Public Works (1899) Department.

G.O., No. 2430 2431 W

DATED 15 September 1899

[Despatch Abstract.]

Light house Battery & Law Court Buildings:

Ordered that the Govt of India be requested either to arrange either for the removal of the Light-house Battery or the restriction of firing within the narrowest limits possible.

Light house Battery & Law Court Buildings:

Requesting the Govt of India to arrange either for the removal of the Light house battery or the restriction of firing within the narrowest bomb limits possible.

[P. W. 26. 300—1-99]

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
MILITARY WORKS.

Government {1899} of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Recd } 1899. *Enclosures*
Regd } *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 2430 W., 15th September 1899.

SEPTEMBER

Lighthouse Battery and Law Court Buildings

Ordered that the Government of India be requested to arrange either for the removal of the Lighthouse Battery or the restriction of firing within the narrowest limits possible.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Military Works.

READ—the following papers:—

From the Secretary, Defence Committee, Simla, to the Adjutant-General in India, dated 18th July 1899, No. 175.

In returning, as requested, your memorandum, No. 2648/1 of 16th June 1899, and all enclosures, I am directed by His Excellency the President to inform you that the Defence Committee do not consider that any case has been made out to justify the proposal to remove the Lighthouse Battery, Madras, from its present site.

2. This battery is the most important one in the Madras Defences, as they now exist, and the proposed eventual Defences of Madras, sanctioned by Government, but the construction of which is indefinitely postponed, include a battery here for four guns instead of two as at present.

3. The Madras Government insisted on building their High Court on its present site, though this was strenuously opposed on military grounds by the local military authorities and by the Defence Committee.

4. The building, judging from the report now submitted by the Consulting Architect to the Madras Government, was built of a very light and weak style of construction, on a sand foundation, and close to a battery from which it was known heavy guns must be fired.

5. The removal of the High Court and its reconstruction on a safe site appears to be the best solution of the difficulty.

No. R.A/11793.

Forwarded, for information, with reference to the correspondence ending with Proceedings of Madras Government, No. 1333 W., dated 22nd May last.

OOTACAMUND,
3rd August 1899.

(Signed) G. SIMPSON, Brigdr.-Genl.,
Deputy Adjutant-General.

Endorsement thereon in the Judicial Department, dated 7th August 1899, No. 1993.

ORDER—No. 2430 W., dated 15th September 1899.

Ordered that the Government of India be requested to arrange either for—

(1) the removal of the Lighthouse Battery, or
(2) the restriction of firing within the narrowest possible limits.

Meanwhile, the Lieutenant-General Commanding the Forces will be requested to suspend practice from this Battery, pending settlement of the question.

[Here enter No. 2431 W., dated 15th September 1899.]

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. B. DEWINTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Consulting Architect to Government.
" Judicial Department.
" Deputy Adjutant-General, Madras Command, for the information of the Lieutenant-General Commanding, with copy of letter to the Government of India.

Exd. A. Rangasawmy Aiyangar.

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
MILITARY WORKS.

Government {1899} of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Recd. } 1899. *Enclosures*
Regd. *Spare copies*

Letter, No. 2431 W., 15th September 1899.

SEPTEMBER.

Lighthouse Battery and Law Court Buildings

Requesting the Government of India to arrange either for the removal of the Lighthouse Battery or the restriction of firing within the narrowest limits possible.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Military Works.

LETTER—from

W. B. DEWINTON, Esq.,

Secretary to the Government of Madras,

Public Works Department,

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,

MILITARY DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

I am directed to refer to the correspondence ending with your letter No. 724 M.W., dated 17th April 1888, in regard to the selection of a site on which to erect the Law Courts at Madras.

2. The circumstances under which the present site was finally adopted are detailed in this Government's letter No. 343 D., dated 16th July 1887. This site was, it will be remembered, not free from objection from a military point of view. It was, at the time, urged by the military authorities that its contiguity to Fort St. George and the Lighthouse Battery would restrict the defensive powers of those works. It was also held to be desirable to keep the Esplanade on the land side of the Fort free from buildings. These considerations were carefully weighed by the Government of India; and, after consultation with the Coast Defence Committee, it was decided that the difficulties inseparable from any other site far outweighed these objections, and permission was accordingly granted by the Government of India to the erection of the Law Court buildings on the Esplanade to the north of Fort St. George and west of the Lighthouse Battery.

3. It is now proved that the vibration caused by the firing of the heavy guns in the Lighthouse Battery is a source of danger to the building and its occupants. Portions of the stone copings and other heavy masses of material have become detached and have fallen, and considerable damage has been caused to other portions of the building.

4. Under these circumstances, the Lieutenant-General Commanding the Forces, Madras, has been requested to suspend practice from this Battery; but it will be seen from the accompanying copy of letter from the Secretary to the Defence Committee to the Adjutant-General in India, No. 175, dated 18th July 1899, that the only remedy, in the opinion of the Committee, is the removal of the Law Court buildings and their reconstruction on a safe site. In this letter some stress is laid on the contention that the Madras Government insisted on building its Law Courts on the present site, though this was strenuously opposed on military grounds by the local military authorities and by the Defence Committee. In this connection I am to invite attention to the specific objections raised by the military authorities when the question of site was under consideration. These are stated in paragraph 2 of my present letter. It will be observed that no mention is here made of the source of danger which has now been disclosed. The objections of the Defence Committee and of the other military authorities consulted were based, not on the effects of the Battery on the buildings, but on

the effects of the buildings on the defensive powers of the Battery and of the Fort. It is, moreover, not quite accurate to say that the selection of this site was "strenuously opposed" by the local military authorities and the Defence Committee. So far as the Defence Committee is concerned, it alleged no specific grounds of objection, but contented itself with a mere statement of disapproval, notwithstanding that the Madras Government had, in letter No. 343 D., dated 16th July 1887, particularly requested an expression of the opinion of the Committee as to whether there was any "real objection" to the appropriation of this site. All that the Committee said in reply was that it was "unanimously opposed to the site on the Esplanade of Fort St. George, marked B on the plan, being appropriated for this purpose"—*vide* letter from the Secretary to the Committee communicated to the Madras Government with your letter No. 2017 M.W., dated 26th September 1887. As regards the opinion of Sir Frederick Roberts, then Commander-in-Chief of Madras, this authority, while agreeing with the Committee that the site selected was "not a desirable one," nevertheless approved of it, as "no other suitable site could be found." His successor, Sir Charles Arbuthnot, was also by no means resolute in his opposition to this site, as will be seen from paragraph 8 of this Government's letter to the Government of India, No. 343 D., dated 16th July 1887.

5. As regards the remark of the Defence Committee in paragraph 4 of its present letter in regard to the very light and weak style of construction, on a sand foundation, of the Law Court buildings, I am to remark that the building was undoubtedly lightly constructed, but not more so than was permissible under ordinary circumstances. As for a sand foundation, it would be difficult to found any building on the Madras Beach otherwise than on sand. His Excellency in Council is, moreover, informed that sand foundations are not objectionable *per se*.

6. Under these circumstances, His Excellency the Governor in Council cannot admit the validity of the grounds on which the Defence Committee now proposes that the buildings should be removed, in preference to the removal of the Battery. The cost of these buildings has been very great, amounting to no less a sum than Rupees 13·17 lakhs. If the structure is now to be demolished and re-erected on a different site, this large expenditure will have been wasted; and, considering that the cause of removal is one which might have been foreseen by the military experts consulted both by the Madras Government and the Government of India before the erection of the buildings, His Excellency the Governor in Council is constrained to remark that it would be a great hardship on the Provincial Government to be now called on to suffer the great loss which the proposed removal of the buildings would occasion. I am, accordingly, to request that the matter may be placed before His Excellency the Viceroy in Council for his careful and sympathetic consideration, and that it may, if possible, be arranged either that—

(1) the Lighthouse Battery be removed, or,
(2) the firing from this Battery be restricted within the narrowest possible limits.

I have the honour to be,
SIR,
Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) W. B. DEWINTON,
Secretary to Government.

OOTACAMUND,
15th September 1899.

Exd. A. Rungasawmy Aiyangar.

[J. / 52]
1,000—28-6-98.

P. W.

Judicial (1899) Department.

6898
cF

CURRENT No. ~~3218~~

C.S.

From The D.A.G.,
Madras Command

~~*Order*~~

Endorsement No. 1993 dt 7-8-99. No. R.a / 11793

Transferred to the Public Works Dept.

Dated 3d August 99

Received at Fort St. George 10.8.99

Registered at Madras ~~4 Aug 1899~~ 23-8-99

Enclosures Plans nil / Others 1 nil } Total 1.

Spare copies

G. Sukes
Chief Secretary.

H. 5/8/99.

Cm 7.8.99

SUBJECT.

Re: the proposal for the removal of the Lighthouse Bakery, Madras, from its present site.

To the Public Works Dept.

0.S 75

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
834	8	29	5 89
284	8	14	2 89
872	8	17	1 89
101	8	17	1 89

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	1333W		22.5.89

3218

Copy of ~~Extract from~~ Letter, ~~Memorandum~~, ~~Telegram~~, No. 175, dated 18 July 1899,

from the Secretary Defence Committee Simla, to the Adjutant General in India.

CHIEF SECRETARY 4 AUG. 1899 GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

18

In returning, as requested, your memorandum, No. 2648, of 16 June 1899, and all enclosures, I am directed by His Excellency the President to inform you that the Defence Committee do not consider that any case has been made out to justify the proposal to remove the Lighthouse battery, Madras, from its present site.

2. This battery is the most important one in the Madras defences as they now exist, and the proposed eventual defences of Madras, sanctioned by Government, but the construction of which is indefinitely postponed, include a

battery

No. 55.—B.-G., R.A., 14-11-98—200.

battery here to four guns instead of two as at present.

3. The Madras Government insisted on building their High Court on its present site though this was strenuously opposed on military grounds by the local military authorities and by the Defence Committee.

4. The building, judging from the report now submitted by the Consulting Architect to the Madras Government, was built of a very light and weak style of construction, on a sand foundation, and close to a battery from which it was known heavy guns must be fired.

5. The removal of the High Court and its reconstruction on a safe site appears to be the best solution of the difficulty.

Artillery
Defences
No. 2a
11793

Chief Secretary to Government of Madras

Head Qrs. Madras Command,
Fort St. George,
Madras, the 3rd August 1899.

Forwarded

Forwarded for information with reference to the correspondence ending with
P.M.G., No. 1333-W., dated 22nd May last.

IV. 834
29-5-99

20

C. Gleadow
Brig.-Gen.
D.A.G.

READ the following :—

Enclosure No: 3218

Copy of Letter No: 175 d/ 18 July 1899. from the Secretary, Defence Committee, Simla, to the Adjutant General in India, forwarded for information by the Dy: Adjutant General, Madras Command in reference to the Correspondence ending with P. M. G. No: 1333 W d/ 22 May 1899.

Effect of Lighthouse Battery on High Court Buildings, Madras.

Circulated to
1. H.E. The Governor
3. Hon: A.T. Arundel
2. Hon H.M. Winterbotham

Flag II

FOR ORDERS

The above is Submitted for orders of Government. The previous history of the Case will be found in the note attached to No. 1333W, d/ 22 May 1899.

2 With reference to Para 3 of the Enclosure, it is true that the Construction of the High Court on its present Site was opposed by the Defence Committee, Vide Para 16 of their Report, printed with No: 3783, Military, of 13 July 1885 but it will be seen from Para 4 of letter from the Quarter Master General, printed on the first page of the above No. that Sir Frederick Roberts then Commander in Chief of Madras

Flag II

Flag I

letter to be sent accordingly
24.8.99

Seen
DW

[P. W. 43.
1,000—28-2-19.]

Madras, while agreeing with the Committee, had Approved the Site because he had been informed that no other Suitable Site could be found. It will Also be observed from Para 8 of this Government's letter No: 343 D of 16th July 1887 to the Government of India, that his Successor, Sir Charles Arbuthnot, was by no means resolute in his Opposition. It is not therefore Correct to Say that the project was opposed by the Local Military Authorities.

Hag III

3. The upshot of the whole discussion will be found in Sp. 1324 W. d/5th May 1888, in which the Government of India gives its Consent to the Erection of the buildings on the Site proposed.

Hag IV

It will be noticed that the Objections of the Defence Committee were based not on the Effects of the Battery on the High Court, but on the Effects of the High Court on the Battery, as prejudicing its offensive powers.

Under the Above Circumstances, I Submit that the Suggestion made in Para 5 of the Current, that the High Court should be removed, is Absolutely untenable.

4. The building, as Stated in Para 4 of Current, was undoubtedly lightly built, but not more So than was permissible under Ordinary Circumstances: As for the Sand foundation, it would be difficult to found any building in Madras otherwise. It is probably true that the Effect of the firing of the heavy guns was not Sufficiently realised at the outset, but even if it had been, I doubt if it would have been possible to render So large a building absolutely Safe from the Vibrations

Q.O

With reference.
A.G.H.

Sand foundations are not the best, as Mr. Hunter tells me.
A.G.H.

Is this the Madras beach? Much of Madras is stiff clay — excellent for building on.

vibrations Set up.

5. The removal of the High Court being out of the question, there are only two other Courses possible: ——

(1) The removal of the battery

(2) The restriction of firing practice therefrom to the minimum necessary to test the Efficiency of the Armament.

With regard to the former, the battery must now be at least 1/4 mile further from High Water line than it was when Constructed, and I believe it will be found that the Defence Committee would be ready on this, and possibly other grounds, to remove it. It will be seen from Fo. 1673 Judicial of 24th June 1885, that in discussing the various Sites, Mr. Chisholm, the Consulting Architect, added Rs 35000 to the Cost of the Esplanade Site, to pay for the removal of the battery (Para

Flag V

90

(Para 5 of his letter) because the High Court "would form the butt for Erring Shot & Shell"

In view of the damage already done to the High Court (and Certain to be done in the future) which was unforeseen either by Government or the Military Authorities when that building was Constructed, I think Government might meet the Defence Committee halfway by offering to bear half the Cost of the removal.

6. With regard to the Alternative of restricting the firing at the battery, Some Annual practice is probably unavoidable, to See that the Guns are in working Order, and to give the Gunners practice in range finding, but I think it may be reduced to very Small proportions, without danger to the State, and might be timed to take place during the High Court Vacations, when

when there would be no re-
sulting danger to life.
I. I. therefore, recommend
that the Government of
India be addressed on
the subject, and requested
to arrange either for (1) the re-
moval of the battery or (2) the
restriction of firing within
the narrowest possible limits
preferably the former, and
that the Lieutenant General
Commanding the Madras Forces,
be requested to defer any
action in the matter, pending
Settlement of the question.
It is quite certain that
if the battery remains
in its present position
and Madras has ever
to defend herself from
an Enemy at Sea, the
High Court will be 'knocked
into a Cocked hat'

W. 17.8.99

This should be done, the case being set out as stated in this Note. A.G.H. 19.8.99

H.W. 19-8-99

A.A. 22.8.99

and the Senate House & B. of Rev. Offices also H.W.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

Urgent

Read the following:—

From the Dy. Adjutant General, Madras Command, No. RA/1793, d/ 3rd August, 1899.

Endorsement thereon in the Judicial Dept., No. 1993, d/ 7th Aug. 1899.

Lighthouse Battery & Law Courts Buildings.

Circulated to
H.E. the Governor
The Hon'ble Mr. Arundel C.S.I.
The Hon'ble Mr. Winterbotham

4 P A.G.H. 26.8.99

A.A. 28.8.99.

H.W. 28-8-99

To
The C.A. to Govt.
„ Judicial Dept.
„ Dy. Adjutant General, M.C.
for the information of the
L.G.C., with copy of letter
to the Govt. of India.

2 7/10/99

ORDER.

No. 2430 W. d/15.9.99

Ordered that the Govt. of India be requested to arrange either for
(1) the removal of the Light-house Battery, or,
(2) the restriction of firing within the narrowest possible limits.
Meanwhile the Lt. Gl. Commanding the Forces will be requested to suspend practice from this Battery, pending settlement of the question.

(H.E. No. 243/W, d/15/9/1899)

To the Secy, to the Govt, of India,
Military Dept.

Sir,

I am directed to refer to the correspondence ending with your letter No. 724 M.W., d/ 17th April, 1888, in regard to the selection of a site on which to erect the Law Courts at Madras.

Hag IV

P. W. 42-A.
1,000—2-3-99.

2. The circumstances under which the present site was finally adopted are detailed in this Government's letter No. 343 D, d/ 16th July, 1887. This site was, it will be remembered, not free from objection from a military point of view. It was, at the time, urged by the Military authorities that its contiguity to Fort St. George and the Light house Battery would restrict the defensive powers of those works. It was also held to be desirable to keep the Esplanade on the ~~same~~ land side of the Fort, free from buildings. These considerations were carefully weighed by the Govt. of India, and, after consultation with the Coast Defence Committee, it was decided that the difficulties inseparable from ~~every~~ any other site far outweighed these objections, and permission was accordingly granted by the Govt. of India to the erection of the Law Court buildings on the Esplanade to the north of Fort St. George and west of the Light house Battery.

3. It is now proved that the vibration caused by the firing of the heavy guns in the Lt.house Battery is a source of danger to the building and its occupants. ~~Portions of~~ The stone copings and other heavy masses of material have become detached and ~~already~~ have fallen, and considerable damage has been caused to other portions of the building.

4. Under these circumstances the Lt. Gl. Commanding the Forces, Madras, has been requested to suspend practice from this Battery; but it will be seen from the accompanying

Better return if portions of 1/2"

Return a cine

29-1-11

3

copy of letter from the Secy. to the Defence Committee to the Adjutant General in India, No. 175, d/ 18th July, 1899, that the only remedy, in the opinion of the Committee, is the removal of the Law Court buildings and their reconstruction on a safe site. In this letter some stress is laid on the contention that the Madras Govt. insisted on building its Law Courts on the present site, though this was strenuously opposed by the local Mily. authorities and by the Defence Committee. In this connection I am to invite attention to the specific objections raised by the Mily. authorities when the question of site was under consideration. These are stated in Para. 2 of my present letter. It will be observed that no mention is here made of the source of danger which has now been disclosed. The objections of the Defence Committee and of the other military authorities consulted

were based not on the effects of the Battery on the buildings, but on the effects of the buildings onthe defensive powers of the Battery and of the Fort. It is, moreover, not quite accurate to say that the selection of this site was "strenuously opposed" by the local Mily. authorities and the Defence Committee. So far as the Defence Committee is concerned, it alleged no specific objection, on military grounds, but contented itself with a mere statement of disapproval, notwithstanding that the Madras Govt. had in Letter No. 343 D, d/ 16th July, 1887, particularly request

ed

57

Flag III

d an expression of the opinion of mmittee as to whether there was any objection to the appropriation of is site. All that the Committee said in eply was that it was " unanimously opposed to the site on the Esplanade of Fort St. George, marked B on the plan, being appropriated for this purpose"- vide letter from the Secy. to the Committee communicated to the Madras Govt. with your letter No. 2017 M.W., d/ 26th September, I887. As regards the opinion of Sir Frederick Roberts, ~~the~~ then Commander in Chief of Madras, this authority, while agreeing with the Committee that the site selected "was" not a desirable one", nevertheless approved of it , as "no other suitable site could be found." His successor, Sir Charles Arbuthnot , was also by no means resolute in his opposition to this site, as will be seen from Para. 8 of this Govt.'s letter to the Govt. of India, No. 343 D, d/ I6th July, I887.

5. As regards the remark of the Defence Committee in Para. 4 of its present letter in regard as to the very light and weak style of construction , on a sand foundation , of the Law Court buildings, I am to remark that the building was undoubtedly lightly constructed, but not more so than was permissible under ordinary circumstances. As for a sand foundation , it would be difficult to found any building on the Madras Beach otherwise than on sand. H.E. in Council is, moreover, informed that sand foundations are not objectionable per se .

6. Under these circumstances H.E. the Governor in Council cannot admit the validity of the grounds on which the Defence Committee now proposes that the buildings should be removed, in preference to the removal of the Battery. The cost of these buildings has been ~~enormous~~ very great, amounting to no less a sum than £13.17 lakhs. If the structure is now to be demolished and re-erected on a different site, this large expenditure will have been wasted ; and, considering that the cause of removal is one which might have been foreseen by the Mily. experts consulted both by the Madras Govt. and the Govt. of India before the ~~erection~~ Erection of the buildings, H.E. the Govr. in Council is constrained to remark that it would be a great hardship on the Provl. Govt. to be now called on to suffer the ~~enormous~~ Great loss which the proposed removal of the buildings would occasion. I am, accordingly, to request that the matter may be placed before H.E. the Viceroy in Council for his careful and sympathetic consideration, and that it may, if possible , be arranged either that

(I) the Light house Battery be removed,

or,

(2) the firing from this Battery be restricted within the narrowest possible limits.

I have etc,

W. 20-8-99

C. No 3218. Copy of letter No 175 dated 14 Oct 99 from the Lees Defence Committee, Sunderland to the Govt Pool in India, forwarded for information of the Govt. Pool Leaders with reference to the correspondence ending with this Govt. No 1333 dated 22 May 99

Effect of Legislative Matters on Govt Contractors

The above is submitted for orders of Govt. The necessity of the case will be found in the Note attached to G.O 1333 dt 24 May 1911

2. With reference to para 3 of the Resolution of this Govt that the Govt contracts secured the Govt has approved the Defence Committee, who have 16 of their

Report forwarded with GO No 3783 dated 4 of 12 Sept 1884, which will be seen from para 4 of letter from the Quarter Master General, printed at the first page of the above GO that Lt Colonel Commanding Corps of Madras, while agreeing with the Committee had afterwards the site became he had been informed that no other suitable site could be found. He will also be observed from the letter of the Govt of India No 243 D of 16 Sept 1884 to the Govt of Madras, that, his successor, Sir Charles Cunningham has by no means concluded his operations. It is not therefore correct to say that the project has opposed by the local military authorities —

Flag I.

Flag III

3. The estimate of the whole drainage scheme forms an Appendix to GO 1324 dated 1 May 1884, in which the Govt of India pass orders on the execution of the works proposed. The whole object of the Defence Committee here, and not in the effects of the sanitary in the Hyde Court, but the effects of the Hyde Court on the Battery, as depending its Flanks for honors. Under the circumstances, I submit that the suggestion made in para 5 of the current Hyde Court should be carried into effect.

4. ~~The Commandant~~ ~~Drawing~~ ~~What is wanted~~ The building, as stated in para 4 of current, lies under Hyde Court

Flag II

will not interfere to any
serious extent under ordinary circumstances
as to the same foundation. It would
be different to found any building
on heaps thereon. This building
time had the effect of the firing
of the heavy guns has not affected
recently reached at the extent,
whereas if it had been, it would
have very greatly increased. The effect
of the building extending it would affected
I doubt if it would have been possible
to erect a building of
similar character and size from the existing
letter.

5. The removal of the High Court
being out of the question, there are
two other courses possible
(1) The removal of the Lobby
(2) The ~~total~~ destruction of Storey
~~over~~ practice thereof
to the minimum necessary to test
the efficiency of the armament.

with regard to the former the letter
would not be at least as suitable
as the present one, whereas if it would be possible to erect
the Defence Committee would
very readily adopt it. It would seem
to me that 1670 indeed if we have
to go back in date even
as far as the Charter House
Site. The Architect added £3,000 to the
cost of the esplanade site to
pay for the removal of the Lobby
(have not the letter) because the
Hyphenist would prefer to put the
covering stone & theft"
In view of the damage already
done to the High Court (a Calamity
we done in the future) & likely
which has impressed with

Flag.

... of the existing authorities when that bridge was constructed, & that Govt. must meet the difference. Committee half way by offering to bear half the cost of the removal.

6. With regard to the alternative of restricting the spring tides Letter. Some annual practice is hardly warranted, to see that the arms are in working order, & to practise gunners practice in large sunday. It is I think it may be advanced to very small proportions without danger to the state which ought to be timed to take place during the high Coast navigation, when there will be no resulting danger to life.

7. I therefore recommend that Govt. of India be addressed in the sense, & requested to agree either to (1) the removal of the bridge or (2) the restriction of spring within the narrowest possible limits, leaving the powers of the Harbour Council to defer any action to be requested to defer any action in the matter, pending settlement of the question.

H.H.S.
17.8.11

This note contains what I have remarked with regard to the Madras Harbour Bridge & to defending the Madras Coast from an enemy at sea. I have now drawn the 'Bombay' the Thames Coast with into a cocked hat.

H.H.S.
17.8.11

Urgent

C.P.Ls

Please have a short
(1) note written of
the history of the
case from the letters
I have tied the white
tape - I don't see the
(2) latest correspondence
in the office in
the file

14-8-88

W

(1) Note submitted. He will now see that the history of the site has already been written.

(2) These papers have been telegraphed for.

R.P.
15 Augt 88

(2) Let me see them
when read

W
Submitted.
R.P.
16 Augt

10

Law Courts buildings, Public Works Department
Madras.

Note.

* Flag Y.

Letter No 3432, dated 16th July 1887 gives a full history of the circumstances under which the present site was selected for the Law Courts buildings. The only objection to the site, on military grounds, which was then raised was its contiguity to Fort Saint George and the Lighthouse Battery, whereby the defensive powers of these works would be restricted. But no military authority raised the specific objection which is now threatening the safety of the buildings, viz, that the concussion from the guns would shake the fabric.

× Flags S and T

2. The Madras Government, in their letter of the 16th July 1887 already quoted, specifically requested that the opinion of the Coast Defence Committee might be obtained on the question of site, presumably from every military

Flag Y

military point of view. In reply, the Defence Committee objected to the site, but assigned no reasons for their objection. What they say is "The Defence Committee "are unanimously opposed to the "site on the Esplanade of Fort "Saint George, marked B on the "plan, being appropriated for this "purpose."

The buildings were designed by Mr. Brassington, and the plans and estimates were approved by Government while Colonel Hasted was Chief Engineer. The Construction of the work was undertaken by Mr. Irwin, Consulting Architect.

R.S.

⊗ Vide Letter from the Secretary to the Defence Committee No 284, dy 7th Septr 1887. Flag Z.

* Vide G.O. 1058 W, dy 17th April 1889. (Flag X)

Flag W.

× vide Flags U and V.

S Hw

Soon

2nd Endl. No. 1993 dy 7. 8. 99

Please put up with this paper, the earlier correspondence showing who were responsible for the design and construction of this building and the selection of the site.

R.S.

10 Aug. 99

10

Submitted for information, in the first instance.

R.S.

10 Aug. 99

Noted. Please write letter above in points

W Hall

10.8.99

Telegram

From S Hw

To S Hw

Send soon papers showing who is respon-

for design ~~and~~ construction
~~of law courts Madras~~, and
Selection of Site of Law
Courts Madras...

R.P.
10 Aug 99

Tel. despatched
10th Aug. '99