L. & M.
5,000—5-4-97.

Local & Munl. (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 1656 M

DATED 27-9-98

[Despatch Abstract.]

unicipal limits of Tinnevelly and Palamcottah.

Approving certain modifications suggested by the
llector of Tinnevelly in the proposed ——— and
questing the Collector to submit the necessary
aft notification and a map showing accurately
he revised boundaries -

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

N

Local & Munl. (189) Department.

To lie over pending receipt of the Collector's reply to P.P. No. 908M. dated 29th May 1898.
P.R. 16/7/98.

ABe 18/7/98

CURRENT No. 2334/M

P

Order

From The Residents of Melupalayam

Tinnevelly D.

No.

Dated 29-6-98

Received 11-7-98.

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Protesting against extension of the municipal limits of Palamcottah & Tinnevelly by the inclusion of certain villages belonging to the Melupalayam & Kilamaraganallur Unions

21/9 21/9/7 16-7-98

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
1o	988	Mk	27-5-98

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT.
CURRENT No.....

COURT FEE TWO RUPEES

TO

His Excellency the Right Honourable, the
Governor in council
Fort St. George

CHIEF SECRETARY
-7 JUL 1898
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

The humble memorial of the residents of Melappalayam Tinnevelly Taluq Tinnevelly District.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWTH,

1. Memorialists understand that Your Excellency's Government has under consideration two schemes submitted by the local authorities for extending the limits of the municipalities of Tinnevelly and Palamcottah, one of them being,

(a) To amalgamate both the municipalities into one and extend the boundaries of the amalgamated municipality so as to take in some villages which lie on the banks of the river Thambrapurni which are now included partly in the Melaveeraraghavapuram Union Panchayat and partly in the Kilaveeraraghavapuram Union and also the outlying villages of Pettai in the west, Thachanallur in the north, and Melappalayam in the south east and the other being,

(b) To leave the two municipalities separate but to extend the limits of either, by including within the boundaries of Tinnevelly some villages on the western bank of the Thambrapurni river and some other villages including Melappalayam to the east of the river within the limits of Palamcottah.

2. Both the schemes affect the village of your memorialists and they therefore humbly pray that their objections may be duly considered before any orders are, passed by the Government in the matter.

3. The 1st scheme, though it may look a very bold and attractive idea at first sight, will appear when more closely scrutinized, to be too bold and visionary and calculated to prove a big failure in the actual working thereof. Besides soliciting Your Excellency's attention to the various arguments advanced by the residents of Kailasapuram, Melaveeraraghavapuram &c. in their memorial to Government, your memorialists wish humbly to emphasise that if the scheme should be given effect to, there would arise an extensive municipality about 6 miles long and nearly equally broad, in fact nearly as large as Madras with however a population numerically much smaller and financially much weaker to pay the necessary taxes, and with commissioners with less talents and capacity for municipal administration than are generally available in the metropolis. It has further to be observed that the villages of Melappalayam, Thachanallur and Pettai are nearly $3\frac{1}{2}$ $1\frac{1}{2}$ and 2 miles distant respectively from the present municipal limits and separated therefrom by large areas of paddy fields so as to form, what they really are, naturally distinct townships with no manner of common interests between them. Suffice it further to observe that the extension of the area while not calculated to bring about a proportionate increase of revenue, unless the highly inequitable procedure of taxing the paddy lands is resorted

to, will certainly necessitate a large increase to the present staff of municipal officers and make it impossible to carry on the administration without a highly paid chairman and costly secretaries. In short there will be an unweildy municipality with far greater demands for money and proportionately much weaker resources and necessarily destined in course of time to prove a failure.

4. The scheme looks so very much like a risky adventure that there is already a large body of intelligent, weighty, and responsible local opinion against it and the resolutions carried by majorities by the Municipalities concerned and the District Board were opposed by minorities nearly as large as the majorities and including among others one Divisional officer, one Deputy Collector, some experienced Tahsildars, and the chairman of the Palamcottah Municipality.

5. It is further noteworthy that neither in the District Board nor in the Municipalities in question was there one person who in any manner represented Melapalayam and the other villages similarly situated, whereas the Union Panchayats of Mela Veeraragavapuram and Kila Veeraragavapuram which thoroughly represent some of the villages in question passed unanimous resolutions condemning the amalgamation and extension of the Municipalities.

6. Your memorialists humbly submit under these circumstances that even if the scheme should commend itself to the Government it is better and more prudent to give effect to it gradually in some instalments, leaving Melapalayam and equally remote villages to continue as at present under the sanitary administration of the Uniou Panchayats to which they are attached.

7. With regard to the 2nd scheme your excellency's memorialists humbly submit that even if Tinnevelly should be extended so as to include the some-what wealthy villages of Kailasapuram, Mela Veeraragavapuram, Sanniyasigramam &c., and Palamcottah smilarly extended so as to take in the equally capable villages of Vannarpet and Kokkarakulam, all of which villages are peopled mostly by highly intelligent educated and prosperous public servants and vakils, it is unnecessary and in-expedient to tack on Melappalayam to Palamcottah or to the combind Municipality as it is proposed to be done.

8. Melappalayam under which name memorialists include Melappalayam proper and the adjacent village of Kila Veeraragavapuram is $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles from Palamcottah and as already observed is quite a distinct township with large tracts of paddy fields &c. intervening and having interests quite separate from those of Palamcottah or any other locality. Its needs are different and require separate treatment.

9. It contains about 1,500 houses which with the exception of 2 or 3 houses in each street are all thatched huts very small and poor and quite incapable of paying a large revenue. There are hardly 50 houses which pay more than the minimum Union tax allowed. The revenue derivable under the Municipal system of taxation therefore is not at all likely to answer the Municipal wants of the locality. If the result of the new scheme be to utilize a portion of the Palamcottah Revenue for the purposes of Melappalayam, it is to that extent starving Palamcottah which is already too poor to meet the expenses of necessaryshemes of improvement in sanitation and comfort; if however the resources of Melappa'ayam come to be indented upon in behalf of Palamcottah it is a result which memoria lists cannot too emphatically protest against and Government is bound to obviate. Left to

itself Melappalayam may improve without involving any hardship to its inhabitants but tacked on to a large town like Palamcottah, or to the combind Munieipalitity it will have to pay like its richer neigh-bours and get treated like the very weak factor that it is.

10. The situation of Melappalayam is favourable to its sanitation being improved without great cost. It is pretty high in level and has vast open space available for building purposes. The streets are very broad and the soil healthy- There is scope for free passage of breezes, and drain water naturally escapes with ease into the surroundings. The Palayem channel which is full for 9 months in the year supplies water to the village and the river Thambarapurani is but a half a mile from the village. Good wells are available and more can be sunk at the cost of the Union and of private individuals also. No artificial scheme for the supply of water is necessary and it would neither be possible to create such a scheme so as to cover Palamcottah and also Melapalayam which is $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles away from it. No more than a simple systematic course of drains is necessary and this is possible to be brought about at a small expense within the limits of the capacity of Panchayat administration. Thus it is unnecessary to subject Melappalayam to costly Municipal administration.

11. Almost all the inhabitants of the village are poor weavers. They do their work in the streets under the shade of long avenues of trees planted and grown by them for the purpose, and except when it rains they practically live in the street, their houses being very small. Their implements and materials of work often lie on the pials and in the streets and no one man's work is an inconvenience or nuisance to another as all of them are weavers and the inhabitants from one end of the street to the other combine and weave jointly. This description applies not to one street but to all. Thus the inhabitants have an indefeasible prescriptive right to the use of the street for their professional purposes in the manner described and it is submitted that Municipal administration will involve great interference with such rights. The lower ranks of the Police whose operations are a necessary adjunct to Municipal administration are likely to interfere greatly and unnecessarily with the legitimate right of the people without any corresponding advantage to anybody.

12. It is said that the Palayam channel which runs along the outskirt of the village of Melappalayam is contaminated by its inhabitants who allow the drainage to get into the channel. If the charge were true, it might be asserted against every other village which is situated on its banks, and the remedy proposed, namely of introducing municipal administration, would have to be extended to a dozen other villages, higher up the channel. It is not however true to any great extent, for it is only one out of twenty streets at Melapalayam, which adjoins the channel. To prevent the backyards of the western row of houses in that one street from sending their drainage into the channel a Union Panchayat ought to be quite competent financially and otherwise to devise measures. It is really too big and costly a remedy to introduce a municipality for such a small purpose.

13. With regard to the large blocks of wet land which intervene, nothing can be more unfair than to subject the proprietors of those lands, many of whom are residents outside the limits of the proposed municipality, to a tax three times as much as the local fund cess, and memorialists beg in this connection to draw the attention

of Your Excellency's Government to the following extract from the collector's letter to you on the subject.

"Their (the villages of Melanatham and Kulavanikapuram) exclusion has the effect of excluding from municipal limits a very large block of wet lands, which they with Kilaveeraragavapuram and Melaveeraragavapuram encircle. The inclusion of the large block of land—all double crop compounded wet, paying an average assessment of Rs 18 per acre would, besides to some extent hampering the municipal adminis tration, throw a heavy burden on the land-owners in the shape of municipal land-tax which is on an average treble the landcess paid by them with no compensatiug advanta ges to them".

15. The Memorialists beg humbly to observe that the argument is a sound one and applies as much to Melapalayam and kila Viraragavapuram, as to the two villages recommended to be excluded. The suggestion of the collector to exclude the wet lands themselves and make the municipality reach across to the village of Melapalayam is a queer idea, which at least involves the inconvenience of subjecting some of the lands at any rate to municipal tax. Besides in the face of the argument quoted above, the suggestion is a special plea, for the inclusion of Melapalayam. As for the subcommitee, which recommended extension of the municipal limits they were, as admitted by the Collector, under a misapprehension that the Nanja lands are not liable to tax under the Municipal law. But for this, Memorialists submit that the committee would not have recommended the said extension. Resident land owners would many of them have to pay the land tax in addition to the Municipal house-tax and absentee land holders would be liable to pay without absolutely any advantage to them.

16. As already observed, Melapalayam does not require any drainage system or water works, but yet the Municipal act will not allow it any exemption from drainage and water tax, when-ever that should be imposed for the sake of Tinnevelly and Palamcottah, which necessarily require the said conveviences.

17. Memorialists have reasons to believe that the Head Quarter Deputy Collector has recommended the inclusion of Melapalayam to Palamcottah on the ground that the result would be a larger Municipality with sufficient income to entertain a Municipal secretary, which Palamcottah is not now able to employ. Whether a Municipal secretary is a blessing or not, it is certainly not just or expedient to give one to Palamcottah by taxing Melapalayam.

18. To sum up, the resolution of the Municipalities of Tinnevelly and Palam cottah are neither unanimous nor dis interested; the opinion of the District Board is also divided as twelve against eleven, one member having abstained from voting; and, what is more, there was not a single representative of Melapalayam on the Board. It would have been interesting to have taken the opinion of the members of the Tinnevelly Taluq Board among whom there are some representatives of villages affected by the amal gamation proposal and a number of whom are acquainted with the wants and conditions of such villages.

19. The Sub Commitee which has made the recommendation, has been in error on a most material point and was itself not representative, to any the least extent, of the villages concerned. The Union Panchayat, which are thoroughly representative

of the villages have pronounced against the proposed scheme and Memorialists humbly beg to observe that the Collector himself has recommended the exclusion of Melapalayam and Kilaveeraragavapuram. In his letter above referred to the Collector says as follows:— "I must also add that I am not convinced that the addition of Kilaveeraragavapuram and Melapalayam either to the Palamcottah Municipality or to the combined Municipality is entirely desirable. These village sites which form one compact area lie at a considerable distance away from the rest of the area proposed to be added to Municipal limits and off the main road and would therefore be some-what difficult to supervise. With due deference to Mr. G. S. Forbes's opinion, I submit that they do not form such an important centre of trade as Pettai, a few of the inhabitants are wealthy, but the bulk are poor Muhamedan weavers. It is true that they lie on the bank of the Palayam channel and therefore influence the sanitation of Palamcottah but they are themselves high, dry, and purely healthy places and the contamination of the channel can to a large extent be avoided by stricter attention to sanitation on the part of the Union Panchayet. I would therefore divide the Kilaveeraragavapuram Union by taking away from it the hamlet of Kokkarakulam which can be conveniently attached to Palamcottah or to the combined Municipality and leave the remainder to be administered by the Union Panchayet."

20. Even if it were necessary to increase the funds available for the sanitary administration of Melapalayam, Memorialists would rather suggest a moderate increase to their taxes under the Panchayat administration than the very large increase of tax incidental to the introduction of Municipal administration. In this connection memorialists would observe that such moderate increase of tax may be made possible by the amendment of the Local Boards Act, whose revision seems to be under discussion,

21. In conclusion memorialists pray that the village of Melapalayam and Kilaviraragavapuram may be allowed to remain as a Union instead of being included within Municipal limits.

N. B. It is prayed that any orders or other Communications which the Government may think fit to make to Memorialists may be sent to M.R.Ry K. R. Gurusami Aiyar Avl B.a B.L. Vakil. Tinnevelly Ry Stn.

NAME OF VILLAGE.

கிராமத்தின் பெயர்.

Serial Number. வரிசை நம்பர்.	Signature of the Head of a family. குடும்பத்தின் முக்கியஸ்தன் கையெழுத்து.	Occupation. உத்தியோகம் அல்லது ஜீவனம்.
1		விவசாயம்
2		விவசாயம்
3		விவசாயம்
4		விவசாயம்
5		சொல்லுதிவரை
6		விவசாயம்
7		விவசாயம்
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		

NAME OF VILLAGE.

இராமத்தின் பெயர்.

Serial Number. வரிசை நம்பர்.	Signature of the Head of a family. குடும்பத்தின் முக்கியஸ்தன் கையெழுத்து.	Occupation. உத்தியோகம் அல்லது ஜீவனம்.	

NAME OF VILLAGE.

கிராமத்தின் பெயர்.

Serial Number. வரிசை நம்பர்.	Signature of the Head of a family. குடும்பத்தின் முக்கியஸ்தன் கையெழுத்து.	Occupation. உத்தியோகம் அல்லது ஜீவனம்.

NAME OF VILLAGE.

கிராமத்தின் பெயர்.

Serial Number. வரிசை நம்பர்.	Signature of the Head of a family. குடும்பத்தின் முக்கியஸ்தன் கையெழுத்து.	Occupation. உத்தியோகம் அல்லது ஜீவனம்.

NAME OF VILLAGE.

கிராமத்தின் பெயர்.

Serial Number. வரிசை நம்பர்.	Signature of the Head of a family. குடும்பத்தின் முக்கியஸ்தன் கையெழுத்து.	Occupation. உத்தியோகம் அல்லது ஜீவனம்.	

NAME OF VILLAGE.

கிராமத்தின் பெயர்.

Serial Number. வரிசை நம்பர்.	Signature of the Head of a family. குடும்பத்தின் முக்கியஸ்தன் கையெழுத்து.	Occupation. உத்தியோகம் அல்லது ஜீவனம்.	

NAME OF VILLAGE.

கிராமத்தின் பெயர்.

Serial Number. வரிசை நம்பர்.	Signature of the Head of a family. குடும்பத்தின் முக்கியஸ்தன் கையெழுத்து.	Occupation. உத்தியோகம் அல்லது ஜீவனம்.
—		
—		
—		
—		
—		
—		

The Humble
memorial of
the Residents of
Mulaphalungam
Tuticorin Taluq
Tinnevelly District

Local & Munl. (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 2872 W

Order A

From The Collector of Tuticorin

Ref. in Cur. Pro. No. 420/98.

Dated 28th July 1898.
Rec'd 30th

Received 1 AUG 1898

Registered

Enclosures One plan.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting the report called for in G.O. 988 Mun. dt. 27th May 1898 regarding the extension of the Tuticorin Municipality.

8/8. 8/8

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Tinnevelly DISTRICT COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,

Rom Cur No. 420 /98 28th july 1898

G.O. 1gen Enc: a/s plan Lands & Deputy. Camp Kuttalam.

FROM A. to. B. Higgens, Esquire,

COLLECTOR OF THE

Tinnevelly District,

168

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT.
CURRENT No. 2572-16.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

Local + Municipal DEPARTMENT,

Madras.

SIR,

Referring to G. O. No 988 M. Miscellaneous dated 27th May 1898, I have the honor to return the rough map and to report that, after consultation with the divisional officer and personal inspection, I am of opinion that while, for the reason given by — Government, viz. the conservancy of the Palayam channel, it is desirable to include in the limits of Palamcottah Municipality the villages of Kulavanikapuram, Kilaviraraghavapuram and Melapalayam and a portion of Melanattam, i.e., the Paicheri which adjoins the channel, there is no necessity to include the main village site of Melanattam, which

Tinnevelly DC 829-6-98

does not adjoin the channel. The water which issues from the Palayam channel in Melanattam village runs northwards through the fields and past the main village site of Melanattam to the Vambrapunni river. No drainage from the main village site of Melanattam can therefore enter the Palayam channel. Moreover the main village site of Melanattam is nearly half a mile from the channel, and its conservancy would thus be even more difficult for the Chairman or his subordinates to supervise than that of Melapalayam and the Pacheri of Melanattam which adjoins it. I have marked the Pacheri on the rough map. A small Pacheri of Melapalayam lies to the southeast of Road No VI. This also I have marked in the map and propose to include in Municipal limits.

2. On further inspection, it occurs to me that it will after all be best to include Sikkinaradayan gramam within the limits of Tinnevelly Municipality. It is not different in kind from the other hamlets of Melavikkaraghavapuram which adjoin the river, and it includes a chattram of considerable size and a bathing ghat known as Kunkuthorai, which is much frequented by the inhabitants of Tinnevelly town, and which, with the roads approaching it, it is desirable to keep under Municipal control. With the permission of Government I therefore desire to withdraw my recommendation for the exclusion of Sikkinaradayan ~~gramam~~ gramam from Tinnevelly Municipality.

3. If the present proposals are approved by Government, I request the favour of the return of the rough map so that a more accurate map may be made and a description of boundaries for the new Municipal limits may be prepared and submitted for approval and publication with the necessary notifications.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant
[illegible]
Collector

Compd. RC 29/1/58 DO Nil 29-1-58

re-constitution of the municipal limits of Tinnevelly and Palamcottah

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

5]
27-5-95.

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

1

2

1988

Main G.O., ~~dated~~ No. 988 M ~~189~~, ~~No.~~ of 27-5-98.

Current No. 2334M of 189~~8~~, dated

Current No. 2572M of 189~~8~~, dated

from the residents of Melappalayam.

from the Collr of Tinnevelly.

This Order. No. 1656 M mis of 27.9.98

The modifications suggested by the Collector in the extension of the Municipal limits of Tinnevelly and Palamcottah, proposed in paragraph 3 of the Government order read above, are approved. The Collector is requested to submit the necessary draft notifications under Section 48 of the District Municipalities Act and a map showing accurately the boundaries of these two towns as proposed to be extended.

V.R
7/9/98

1998

To

The Collector of Tinnevelly.

With a map returned
Despd 29/9/98

BACK PAPERS

...n given for copying ——
...n copied 73 ——
...n examined ——
...n signed ——
} 189

...AIN G.O., No. , DATED
189 .

...ENT No.

...CLOSURES TO C. No.

...DER OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .. A A A A A A A

...BER OF GOVERNMENT.

...MENT WITH DITTO.

...PERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.

BACK PAPERS

2-10-35 HI

C.F. 73.

DEPARTMENT.

Paper taken out of the Records from the charge of the Referencer.

~~Press~~ / ~~Miscellaneous~~ / ~~Routine~~ No. 165 M, dated 26-9-1898.

Date taken out.	For what purpose.			Initials of clerk taking the paper or of attender.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			
1-10-35	In Q B III	10780	35	[illegible]	11-6-36	[illegible]