(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 18

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 9/8/89

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

Revenue துறை

அரசாணை எண். —
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 2101

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் : 5-8-1889 1989.

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

ஆவண, சா-1—18,000—15-6-89.

2101/1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

ECCLESIASTICAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From the Venerable J. F. BROWNE, B.D., Archdeacon of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 30th April 1889, No. 33.

I have the honor to request I may be instructed, for the information of Collectors submitting periodical reports on cemeteries, as to what cemeteries are to be included in the reports sent to Government through my office.

2. This question was asked me by the Collector of Salem, calling my attention to G.Os., No. 143, dated 21st January 1857, and No. 162, dated 25th June 1875. At that time I was not in possession of a copy of G.O., No. 143, dated 21st January 1857, but replied that G.O., No. 162, dated 25th June 1875, seemed to deal only with the question of repairs, and not of inspection and report, while that by G.O., No. 141, dated 17th July 1885, Rule XXII, it would appear as if all cemeteries were to be reported on, and this seems to be the general custom from the reports submitted.

3. In reply to this, the Collector of Salem forwarded to me extracts from G.O., No. 143, dated 21st January 1857, and Board's Circular, No. 7413, dated 11th November 1862, and observes in his letter, that as the rules laid down in G.O., No. 141, dated 17th July 1885, relate to Government cemeteries, Rule XXII refers only to the inspection of those cemeteries.

Certainly G.O., No. 143, dated 25th June 1875, only mentions "all Protestant cemeteries," and in G.O., No. 162, dated 25th June 1875, it was the opinion of Government that the Roman Catholic cemeteries at Yercaud and Hosúr do not come under the standing orders regarding European Christian burial-grounds.

———

ORDER—dated 12th June 1889, No. 58, Ecclesiastical.

Collector's annual reports should deal with the following classes of cemeteries:—

(*a*) European Christian burial-grounds in actual use which are under the charge of a Government Chaplain, or for the upkeep of which the Government provides an establishment.

(*b*) Abandoned European Christian burial-grounds and tombs, of whatever denomination.

2. Board's Standing Order, No. 156 (1878 edition), should be modified accordingly. It is observed that the periodical reports prescribed are not now made through the Public Works Department, but through the Archdeacon—*vide* G.O., 31st May 1888, No. 78.

(True Extract.) H. W. Bandeen Capt. R.E.
for Under Secy. to Govt.
for Asst. Secy. to Govt.

To the Venerable the Archdeacon of Madras.
„ the Revenue Department,
„ the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), } with copy of G.O., 31st May 1888, No. 78.
„ all Collectors.
Copy to the Public Works Department.

Exd. A. Raitt.

12.6.C.

Govt. of {1889} Madras.

ECCLESIASTICAL.

Issued.

Read. Encl.

G.O., 12th June 1889, No. 58.

JUNE.

Cemeteries.

Passing orders regarding the classes of — to be reported on by Collectors.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

ECCLESIASTICAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper :—

From H. LE FANU, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Palmanér, 12th June 1889, No. 229.

With reference to G.O., dated 15th May 1889, No. 43, Ecclesiastical, I have the honor to ask what is the definition of the word "Cemetery" as therein contained.

2. The practice in different districts is not uniform. As you will remember, in Salem, Divisional officers were required yearly to inspect and report on all scattered tombs. I find that no such report has ever been submitted from this district, and I wish to know whether it is necessary or not. There are, I should think, dozens of such, and there ought to be a record of them. I think, too, that if they be not "cemeteries," they ought to be included under the separate head of "scattered tombs," so as not to be lost sight of.

3. Looking at the return from Salem, I see that there is a cemetery at Hosúr. I opine that this is the enclosure near the travellers' bungalow on the road to Rayakota. But it may be Mr. Lockart's tomb. Why is Adamankota a cemetery, or Dharmapuri fort, when the tomb at Erramattur is omitted? They are just as much "scattered tombs" as the latter, and those at Dharmapuri are not—or were not—enclosed. There are practically two cemeteries at Rayakota, one enclosed and the other not. Does "enclosure" make a cemetery? If so, the "enclosure" containing some 3 or 4 tombs on the Punganúr road near Palmanér should make a second cemetery at that station. Does "consecration" only make a cemetery? If so, I have no doubt that the tombs at Dharmapuri should be excluded from the list. Does the number of tombs make a cemetery, *i.e.*, is "one tomb," as at Erramattur, omitted, because it stands alone, while the two at Dharmapuri and—I think—at Adamankota rank as a "cemetery." There are half-a-dozen tombs at Venkatagirikota, in two places, but they are not enclosed. There is one in my compound at Chittoor. It is enclosed. Is it a cemetery? There is another in my compound at Palmanér. It, too, is enclosed. Is it a cemetery? There is one on the roadside at Palliconda, which I had recently repaired. It is not enclosed. Is it a cemetery? There is another on the road from Chittoor to Chandragiri. I don't know how the two cemeteries at Arni are made out, unless the single obelisk in the barrack square is one. I only saw one. Certainly at Ranipet there are two, and I should think one of them must be under the charge of the Chaplain of Vellore. On the road from Arni to Kaniambadi, I saw a large cemetery full of tombs which finds no place in our list.

4. What we want, first, is a definition of "cemetery," and clear instructions as to whether "scattered tombs" should be entered or not. Secondly, there is great confusion here by the intrusion of a Chaplain. There was none at Salem, and consequently the Collector answered for all. Here we do not know whom to look to, *e.g.*, for a great part of last year there was no Chaplain at Vellore, and no information was obtainable. I think that there should be for each district a list of European cemeteries and scattered tombs, such as there is in the Salem Manual. If this is to be prepared, we are not likely to get a complete list for some two years, as many of the scattered tombs are hidden away, and it will take time to register them. I do not know, too, how it is decided as to who is in charge of the cemeteries. I always understood that at Chittoor to be in charge of the Chaplain of Vellore. In the printed list, it is

down as in charge of the Revenue Department. I think that the Chaplain should look after it. Some cemeteries are in charge of the Public Works Department, *e.g.*, in Tinnevelly, I see that several of what are obviously "scattered tombs" are in the list. If these latter are to be included, Government cannot expect a full list under two years, as I should think that no district except Salem is in a position to publish it. Even there I found tombs which had been overlooked in former returns supposed to be complete. I have seen several in this district, but have no record of them. I would suggest that Government might now be content with getting the area called for in paragraph 2 of the Government Order under reference and let the matter lie over for two years, when a full list might be sent in for each district. I would suggest that—adding the area—it might be on the plan followed in the Salem Manual: *vide* Volume I, Ecclesiastical.

ORDER—dated 13th July 1889, No. 66, Ecclesiastical.

For the purposes of the annual returns required from Collectors, the instructions contained in G.O., No. 58, Ecclesiastical, dated 12th June 1899, are sufficiently clear.

2. In paragraph 1 (ii) of G.O., No. 117, dated 13th August 1888, isolated tombs have been ordered to be excluded from the consolidated list of cemeteries referred to in G.O., dated 15th May 1889, No. 13, though they are still to be included in the reports of Collectors.

3. For the purposes of this return, a cemetery may be defined as a burial ground containing a number of graves of European Christians, whether it be enclosed or consecrated or not.

4. The Collector's proposal to follow the classification on pages 167—173 of the Salem Manual is inadmissible.

5. In regard to the charge of Government cemeteries, the Collector is referred to section 1, rule 1, of the Ecclesiastical rules published in G.O., dated 17th July 1885, No. 141.

6. The Government concurs with Mr. Le Fanu, that a complete register of all scattered tombs of Europeans in each district should be kept in the Collector's office, and directs that this be prepared where it does not already exist.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To all Collectors.
„ the Venerable the Archdeacon of Madras.
„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
„ the Public Works Department.
„ the President, Municipal Commission, Madras.

Exd. A. Raitt.

2101/3

Govt. of {1889} Madras.

ECCLESIASTICAL.

Issued

Read. *Encl.*

G.O., 13th July 1889, No. 66.

JULY.

Cemetery.

Passing orders defining what a — is for the purpose of the consolidated return of cemeteries, and directing the preparation of a complete register of all scattered tombs of Europeans in each district.

29/4

13TH JULY 1889, No. 66, ECCLESIASTICAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

ECCLESIASTICAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper :—

From H. LE FANU, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Palmanér, 12th June 1889, No. 229.

With reference to G.O., dated 15th May 1889, No. 43, Ecclesiastical, I have the honor to ask what is the definition of the word "Cemetery" as therein contained.

2. The practice in different districts is not uniform. As you will remember, in Salem, Divisional officers were required yearly to inspect and report on all scattered tombs. I find that no such report has ever been submitted from this district, and I wish to know whether it is necessary or not. There are, I should think, dozens of such, and there ought to be a record of them. I think, too, that if they be not "cemeteries," they ought to be included under the separate head of "scattered tombs," so as not to be lost sight of.

3. Looking at the return from Salem, I see that there is a cemetery at Hosúr. I opine that this is the enclosure near the travellers' bungalow on the road to Rayakota. But it may be Mr. Lockart's tomb. Why is Adamankota a cemetery, or Dharmapuri fort, when the tomb at Erramattur is omitted? They are just as much "scattered tombs" as the latter, and those at Dharmapuri are not—or were not—enclosed. There are practically two cemeteries at Rayakota, one enclosed and the other not. Does "enclosure" make a cemetery? If so, the "enclosure," containing some 3 or 4 tombs on the Punganúr road near Palmanér should make a second cemetery at that station. Does "consecration" only make a cemetery? If so, I have no doubt that the tombs at Dharmapuri should be excluded from the list. Does the number of tombs make a cemetery, *i.e.*, is "one tomb," as at Erramattur, omitted, because it stands alone, while the two at Dharmapuri and—I think—at Adamankota rank as a "cemetery." There are half-a-dozen tombs at Venkatagirikota, in two places, but they are not enclosed. There is one in my compound at Chittoor. It is enclosed. Is it a cemetery? There is another in my compound at Palmanér. It, too, is enclosed. Is it a cemetery? There is one on the roadside at Palliconda, which I had recently repaired. It is not enclosed. Is it a cemetery? There is another on the road from Chittoor to Chandragiri. I don't know how the two cemeteries at Arni are made out, unless the single obelisk in the barrack square is one. I only saw one. Certainly at Ranipet there are two, and I should think one of them must be under the charge of the Chaplain of Vellore. On the road from Arni to Kaniambadi, I saw a large cemetery full of tombs which finds no place in our list.

4. What we want, first, is a definition of "cemetery," and clear instructions as to whether "scattered tombs" should be entered or not. Secondly, there is great confusion here by the intrusion of a Chaplain. There was none at Salem, and consequently the Collector answered for all. Here we do not know whom to look to, *e.g.*, for a great part of last year there was no Chaplain at Vellore, and no information was obtainable. I think that there should be for each district a list of European cemeteries and scattered tombs, such as there is in the Salem Manual. If this is to be prepared, we are not likely to get a complete list for some two years, as many of the scattered tombs are hidden away, and it will take time to register them. I do not know, too, how it is decided as to who is in charge of the cemeteries. I always understood that at Chittoor to be in charge of the Chaplain of Vellore. In the printed list, it is

down as in charge of the Revenue Department. I think that the Chaplain should look after it. Some cemeteries are in charge of the Public Works Department, *e.g.*, in Tinnevelly, I see that several of what are obviously "scattered tombs" are in the list. If these latter are to be included, Government cannot expect a full list under two years, as I should think that no district except Salem is in a position to publish it. Even there I found tombs which had been overlooked in former returns supposed to be complete. I have seen several in this district, but have no record of them. I would suggest that Government might now be content with getting the area called for in paragraph 2 of the Government Order under reference and let the matter lie over for two years, when a full list might be sent in for each district. I would suggest that—adding the area—it might be on the plan followed in the Salem Manual: *vide* Volume 1, Ecclesiastical.

ORDER—dated 13th July 1889, No. 66, Ecclesiastical.

For the purposes of the annual returns required from Collectors, the instructions contained in G.O., No. 58, Ecclesiastical, dated 12th June 1899, are sufficiently clear.

2. In paragraph 1 (ii) of G.O., No. 117, dated 13th August 1888, isolated tombs have been ordered to be excluded from the consolidated list of cemeteries referred to in G.O., dated 15th May 1889, No. 43, though they are still to be included in the reports of Collectors.

3. For the purposes of this return, a cemetery may be defined as a burial ground containing a number of graves of European Christians, whether it be enclosed or consecrated or not.

4. The Collector's proposal to follow the classification on pages 167—173 of the Salem Manual is inadmissible.

5. In regard to the charge of Government cemeteries, the Collector is referred to section 1, rule 1, of the Ecclesiastical rules published in G.O., dated 17th July 1885, No. 141.

6. The Government concurs with Mr. Le Fanu, that a complete register of all scattered tombs of Europeans in each district should be kept in the Collector's office, and directs that this be prepared where it does not already exist.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To all Collectors.
" the Venerable the Archdeacon of Madras.
" the Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
" the Public Works Department.
" the President, Municipal Commission, Madras.

Exd. A. Raitt.

2101
5

Govt. of {1889} Madras.

ECCLESIASTICAL.

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 13th July 1889, No. 66.

JULY.

Cemetery.

Passing orders defining what a — is for the purpose of the consolidated return of cemeteries, and directing the preparation of a complete register of all scattered tombs of Europeans in each district.

13TH JULY 1889, No. 66, ECCLESIASTICAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

ECCLESIASTICAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From H. LE FANU, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Palmanér, 12th June 1889, No. 229.

With reference to G.O., dated 15th May 1889, No. 43, Ecclesiastical, I have the honor to ask what is the definition of the word "Cemetery" as therein contained.

2. The practice in different districts is not uniform. As you will remember, in Salem, Divisional officers were required yearly to inspect and report on all scattered tombs. I find that no such report has ever been submitted from this district, and I wish to know whether it is necessary or not. There are, I should think, dozens of such, and there ought to be a record of them. I think, too, that if they be not "cemeteries," they ought to be included under the separate head of "scattered tombs," so as not to be lost sight of.

3. Looking at the return from Salem, I see that there is a cemetery at Hosúr. I opine that this is the enclosure near the travellers' bungalow on the road to Rayakota. But it may be Mr. Lockart's tomb. Why is Adamankota a cemetery, or Dharmapuri fort, when the tomb at Erramattur is omitted? They are just as much "scattered tombs" as the latter, and those at Dharmapuri are not—or were not—enclosed. There are practically two cemeteries at Rayakota, one enclosed and the other not. Does "enclosure" make a cemetery? If so, the "enclosure" containing some 3 or 4 tombs on the Punganúr road near Palmanér should make a second cemetery at that station. Does "consecration" only make a cemetery? If so, I have no doubt that the tombs at Dharmapuri should be excluded from the list. Does the number of tombs make a cemetery, *i.e.*, is "one tomb," as at Erramattur, omitted, because it stands alone, while the two at Dharmapuri and—I think—at Adamankota rank as a "cemetery." There are half-a-dozen tombs at Venkatagirikota, in two places, but they are not enclosed. There is one in my compound at Chittoor. It is enclosed. Is it a cemetery? There is another in my compound at Palmanér. It, too, is enclosed. Is it a cemetery? There is one on the roadside at Palliconda, which I had recently repaired. It is not enclosed. Is it a cemetery? There is another on the road from Chittoor to Chandragiri. I don't know how the two cemeteries at Arni are made out, unless the single obelisk in the barrack square is one. I only saw one. Certainly at Ranipet there are two, and I should think one of them must be under the charge of the Chaplain of Vellore. On the road from Arni to Kaniambadi, I saw a large cemetery full of tombs which finds no place in our list.

4. What we want, first, is a definition of "cemetery," and clear instructions as to whether "scattered tombs" should be entered or not. Secondly, there is great confusion here by the intrusion of a Chaplain. There was none at Salem, and consequently the Collector answered for all. Here we do not know whom to look to, *e.g.*, for a great part of last year there was no Chaplain at Vellore, and no information was obtainable. I think that there should be for each district a list of European cemeteries and scattered tombs, such as there is in the Salem Manual. If this is to be prepared, we are not likely to get a complete list for some two years, as many of the scattered tombs are hidden away, and it will take time to register them. I do not know, too, how it is decided as to who is in charge of the cemeteries. I always understood that at Chittoor to be in charge of the Chaplain of Vellore. In the printed list, it is

down as in charge of the Revenue Department. I think that the Chaplain should look after it. Some cemeteries are in charge of the Public Works Department, *e.g.*, in Tinnevelly, I see that several of what are obviously "scattered tombs" are in the list. If these latter are to be included, Government cannot expect a full list under two years, as I should think that no district except Salem is in a position to publish it. Even there I found tombs which had been overlooked in former returns supposed to be complete. I have seen several in this district, but have no record of them. I would suggest that Government might now be content with getting the area called for in paragraph 2 of the Government Order under reference and let the matter lie over for two years, when a full list might be sent in for each district. I would suggest that—adding the area—it might be on the plan followed in the Salem Manual: *vide* Volume 1, Ecclesiastical.

ORDER—dated 13th July 1889, No. 66, Ecclesiastical.

For the purposes of the annual returns required from Collectors, the instructions contained in G.O., No. 58, Ecclesiastical, dated 12th June 1899, are sufficiently clear.

2. In paragraph 1 (ii) of G.O., No. 117, dated 13th August 1888, isolated tombs have been ordered to be excluded from the consolidated list of cemeteries referred to in G.O., dated 15th May 1889, No. 43, though they are still to be included in the reports of Collectors.

3. For the purposes of this return, a cemetery may be defined as a burial ground containing a number of graves of European Christians, whether it be enclosed or consecrated or not.

4. The Collector's proposal to follow the classification on pages 167—173 of the Salem Manual is inadmissible.

5. In regard to the charge of Government cemeteries, the Collector is referred to section 1, rule 1, of the Ecclesiastical rules published in G.O., dated 17th July 1885, No. 141.

6. The Government concurs with Mr. Le Fanu, that a complete register of all scattered tombs of Europeans in each district should be kept in the Collector's office, and directs that this be prepared where it does not already exist.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To all Collectors.
" the Venerable the Archdeacon of Madras.
" the Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
" the Public Works Department.
" the President, Municipal Commission, Madras.

Exd. A. Raitt.

2101
11

Govt. of {1889} Madras.

ECCLESIASTICAL.

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 13th July 1889, No. 66.

JULY.

Cemetery.

Passing orders defining what a — is for the purpose of the consolidated return of cemeteries, and directing the preparation of a complete register of all scattered tombs of Europeans in each district.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

ECCLESIASTICAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From H. LE FANU, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Palmanér, 12th June 1889, No. 229.

With reference to G.O., dated 15th May 1889, No. 43, Ecclesiastical, I have the honor to ask what is the definition of the word "Cemetery" as therein contained.

2. The practice in different districts is not uniform. As you will remember, in Salem, Divisional officers were required yearly to inspect and report on all scattered tombs. I find that no such report has ever been submitted from this district, and I wish to know whether it is necessary or not. There are, I should think, dozens of such, and there ought to be a record of them. I think, too, that if they be not "cemeteries," they ought to be included under the separate head of "scattered tombs," so as not to be lost sight of.

3. Looking at the return from Salem, I see that there is a cemetery at Hosúr. I opine that this is the enclosure near the travellers' bungalow on the road to Rayakota. But it may be Mr. Lockart's tomb. Why is Adamankota a cemetery, or Dharmapuri fort, when the tomb at Erramattur is omitted? They are just as much "scattered tombs" as the latter, and those at Dharmapuri are not—or were not—enclosed. There are practically two cemeteries at Rayakota, one enclosed and the other not. Does "enclosure" make a cemetery? If so, the "enclosure" containing some 3 or 4 tombs on the Punganúr road near Palmanér should make a second cemetery at that station. Does "consecration" only make a cemetery? If so, I have no doubt that the tombs at Dharmapuri should be excluded from the list. Does the number of tombs make a cemetery, *i.e.*, is "one tomb," as at Erramattur, omitted, because it stands alone, while the two at Dharmapuri and—I think—at Adamankota rank as a "cemetery." There are half-a-dozen tombs at Venkatagirikota, in two places, but they are not enclosed. There is one in my compound at Chittoor. It is enclosed. Is it a cemetery? There is another in my compound at Palmanér. It, too, is enclosed. Is it a cemetery? There is one on the roadside at Palliconda, which I had recently repaired. It is not enclosed. Is it a cemetery? There is another on the road from Chittoor to Chandragiri. I don't know how the two cemeteries at Arni are made out, unless the single obelisk in the barrack square is one. I only saw one. Certainly at Ranipet there are two, and I should think one of them must be under the charge of the Chaplain of Vellore. On the road from Arni to Kaniambadi, I saw a large cemetery full of tombs which finds no place in our list.

4. What we want, first, is a definition of "cemetery," and clear instructions as to whether "scattered tombs" should be entered or not. Secondly, there is great confusion here by the intrusion of a Chaplain. There was none at Salem, and consequently the Collector answered for all. Here we do not know whom to look to, *e.g.*, for a great part of last year there was no Chaplain at Vellore, and no information was obtainable. I think that there should be for each district a list of European cemeteries and scattered tombs, such as there is in the Salem Manual. If this is to be prepared, we are not likely to get a complete list for some two years, as many of the scattered tombs are hidden away, and it will take time to register them. I do not know, too, how it is decided as to who is in charge of the cemeteries. I always understood that at Chittoor to be in charge of the Chaplain of Vellore. In the printed list, it is

down as in charge of the Revenue Department. I think that the Chaplain should look after it. Some cemeteries are in charge of the Public Works Department, *e.g.*, in Tinnevelly, I see that several of what are obviously "scattered tombs" are in the list. If these latter are to be included, Government cannot expect a full list under two years, as I should think that no district except Salem is in a position to publish it. Even there I found tombs which had been overlooked in former returns supposed to be complete. I have seen several in this district, but have no record of them. I would suggest that Government might now be content with getting the area called for in paragraph 2 of the Government Order under reference and let the matter lie over for two years, when a full list might be sent in for each district. I would suggest that—adding the area—it might be on the plan followed in the Salem Manual: *vide* Volume I, Ecclesiastical.

ORDER—dated 13th July 1889, No. 66, Ecclesiastical.

For the purposes of the annual returns required from Collectors, the instructions contained in G.O., No. 58, Ecclesiastical, dated 12th June 1899, are sufficiently clear.

2. In paragraph 1 (ii) of G.O., No. 117, dated 13th August 1888, isolated tombs have been ordered to be excluded from the consolidated list of cemeteries referred to in G.O., dated 15th May 1889, No. 43, though they are still to be included in the reports of Collectors.

3. For the purposes of this return, a cemetery may be defined as a burial ground containing a number of graves of European Christians, whether it be enclosed or consecrated or not.

4. The Collector's proposal to follow the classification on pages 167—173 of the Salem Manual is inadmissible.

5. In regard to the charge of Government cemeteries, the Collector is referred to section 1, rule 1, of the Ecclesiastical rules published in G.O., dated 17th July 1885, No. 141.

6. The Government concurs with Mr. Le Fanu, that a complete register of all scattered tombs of Europeans in each district should be kept in the Collector's office, and directs that this be prepared where it does not already exist.

(True Extract.) W. H. Baddeley
Under Secy. to Govt.
for Chief Secretary.

To all Collectors.
" the Venerable the Archdeacon of Madras.
" the Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
" the Public Works Department.
" the President, Municipal Commission, Madras.

Exd. A. Raitt.

13-7-89

2101/9

Govt. of {1889} Madras.

ECCLESIASTICAL.

No 2101 W dfs - August 1889

Communicated, in continuation of G.O. No. 2720 W dfd 1st September 1888, to Supdg Engineers for information.

Issued

Recd. Encl.

Asst Secy to G.O.

G.O., 13th July 1889, No. 66.

JULY.

Cemetery.

Passing orders defining what a — is for the purpose of the consolidated return of cemeteries, and directing the preparation of a complete register of all scattered tombs of Europeans in each district.

Supdg Engrs
with copy of G.O. 502 dfd 12-6-89
Eccles-