

THE JOURNAL OF THE LONDON UNDERGROUND RAILWAY SOCIETY

Issue No 109

Volume 10 No 1

January 1971

1961 - 1971

It is normal editorial policy to consider Underground as a Journal devoted to the London Underground Railway System, and not a magazine concerned with the affairs of The London Underground Railway Society - information about the activities of the Society and its members being confined usually to information on the future programme, other Society activities, and changes in Officers and Committee members.

There will be something of an exception to this rule, however, during 1971, as the year will see the celebration of TLURS' Tenth Anniversary. Exactly when this falls depends upon whether one takes the day that the first active move was made towards formation of a society - which was on 25th May - or the date of the formal inauguration - which took place on 17th November.

To satisfy both schools of thought, it is intended to publish reminiscent articles throughout the year - but mainly concentrated in the months from May to November.

Also, during the middle of the year, there will be various events especially intended to celebrate ten really successful years - for it cannot be denied that, despite minor difficulties which have arisen from time to time, the Society has filled a very real need in the enthusiasts' world in a manner which, although not perfect, has been reasonably efficient and effective. It is true to say that the prestige and influence of TLURS has never been higher than it is now, which is a happy position to be in at the beginning of an anniversary year; it is also in the nature of a challenge to maintain standards and to improve upon them. It is a challenge which must be accepted.

U
N
D
E
R
G
R
O
U
N
D

LT HAVE DONE IT AGAIN

There has been yet another tunnel holdup involving the trapping of passengers in trains for an inordinate length of time.

During the morning rush hour on Wednesday 18th November, a Bakerloo Line train stalled between St. John's Wood and Baker Street, and held up three following trains. Current was cut off, and tunnel lighting came on as is usual in such circumstances, while in due course the passengers from the defective train were escorted along the track to St. John's Wood station, apparently in fairly reasonable time after the breakdown. But, for no very obvious reason, all the passengers in the other trains were made to wait until current was restored, and the trains were on the move again, which was, it seems a little matter of two hours.

It would have been reasonable to assume that, after two similar episodes in a period of a little over a year, some experience would have been gained - at least enough to prevent a third unpleasant episode, but it seems not. What makes the occurrence even more inexplicable is that it is believed that, not very long before - in the early hours of Sunday 8th November to be precise - LT had staged a complete power failure with the object of testing communications under such circumstances. It does not seem to have taught them a great deal, unfortunately.

If this sort of incident is to become a regular part of the Underground scene, a lot of passengers will be lost, and those who put up with it will be looking round for means of redress. Of course, the passenger has no remedy for trains running late, but it does seem at least possible that, in cases where exorbitant delays occur before stranded passengers are rescued, an action would lie for damages for wrongful detention or some similar wrong.

The fault must lie in staff inefficiency somewhere along the line; if train crews are at fault in any instance it is probably due to inexperience - but it is difficult to believe that it is the crews who are responsible. The real trouble must lie higher up the scale, and it is high time effective action was taken.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

22 November 1970

Dear Sir,

Metro-land

Can anyone say exactly when the term Metro-land first came into use? In the July 1966 issue of UNDERGROUND, D.F.Edwards wrote about the late J.Garland, to whom he attributed this word, and implied that it was adopted before 1914. The Railway Magazine of October 1919 reports a "further addition" of the Metro-land guide, but I can trace no earlier reference. British Transport Historical Records have no early copies of the booklet and cannot supply any clues to the date of its first issue. Perhaps a private collector can help.

Yours sincerely,

71 Overdale,
Ashtead, Surrey.

Alan A.Jackson

6 November 1970

Dear Peter,

With reference to NF 978 in the October Underground which I received today, Mr Charles Cope thinks New York is doing an excellent job, unquote. I would put it to Mr Cope that he could not find one person who uses any part of the New York subway system with any frequency to agree with him.

I have been living here in New York for the past seven years and have lived and worked in a number of different areas around and close to the city. I have used the subway system almost daily in that time and can truthfully say that in a 5-day week totalling ten trips, in those seven years, one trip a week involves a breakdown of the train. Three times this past week the train was delayed from leaving the station because the doors would not close. A further delay of 12 minutes in a tunnel also occurred this week. This door problem New York city has had for as long as I can remember.

The trains, by British standards, are dirty, uncomfortable and very very jerky. Of course they are also crowded; twice since I have been here, standing in a very crowded car, I have

managed to lift my feet from the floor, and still remain upright, by the crush.

I could go on and on. London Transport may not have the most perfect railway, but it is vastly superior to anything in New York.

S.Sparke

226 Demarest Avenue,
New Milford,
N.J. 07646, U.S.A.

LONDON TRANSPORT INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
CONFERENCE

A forceful talk on the hard facts of life facing London Transport was given by Sir Richard Way, Chairman of the Executive, to an industrial relations conference held at Reading on Tuesday 22nd September 1970. The conference - called by Sir Richard to give industrial relations a thorough airing - was attended by more than 100 full-time officials from eleven unions, staff representatives and senior London Transport management staff.

Sir Richard dealt with the changed political responsibility for London Transport; subsidies as a means of keeping fares down; public criticism of LT, and the serious effect on services that could result from industrial action by a minority of staff.

Referring to the transfer in January of political responsibility for London Transport from Whitehall to County Hall, Sir Richard said that this was a natural and sensible move. London Transport had previously been a nationalised industry in the same way as the Coal Board, electricity and gas undertakings and British Rail. But these industries were really national in the sense that they covered the whole country. London Transport's activities, however, were confined to London and it was more natural for LT to be answerable to the political body responsible for London's affairs - the Greater London Council - than to the Ministry responsible for transport in the country as a whole.

Subsidies

Both political parties at County Hall, Sir Richard continued, had expressed different views in their policies on fares and the extent to which London Transport should be subsidied to keep fares down.

Neither party was saying that London Transport should pay its way in its overall financial operations. The Conservaties had directed London Transport to make an average annual surplus of £2 million on revenue account, but they were committed to giving substantial financial assistance each year towards capital expenditure.

"We are receiving £2 million this year and I hope considerably more next year, quite apart from any expenditure on extensions of the system like the Fleet Line or the extension of the Piccadilly Line to Heathrow.

"The Labour Party on the other hand is committed to paying us a subsidy to keep fares down. The Conservatives already do this by meeting part of our capital expenditure. Our present fare levels take full account of the money we receive from the Greater London Council, so presumably the Labour Party would pay us more in order to keep fares below the level at which we can keep them on the basis of the help we get from the Conservative Greater London Council. Thus, the argument between the parties is really not about whether or not London Transport should be subsidied, but how big that subsidy should be."

Sir Richard went on to say that there should be some clear thinking on the use of the word "subsidy". It did not in London Transport's case mean a payment from public funds to bolster inefficient management incapable of running an organisation on sound commercial lines.

"The management of London Transport is perfectly capable of running a public transport system in London on a strictly commercial basis, but I very much doubt whether in the eyes of either of the two parties at County Hall, it would be the sort of public transport system which they could regard as adequate for the greatest city in the world.

"If we were to concentrate wholly on those parts of the system which could bring us a profit, very many people in London would find themselves with no public transport at all. On the other hand, if we are required to run a transport system which is not wholly profit-making, then someone has to pay us for doing so. I do not regard such a payment as a subsidy at all; it is a payment by the community for services which we are providing for the community."

Public Criticism

Speaking of the volume of public criticism directed at London Transport, Sir Richard said that in this respect London Transport was no different from other nationalised industries.

"Judging from the Press and from most of the many letters we receive each year, you would suppose that public employees have a monopoly of incompetence and discourtesy; that the employees of private enterprise, on the other hand, are unfailingly efficient and considerate. You would suppose that the management of the public corporations was rotten with incompetence from top to bottom, whilst the management of most companies in the private sector was a model of efficiency.

"None of this bears any resemblance to life as most of us know it. The shop assistant in our local supermarket or in a London store is at least as likely to be inefficient or rude as a bus conductor or booking clerk. And the management of the public corporations is simply not inferior to that in private industry. In many respects it is a good deal better."

One of the reasons for this volume of criticism was the monopolistic nature of nationalised industries - the public was more likely to be critical of a nationalised undertaking because they could not go elsewhere as they could if, for example, they received unhelpful or rude treatment in a shop. It was understandable that some people, feeling that they could not escape from what they regarded as the "maw of a heartless and unsympathetic monster", should be more critical of it for this reason.

As far as London Transport was concerned, one of the reasons it received more than its fair share of public criticism was the intense volume of its business. "After all," said Sir Richard, "we carry over two-and-a-quarter thousand million passengers each year. The organisation does not exist which could deal with that volume of business without mishap due either to unreasonableness on the part of the customers or stupidities on the part of the staff. We are even more vulnerable to public criticism than most publicly-owned undertakings because we deal with more customers per year in a limited area of the country than any other.

"We are also vulnerable in another way. There are alternatives to the services we offer - the private car, the taxi or our own feet. If we do not give the public the service they want, they can - and many of them do - turn to other means of travel. We see the depressing, and now unfortunately familiar spectacle of a decreasing total number of passengers.

"My reaction to this is that we ought to be absolutely determined to give people such a reliable service of public transport that they regard the bus and Underground systems as the natural way of travelling around London. I use the word 'reliable' deliberately because I regard this as the most important single target. Speed, comfort and cost are also important, but if we could provide reliable services the public would forgive many shortcomings in other directions."

Sir Richard went on to say that both Labour and Conservative parties in the Greater London Council, and the Liberals, had expressed their views on improving public transport. "It still remains to be seen what they do about it in their different ways. But nothing they try to do can be of any use unless we in London Transport can provide a thoroughly good service to the public. At present we are not doing this - not by a long way."

Staff Problems

There were, said Sir Richard, two main reasons for this. The first was the problem of recruiting and keeping staff in the numbers required to run full (cont'd on page 10)



Rickmansworth, 15th April 1967

N.A.Davis



ESL 118A & ESL 118B, Rickmansworth, 15th April 1967

N.A.Davis



Chesham, 15th April 1967 N.A.Davis



A Stock in bay at Chesham, 15th April 1967 N.A.Davis

scheduled services. Staff shortage was not a problem peculiar to London Transport. Most public services and many private concerns were short of staff. What was peculiar to London Transport was the severe effect of even quite small staff shortages. A guard or conductor short could mean a train or bus cancelled.

London Transport needed a reasonable even spread of staff over the whole of London, but staff shortages followed an uneven pattern - the west and south-west of London being particularly difficult areas.

Recruitment was easier than keeping staff. Again, this was not peculiar to London Transport. Competition and fluidity in the labour situation made a good deal of staff wastage normal and inevitable, but it was too high, and means of reducing it must be found.

The second reason why London Transport was not providing the best possible services lay in the effect on those services which action by a comparatively small number of men could have.

"Here," said Sir Richard, "I realise I am treading on delicate ground. It is the duty of the unions to act in the best interests of their members. It is the right of those members to express themselves clearly if they think the unions are not doing this.

"But the best interests of union members cannot possibly mean that the transport services which we give shall be allowed to get worse and worse. This is the surest way to destruction. If we cannot provide reliable transport, fewer and fewer people will use it.

"I cannot believe that such a process can be regarded as in the best interests of any member of the staff of London Transport or of the unions represented here today. Yet in eight months since I became Chairman of London Transport, I have seen a number of actions by comparatively small groups of men which have had a direct and serious effect on our services, which have brought us into disrepute with the public and the Press, and which have sent us several yards further on the downward slope. All of us here must

try to work together to eliminate these incidents and to persuade the staff that it cannot possibly be in their interest to take action which alienates the public even further than they are at present."

THE CHANDOS PAPERS MICROFILM AND
THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

Arising from the necessity to find a safe and accessible home for the Society's microfilm of the Chandos Papers concerned with the Wotton Tramway, discussions have been carried on recently with the University of London. These have now reached an advanced stage, and have turned out very successfully for TLURS - and we hope equally so for the University.

Thanks to the willing co-operation of Mr. D. T. Richnell, B.A., F.L.A., Director of the University of London Library and Goldsmiths' Librarian, it has been agreed that the microfilm will be deposited shortly in the Library on permanent loan, to form part of the already-extensive collection of railway material there. In return, members of the Society will, upon recommendation of the Committee, become eligible for Reference Membership of the Library. This will mean that those members who are granted reference tickets will not only have access to the Society's microfilm, and the use of a reader, but will also be able to use the rest of the Library's facilities as well. This will be of very great benefit to those members who are engaged in research, and the thanks of the Society are extended to the University, and particularly the Librarian, for the generous assistance given - which has culminated in the granting of a privilege not normally available to such Societies as this (membership of the Library normally being restricted to members and students of the University and a few other very limited categories of people).

Fuller details will be published very soon; in the meantime, members are asked not to apply for Library membership yet. Arrangements will be completed as soon as possible, and applications will be invited then.

REVIEWS

Books

Thomas B. Peacock; Great Western London Suburban Services; new, revised and enlarged edition; 108 pp + 8 pp plates, 8½" x 5½"; limp card covers; Lingfield, 1970; The Oakwood Press; £1-1-0d or £1.05.

Readers who can recall the first edition of this book, which appeared over twenty years ago, will be delighted to see this new edition which appears as Locomotion Paper No 48.

The original was concise, informative and interesting; the author has now considerably extended his text, added various tables and illustrations, and in so doing has made a book which is even more valuable to the London railway student.

Recalling the close and lengthy association of the Great Western with the Metropolitan, it will be realised without your reviewer pointing it out that a book with a title like this one's must be of interest to Underground enthusiasts, and no-one will be disappointed on that score. The original Met services, the Hammersmith & City, Middle Circle and GW through services over the Metropolitan are all dealt with in considerable detail, as is the rest of the GW suburban network. There is always a tendency to look upon the suburban services of this company as inconsiderable or almost non-existent; while this may be true - or at least contain an element of truth when a comparison is drawn with similar services of other companies, Mr Peacock will go a long way towards removing any misconceptions of this nature. In fact he makes it clear that the GW had suburban services of considerable complexity, operated not only by conventional trains, but also by railcars of various forms of motive power, auto-trains, feeder bus services and so on.

The period dealt with is 1858-1948, and not very much in the ninety years' history of the services is left out; there are chapters on slip carriage services, mixed trains, motive power (which includes the first locos for the Met), and fares, while, in addition to the plates (which are all of interest although some are not too clearly reproduced), there is a route diagram, sketches of signals and a very

detailed "Index and Schedule of Stopping Places" which gives dates, distances, etc.

Altogether, a very welcome addition to the library.

Scale Drawings

1903 Central London Railway Motor Car
 District Railway 1905 Motor Car
 1920 Watford Joint Stock Motor Car
 1920 Watford Joint Stock Trailer Car

Drawn by P.R.Connor and Published by the Society at 3/- each or 10/- for the set of four. Obtainable from R.J.Greenaway, 203 Gunnersbury Park, Popes Lane, Ealing, London, W.5.

These four drawings are the first of what is hoped will eventually be a series containing most, if not all, the types of electric stock used on the London Underground. Each one shows the side elevation, the plan and the two ends, except that the 1920 Trailer gives the alternative end elevations for trailers and control trailers. All drawings are reproduced in black and white and in 4mm scale, and measurements are given in both feet and inches and in metres. Meticulously prepared, these drawings are most attractive and should prove of the greatest value to modellers.

Print

John Chalkley; Metropolitan Railway 4-4-4T No 104 hauling train of steam stock in country surroundings; published by the Society and obtainable from R.J.Greenaway as above, price 6/- or 30p.

A delightfully evocative black and white drawing, 22 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 15 $\frac{1}{4}$ " in size, admirable for framing, this will make an attractive addition to any railway enthusiast's study wall, being not so large as to be prohibitively expensive to frame, nor too small to make an acceptable decoration. One gets the impression that the drawing was done with affection for the subject, and it would be nice to see similar subjects depicted by the same artist - for there is not all that much art devoted to Underground themes.

SIGNALLING ALTERATIONS ON THE WIMBLEDON LINE

R.Thomas

On Sunday 29th November 1970 the only section of line signalled by semaphore signals, between East Putney and Wimbledon (the section between Gunnersbury and Richmond having colour light distant signals) was converted to British Railways 3-aspect colour light signals. The signal cabins at Cromer Road, Southfields and Revelstoke Road have been permanently closed (the last having been shut for some time).

Most of the signals are 3-aspect automatic, but at East Putney, Wimbledon Park and Wimbledon semi-automatic stor signals are being installed. The signal box codes for the remaining cabins are as follows:-

East Putney	WBE
Wimbledon Park	WBF
Wimbledon	WH - as before

The new signalling will enable a four-minute District Line service to be provided during Monday to Friday peak hours, all the trains previously reversing at Putney Bridge being extended to Wimbledon.

Thus ends 81 years of semaphore block working on the line.

METROPOLITAN SIGNAL BOXES IN THE ELECTRIC ERA

E.D.Chambers

Previous reference - Volume 8 No 7 Issue No 91, July 1969, p.107

Some additions:	<u>Original</u>	
High Street Kensington	J	
Praed Street Junction	A	
Kings Cross	J	
(if this later became C, why?)		
St Johns Wood	B	
Great Northern and City Section:		
Moorgate	A	ND
Drayton Park	B	NC
Finsbury Park	C	

NEWS FLASHES

NF 988 The Secretary of State for the Environment announced on 4-12-1970 that the Government would make a 50% infra-structure grant towards the replacement of the lifts and improvement of the interchange facilities at South Kensington station. The Greater London Council had already agreed to contribute £600,000 to the scheme.

NF 989 The Greater London Council are seeking an interview with the Minister for the Environment, when a deputation will discuss with him the question of Government grants towards the cost of the Heathrow Extension (where a grant has been refused) and the Fleet Line.

NF 990 The new arrangement of the booking hall at Victoria (Circle and District Lines) has been criticised - the main complaint being that the booking office is next to the main exits from the platforms instead of being near the entrance to them.

NF 991 An interesting sidelight on the building of the Moscow Metro appears in the Krushchev Memoirs now being published. It seems that it was Stalin himself who made the decision to construct this to tunnelling shield and tube methods rather than use cut and cover as had been planned. The engineer who made the suggestion, Makovsky, also proposed escalators instead of lifts, and won his point here also.

NF 992 Because of vandalism, London Transport have closed the toilets at Hornchurch, Elm Park, Dagenham Heathway, Upton Park and Bromley-by-Bow. Toilet facilities at other stations on this section of the District Line are being retained, but will be closed at 19.00 daily.

NF 993 A young student was killed when he fell beneath a District Line train at East Ham on 29-11-1970.

NF 994 It has been pointed out to us that the first CO stock cars to be transferred to the District Line were not 53047 and 53048 as stated in NF 973. We now report that the first unit to be transferred from Hammersmith to the District was 53021 + 53040, which worked T72 on 2-9-1970 and again on 4-6-1970. Up to 24-11-1970, these were the only CO stock to have worked the District.

NF 995 A skinhead battle took place at South Harrow station on the night of Wednesday 18.11.1970, when 30 of them battled with ten coloured youths. One youth was fairly badly hurt before the police arrived.

SOCIETY NOTICES

Annual General Meeting. The Society AGM will be held on the 20th March 1971. Notice of any proposed changes in the Rules, and Nominations for election to the Committee must be sent to the Secretary at 17 Garth Road, Sevenoaks, Kent by February 15th 1971. The retiring members of the Committee are - P.R.Connor, P.R.Davis and J.P.Wirth, and they are all eligible for re-election.

Accounts for 1970. So that the accounts for the year 1970 may be prepared for audit as soon as possible, will all members holding Society funds pay the money over to the Treasurer, at 3 Bush Grove, Stanmore, Middlesex, HA7 2DX, by January 7th 1971. Likewise, all claims for expenses incurred on behalf of the Society up to 31st December 1970 should be claimed from the Treasurer by the same date.

 THE TIMETABLE

19.00 for 19.15 Friday 8th January at Hammersmith Town Hall; A Film Show entitled "A Railway Miscellany" will be presented by one of our Past Presidents - C.R.L.Coles. Mr Coles is one of the best-known of modern railway photographers, and members will be well advised not to miss this selection from his library of cine films.

19.00 for 19.15 Friday 12th February at Hammersmith Town Hall; An Illustrated Talk by W.Akerman entitled "The Alexandra Park Branch". This interesting line, which has been walked over by the Society, deserves more attention than it has received recently. This talk will do much to redress the balance.

Saturday 20th February (provisional) Visit to the London Transport Depot at Lillie Bridge. DO NOT BOOK YET - please await the February Journal for confirmation.

19.00 for 19.15 Friday 12th March at Hammersmith Town Hall; A Paper will be presented by our Vice-President, Charles E. Lee, on "The Brill Branch". The excellence of Mr.Lee's work is well-known to members, so that they will need no encouragement to come to this meeting - which is particularly appropriate at this time, as it is so near the centenary of the opening of the line on 1st April 1871.

Lithoed by The Celtic Bureau, 93-94 Chancery Lane, London, WC2, and Published by TLURS, 62 Billet Lane, Hornchurch, Essex, RM11 1XA. Copyright.