(1) Number of pages 30

(2) Date of repair 18-8-87

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P.W DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 400W
B.P. No.

Press.
Mis.

Dated 19 — 2 — 1885 ~~198~~.

V.S.M

ot to be folded or roughly handled

rchives I--10,006 I -80.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Military Works.

Read—the following papers:—

From Captain C. C. RAWSON, R.E., Executive Engineer, Eastern Division, Godávari, to the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, dated Dowlaishweram, 30th November 1884, No. 572.

With reference to G.O., No. 2769 W., dated 6th November 1884, communicated to me with your No. 307 G.L., dated 24th November 1884, I have the honor to request that you will obtain from Government a definite ruling as to whether Sámalkót is a cantonment or not.

No. 2461 G.D.

Endorsement on the above.

Submitted to Government for the favor of early orders.

Dowlaishweram, 19th January 1885. (Signed) W. A. MATHEWS, Assistant Engineer, *for* Superintending Engineer, I Circle.

No. 180 C., Public Works.

Referred to the Military Department for favor of information whether Sámalkót is a cantonment, as defined by the Advocate-General in proceedings, dated 17th October 1884, No. 2442, Financial.

(By Order.)

Chepák, 30th January 1885. (Signed) C. BOWEN, Major, R.E., Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

No. 587, Military.

Referred to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief.

(By Order.)

Fort St. George, 3rd February 1885. (Signed) A. R. KENNEY-HERBERT, Lt.-Col., Offg. Secretary to Government.

From the Quartermaster-General, to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, dated Ootacamund, 14th February 1885, No. 345 B.

In returning reference order No. 587, dated 3rd February 1885, I have the honor, by order, to intimate that apparently Sámalkót is a cantonment in the sense stated by the Advocate-General, inasmuch as the limits of the same have been defined by Government and published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 15th July 1856, page 78.

No. 832, Military.

Transferred to the Public Works Department and the referred papers returned.

(By Order.)

FORT ST. GEORGE,
16th February 1885.

(Signed) A. R. KENNEY-HERBERT, Lt.-Col.,
Offg. Secretary to Government.

ORDER—dated 19th February 1885, No. 400 W., Public Works.

Communicated to the Superintending Engineer, I Circle.

(True Extract.)

Major, R.E.,
Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, I Circle.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" Military Department.
" Financial "

Exd. A. Aubert.
Spare Copies

400
2

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
MILITARY WORKS.

Govt. of (1885) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated February, 19th.

Read. *Recd.*

G.O., 19th Feb. 1885, No. 400 W.

FEBRUARY.

Samalkot

Letter from the Quartermaster-General stating that — is a cantonment, communicated to the Superintending Engineer.

10th June 1884, No. 1282, Financial.

40

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers :—

G.O., dated 19th April 1883, No. 2257, Military.

Read—the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel R. C. STEWART, Officiating Quartermaster-General, to the Acting Secretary to Government, Military department, dated Fort St. George, 1st March 1883, No. 1735 :—

Referring to O.G., No. 1061, dated 17th ultimo, I am desired to submit the following remarks.

2. The cantonment of Trichinopoly was brought under the operations of the Cantonment Act (I of 1866) by G.O.G., No. 80, of 1866, but though in O.G., No. 3590, dated 12th October 1869, it was declared that chapter V of the rules framed under section 19 of that Act and such portion of the rules in chapter II as might be necessary to give effect to the rules in chapter V were, from 1st December 1869, to be in force there, no other part of the said rules were ever introduced there, nor, at present, are even the rules introduced by O.G., No. 3590, dated 12th October 1869, practically in force, for since then the withdrawal of British troops from the station has been held to remove Trichinopoly from the category of those stations to which Act I of 1866 and the rules framed under it should be applied—see O.G., No. 7074, dated 10th November 1880.

3. This being the case, there is at Trichinopoly no cantonment committee, nor is the action indicated in paragraph 3 of the O.G. under notice possible.

4. It is requisite therefore to ask that Government will be pleased to issue orders under which the officer commanding Trichinopoly can act with authority in the removal of the buildings.

5. From the opinion of the Advocate-General it would appear that failing institution of a suit to recover the several sites compensation must be paid for the materials of the objectionable buildings upon them. It is suggested, therefore, that the officer commanding be empowered to act under clauses VII and VIII of paragraph 9, or under paragraph 21 of the rules in G.O.G., No. 71, of 1849, which have been declared to be still in force.*

* O.G., No. 1482, dated 27th November 1867.
" " 1851, " 13th October 1876.
" " 554, " 29th January 1883.

From Lieutenant-Colonel R. C. STEWART, Officiating Quartermaster-General, to the Acting Secretary to Government, Military department, dated Fort St. George, 19th March 1883, No. 2290.

Referring to this office letter, No. 1735, dated 1st instant, I am desired to forward, for the information of Government, the estimates, as per margin, of the value of the houses in question, which were called for in anticipation of Government approving the proposal of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief.

	RS.	A.	P.
No. I	137	14	2
" II	87	15	2
" III	107	11	6
" IV	78	4	6
Total ..	441	13	4

2. It will be observed that in these estimates the cost of removal of the materials is deducted from the amount to be paid to the owners, but His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief considers this is a charge which must be met by Government, the owners of the houses being paid the amount at which their property, as it stands, is actually valued.

3. Rs. 30-12-0 would thus have to be added to the amount above shown, and raise the total cost of the measure to Rs. 472-9-4.

Order—dated 19th April 1883, No. 2257, Military.

The Government are asked to issue orders authorizing the removal of four ruinous buildings situated near the lines of the 21st Regiment, Native Infantry, at Trichinopoly, and it is suggested that the officer commanding the station be empowered to act under the provisions of G.O.G., No. 71, of 1849.

2. It is observed, however, that if these buildings were constructed—as seems probable from the correspondence submitted—prior to 1849, the provisions of the G.O.G. referred to would be inoperative.

3. The buildings in question have been valued at Rs. 472-9-4, and the Right Honorable the Governor in Council authorizes the offer of that sum to the owners.

4. If the offer is accepted, the buildings will be pulled down and materials sold.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) E. L. HANKIN, Colonel,
Secy. to Govt., Mily. Dept.

To the Quartermaster-General, with 4 enclosures.
„ Adjutant-General for information.

From H. SEWELL, Esq., President of the Municipal Commission, Trichinopoly, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Trichinopoly, 11th February 1884, No. 44.

Referring to G.O., Nos. 104 and 105, dated 15th January 1884, I have the honor to enclose an extract from the proceedings of the municipal commissioners passed at a meeting held on 5th February 1884, and request the favor of your obtaining the orders of Government on the subject.

ENCLOSURE.

EXTRACT from the proceedings of the municipal commissioners for the town of Trichinopoly at a meeting held on 5th February 1884.

* * * * * *

Paragraph 2. Read G.O., Nos. 104 and 105, dated 15th January 1884, recording certain papers and communicating to all Presidents of municipalities, &c., resolution of the Government of India, No. 5—165-81, dated 21st December 1883, prohibiting the levy of municipal tax on Government property in cantonments, as also letter, No. 445-M, from the Executive Engineer, returning house-tax bills on military buildings in cantonment with the Vice-President's endorsement thereon.

With reference to G.O., No. 1860, dated 22nd August 1883, Financial, Government will be requested to inform the commissioners whether they are or are not entitled to levy these taxes, inasmuch as Government have stated therein that the military authorities no longer regard Trichinopoly as a military cantonment. If that is the case, and if Government endorse that opinion, it would appear that the commissioners are entitled to the taxes on military buildings, &c.

* * * * * *

From Lieutenant-Colonel H. R. MEAD, R.E., Superintending Engineer, VI circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works department, dated Trichinopoly, 4th February 1884, No. 2197-T.J.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of G.O., No. 266 W., of 30th January 1884, forwarding resolution of the Government of India ordering that no municipal tax should be levied on Government buildings in any cantonments in India, and with reference to your memorandum, No. 132-C, dated 18th January 1884, to point out that Trichinopoly is not, I believe, a military cantonment, and therefore I suppose this resolution does not apply to it. If this is the case the municipality have a claim of Rs. 3,260 on Government, and I request that I may receive a grant under Repairs, Military, as asked for in my application, No. 568-T.C., of the 7th January 1884.

No. 305-C.

Referred to the Military department for opinion whether, under the circumstances stated by the Superintending Engineer, the claim of the Trichinopoly municipality should be admitted.

CHEPAK,
9th February 1884.

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

From Brigadier-General R. C. STEWART, Officiating Quartermaster-General, to the Acting Secretary to Government, Military department, dated Ootacamund, 19th April 1884, No. 3005.

No. 696, of 12th February 1884.
„ 1088, of 4th March 1884.

In returning the reference orders from Government, quoted in the margin, relating to the claim of the Trichinopoly municipality to levy tax on the Government buildings situated within the cantonment of Trichinopoly, I am desired to remark as follows.

2. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief having concurred in the views of Government expressed in paragraphs 2 and 3 of G.O., No. 3668, dated 2nd July 1883, Military department, did not consider it necessary at that time to trouble Government on the question now under consideration, though he could not accept as correct the decision of the Financial department in G.O., No. 1860, dated 22nd August 1883, viz., "that the military authorities *no longer* regard Trichinopoly as a military cantonment," but the questions embodied in the correspondence submitted for his remarks under the reference orders above quoted demand that he should now express his views on the subject of the position of Trichinopoly and of other cantonments.

3. From the decisions in the Financial department, recorded in orders of Government, No. 5570, of 12th October 1882, and No. 5079, of 18th September 1883, it appears that Government applies the term "cantonment" only to those military stations in which a Cantonment Act is in force with rules framed under it for administrative purposes. His Excellency, however, submits that this limited application of the term is incorrect, as it must be conceded that the term "cantonment" was in use to describe a military station, the limits of which had been defined by the authority of Government long before the creation of a "Cantonment Act," and the fact that the provisions of such Act were not made applicable to it did not nullify the claim of such military station to be a "cantonment." The definition of a military cantonment as laid down in Madras Army Regulations, paragraph 2046, is "a locality set apart primarily for military and medical officers, chaplains, soldiers," &c., and whose limits have been defined for that purpose. In this sense therefore His Excellency considers the cantonments of Trichinopoly, Vellore, Berhampore, &c., as still being military cantonments, notwithstanding their having been subsequently included in the limits of a municipality.

4. The cantonment of Trichinopoly was brought under the operations of the Cantonment Act (I of 1866) by G.O.G., No. 80 of 1866, and its limits and boundaries have been clearly defined by Government itself in its General Orders, and until the Government cancel its order above quoted, applying the Cantonment Act to Trichinopoly, it is evident that it is not only a cantonment, but a military cantonment, as being a locality whose limits have been defined by Government primarily for the residence of its military and civil servants, and as such His Excellency is of opinion that the Officer Commanding the Station has distinct authority in it. In G.O., No. 3668, dated 2nd July 1883, Military department, Trichinopoly is acknowledged by the Government to be a *military* cantonment, and reference is made to the authority that can be lawfully exercised by the Officer Commanding the Station.

5. Government in the Military department, in the above-quoted order, declined to define the powers of the military authorities in the cantonment of Trichinopoly, because the whole question of cantonments is now being considered by a committee at Simla; if, however, the Civil or Financial department does not likewise suspend action

as regards taxation, &c., or passing orders on these questions, ignoring the powers of the military authorities, it seems to His Excellency that the matter should be referred to the Government of India for decision at once, it being impossible that the military authorities can submit to be set aside without distinct authority.

6. As regards the question of taxation on Government buildings and property, the cantonments of Bellary and Cannanore are actually under the Act, and therefore all public property within their limits is under the provisions of paragraph 2 of the Resolution of the Government of India in the Home department, republished in G.O., No. 512, dated 1st February 1884, Military department, exempt from municipal taxation, and for the same reason His Excellency is of opinion that public property in the cantonment of Trichinopoly should be exempted from taxation until this station is declared by Government to be relieved from the Cantonment Act.

No. 1927.

Transferred to the Financial department, with Public Works No. 305-C, dated 9th February 1884, and the referred papers returned.

2. The Government in the Military department concur in His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief's opinion expressed in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Quartermaster-General's present letter, but does not consider it necessary to make any reference at present to the Government of India, to whom this correspondence will be communicated on receipt of the final orders of Government thereon, with a request for an early decision on the question of cantonment law referred to in G.O., (Military) No. 3668, dated 2nd July 1883.

(By Order.)

Ootacamund,
24th April 1884.

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

From Brigadier-General R. C. STEWART, Quartermaster-General, to the Secretary to Government, Military department, dated Ootacamund, 21st April 1884, No. 3020.

I have the honor to submit the correspondence, as per margin, relative to the imposition of a toll at Trichinopoly for carts passing between the bazaars and the new lines now under construction by the 30th Regiment, Native Infantry.

Copy of letter No. 295, dated 16th January 1884, from Officer Commanding 30th Regt. Native Infantry, to Station Staff Officer, Trichinopoly.
Copy of letter No. 14, dated 18th January 1884, from Station Staff Officer, Trichinopoly, to President, Municipal Commission.
Copy of letter No. 1906, dated 28th January 1884, from President, Municipal Commission, to Station Staff Officer, Trichinopoly.
Copy of letter No. 317, dated 11th February 1884, from Officer Commanding 30th Regiment, Native Infantry, to Station Staff Officer, Trichinopoly.
Letter No. 45, dated 11th February 1884, from Officer Commanding Trichinopoly, to Quartermaster-General.
Copy of letter No. 2008, dated 27th March 1884, from Quartermaster-General, to Officer Commanding Trichinopoly.
Letter No. 5, dated 5th April 1884, from Officer Commanding 30th Regiment, Native Infantry, to Station Staff Officer, Trichinopoly.
Letter No. 168, dated 14th April 1884, from Officer Commanding Bangalore Division, to Quartermaster General.

2. The inconvenience arising from this toll are detailed in the correspondence, and as it is in contemplation to locate two regiments of Native Infantry permanently on the site already chosen for the lines of the 30th Regiment, Native Infantry, it seems to the Commander-in-Chief to be very undesirable to place a toll-gate in the situation it now occupies, which is within the limit of the cantonment of Trichinopoly.

3. The President of the Trichinopoly Municipality declines to move in the matter, on the ground that toll-gates have nothing to do with cantonment limits, and that Government has decided that Trichinopoly is no longer a military cantonment.

4. This latter question is one which I have been directed to submit to Government, and forms the subject of a separate communication to your address, but I am desired to remark that the levying of toll on cartloads of bamboos, posts, &c., which are being conveyed to the site of the lines now under construction by Government under regimental agency, was not contemplated, nor was the additional expenditure thereby incurred taken into consideration. I am therefore to solicit the orders of Government on the subject in view of the toll being removed from its present site, or, at all events, the exemption of the articles required in the construction of the new lines.

No. 1935.

Transferred to the Financial department for early consideration and orders, in continuation of Military department No. 1927, dated 24th April 1884.

(By Order.)

Ootacamund,
24th April 1884.

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

Order—dated 10th June 1884, No. 1282, Financial.

The Government observe that the notification declaring Trichinopoly to be a cantonment under Act I of 1866 has not been cancelled, consequently the claim made by the municipal commissioners in the President's letter, No. 44, dated 11th February 1884, cannot be maintained.

2. With reference to the question raised in endorsement, No. 1935, dated 24th April, from the Military department, copy of G.O., 25th April, No. 901, will be communicated to that department and to the President, Trichinopoly Municipality.

(True Extract.)

E. F. WEBSTER
Chief Secretary.

To the Military department, with 8 enclosures, } with copy of G.O., Mis. No. 901, dated 25th April 1884.
" President, Municipal Commission, Trichinopoly, }
" all other Presidents of Municipalities.
" Public Works department.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

C.W.D

Govt. of 1884 Madras.

FINANCIAL.

No 1727 W. of 12th July /84

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 10th June 1884, No. 1282.

No 1727 W. of 12th July /84

Communicated to the Supg. Engr. VI Circle also to other Sup. Engrs. for information.

Sd/ J.S.S.

JUNE.

Municipal—Taxes.

Observing that the claim of the Trichinopoly municipality to taxation of military buildings cannot be maintained, as the notification declaring Trichinopoly to be a cantonment under Act I of 1866 has not been cancelled.

S.E. VI Circle
Collr., L. Fes
Ex. P. W. Accts.
} with Fin. G.O. No. 901 of 25 April /84

15th January 1884, Nos. 104, 105, Financial.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—again G.O., dated 8th August 1883, No. 1693, Financial.

Read—also the following papers:—

From the President of the Municipal Commission, Bellary, dated 27th September 1883, No. 239.

Abstract.—Replying to the several questions of the Government of India regarding municipal taxation, &c., so far as the Bellary municipality is concerned.

From the President of the Municipal Commission, Cannanore, dated 3rd October 1883, No. 451.

Abstract.—Submits information on military buildings, &c., at Cannanore.

From the President of the Municipal Commission, Trichinopoly, dated 5th October 1883, No. 25.

Abstract.—Forwarding information regarding the municipal tax on military buildings, situated within the cantonment limits of the Trichinopoly municipality.

From the President of the Municipal Commission, Bellary, dated 31st October 1883, No. 264.

Abstract.—Submitting a revised estimate of municipal income and expenditure in connection with the cantonment of Bellary.

From the President of the Municipal Commission, Cannanore, dated 19th November 1883, No. 523.

Abstract.—Explaining certain discrepancies contained in the statement forwarded with letter, No. 451, dated 3rd October 1883.

From the President of the Municipal Commission, Trichinopoly, dated 10th December 1883, No. 36.

Abstract.—Explaining discrepancies in statement already forwarded.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Government of India, in the Home department (Municipalities), dated Calcutta, 21st December 1883, No. 5—165-81.

Read—the following papers:—

Home department order, No. 163, dated 18th November 1881.
Ditto resolution, No. 1—70-86, dated 30th June 1882.

Resolution—

Since the issue of Home department resolution, No. 1—70-86, dated 30th June 1882, which permitted the levy of municipal taxation on Government buildings in cantonments, the Governor-General in Council has been advised that the exemption of such buildings in cantonments from municipal taxation is authorized under section 24, Act III of 1880, and that the practical difficulties in the way of removing such exemptions are found to be insuperable. His Excellency in Council is, therefore, pleased to direct that the resolution of 30th June 1882 be cancelled, and that the original order, No. 165, dated 18th November 1881, be restored.

2. Under the present orders no municipal tax whatsoever shall be levied in any cantonment in British India on public property.

Order—

Ordered that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Local * Governments and Administrations for information and guidance, and that a copy be forwarded to the several departments of the Government of India for information.

* Madras.
Bombay.
Bengal (Munl. Dept.).
North-Western Provinces and Oudh.
Punjab.
Central Provinces.
British Burma.
Assam.
Coorg.
Hyderabad.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) A. MACKENZIE,
Secretary to the Government of India.

To the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras.

Order—dated 15th January 1884, No. 104, Financial.

The letters read above will be recorded with reference to resolution, No. 5—165-81, dated 21st December 1883, which will be communicated to all Presidents of municipalities and to the Military and Public Works departments.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To all Presidents of Municipal Commissions.
„ the Military department.
„ the Public Works department.

Endorsement—dated 15th January 1884, No. 105, Financial.

Copy to the Government of India, Military and Home departments.

E. F. WEBSTER,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. H. Frantz.

No 266 W. dt/30th Jany/84

Communicated to the officers of the Public Works Deptt for information and guidance.

(Sgd) J. S. S.

S. Es.

C. A. Colgst.

J. P. W. A.

Govt. of (1884) Madras.

FINANCIAL.

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G.O., &c., 15th January 1884, Nos. 104, 105.

No 266 W. dt/30th Jany/84

JANUARY.

Municipal Taxes.

Recording certain papers and communicating to all Presidents of municipalities, &c., resolution of the Government of India, No. 5—165-81, dated 21st December 1883, prohibiting the levy of—on Government buildings in cantonments.

With orders

No. 572.

Godavari District
Eastern Division Office
Dowlaishweram
30th November 1884
Despd. 3rd December/84

From

The Executive Engineer
Eastern Division
Godavari

To

The Superintending Engineer
1st Circle

Sir,

With reference to G. O. No. 2769 W dated 6th November 1884 communicated to me with your No. 307 G.l. dated 24th November/84 I have the honor to request that you will obtain from Government a definite ruling as to whether Samulcottah is a Cantonment or not.

I have the honor &c.

(Signed) C. C. Rawson Captn. R.E.
Executive Engr.

(True Copy)

No 2461 C/D

Submitted to Government for
the favour of early orders

Dowlaiswaram
19th January 85
Despd 20th

Asst Engr
For Superintending Engr
1st Circle

FK

400
9

P. G. 20 Nov/84 No. 430-432 D
9 Dec/84 - 176-178 D

Chepak

No. 180 C 30th January /85

Referred to the Military Department for favour of information whether Samalkot is a cantonment, as defined by the Advocate General in Proceedings d/ 17th October 1884, No. ~~[illegible]~~ 2442 Financial.

(By order)

C. Unwin
Major R.E.
Under Secy. to Govt. P. W. Dept.

W
28.1.85

F. S. Proved
3 Feby 85

No. 587 Referred to H.E. the Commander in Chief

REQUESTED TO BE RETURNED WITH [illegible]

(By Order)

A. Kennedy Prescott Lt. Col.
Offg. Secy. to Govt.

3 Feby [illegible]

Military - 1885 D.
No.

From
The Supg. Engineer
The R. W. Circle

To
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.
Madras.

No. 180 C
D/ 30 Jany
F/ 2nd Feby

Dated 19th
Desp. 20th } January 1885
Recd

No. 2461 G. D.

Encls —

Samalcotta.

Submits copy of the Dt. Officer's letter & requesting to obtain from Government a definite ruling as to whether or not — is a Cantonment.

Nº 1553 d/ August 5

Public Works Department

Letter from the President, Madras Municipal Commission, No. R 847 d/ July 25th 1884

Endt. thereon in Financial Dept. No. 1729 d/ Augt. 1. 1884

requesting that orders may be passed for the payment of municipal taxes for the current year on military buildings within the Madras Municipality

Referred to the Supdg. Engr. V Circle, for report as to the admissibility of the demand, with reference to G.O. No. 266 W d/ 30th January 1884. There is nothing in the papers to show the buildings on account of which municipal tax is demanded.

W
5.8.84
W

S. E. V Circle in original to be returned

Despd. 5/8/84

R. S.

No. 1521 Wd/ 8.9.83
" 1832 W d/ 8.9.83
" 1904 Wd/ 15.10.83
" 1905 Wd/ 15.10.83
" 2065 W d/ 30.1.84
" 2068 W d/ 30.1.84
" 7727 W d/ 12.9.84
" 357 W d/ 7.7.84
" 374 Wd/ 18.7.84
" 382 Ed/ 23.7.84

No. 433 Ed/ Aug. 5. 84

Cantonments.
Samalkot

QUARTERMASTER-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Ootacamund,
14th February 1885.

No. 345/15

40
10

From
THE QUARTERMASTER-GENERAL,

To
THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
MILITARY DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

In returning Reference Order No. 587 dated 3rd February 1885, I have the honor, by order, to intimate that apparently Samalkot is a Cantonment in the sense stated by the Advocate General, inasmuch as the limits of the same have been defined by Government and published in the Fort Saint George Gazette dated 15th July 1856, page 78.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Obedient Servant
Major
For Quarter Master General

Pasd

m 832

Transferred to the Public Works department and the referred papers returned.

(By order)

A. Kenney Herbert. Lt Col
Offg Secy to Govt
M.D.

J. S. Trove
16/2/85

Military (1885) Department.

No. ~~[illegible]~~

From
The Quartermaster-General,

To
The Secretary to Government,
Military Department.

No. 345 B

Dated 14 }
Recd. 16 } February

Enclosures. 2

Returning Reference Order stating that Samalkot is apparently a Cantonment in the sense stated by Advocate General, inasmuch as its limits is published in Fort Saint George Gazette dated 15th July 188[illegible].

1885.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Current No. 734

14
12

From The Supdg Engineer
I Circle

Enclos.—

No. 2461 G.D.
Dated 19th January 1885.
Received 28th "

Subject.

Samalkot Submitting copy of Divn officers letter requesting to obtain from Govt. a definite ruling as to whether —— is a cantonment or not.

Disposal.

No. 806 Dated 30th [illegible]

Referred to the Military Dept. for favor of information whether Samalkot is a cantonment as defined by the Advocate General in Pros. of 17th Octr. 1884, No. 2412 Financial.

(By order)

(Sd) C. Bowen
Major R.E.
Under Secy to Govt P.W. Dept.

G.O. B/ 2769 W d/ 6-11-84
" 266 W d/ 30-1-84
No 433 E d/ 5-8-84
" 374 E d/ 18-1-84
G.O. 1727 W d/ 12-7-84

45/13

No 374 E d/ 18 July/84

P.W. Department

Letter from the Supt g: Engineer II, Circle No 1456 d/ 15 July/84 explaining that the delay in verifying the Bills has been caused by the necessity for looking into the correctness of the claims made by the Municipality for taxes on public buildings due for the 1st half of 1884 & stating that the matter has not as yet been settled.

Transferred to the Financial Dept: with reference to endorsement in that Department No 459 d/ 4 July/84.

Sgd/ Jo. H.
For. W

To
The Financial Dept:
with original reference returned.

No 358 E d/ 17-7-14

No 374 E d/ 18th July/8

F.L. 40/7

Public Works Department.

40/14

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the

Read the following

From the Suptg: Engr: I Circle H.E. No 2261. G.D d/ 19th Jany/85	
Endt of the Mily. Department	587 d/ 3rd Feby/85
Letter from the Qr Master Genl	345 B d/ 14th Feby/85
Endt thereon by the Mily. Dept	832 d/ 16th Feby/85

Communicated to
the Suptg: Engineer
I. Circle.

CW.
19.2.85

S.E. I. Circle.
Ex: P.W accts.
Mily: Dept.
Finl. Dept.

1474

Govt. of 1885 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.