision. Further encouragement for the future of the line has arisen from a meeting with the Minister by Mr. Page accompanied by Dr. Caton, the Society's Chairman. On this occasion, the Minister stated that, provided local authorities would give financial assistance, it might be possible to save the line.

The Railway Magazine for May contained a leading article entitled "Whittling away" which stated that British Rail's deficits have continued to grow while the system has become smaller. The article asked why British Rail ignored contributory revenue in assessing a line's viability and, in support of the contention that British Rail should take this into account, made reference to the Society's memorandum concerning the official costings for the King's Lynn-Hunstanton line. ✗

Somerset, Dorset and Western Hampshire

Representative: The Rev. W. Martin Andrew, 30, Richmond Wood Road,
Bournemouth, BH8 9DH

The TUGC has reported to the Minister that considerable hardship would result should the Minhead branch be closed to passenger traffic.

British Rail has announced that the Wareham branch will be closed to passenger traffic from 6th October.

Three Counties (Gloucestershire, Herefordshire, Worcestershire)

Representative: Mr. W. H. Parker, MBE, Well Meadow,
Pontshill, Ross-on-Wye,
Herefordshire.

The Stratford-upon-Avon Transport Action Committee has been formed with the object of reviving passenger services on the Stratford-Cheltenham line.

YOUR HELP IS NEEDED

The editor wishes to make these progress reports as interesting as possible. While there is usually no dearth of information from branch secretaries and area representatives, there is always a distinct lack of news and views from the ordinary members of the Society. These are always welcome - especially letters to the editor on topics of general interest to members - and every effort will be made to include contributions of this type.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

If according to the Membership's Secretary's records, your subscription has not been renewed (ignoring remittances received within the last week or so), you will find a reminder from him enclosed with this report. Do please read it and act upon it at once!

OTHER NEWS

The TUGC public inquiry into the proposed closure of the Kirkham-Fleetwood line took place on 1st May.

Manchester Exchange station was closed from 5th May. Trains which formerly served it were transferred to Manchester Victoria. Also closed from the same date was another Manchester principal station, Central; in this case, trains were transferred to Oxford Road, with some extended to Piccadilly.

Garstang & Catterall, Hest Bank and Bolton-le-Sands stations, all on the Preston-Carnforth line, have been closed to passenger traffic.

Three appeal judges have ruled that British Rail acted wrongly in announcing the

closure date of the Tyseley-Bearley West Junction line (Warwickshire) before the hearing and determination of an appeal by several local authorities to the Minister on the grounds that alternative bus services are inadequate. The appeal court granted an injunction restraining British Rail from proceeding with the closure until a decision has been reached on the appeal.

British Rail has started to run down services on the Inverness-Wick/Thurso line. Timings of trains were extended by about 30 minutes under the new timetable which commenced on 5th May.

The Border Union Railway Company has been formed with the object of running a daily commuter service and special summer excursions on the Edinburgh-Hawick-Carlisle line.

Following the decision of Tynwald (the Manx parliament) to grant a subsidy of £7,500 a year for three years towards the running of steam trains on the Isle of Man (as reported in our last issue), a company has been formed to operate a service between Douglas and Port Erin. This opened to the public on Whit Sunday, 25th May, and the new company intends to restrict its operations to this line.

EDITORIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Editor: Mr. L. G. Hipperson, 21, Ullet Road, Liverpool, L17 3BL
(Telephone: 051 733-3446)

Sub-Editor: Mr. H. R. Purser, 30, Staines Road, Feltham, Middlesex.

Important

To ensure inclusion in the next issue (to be published in September) material must be submitted by 1st August. Branch and area reports are dealt with by Mr. Purser, all other matter by Mr. Hipperson. So that production of the progress report may be unimpeded, contributors are earnestly requested to submit copy on time. Exceptionally, urgent late news may be sent to Mr. Hipperson only, to reach him by 9th August.

PUBLISHED by the RAILWAY INVIGORATION SOCIETY

Chairman: Dr. M. P. L. Caton, 10, Grosvenor Gardens, Upminster, Essex.

General Secretary:
Mr. J. M. Stanley, 11, Berkeley Court, Tulse Hill, London, S. W. 2.

Membership Secretary:
Mr. D. J. Bradbury, 59, Dore Road, Dore, Sheffield.