

Heil & Co. London



B. No. 175 Waf 21 of Jan 1886

B. May

Handwritten signature and date 26/1

Jan 5/2

Cal 21

Dec 21-1-86

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following G.O., dated 7th September 1885, No. 4778, Revenue :—

Read—the following letter from Colonel H. R. MEAD, R.E., Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Trichinopoly, 6th August 1885, No. 237 T. C. :—

I have the honor to report that there has been a correspondence between the Executive Engineer of Trichinopoly and the Municipality regarding the maintenance of what is called the citadel wall of Trichinopoly fort. This wall was part of the fortification of Trichinopoly, and it now consists of a massive revetment wall built round a portion of the Trichinopoly rock and supporting streets, houses, &c.

2. In G.O., No. 240, dated 25th January 1865, and Proceedings of the Public Works Department, No. 500, of the 25th January 1865, it is stated in paragraph 3 that letter No. 1802, of 12th September 1846, from the Assistant Quartermaster-General, directed that the fort walls of Trichinopoly should no longer continue on the military returns. I suppose this refers to the citadel wall as well as to the outer walls of the fort. The outer walls have been removed, the materials used on various works and those left and the land were handed over to the Trichinopoly municipality ; but there is no record to show that the citadel wall (which is, as before stated, now a revetment wall holding up a portion of the town) ever was formally handed over to the municipality.

3. In 1865 some of the stones of this wall were removed by Captain Palmer, then District Engineer, I believe, to prevent damage, and a suit was brought in the court by the " Audinakartar " (I believe trustee) of the Rock Temple, and Rs. 999 claimed as damages, being the alleged value of the stones removed ; the plaintiff asserted that the wall in question was the property of the pagoda and not the property of Government. The court decided that the wall in question was Government property.

4. In November 1883, the Vice-President of the Municipality addressed the Executive Engineer, and requested him to repair the wall which was said to be in a dangerous state, and again in January and July 1884, asked that the wall should be repaired at the cost of Government. The Executive Engineer on emergency expended Rs. 170 on repairs, and pointed out to the Commissioners that he considered that the wall should be kept in repairs by the municipality, and requested repayment of the amount expended. At a meeting held on the 29th July 1884, the Commissioners declined to pay the amount, and asserted that the wall in question was in the charge of the Public Works Department.

5. I addressed the Collector on the subject and proposed that, should the citadel wall not have been (as I believe was the case) handed over to the municipality at the same time that the other old fortifications were, he should address Government and have it handed over without delay. In reply, he forwarded to me an extract of proceedings of the Municipal Commissioners, dated 23rd September 1884, asserting that the citadel wall never had been handed over to them, and stating their opinion that it should remain in charge of Government and be repaired at the expense of Government. I again addressed the Collector and pointed out that the above was no reply to my letter asking for information and for his opinion as Collector, and also that if the wall was Government property, it was in his charge and not in that of Public Works Department.

6. I enclose a copy of his letter and enclosure No. 2582, dated 22nd July, and request instructions. I most certainly do not agree with the Collector in his opinion that the wall in question is, and always has been, in the charge of this department.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Letter from H. SEWELL, Esq., Collector of Trichinopoly, to the Superintending Engineer, Trichinopoly, dated 22nd July 1885, No. 2582.

With reference to your letter, No. 525-T.C., dated 9th October 1884, I have the honor to forward, for your perusal and return, copy of judgment in original suit No. 3 of 1865, which I obtained from the Trichinopoly District Court. The suit was brought by the trustees of Rock Fort pagoda against the then Executive Engineer for the recovery of Rs. 999, the value of the granite stones removed from what is called the citadel wall. You will notice from the judgment that the suit was dismissed with all costs, and that the wall was pronounced Government property. It has continued to be in charge of your department both previous to and since the decision.

2. The residents of the northern street in the Rock Fort have presented a Mazar complaining that the citadel wall on the northern side is in such disrepair that the next rains might bring it down with a run. I forward it in original for such action as you may deem necessary. A perusal of the decision will, I think, make it clear to you that the citadel wall is Government property. It has never been made over formally to the municipality, who appear to be unwilling to take charge of such a white elephant. Even if Government insisted on their taking charge, it would, I think, be only fair that your department should put it in good order before the transfer.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Copy of Judgment.

No. 509-E.

Referred to the Revenue Department for favor of opinion whether, under G.O. in that department, dated 21st September 1868, No. 2436, paragraph 2, clause 1, the citadel wall at Trichinopoly should not be regarded as being under the care of the Collector.

(Signed) J. SHAW-STEWART, Col., R.E.,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

Order—dated 7th September 1885, No. 4778, Revenue.

Referred to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, for the favor of information as to whether, referring to the correspondence quoted in paragraph 2 of the Superintending Engineer's letter, on which the present reference by the Department of Public Works is made, the "fort walls" of Trichinopoly, which, it was directed, should no longer be borne on the military returns, included the *citadel* walls.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. WILSON,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Military Department, with original papers to be returned.

No. 5165.

Referred for favor of early report.

(By Order.)

(Signed) A. KENNEY-HERBERT, Lt.-Col.,
Offg. Secy. to Govt., Mil. Dept.

18th September 1885.

To the Quartermaster-General.

READ—also the following letter from Brigadier-General R. C. STEWART, Quartermaster General, to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, dated Ootacamund, 16th October 1885, No. 2507-B:—

In returning the papers regarding the fort and citadel walls at Trichinopoly, referred for report under endorsement No. 5165, dated 18th ultimo, I have the honor, by order, to state, for the information of Government, that the returns furnished to

this office include only "buildings" and never walls only of forts, unless they contain chambers or casemates on which these are shown.

2. The returns of Trichinopoly for years 1845, 1846, therefore do not include either the citadel or fort walls, and it is not clear therefore what was meant when in this office letter, No. 1802, dated 12th September 1846, the removal of the "walls of the fort of Trichinopoly" from the returns was authorized.

3. A copy of this office letter, No. 648, dated 19th December 1845, recommending the demolition of the fort walls is attached, and the order of Government which was passed on that letter is No. 109, dated 8th January 1846.

4. The sketch which accompanied the enclosure of this office letter, mentioned in the previous paragraph, might perhaps give some information which will be of value in connection with the matter.

No. 5927.

Transferred to the Revenue Department and the referred papers returned with file of previous correspondence.

(By Order.)

FORT ST. GEORGE,
28th October 1885.

(Signed) A. KENNEY-HERBERT, Lt.-Col.,
Offg. Secy. to Govt., Mily. Dept.

ORDER—dated 7th January 1886, No. 9, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

E.M.C., Military Department, No. 3696, dated 19th August, and No. 3858, dated 31st August 1846.

From the papers marginally noted, the entire fortifications at Trichinopoly appear to have been abandoned by the Military Department. The citadel walls referred to in the foregoing correspondence must, therefore, be held to be in charge of the Collector with reference to the terms of clause 1, paragraph 2 of G.O., No. 2436, dated 21st September 1868.

2. The Collector, in consultation with the officers of the Public Works Department, will have an estimate prepared for the demolition of the wall and for stacking the stone in view to its being subsequently sold by auction, unless it is recommended that the materials be sold *in situ*, in which case an agreement should be made with the purchasers for the removal of the materials within a specified time and a deposit, to be forfeited in case of failure, should be taken.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Public Works Department, with three original papers returned.

„ the Military Department.
„ the Board of Revenue.
„ the Financial Department.

Exd. W. H. French.

100 Copies.

No. 178 Wd/ Jan'y 22. 1886
Communicated to
the Superintending Engineer
III Circle.
15d/ Dm Ch C.
DW

Govt. of 1886 Madras.
REVENUE.

Issued
Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 7th January 1886, No. 9.

No. 178 Wd/ Jan'y 22. 1886

JANUARY.

Fort walls of Trichinopoly.

Orders passed regarding the demolition of the —.

With order

S.E. III Circle

7TH NOVEMBER 1885, No. 2658 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
 Civil Works.

ORDER—dated 7th November 1885, No. 2658 W., Public Works.

The following sums are appropriated from the reserve with the Government under Provincial :—

	RS.
Sub-Collector's office at Madanapalle	900
Constructing an embankment for the Gadilam river for the protection of Tirupapuliyur	2,000
Tools and plant, South Arcot division	250
Do. North Arcot do.	1,250
Repairs to Superintendent's quarters, School of Arts, Madras	763
Improvements to the South Beach Promenade, Madras	6,000
Total ...	11,163

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. SHAW-STEWART, Colonel, R.E.,
 Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

- To the Superintending Engineer, III Circle.
- " Consulting Architect to Government.
- " Revenue Department.
- " Financial "
- " Educational "
- " Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. J. Henricus.
 Spare Copies of

With disposal

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of (1885) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated November, 7th.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 7th Nov. 1885, No. 2658 W.

NOVEMBER.

Funds

Orders allotting — for certain works.

P. W. D.

Consulting Architect's Office,
Chepauk, Madras,
January 15th 1886.

No. 1469.

From

The Consulting Architect to the Government of Madras,

To

The Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department.

Sir, I have the honor to request that you will be good enough to sanction an additional allotment of funds to the extent of Rs 4,000/- to enable me to carry on the work "Improvements to the South Beach Promenade".

2. The funds already allotted to this work have been entirely spent.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

W. H. Ash

Consulting Architect to Govt.

226/13/2
E. M. 5/2

With Disposal

Public Works Department

From

THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT

TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

The Chief Engineer

P. W. D.



No. 1467

Dated 15th January 1886

Received 18

No. of ENCLOSURES.

Subject.

Applies for an additional allotment of Rs 4,000 for the work "Improvements to South Beach Promenade".

to
soon

C no 406

note

The balance of the Reserve with the Govt under Provincial is Rs 14,000 made available by not-allotting the sum of Rs 13,316 proposed by the S. & V. Circle to be appropriated, by transfers, for the Collector's Office at Calicut.

The sum of Rs 4,000 required for the South Beach Promenade may be met from the above sum.

Submitted for orders

19/1

26/1/86

22-1-86
E/M 5/2

With disposal

2658 W 77/11/85

2000 W 2

ment



B. No 175 W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 21st Jan'y. 1886

Read the following

Letter from the Consig. Architect, H.E. No 1467, d/15-1-86.

A further sum of Rs 4,000 is appropriated from the reserve with Government under Provincial, for improvements to the South Beach Promenade, Madras.

Lu
19/1/86

W
20-1-86

The Consig. Archt. to Govt. ✓
in Exams P.W. Accts. ✓
in Financial Dept. ✓
Recd 21-1-86.

Cu
19/1

Er 26/1/86
Recd 22-1-86
E/M 5/2

With disposal