

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Civil DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.

1699

Press

~~Mis.~~

236-237

Dated

26. 11. 1864

5/6

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1699

54

1/18

26th November 1864.

No. 256. Read the following letter from J. FRASER, Esq., Officiating Magistrate of the Godavery District; to the Honorable A. J. ARBUTHNOT, Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated Cocanada, 25th October 1864, No. 19.

With reference to the Notification published in the *Fort Saint George Gazette* of 8th July 1864, regarding the proposed introduction into Cocanada and Jaggernaikpur of Act XXVI of 1850 (the Municipal Act), I have the honor to state that, as prescribed in paragraph 2 of the Notification, a book was kept from 8th July at the Sub-Magistrate's Outcherry in Cocanada as a convenient and central spot; notice of this was circulated and proclaimed; and all who felt any interest in the matter were invited to subscribe their names therein as either for or against the introduction of the Municipal Act.

2. The result is that, by the 8th October, 372 parties had signed their names as for, and 204 as against the measure.

3. On a careful analysis of the assentients and dissentients it is found that they are as under:—

Classes.	For the introduction of the Municipal Act.	Against the introduction of the Municipal Act.
1. European Merchants	23	None.
2. East Indian do.	5	None.
3. Native do.	88	19
4. Public and private servants	163	21
5. Inamdars and Ryots	22	16
6. Petty handicraftsmen	58	60
7. Fisher and boatmen	13	88
	372	204

The first five classes represent the wealthy, intelligent, and influential portion of the community. These classes will be the principal payers of any taxes that may be imposed, and they are six to one in favor of the Municipal Act being introduced. I can, therefore, safely affirm that a very large and influential majority of those who will be tax-payers under the Act are in favor of its introduction. I beg to forward the following names of European and Native Merchants, whom I would recommend to be associated with myself as Commissioners for the purposes of the Act. The names were furnished to me by the merchants themselves, as best representing their interests, and I approve of them.

European Merchants.

1. Mr. R. H. D. Towle.
2. " L. Goudalphe.
3. " E. LeFaucheur.
4. " A. Faciolle.
5. " A. Burmester.
6. " F. J. Simon.
7. " J. Daffield, and
8. " J. H. Dennis.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
26th November 1864.

Native Merchants.

1. Nilam Viraragavulu Nayudu.
2. Paida Ramakrishnaia.
3. Akella Ayappa Sastrulu.
4. Batchu Ramesam.
5. Mutta Kannayya.
6. Kakileti Madhavarayudu.
7. Puram Sitarama Swami.
8. Palakurti Subbarayudu.
9. Mutta Ramanna.
10. Badam Manikkiyalu.
11. Kadambari Jagannatham, Treasury Deputy Collector.
12. Bandaru Bangaraiya, Head Sheristadar.

Ex-Officio Commissioners.

Civil Surgeon.
Assistant Collector.
Master Attendant.

4. I received the enclosed petition* from Government this morning. The statements in it are entire and gross falsehoods.

* No. 2713 of 1864.

From T. SUBBANNA, H. NARASIMHALU, and several other inhabitants of Cocanada and Jaggannachapuram, in Godavery District.
(Dated 1st October 1864, No. 2713.)

From G. SIMHADRI, T. VEERASAWMY, and many others residing in Jaggannachapuram, Godavery District.
(Dated 30th October 1864, No. 3057.)

No. 257. ORDER THEREON, 26th November 1864, No. 1099.

The Governor in Council remarks that the dissenting minority is a very large one, and that 163 or nearly half of the majority are public or private servants.

2. Under these circumstances, he considers that it is not advisable to introduce the Act at present; but the measure may be brought forward at some future time, when the public feeling is more unanimous.

3. Petitions Nos. 2713 and 3057 will be lodged.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Magistrate of the Godavery District

Ed. T. Curdison.

Judicial Department

No. 277

From the Off. Collector of the Godavery District.
Dated 25 October 1864

For Orders

The minority is very large - more than half the majority -

Of the majority (872) 23 are European merchants - & 163

are public or private / I don't quite understand what this means / servants -

I don't think it would be safe to introduce the Act under these circumstances - The measure - here had better be brought

100

Judicial Department.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letter;

From the Collector of Godavari District " 26th " 1861, No. 17)

Order Larson 20th November 1899

the public feeling is more
unanimous.

3 Petitions Nos 2713 and 2687
will be lodged.

AW

The Magistrate of the
Prerogative District

European Merchants.

- 1 Messrs R. A. D. Toole
- 2 " L. Gondalphe
- 3 " E. Le Faucheur
- 4 " A. Faciolle
- 5 " A. Burmeister
- 6 " F. G. Simon
- 7 " J. Duffield
- 8 " and J. A. Demisson.

Native Merchants.

- 1 Kilam Thangavulu Kayulu.
- 2 Pandu Ramakrishnaia.
- 3 Orula Syappa Eastulu
- 4 Batulu Ramoia.
- 5 Muttu Kannayya.
- 6 Katkili M. Adhamarayaudu
- 7 Puram Sitarama Swami.
- 8 Pulakurti Subbarayaudu

- 9 ~~Adam~~ ~~Mamit~~ ~~Kiyala~~
- 10 Adam Mamit Kiyala

- 11 Kadambari Jayamatham Secretary
- 12 Pandaru Kongaraiya Head Constable

honorable
will have
some thing

The first five classes represent the wealthy, intelligent, and influential portion of the community. These classes will be the principal payers of any taxes that may be imposed, and they are to be in favor of the Municipal Act being introduced. I can therefore safely affirm that a very large and influential majority of those who will be taxpayers under the Act are in favor of its introduction. I beg to ~~forward~~ ^{forward} the following

names of European and Native Merchants, whom I would recommend to be associated with myself as Commissioners for the purposes of to me by the Merchants themselves, as best representing their interests, and I approve of them.

this was circulated and proclaimed, and all who felt any interest in the matter were invited to subscribe their names thereon as either For or Against the introduction of the Municipal Act.

2. The result is, that by the 8th October 372 parties had signed their names as For, and 204 as Against the measure.

3. On a careful analysis of the assentive and dissentive it is found that they are as under

Classes.	For the introduction of the Municipal Act.	Against the introduction of the Municipal Act.
1 European Merchants.	23	None
2 East Indian Co.	5	None
3 Native Co.	88	19
4 Public & private servants	143	21
5 Maudars and Ryots	22	16
6 Petty handicrafts men	58	60
7 Fisher and boatmen	13	88
	372	204

The

No 19

Godavery District
Magistrate's Office
Cocanada 25th Octob 1864

From James Fraser Esq

Officiating Magistrate of the
Godavery District.

To The Honorable S. J. Subramaniam
Chief Secretary to Government
Fort St George

Sir, With reference to the notification
published in the Fort St George

Gazette of 8th July 1864, regarding the
proposed introduction, into Cocanada
and Jaggermaitpur, of Act XXVI

of 1850 (the Municipal Act), I have
the honor to state that, as prescribed

in para 2 of the notification, a Book
was kept from 8th July at the Sub
Magistrate's Cutchery in Cocanada as
a convenient and central spot, notice of
this

G. D. Ramachandran
H. Clerk

Exc Officio Commissioners.
Civil Surgeon.
Assistant Collector
Master Attendant.

No 2713
7/1864

" I received the enclosed Petition
from Government this morning. The
statements in it are entire and gross
falschroods.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your Most Obedient Servant

J. Fraser
Officiating Magistrate.

Dec 27/1864

list of 6 Dec!

1864
The 1st of Dec
1864

1864
The 1st of Dec
1864

1864
The 1st of Dec
1864

1864
The 1st of Dec
1864

1864
The 1st of Dec
1864

1864
The 1st of Dec
1864

1864
The 1st of Dec
1864

1864
The 1st of Dec
1864

1864
The 1st of Dec
1864

1864
The 1st of Dec
1864

1864
The 1st of Dec
1864

27-1864

235

1697

hit of 6 Dec.

1797

Adm. of 186 . Department

No 1699

PROCEEDINGS OF GOVERNMENT.

Dated 20 December 1862

235. 237.