[L & M.
1,000—22-4-96.]

Local & Munl. (189) Department.

PRINTED.

G.O., No. 1632 M

DATED 4-11-99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Municipal limits

Approving with remarks the alterations proposed in the —— of Palamcottah & Tinnevelly, ordering the publication in the Fort St. George & the Tinnevelly Dt. Gazettes of the necessary notifications regarding the alterations in the municipal limits of the former town & requesting the Collector to submit a revised notification in regard to the alterations in the municipal limits of the latter

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Cmo 421 M/00							
Cmo 591 M/00							

Prst
13/11

HDA

Government (1899) of Madras.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL.

Proof for approval

Strike off as amended
V.R. 13/11/99

TKA
11/11

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

G.O., No. 1632 M., 4th November 1899.

NOVEMBER.

Municipal Limits.

Approving, with remarks, the alterations proposed in the — of Palamcottah and Tinnevelly, ordering the publication in the Fort St. George and the Tinnevelly District Gazettes of the necessary notifications regarding the alterations in the municipal limits of the former town, and requesting the Collector to submit a revised notification in regard to the alterations in the municipal limits of the latter.

M. Srinivasa Iyengar

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—again the following paper:—

G.O., No. 983 M., dated 12th July 1899.

Abstract.—Approving, with remarks, the alterations proposed in the municipal limits of Tinnevelly and Palamcottah, and ordering the publication of the necessary notifications in the Fort St. George and the Tinnevelly District Gazettes.

Read—also the following papers:—

From the inhabitants of Sindupundurai village, ~~Tinnevelly taluk, Tinnevelly district~~, dated 30th December 1898.

Abstract.—Praying that in consideration of their poverty their village may not be included within the limits of the proposed extension of the Tinnevelly Municipality.

From J. P. BEDFORD, Esq., Acting Collector of Tinnevelly, to the Secretary to Government, Local and Municipal Department, dated 12th August 1899, R.D. No. 13-Eng.

With reference to Government endorsement No. 561, dated 15th May 1899, I have the honour to report that the petitioners appear to be really poor people living by daily labour. The hamlet of Sindupundurai which they occupy is isolated and very little income will ever be derived from it, whilst its inclusion within the union limits must always be a source of considerable expense. I am, therefore, of opinion that the petitioners' request to exclude their hamlet from the proposed extension of the Tinnevelly Municipality is reasonable and may be complied with, and the boundary of the proposed municipality altered accordingly.

2. The enclosure received with the order under reply is returned herewith.

From J. P. BEDFORD, Esq., Acting Collector of Tinnevelly, to the Secretary to Government, Local and Municipal Department, dated 3rd September 1899, Ref. on Cur. No. 47-G. B. Eng.

With reference to paragraph 3 of G.O., No. 983 M., dated 12th July 1899, I have the honour to report that the notification regarding the extension of the Tinnevelly and Palamcottah Municipalities was published in the District Gazette, dated 1st September 1899.

From P. M. KAILASAM PILLAI, Chairman, Municipal Council, Tinnevelly, to the Secretary to Government, Local and Municipal Department, dated 11th September 1899.

With reference to the notification published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 22nd August 1899, proposing to alter the limits of the Tinnevelly Municipality, I have the honour to submit that the subject was placed before the Council at this day's meeting and that the Council is of opinion that the portion of the Kurukkuthurai road, survey Nos. 628, 637, 672 and 674 of the Tinnevelly village, should be added to the Tinnevelly Municipality, and should be made to form Block No. VI.

~~Govt. Memorandum~~ Endorsement No. 561. dated 15th May 1899.

Referred to the Collector of Tinnevelly for remarks.

(Signed) A. Edgington.
Ag. Asst. Secretary

The eastern boundary of the Tinnevelly Block No. II comes up to the starting point of the Kurukkuthurai road and the western boundary of the Melaviraraghavapuram Sindupundurai Block No. III includes a portion of the Kurukkuthurai road, up to the western end of survey No. 731. The portion of the road referred to above forming survey Nos. 628, 637, 672 and 674 is left out. It is a very important road and is very largely used by the people of this town for going to and returning from the river, besides being used for going to very many other places. It is used largely in all parts of the year, and in summer seasons crowds of people make use of it at all times of the day. Seeing that this road is close to the Tinnevelly Block and connects it with Block No. III, and seeing that it is very largely used by the people of this town, the Council thinks that this should be under the direct control of the Municipal Council.

I have therefore the honour to request that the Government will be pleased to consider this point favourably, and to alter the limits of the Tinnevelly Municipality as suggested by the Council. A copy of the resolution is herewith forwarded.

Endt. R. Dis. No. 56-Eng.

Forwarded.

Should Government think fit to adopt the suggestion of the Council, the wet lands on both sides of it should be excluded. I doubt myself whether it is worth while making any alteration at this stage.

(Signed) J. P. BEDFORD,
Acting Collector.

4th October 1899.

From the Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor, dated 7th October 1899.

Abstract.—Transferring a petition, dated 27th September 1899, from the inhabitants of Melaviraraghavapuram Union, ~~Tinnevelly~~, praying that the scheme for the extension of the municipal limits of Palamcottah and Tinnevelly may not be carried out.

Order—No. 1632 M., dated 4th November 1899.

The Government considers that the objections raised in the last of the papers read above against the proposed alterations in the municipal limits of Palamcottah and Tinnevelly are not valid. The proposed alterations in the municipal limits of the former town are accordingly approved, and the following notification will be published in the Fort St. George and the Tinnevelly District Gazettes:—

NOTIFICATION.

In exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (3) of section 4-A of the Madras District Municipalities Act IV of 1884, as amended by Act III of 1897, and in modification of all previous notifications on the subject, His Excellency the Governor in Council is pleased to declare that the boundaries of the Palamcottah Municipality shall, from the date of the publication of this notification, be as follows:—

Block No. I, Palamcottah-Melapalayam Block.

Northern Boundary.—(*Note.*—This boundary lies wholly within Palamcottah village.)

Starting from the south-western corner of survey No. 347, eastward along the southern boundary of (so as to exclude) survey Nos 347, 364, 365, 382 and 383; thence southward along the western boundary of (so as to exclude) survey Nos. 403 and 404; thence eastward along the southern boundary of (so as to exclude) survey Nos. 404, 405, 434-C, 467, 468 and 469-A; thence northward along the western boundary of (so as to include) survey Nos. 469-B, 470, 471 and 506; thence eastward along the northern boundary of (so as to include) survey Nos. 506 and 505; thence southward along the eastern boundary of (so as to include) survey Nos. 505, 945, 508 and 510 across survey No. 511 (Palayam channel) and along the eastern boundary of (so as to include) survey Nos. 512 and 513; thence eastward along the northern boundary of survey No. 582 (Vettukalkulam tank) of Palamcottah village up to its north-eastern corner.

3/

Eastern Boundary.—Starting from the north-eastern corner of survey No. 582 (Vettukal-kulam tank), southward along the eastern boundary of the same number across survey No. 655 (road to Sivalapperi) and along the eastern margin of (so as to include) survey Nos. 654, 655 and 656; thence westward and southward along the northern and the western boundary of survey No. 666 (Prandankulam tank) of Palamcottah village; thence across the road to Tiruchendur; thence eastward along the southern margin of (so as to exclude) the same road up to the north-eastern corner stone of the old military cantonment; thence southward along the eastern boundary of the old military cantonment up to its south-eastern corner stone.

Southern Boundary.—Starting from the south-eastern corner of the old military cantonment, westward along its southern boundary till it meets the north-eastern corner of survey No. 392; thence westward in a straight line along the northern boundary of (so as to exclude) survey Nos. 392, 401, 402, 409, 410, 433 and 434 till it meets the eastern limit of survey No. 436 at a point 175 links from its north-eastern corner; thence westward in a straight line across survey Nos. 436, 437, 460, 461, 462, 464, 465, 466 and 950 till it meets the point where the road to Nánguneri (No. V) and the road to Kalladakurichi (No. VI) bifurcate; thence south-westward along the southern margin of (so as to include) that road (survey Nos. 357, 356 and 355 of Kulavanikapuram and 348 and 387 of Kilaviraraghavapuram village and 90 of Mélappálaiyam village) up to where it touches the surplus weir of Kannimarkulam tank in Mélappálaiyam village; thence southward along the bund of that tank up to the north western corner of survey No. 89; thence round (so as to include) survey Nos 89 and 88 (Palla quarters) up to the south-western corner of survey No. 88; thence westward across survey No. 90 (road No. VI) and along the southern boundary of survey No. 163; thence northward along the western boundary of the same number; thence westward along the northern boundary of (so as to exclude) survey No. 169 (Chettikulam tank) up to the south-western corner of survey No. 175; thence northward along the western boundary of survey Nos. 175 and 170; thence westward along the southern boundary of survey Nos. 152 and 179 and across the Palayam channel up to the south-eastern corner of survey No. 2/2 of Mélappálaiyam village.

9/

Western Boundary.—Starting from the south-eastern corner of survey No. 292 of Mélappálaiyam village, eastward along the outer margin of (so as to include) the left bank of the Palayam channel up to the south-western corner of survey No. 462; thence round (so as to include) survey No. 462 (mosque inam wet); thence northward and westward along the outer margin of (so as to include) the left bank of the Palayam channel up to the south-eastern corner of survey No. 163 (Palla quarters) of Melanatham village; thence round that number (so as to include it) up to its north-eastern corner; thence again along the outer margin of (so as to include) the left bank of the Palayam channel up to the south-eastern corner of survey No. 358 of Kilaviraraghavapuram village; thence northward along the western boundary of survey No. 142 (road No. VI-A) and eastward along the northern boundary of that number up to the south-eastern corner of survey No. 195; thence round (so as to include) survey Nos. 362, 366, 363, 367, 365, 364, 388 and 389 (Agraharam) to the south-western corner of survey No. 389 of Kilaviraraghavapuram village; thence eastward along the outer margin of (so as to include) the left bank of the Palayam channel up to the north-eastern corner of survey No. 216 of Kulavanikapuram village; thence round (so as to include) survey Nos. 215, 208 and 206 (Palla quarters) of the same village to the northern corner of the last survey number; thence again along the outer margin of (so as to include the left bank of the Palayam channel) up to the south-western corner of survey No. 199 of Palamcottah village; thence round (so as to include) the following survey numbers of Palamcottah village lying to the west of the Palayam channel and to the south of the trunk road between Tinnevelly and Palamcottah survey Nos. 199, 198, 197, 200, 202, 203, 204, 101, 100, 99, 98, 207, 915-A, 914, 919, 913, 912, 911, 910, 908 and 907 to the north-western corner of survey No. 907; thence across the said trunk road and thence eastward along the southern boundary of (so as to exclude) survey Nos. 875, 862, 860 and 846; thence round (so as to include) survey No. 844; thence eastward along the northern boundary of (so as to include) survey Nos. 909, 215 and 225 up to the south-western corner of survey No. 231; thence northward along the western boundary of (so as to include) survey Nos. 231 and 230; thence eastward along the northern boundary of (so as to include) survey Nos. 230 and 227; thence northward along the eastern boundary of (so as to exclude) survey Nos. 228 and 305; thence eastward across survey No. 396 (Vellakoil road) and along the northern boundary of survey No. 414 (Mulikulam tank) up to the south-eastern corner of survey No. 307; thence northward along the eastern boundary of (so as to exclude) survey Nos. 307, 332, 331, 330 and 329 up to the south-western corner of survey No. 347 of Palamcottah village.

BLOCK No. II, KOKKARAKULAM-VANNARPET BLOCK.

Northern Boundary.—The northern boundary of Palamcottah village from the north-western corner of survey No. 12 to the north-eastern corner of survey No. 1.

Eastern Boundary.—Starting from the north-eastern corner of survey No. 1, southward along the eastern boundary of survey Nos. 1 and 2 up to the north-western corner of survey No. 892; thence westward across survey No. 2 and along the northern boundary of survey Nos. 5 and 6; thence southward along the eastern boundary of survey No. 26; thence eastward along the northern boundary of survey Nos. 36 and 35; thence southward along the eastern boundary of survey Nos. 35, 38, 49, 48 and 47 and across survey No. 66 (trunk road between Palamcottah and Tinnevelly) up to the north-eastern corner of survey No. 72; thence westward along the southern boundary of survey No. 66 up to the north-eastern corner of survey No. 70 (Gnanamani Ammal chattram); thence southward along the eastern boundary of survey No. 70; thence westward along the southern boundary of survey Nos. 70 and 67 up to the north-western corner of survey No. 68 of Palamcottah village; thence southward along the eastern boundary of (so as to include) survey No. 115 of Kilaviraraghavapuram village (road No. VI-A) up to the point where it turns west.

Southern Boundary.—(*Note.*—This boundary lies wholly within Kilaviraraghavapuram village.)

Starting from survey No. 115 (road No. VI-A) where it turns west-westward along the southern boundary of the same number up to the north-eastern corner of survey No. 113; thence southward along the eastern boundary of that number and across survey No. 12 up to the north-eastern corner of survey No. 10; thence westward along the northern boundary of survey Nos. 10 and 11; then southward along the eastern boundary of survey No. 13; thence westward along the southern boundary of the same number and across survey No. 61 (Odai); thence southward along the eastern boundary of survey No 110; thence westward along the southern boundary of the same number and survey No. 109 (road No. VI-A); thence southward along the eastern boundary of survey Nos. 78 and 76; thence westward along the southern boundary of (so as to include) survey Nos 76, 77 and 79; thence northward along the western boundary of survey No. 79; thence westward along the southern boundary of (so as to include) survey No. 103 up to its south-western corner.

Western Boundary.—Starting from the south-western corner of survey No. 103 of Kilaviraraghavapuram village, northward along the western boundary of that number up to its north-western corner; thence north-eastward along the western boundary of Kilaviraraghavapuram village up to the north-western corner of survey No. 121 of that village; and thence along the western boundary of Palamcottah village up to the north-western corner of survey No. 12 of that village.

BLOCK No. III.

The portion of the trunk road between Tinnevelly and Palamcottah comprising survey No. 902 and a portion of survey No. 66 of Palamcottah village.

e/

2. The Collector's proposal to exclude the Parchari of the Sindupundurai village from the proposed extension of the Tinnevelly Municipality and the suggestion of the Municipal Council of Tinnevelly to include within the municipal limits of that town the portion of the Kurukkuthurai road specified by it, excluding the adjoining wet lands, are approved. The Collector is requested to submit a revised notification defining the boundaries of this municipality as now altered.

3. The Superintendent, Government Press, will print the required number of copies of the notification in paragraph 1 *supra* in English and supply them to the Collector for circulation with the District Gazette.

(True Extract.)

for *Ag. Secretary to Government.*

To the Chairman, Municipal Council, Palamcottah.
" " " Tinnevelly.
" Collector of Tinnevelly.
" Superintendent, Government Press.
Gazette.

Exd. A. F. Eccleston

Curr^t. 537/-'84.

2 abstracts

1 - JUN.

Local & Munl. (1899) Department.

To lie over pending receipt of the draft notification for the alteration of the municipal limits of Tinnevelly called for from the Collector in G.O. No. 1656 M. dated 27th September 1898.

24/1/99

CURRENT No. 40 M

From

The Inhabitants of Seindupoothurai Village Tinnevelly Taluk, Tinnevelly Dt.

No.

Dated 30-12-98

Received 4-1-99

Registered 5-1-99

Enclosures nil

Spare copies "

TO BE RETURNED WITH REPLY.

~~Order~~ No. 561 of 15-5-99

Referred to the Collector of Tinnevelly for remarks.

(By order)

A. Edgington

Ag. Assistant Secretary

11-5-99

To the Collector of Tinnevelly

SUBJECT.

Praying that in consideration of their poverty their village may not be included within the limits of the proposed extension of the Tinnevelly municipality.

2071

P. Private Secretary

BACK PAPERS

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Ro	1656	L	27-9-98
do	988	L	27-5-98

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department	Date.

COURT FEE INDIA TWO RUPEES 2 Rs

572
10
31-12-98

CHIEF SECRETARY
[illegible] JAN. 18[illegible]
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT.
40 M

To

His Excellancy the Governor in Counil
Fort Saint George.

The humble petition of the undersigned Pallars of Seindupoonthurai village Tinnevelly Taluq Tinnevelly District
Most respectfully Showeth;

That the petitioners are very poor inhabitants of the above said village living from hand to mouth by daily labour.

2. That they hear that the village in which they live, is proposed to be included within the limits of the proposed extension of the Tinnevelly municipality.

3. The poor petitioners most humbly request that in consideration of their poverty, your Excellancy will be pleased to exclude, at least the patcharie habitation of the petitioners, from the municipal limits.

30-12-98

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Forwarded to the Assistant Collector in charge of the head qrs Division for report as to the actual condition of the petitioners and their ability to pay the municipal taxes.

[illegible]
31-5-99

Collector

WR

Local & Munl. (1899) Department.

N

To lie over until the expiry of the period of six weeks referred to in Notification No. 2 printed on page 12 of G.O. No. 983 M, dated 12th July 1899.

WR
2.9.99

ale
4/9/99.

CURRENT No. 2198 M

Order

From

The A.C. Collector of Tinnevelly.

R.Dis **No.** 73/Exptl d/12.8.99.

Dated 12. VIII. 99.

Received 16 AUG. 1899

Registered 17th

Enclosures G.O. No. 40 M 9.9.9 returned

Spare copies nil.

SUBJECT.

Reporting on the exclusion of the Pacheri, a hamlet of Tachanallur from the proposed extension of the Tinnevelly Municipality.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

UR

Aur 175 / 8183

Local & M[illegible]l. (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 2471 M

From

The Chairman,
Muni. Council,
Tinnevelly.

No. 542

Dated 11th Sept. 99

Received 18 SEP 1899

Registered —

Enclosures 1

Spare copies nil

~~Order~~ No. 1026 d/ 29-9-99

1 OCT. 1899
TINNEVELLY

Referred to the Collector of Tinnevelly for remarks.

(By order)

A Edgington
Ag Assistant Secretary.

UR
22.9.99

SUBJECT.

Requesting that a certain portion of the Kurukkuturai road may be added to the Tinnevelly Municipality.

To

The Collector of Tinnevelly –

12/9

Private Secretary

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

---

7 abstract

Local & Munl. (1899) Departmen

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
10-OCT-1899
LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

CURRENT No. 2666

From

H. A. Stuart Esquire I.C.S.
Private Secretary to
H.E. the Governor

Order

No.

Dated 7th October 1899.
Received 12th ——
Registered 13th ——
Enclosures 1
Spare copies nil

SUBJECT.

Transfers a petition dated 27th September 1899 from the inhabitants of Méla Viraraghavapuram Union Tinnevelly, praying that the scheme for the ~~ex~~ extension of the municipal limits of Palamcottah and Tinnevelly may not be carried out.

(By order)

Private Secretary

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
-	1656	mis	27-9-98

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Tinnevelly Ry Station

27" September 1898.

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT.
[illegible] No. 2666 M

To

His Excellency The Governor in Council

Fort St George

Humble memorial of the undersigned inhabitants of Melaveeraraghavapuram

Respectfully sheweth:-

That the memorialists understand from a notification in the Fort St George Gazette that the limits of the Tinneve and Palamcottah Municipalities are to be extended up to the Tambrapor River.

2. The memorialists humbly beg to object to the said course and reque that your Excellency may be pleas to consider again the memorial -

Submitted on this Subject* last year copy of which is herein enclosed.

*Vi/s 988M / 27·5·98 87 Leg L

3. The memorialists further beg to submit that, as it is in contemplation to amend the Local Boards Act, it is desirable that it may be first ascertained whether the ends desired to be accomplished by the extension of the municipal limits, may not be attained by introducing new provisions in the Local Boards amendment Bill and allowing the Union to continue for a few years more so that it may be seen whether under the aid of the new Law sufficient improvement could not be effected.

4. The Revenue of Union may be increased by introducing a provision in the new Bill authorising the Levy of a graduated house tax upon big buildings instead of the paltry sum of Rs 5 now levied from them.

The memorialists humbly pray that the Scheme for the extension of the municipal limits of Palamcottah and Tinnevelly may not be carried out.

சொக்கலிங்கம்

V Chockalingam Pillai

28--9--99

To

THE RIGHT HONORABLE
THE GOVERNOR-IN-COUNCIL
FORT ST. GEORGE.

Humble Memorial of the residents of 1 Kailasapuram 2. Mela Viraragavapuram, 3. Sanniasigramam, 4. Sikkanarasyan Gramam, 5. Minakshipuram, 6. Sinthupunthurai, 7. Vannarpet, 8. Kokkarakulam, 9. Kurichi 10. Melapalyam & 11. Melanathaam villages, Tinnevelly Taluk, Tinnevelly District.

Most Respectfully Showeth,

i. That the memorialists are given to understand that the District authorities have recommended to your Excellency's Government

Either

(1) that the two Municipalities of Tinnevelly and Palamcottah may be amalgamated into a single Municipality and the above mentioned villages may be included within it.

or (2) that the areas of the Tinnevelly and Palamcottah Municipalities may be extended by including within the area of the former the first six of the above-mentioned villages which are situated on the western bank of the Tambraparni river, and incorporating with the latter the last five of the said villages which are situated on the eastern bank of the same river.

ii. As either of the aforesaid schemes is likely to vitally affect the interests of the memorialists they crave permission to submit the undermentioned circumstances for the consideration of your Excellency's Government before passing any order in the matter.

iii. The introduction of Municipality must be shewn either to be necessary or advantageous to the villages in question before their incorporation into Municipal limits may be justified. The following circumstances will shew that there is neither necessity nor advantage.

iv. Of the abovementioned villages 1. Kailasapuram 2. Melaviraragavapuram 3. Sanniasigramam 4. Sikkanarasyangramam 5. Minatchipuram 6. Sinthupunthurai 7. Vannarpet form at present a Local Fund Union styled Melaviraragapuram Union; and 1. Kokkarkulam 2. Kurchi 3. Melapaliam 4. Melanatham, form another by name Kilaviraragavapuram Union. The sanitary arrangements of all the villages are well looked after by the Panchayets of the respective Unions. The state of the villages is sufficiently satisfactory from a sanitary point of view. The streets have been properly metalled and are kept in a far better condition than

1/2666/Mu/99

those in the two Municipal towns of Tinnevelly and Palamcottah. There is already sufficient outlet of water &c. falling into these villages and there is no necessity at all for making artificial arrangements for drainage. The close proximity of the river secures to the villages ample supply of drinking water. Scavengers are employed by the Unions to clean the streets daily and to remove sewage water. The system of private scavengering is being gradually introduced and promises to become a complete success. Thus all the advantages that can be secured by placing the said villages under Municipal Councils viz., Proper drainage, supply of drinking water improved village site, and scavengering system are already enjoyed by the memorialists without subjecting themselves to the extra-taxation incidental to Municipal institutions. There is also a Local Fund Dispensary at Melaviraragavapuram which amply meets the need for medical aid for the inhabitants of these villages. The memorialists understand that the Collector has reported to your Excellency's Government that the Panchayets 'with their limited resources cannot provide these villages with that highly developed sanitary system which these villages require and which can be secured under the District Municipalities Act'. With due deference to the Collector's opinion the memorialists beg to submit that the sanitary arrangements made by the Panchayets are quite up to the mark and leave nothing to be desired in the way of sanitary improvements. Any further improvements which may be desirable to be made may be effected through the agency of the existing Unions, whose funds may be increased if necessary,by so amending the Local Boards Act as to provide for graduated house-tax.

v. While there is thus no advantage likely to be gained by including the villages within Municipal limits, there is every thing to lose by the adoption of any of the alternative proposals before your Excellency's Governments.

vi. The proposal to have a single Municipality for Tinnevelly and Palamcottah and all the intervening villages will, if adopted, bring into existence a big Municipality $6\frac{1}{2}$ miles from east to west and $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles from north to south. (vide Resolution No. 15 Proceedings of the Tinnevelly District Board dated 18th October 1897). The said Municipality will comprise within it 2 distinct towns situated at a distance of $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles from each other, and a number of villages situate apart and distant from the said towns (vide plan submitted to Government by the District authorities). It will be necessary to maintain costly establishments in all departments in order to cope with the work devolving upon such a big institution. A big high road requiring abont 4000 ₨ for its annual upkeep and lighting, a Local Fund dispensary at Mela Veeraragavapuram and several schools now either maintained by or assisted by grants from the Local Funds will be made over to the newly constituted Municipality. All this will necessitate a large additional expenditure of money and the financial strain will not in any way be diminished by the proposal to transfer the income from the toll now managed by the District Board to the Municipality subject to a contribution of ₨ 8000 or 9000 to the District Board. As will be seen from the letter sent by the Collector to Government, the transfer of tolls will be just sufficient to meet the cost of the above mentioned high road and other institutions. The income from the Tolls in question cannot be relied on as a permanent source of receipt, as there is every likelihood of its dwindling down considerably by opening of the Railway to Quilon, which will certainly replace the the present enormous cart traffic from Tinnevelly to Shermadevi, Viravanallur, Ambasamudram, Papavinasam, Tenkasi, Kuttalam, Sencottai and Quilon. Thus ultimately there is every probability of the extra expenditure becoming a burden upon the general Municipal Revenue. Judging from the present annual expenditure of the Tinnevelly and Palamcottah Municipalities which together amount to about Rs 54000, the amout that will have to be expended for the big Municipality that will come into existence will not be less than 100,000 Rs, an amount which the memorialists beg to submit will be impossible to raise. Even the officer who originated the proposal i. e. the Head quarter Deputy Collector of Tinnevelly, estimates the income to be about only Rs 80,000. The memorialists are not aware upon what data the said officer has based his estimate but think that the said officer has not forseen the likely fall in the receipts from tolls in future years. The present incomes of the Tinnevelly and Palamcottah Municipalities amount together to about Rs 53,000 per annum; and those of the portions of the Unions of Mela Viraragavapuram, Kila Viraragavapuram and Pettai which are to be incorporated within Municipal limits, amount together to about Rs 8000, which may perhaps be increased to Rs 12000 by introducing Municipal methods of taxation. Thus there is a probability of only Rs 65000 being raised from sources other than tolls which have, for reasons stated above, to be left out of consideration in calculating permanent sources of revenues. The expenditure of the combined Municipality as well as of the extended Municipalities appear to have been under estimated by the Deputy Collector. The amount of Rs 80,000 estimated for the combined Municipality will not at all be sufficient for efficiently administering the affairs of a such a large Municipality as the one proposed. In-sufficiency of resources and excess of expenditure will lead to resort being had to the oppressive measure of imposing Municipal land tax upon the nunjah fields which will come under Municipalities as a consequence of the incorporation of the villages in question within Municipal limits. As will be pointed out later on such a measure will prove a great hardship to ryots whose holdings are already over assessed. Thus the proposal will bring into existence an institution which will find it impossible to make both ends meet and the result will be that either even the amounts now spent on the improvement of the villages in question will, by being compelled to be diverted to other purposes, cease to be spent on their behalf or the lot of the agricultural population will be rendered more miserable by taking away from them the little margin of profit, if any, they derive from their Nanjah lands. The memorialists hear that the Collector says in his letter to Government that personally he is not for this proposal and that the Councillors of the Tinnevelly and Palamcottah Municipality have not adopted it unanimously.

vii. Similar objections apply with equal force to the other proposal also. The extension of the Palamcottah Municipality westward to the Tambraparni River, and of the Tinnevelly Municipality eastward to the same river, will bring into existence two Municipalities with scattered villages situated at a distance from the central Towns instead of a single Municipality with distant towns and scattered villages which will be the result of the proposal referred to in para vi. The high road referred to in the same para will be apportioned between the two Municipalities, one mile of it going to Palamcottah and 1½ miles to Tinnevelly. The burden of maintaining the Viraragavapuram dispensary will fall upon Tinnevelly and each of the two Municipalties will have its quota of additional schools either to maintain or assist with grants. All this means large additional expenditure which they will be unable to bear. For reasons stated in para vi the income from tolls may not prove a permanent source of revenue. Both the Municipalities will find the need to maintain increased establishments in all the departments and this circumstance along with the others mentioned above will necessitate the diversion of the amounts now available for the villages in question to other channels which will not at all be beneficial to them. For reasons similar to those mentioned in para vi, the memorialists beg to point out that both the Municipalities will find it difficult to shew even the present progress that is being made by them unless they have recourse to the objectionable measure of subjecting Nunjah lands to the Municipal land tax. The official estimates of the probable expenditure of the proposed extended Municipalities are very low and will have to be increased.

viii. The natural situation of the villages in question lying detached and far away from the Municipal towns, as will be seen by the plan submitted to your Excellency's Government by the District officers, is itself a strong circumstance against their inclusion within the municipal limits of Tinnevelly and Palamcottah. The Collector says in his letter to Government that none of these localities taken by itself is large enough to constitute a Municipality, nor can they be grouped into a distinct Municipality apart from Tinnevelly and Palamcottah. The said statement is based upon the geographical situation of the villages in question. The same circumstance is equally against the feasibility of the proposals submitted by him to Government.

ix. The memorialists hear that the Collector has recommended that the village of Melapalayam may be exempted from being included within Municipal limits. If this information is correct, the memorialists beg to point out that the case of the other ten villages does not differ from that of Melapoliam and they also deserve to be excluded.

x. The inclusion of the villages in question within Municipal limits under either of the above schemes will result in placing the large area of Nanjah fields which surround the villages and separate them from the Towns of Tinnevelly and Palamcottah, under the mercy of the Municipal Council. The memorialists fear that all this large area of Nanjah lands will be-come liable to Municipal land tax under Section 63A. The memorialists respectfully but firmly protest against such injustice being done to the ryots owning such lands. Most of the lands are charged with the higest rate of assessment prevailing in the district and to subject them to a further charge by imposing Municipal tax means to their owners financial annihilation, which will not fail to indirectly act adversely upon the agricultural labourers whose present condition itself is far from encouraging. A perusal of para 6 of Collector's letter will bear out the above statement about the heavy assessment, to which the Nanjah lands in the villages in question are subject. The agricultural population is already over-taxed to a degree that even the present road cess and village cess press heavily upon them. To strain their resources further on the plea of founding institutions for their supposed improvement, will be nothing else than killing the patient in attempting to cure his disease. The Sub Committee who first formulated the schemes in question were under the mistaken impression that under the new Municipal Act exemption of Nanjah lands from Municipal assessment may be secured, when they approved of the proposal to include the villages in question within Municipal limits (vide para 7 of the Collector's letter). The Collector is also not for subjecting Nanjah lands to Municipal land tax, which is more than three times the land cess paid for such lands to the Local Funds. But he tries to get over this phase of the question by observing that 'the several localities are each a compact block of habitations and are connected with one another and with the existing Municipal area by roads and that it can be easily arranged to convert them and the connecting roads into Municipal tracts with only as much of the adjoining assessd lands as must necessarily be added to make up good boundaries'. A view of the plan submitted by the District officers to Government will shew that even under this arrangement a large area of heavily assessed Nanjah lands will have to be included within Municipal limits and a large number of ryots will be injuriously affected thereby. The fields that outskirt the villages in question and the connecting roads are all wet lands and it will not be possible to avoid inflicting serious loss upon a large number of people. The said proposal has also the objection of creating individious distinction between burdens imposed upon lands situated in the same village and, in a number of cases, side by side with each other. The memorialists learn that the Tinnevelly Council has already recommended the levy of land tax on the nanjah lands situated within the present municipal limits. This circumstance is enough to show that the above mentioned lands will not escape taxation if any of the alternative schemes are sanctioned.

xi. The situation of Tinnevelly and Palamcottah at a distance from the Tambraparni river, renders it necessary to introduce pipes for supplying the towns with drinking water. Under the Municipal Act, it will be necessary to impose a drainage and water tax to recoup the cost incurred by the introduction of pipes. If the villages in question are to be incorporated within the limits of the Municipalities of Tinnevelly and Palamcottah, the memorialists also will have to be made to pay drainage and water tax though no works connected with either are necessary to be made and as a matter of fact need not be made on their behalf. The provisions of the Municipal Act seem to be peremptory and cannot be avoided even though the executive authorities may be inclined to afford some relief in the matter of such taxes.

xii. More than one half of the houses situated in the villages are small ones and the owners thereof feel the existing Union taxation itself very heavy. It will be cruel to further strain their slender resources by imposing upon them a costly Municipal institution.

xiii. A major portion of the inhabitants are poor agriculturists, and labourers such as Shepherds, Shanars, Pallars, Weavers, Barbers, and Washermen, living from hand to mouth. There are a few substantial houses, but most of them belong to people who are dependent upon the house rent as the sole means of their livelihood. The officials have evidently been misled by the sprinkling of Vakils, officials &c. in the villages in question and have failed to see that the bulk of the inhabitants are very poor. Thus the introduction of Municipal institution will result in the imposition of burdens direct or indirect, upon persons who will be hardly able to bear them.

xiv. The memorialists hear that the proposals have not the unqualified approval of the Local Boards here. The three Unions of Mela Viraragavapuram, Kila Viraragavapuram and Pettai, are opposed to both the proposals. The District Board simply said that it has no objection to the proposal of the Municipalities and even that statement has been made by a majority of 12 against 11 one member present abstaining from giving his vote. More than this the District Board has not been prepared to do: for, when it was proposed that it should record a resolution supporting the proposal to combine the two Municipalities with the proposed extensions of each into one Municipality, the sense of the meeting was evidently against the proposition and the same had to be withdrawn. The Tinnevelly Municipal Council has not unanimously declared in favour of either of the two schemes. The proposal to have a consolidated Municipality was carried only by a majority of 6 against 3, one Councillor abstaining from voting and on the other scheme the Council was equally divided and it required the casting vote of the Chairman to carry it. The Palamcottah Municipal Council alone adopted the proposal of extending the Municipal limits to the Tambraparni river unanimously, and even the said body accepted the other proposal only by a majority. The memorialists humbly beg to state that the rate-payers of the two towns are not in favour of the extension. All these circumstances go to shew that the proposals have not such an amount of popular assent as to justify their adoption by Government.

xv. The memorialists beg to bring to the notice of your Excellency's Government that similar proposals were considered by Government in 1886 on the recommendation of District officers, but were given up for reasons which retain their force to the present day.

xvi. From the report of the proceedings of the District Board the memorialists learn, that the Head Quarter Deputy Collector has recommended the alternative proposals in view of appointing paid secretaries to the Tinnevelly and Palamcottah Municipalities–a concession granted by Government to Municipalities with an annual income of ₨ 30,000 and upwards. The memorialists also believe that the desire to have paid secretaries seems to have influenced the Municipal Councils in not rejecting the proposals. The financial condition of the Palamcottah and Tinnevelly Municipalities not admitting the entertainment of paid secretaries, is no ground why the outlying villages should be made to suffer in order to enable them to have such officers on their staff. As already pointed out, the villages in question have everything to lose and nothing to gain by their inclusion within Municipal limits.

xvii. From para 10 of the Collector's letter it will appear that the gain to the existing Municipal areas has chiefly induced the adoption of the schemes in question by the Local officials, and that surplus receipts are expected to be raised from the memorialists' villages and utilised for the existing Municipal areas. This circumstance lends support to the fear entertained by the memorialists that the desire to make them pay for the improvement of existing areas is at the bottom of the proposals in question. The memorialists beg to submit that such a policy will work great injustice to the inhabitants of the villages in question.

The memorialists therefore humbly pray that both the proposals before your Excellency's Government may be rejected and matters be ordered to remain *instatu quo*.

NAME OF VILLAGE. Melaveeraraghavapura

கிராமத்தின் பெயர். [illegible] புரம்

Serial Number. வரிசை நம்பர்.	Signature of the Head of a family. குடும்பத்தின் முக்கியஸ்தன் கையெழுத்து.	Occupation. உத்தியோகம் அல்லது ஜீவனம்.
1	[illegible]	[illegible]
2.	P. A. [illegible]	[illegible]
3	[illegible]	
4	R. R. Nagamiah	land lord
5	[illegible]	[illegible]
6	M. [illegible]	[illegible]
7.	O. A. Vaidisvarayir	[illegible]
8	M. Conery Rao	Land lord
9	G. S. Srinivasa Iyer	Trade.
10	G. Krishna Rau	Land holder
11	N. Rama Rau	[illegible] Zamindar
12	K. Rama Rau	
13	A. Varadhachariyar	
14	[illegible]	Ryot
15	S. Venkata [illegible]	
16	[illegible]	[illegible]
17	[illegible] ஆசாரி [illegible]	
18	[illegible]	
19	[illegible]	
20	[illegible]	
21	[illegible] Pillai	
22	[illegible]	

NAME OF VILLAGE. Melaveeraraganapuram

கிராமத்தின் பெயர். மேலவீரராகவபுரம்

Serial Number. வரிசை நம்பர்.	Signature of the Head of a family. குடும்பத்தின் முக்கியஸ்தன் கையெழுத்து.	Occupation. உத்தியோகம் அல்லது ஜீவனம்.
	[illegible]	[illegible]
	A Sundaram	Land Lord.
	[illegible] Venkatachalam	[illegible]
	[illegible]	[illegible]
	[illegible] achariyar	Land Lord
	[illegible]	[illegible]
	[illegible]	
	V. Narayana Rao.	Land Lord.
	வாசுதேவாசாரியார்	வைதிக ஜீவனம்
	A Ramanujam Iyengar	Land Lord
	[illegible]	[illegible]
	A Bayananda Rao	Land Lord.
	[illegible]	நிலச்சொந்தக்காரர்
	[illegible]	[illegible]
	[illegible]	[illegible]
	சீனிவாசராவ்.	Land Lord.
	[illegible]	Land Lord.
	Chakrakarkan.	Do.
	[illegible]	
	[illegible]	
	[illegible]	[illegible]
	[illegible] Land Lord	Land Lord

NAME OF VILLAGE. Meluvarakuthavathuram

கிராமத்தின் பெயர். [illegible]

Serial Number. வரிசை நம்பர்.	Signature of the Head of a family. குடும்பத்தின் முக்கியஸ்தன் கையெழுத்து.	Occupation. உத்தியோகம் அல்லது ஜீவனம்.
1	[illegible]	விவசாய ஜீவனம்
2	[illegible]	[illegible] ஜீவனம்
3	[illegible]	[illegible] ஜீவனம்
4	[illegible]	[illegible] ஜீவனம்
5	R Subba Rao	2d grade Pleader
6	S. Thothadhri Row	Landlord
7	[illegible]	〃
	[illegible]	〃
	[illegible]	〃
	Subbier	〃
	[illegible]	〃
	[illegible]	〃
	Ramintarami	〃
	L. Appudurai Aiyer	〃
	[illegible]	〃
	[illegible]	〃
	T S Venkateswara Iyer	〃
	K Venkatraman Iyer	〃
	[illegible]	〃
	[illegible]	〃
	[illegible]	〃
	[illegible]	〃
	[illegible]	〃
	[illegible]	〃
	[illegible]	〃
	[illegible] தேவன்	

NAME OF VILLAGE.

கிராமத்தின் பெயர்.

Serial Number. வரிசை நம்பர்.	Signature of the Head of a family. குடும்பத்தின் முக்கியஸ்தன் கையெழுத்து.	Occupation. உத்தியோகம் அல்லது ஜீவனம்.
	அங்கப்பதேவன்	விவசாயம்
	[illegible]	do
	[illegible]	do
	சுப்பய்யாபிள்ளை	do
	[illegible]	do
	[illegible]	do
	[illegible]	do
	[illegible]	do
	[illegible]	do
	[illegible]	do
	J. S. Kuppusamy Row	do
	[illegible]	do
	[illegible]	do
	[illegible]	do
	Somayajulu	do
	R. Rengu Rao	do
	[illegible]	do
	[illegible]	do
	[illegible]	do
	[illegible]	do
	[illegible]	do
	[illegible]	do
	Ramanathaiyer	do
	V. Ramasubramania Iyer	do
	P. Ramachendra Mudaliar	do
	[illegible]	do
	[illegible]	do
	H Annasamy Naidu	Pleader

NAME OF VILLAGE.

கிராமத்தின் பெயர். [illegible]

Serial Number. வரிசை நம்பர்.	Signature of the Head of a family. குடும்பத்தின் முக்கியஸ்தன் கையெழுத்து.	Occupation. உத்தியோகம் அல்லது ஜீவனம்.
1.	சொக்கலிங்கம்	வக்கீல் குமாஸ்தா
2	V. Chockalingam Pillai	Vakil Gumastah
3	S. Chockalingam Pillai [illegible]	Vakil Gumastah [illegible]

Alterations in the Municipal limits of Palamcottah & Tinnevelly

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., No. dated 189 .

Again G.O, No. 983 M dated 12th July 1899.

Current No. 40 M of 1899, dated 30. 12. 1898, ~~from~~ Petition
" " 2198 M " 1899, " 12 - 8 - 1899, from the Collr. of Tinnevelly.
" " 2398 M " 1899, " 3 - 9 - 1899, " do
" " 2471 M " 1899, " 11 - 9 - 1899, " the Chairman, &c. Tin
" " 2625 M " 1899, " 4 - 10 - 1899, " the Collr. of Tinnevelly.
" " 2666 M " 1899, " 7 - 10 - 1899, " Petition.

P.S.

ORDER. No. 1632 M / 4-11-99

AM

ACA 1.11.99

The Government considers th
objections raised in the last o
papers read above against the
-posed alterations in the Mu
limits of Palamcottah and Ti
are not valid. The proposed a
in the Municipal limits of th
town are accordingly approved
the following notification will
published in the Fort Saint
and the Tinnevelly District Gaz

Notification.

In exercise of the power co
subsection (2) of Section 4 A o
Madras District Municipalities
of 1884, as amended by Act III
and in modification of all p
notifications on the subject,

, the Governor in Council is pleased
lare that the boundaries of the
ottah Municipality shall, from
te of the publication of this
ication, be as follows:—
ere enter the description of the bounda
given in notification No. 1, printed on
10 to 12 of G.O. No. 983 M, dated 12th
899.)

The Collector's proposal to ex-
the Parcheri of the Lindu-
lwai village from the proposed
ion of the Tinnevelly Municipa-
and the suggestion of the
ipal Council of Tinnevelly to
within the Municipal limits
town the portion of the Kuruk-
rai road specified by it, excluding
joining wet lands, are approved.
llector is requested to submit a
notification defining the bound-
of this Municipality as now
.

The Superintendent, Government
ill print the required number
ies of the notification in para 1
in English and supply them to the
for circulation with the District Gazette.

31.x.97

K

CM 2198 M

Note

This seems doubtful. The Sweeper hamlet is apparently close to the Rail Station & requires, apparently to be looked after - Sanitary reasons, it may be excluded now & if necessary included later on.

CM 2471 M

31.x.97

To
The Chairman, M.C. Palamcottah
" " " Tinnevelly.
" Collector of Tinnevelly.
" Superintendent, Govt. Press.

Gazetted 21/11/97 Desp 16/11/97

N

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED. Order complete. 40
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter.

od in print 11-99

G.O., No. 983 M DATED 12-7-99 P.
189

9

40 m-P
2198 m-A
2358 m-A
2471 m-A
2625 m-A
2666 m-P

Show proof please

4/XI/99

to G. No.

Government.

Statement with ditto.

apers not filed up, being meant for despatch in original.

= Print in full
= Not to be printed.
= Print abstract only.
= Print heading only.