Government of Madras

HOME DEPARTMENT (MISCELLANEOUS)

G.O. No. 647, 10th September 1918

Bifurcation of the Malabar district

Recording the correspondence on the subject of the proposed —.

ORIGINAL.

1,000—16-7-18.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

NUMBER OF COPIES { Letter. / Order.

Government of Madras

HOME DEPARTMENT (MISCELLANEOUS)

G.O. No. 647, 10th September 1918

Bifurcation of the Malabar district

Recording the correspondence on the subject of the proposed —.

READ—the following papers :—

I

Official Memorandum No. 673-2, Public, dated 25th March 1916.

The Board of Revenue is requested to consider and report on the question of dividing Malabar into two revenue districts.

2. The district forms a very heavy charge at present, comprising as it does, an area of 5,794 square miles with a population of over three millions, while the Mappilla element of the population adds considerably to the difficulties of administration. The question of affording relief to the Collector and District Magistrate has already been discussed more than once. Several objections to the division of the district were considered by Sir William Meyer in paragraphs 287 and 288 of his report on the constitution of additional districts, divisions and taluks, but the only one which appears to have been considered insuperable was the lightness of the proposed North Malabar district. The Government are not convinced of the overwhelming importance of this objection; while on the other hand they observe that the district has already been divided into two for judicial, registration and police purposes. They consider that this fact is of considerable importance in deciding the question of division, as not only may the complete severance be effected without great expense, but no sentimental or factitious agitation against the partition need be anticipated.

3. The suggestion has been made to include in the proposed North Malabar district the Kasaragod taluk of South Kanara. The possibility of adding Coorg to the reduced South Kanara district and the inclusion of the Laccadives in the proposed North Malabar district should also be taken into account in this connexion.

4. The Board of Revenue is requested to examine the question in the light of the above observations and to report whether it finds that to give effect to the proposal is practicable and desirable. If it does, the Board is further requested to draw up proposals in conjunction with the Collector of Malabar, worked out in some detail; the District Magistrate of South Kanara should be consulted also if necessary.

5. Pending the consideration of this question, the construction of a residence for the Headquarters Sub-Collector at Calicut referred to in the correspondence ending with the Board's Reference No. 963-Gt./15-2, dated 5th July 1915, will be held in abeyance.

H. A. B. VERNON,
Special Officer.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
Copy to the Revenue Department.
" " Public Works Department.

II

Reference from the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 654-Gt./16-1 (Confdl. No. 44), dated 29th May 1916.

The Hon'ble Mr. R. B. CLEGG,
Commissioner of Land Revenue.

The Hon'ble Mr. N. S. BRODIE,
Commissioner of Salt, Abkāri and Separate Revenue.

The Hon'ble Mr. LL. E. BUCKLEY,
Commissioner of Revenue Settlement, Survey, Land Records and Agriculture.

The Hon'ble Mr. H. F. W. GILLMAN,
Commissioner of Land Revenue and Forests.

Read—the following paper :—

Memorandum No. 673-2, dated 25th March 1916.

Reference—*No.* 654-*Gt.*/16-1 (*Confdl. No.* 44), *dated* 29*th May* 1916.

With reference to Government Memorandum No. 673-2, dated the 25th March 1916, regarding the division of Malabar into two revenue districts, the Board begs to submit that, if the Kasaragod taluk is to be included in the proposed North Malabar district, it is essential that Coorg should be added to the reduced South Kanara district. The latter district is already a light one and if Coorg is not to be added to it there is not much point in taking away Kasaragod and thereby making the district still lighter. The Board observes from paragraph 285 of Sir William Meyer's report on the constitution of additional districts, divisions and taluks that the Government of India have steadfastly objected to the annexation of Coorg to this Presidency. If their objections still hold good, the formation of the new districts will have to proceed on other lines. Before working out a scheme, the Board considers it desirable that the question of Coorg should be settled. It accordingly requests that Government will be pleased to ascertain whether the Government of India will reconsider their refusal to transfer Coorg to the Madras Presidency and include it in one of our districts.

G. T. H. Bracken,
Secretary.

To the Chief Secretary to Government.

III

Memorial—from the Inhabitants of Kasaragod taluk, South Kanara district.
To—His Excellency the Right Hon'ble John, *Baron* Pentland of Lyth, P.C., G.C.I.E., Governor of Madras.
Dated—the 30th May 1916.

May it please your Excellency,—That it is with feelings of regret and alarm that your memorialists learn that your Excellency's Government is now considering a proposal for the partition of the South Kanara district by separating the Kasaragod taluk from South Kanara and adding it on to North Malabar with the view of forming the latter into a separate district.

2. That your memorialists beg leave to submit that the scheme now under contemplation is calculated to cause much hardship and inconvenience to the people of Kasaragod taluk.

3. That the Kasaragod taluk which extends up to about seven miles to the south of Mangalore which is the headquarters of the district, is essentially a Kanarese tract with nothing in common with Malabar, which is purely a Malayalam country.

4. That the said taluk is inhabited chiefly by Kanarese and Tulu speaking people except a few villages on the Malabar border where Malayalam is spoken. Kanarese has also been the official vernacular of the district for several centuries and though Malayalam has recently been introduced as an additional language, the official records continue to be maintained in Kanarese. Even the Malayalee litigants for whose benefit apparently the new language was introduced are seldom having recourse to Malayalam.

5. That Kanarese is also the language taught in all the schools in the taluk except a few in the abovementioned villages on the Malabar border. Landlords and traders keep their records such as documents, tenants' leases and even their private correspondence in Kanarese and there are very few among the literate people of the taluk who do not understand Kanarese while the bulk of the population is unacquainted with Malayalam.

6. That the customs of the people, the systems of inheritance prevailing among them, and the land tenures obtaining in the district of South Kanara including Kasaragod taluk are different from those in Malabar and the amalgamation of the two will create confusion and disunion.

7. That your memorialists beg to observe that no administrative convenience will be promoted by the absorption of the taluk into Malabar as the people of Kasaragod taluk, most of whom know no language except their mother tongue, Tulu or Kanarese as the case may be, will be under a great disability if they have to resort to courts and offices in Malabar, where Malayalam is the only vernacular known.

8. That, besides the administrative separation that would be caused by the disruption of the district, there would also be the more important social separation between the two dismembered portions of the district. As a necessary consequence of the change, all business will be diverted to the new headquarters in Malabar, and with it will also cease all social intercourse with the old district. The people of this taluk will thereafter form fewer connexions with the rest of the district, and there being no scope for any social intercourse between the ordinary Hindus of the district, who form the majority of the population here, and the people of Malabar, the Hindu population of the district of South Kanara will suffer much on account of the proposed partition. Similar consequences that flowed from the partition of the old Kanara district into North and South Kanara are within the experience of the inhabitants of this district.

9. The fact that there are several ancient Royal families in Kasaragod taluk may further suggest that the Rajas living in Kasaragod taluk may have their sentimental objections to associate with the Rajas of Malabar where the former may not be allowed the position and rank which they may claim to belong to them.

10. Your memorialists humbly hope that your Excellency's Government will recognize that there is much in the sentiments of a people that should be regarded with sympathy. Kasaragod taluk has been an integral part of Kanara for centuries from the time of Native Rulers of whom Tippu Sultan was the last, and the people of the district instinctively cling to the system graciously continued by the benign British Government of administering the district from its chief town, Mangalore, and they naturally object to this ancient system being now abolished in respect of Kasaragod taluk by absorbing it into Malabar which is alien in race, customs and prejudices and placing it under the administration of its Collector who is naturally surrounded by Malabar environments and Malabar influences. Your memorialists are supported in this statement by the following opinion recorded by an eminent officer of the Indian Civil Service, viz., their late Collector Mr. M. E. Couchman. The said opinion was submitted by the people of Kasaragod in support of their memorial praying for a withdrawal or modification of the order of the Government abolishing Kanarese as the language of the Court of the District Munsif of Kasaragod and substituting Malayalam. On a consideration of the said opinion and the memorial the Government were pleased to modify their order and retain Kanarese as the Court language.

"In reply to your letter asking me for an expression of opinion as to the substitution of Malayalam for Kanarese in the Kasaragod taluk, I can say that I have travelled in every portion of the taluk including the Kumri villages and also the villages in the extreme south of the Malabar frontier. I found that the village officers were everywhere conversant with Kanarese. It is only south of Nileshwar that Malayalam is the sole language of the people. In the other parts Tulu and Kanarese are found and the relative proportion of these to Malayalam increases rapidly north of Hosdrug. In the interior, near Coorg, Kanarese is the most common language, and on the coast, Tulu. Few Tulu and Kanarese speaking people know Malayalam. Whereas most Malayalam people who have business in the taluk north of Nileshwar know either Tulu or Kanarese. Mappilla for instance who are usually petty traders generally know all three languages. As Kanarese has been the official language of the taluk for hundreds of years long before the advent of the British I think more inconvenience to the public would be caused by the use of Malayalam than by the continuance of Kanarese."

11. That your memorialists further submit that South Kanara is a moderate sized district and the loss of Kasaragod taluk would make it too small for a collectorate or a judicial district.

12. That the addition of Coorg to South Kanara, your memorialists submit, would be no compensation, as the country is still in a primitive condition, being mostly covered by hills and waste lands. The population of Coorg is also comparatively very small, being only a little more than one-half of that of Kasaragod taluk.

13. That, besides, the Coorgs with their peculiar ways and customs are not a people who can be easily absorbed into the Kanarese and Tulu speaking people of this district.

14. That in conclusion your memorialists pray that the proposal now before the Government of adding the Kasaragod taluk to Malabar may be abandoned.

For which act of kindness your memorialists shall ever be grateful.

IV

Telegram—from Diwan Bahadur A. Pinto, Chairman, Public meeting, Mangalore.
To—the Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—the 6th June 1916.

Public of Mangalore in meeting assembled respectfully protest against reported partition South Kanara by separating Kasaragod taluk. Pray postponement final orders until receipt of memorial being submitted through Collector.

V

Telegram—from Diwan Bahadur A. Pinto, Chairman, Public meeting, Mangalore.
To—the Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Revenue and Agriculture.
Dated—the 8th June 1916.

Public of Mangalore in meeting assembled respectfully protest against reported partition South Kanara by separating Kasaragod taluk. Pray postponement final orders until receipt of memorial being submitted through local Government.

VI

Letter—from M.R.Ry. Kodyamme Shiva Varma Arasu Avargal, Kumbla, South Kanara.
To—the Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—the 14th June 1916.

I beg to forward herewith a copy of the proceedings of a public meeting held in Kumbla on the 9th instant, protesting against the reported partition of South Kanara district and to request that the same may be placed before His Excellency the Governor of Madras in Council.

Enclosure

Proceedings of a meeting of the inhabitants of Kumbla and neighbouring villages held in the office of the Kumbla Co-operative Credit Society on the 9th June 1916.

Proposed by M.R.Ry. Kumbla Narasimha Lakshmana Nayak and seconded by M.R.Ry. Padmanabha Irnuraya that M.R.Ry. Kodyamme Shiva Varma Arasu do take the chair.

M.R.Ry. Panduranga Nayak then read the notice convening the meeting.

The chairman then briefly addressed the meeting pointing out the difficulties and hardships that would be caused to the people by the reported partition of the district and the adding of Kasaragod taluk to Malabar.

M.R.Ry. Padmanabha Irnuraya moved the following resolution :—

"That the inhabitants of Kumbla and neighbouriug villages in meeting assembled view with regret and alarm the reported partition of South Kanara district and the adding of Kasaragod taluk to Malabar and beg to protest emphatically against the partition as the proposed measure will cause considerable inconvenience and hardship to the people.

"That we do therefore join in the memorial proposed to be submitted to Government on behalf of the whole of the Kasaragod taluk and do take necessary action in the matter."

M.R.Ry Bombrana Ramaya Alva seconded this resolution and M.R.Ry. Kumbla Sridhar Nayak supported the same which was finally carried *nemine contradicente.*

M.R.Ry. Konamme Mahalinga Bhatji proposed the following resolution :—

"That the President of this meeting be authorized to submit copies of the above resolution to the Collector of South Kanara and also to the Local Government."

This was seconded by M.R.Ry Anantha Bhakta and carried unanimously.

The meeting then disbursed with a vote of thanks to the chair.

VII

Telegram—from Thayakat Manayil Neelakantam Tirumunpu, President, Public meeting, Nileshwar.
To—the Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor of Madras.
Dated—the 10th July 1916.

Malayalis of Kasaragod in meeting assembled yesterday unanimously resolved to request Madras Government to give early shape to its proposal to annex Kasaragod to North Malabar.

VIII

Memorial—from the Malayali Residents of Kasaragod taluk, South Kanara.
To—His Excellency the Governor (through the Collector of South Kanara).
Dated—the 9th July 1916.

May it please your Excellency,—We, the residents of Kasaragod taluk, South Kanara, in meeting assembled, beg to approach your Excellency with this humble memorial calling your Excellency's gracious attention to our devout sense of approval of the proposal suggested by your Excellency's Government to add this taluk of the district of South Kanara to North Malabar.

2. We beg to avail ourselves of the occasion to ventilate the grievances of the large Malayalee population inhabiting Kasaragod which naturally accrue from the simple but stern fact of this Malayali area being for administration annexed to South Kanara, a district which adopts customs and manners indubitably divergent from those prevalent in this taluk. We may respectfully ask your Excellency's sympathetic attention to the last census records from which it can easily be gleaned that Kasaragod, the southernmost part of South Kanara hangs by itself in the district almost like an 'imperium in imperio' in respect of the language it speaks and customs it follows It is also evident from the same authentic authority that the population of our taluk is pre-eminently Malayalee linked in myriads of ways to the population of North Malabar with which it is in very close touch.

3. The difficulties we have to encounter on the score of language to sustain ourselves as residents of South Kanara are too patent to call for exhaustive treatment. Kanarese, recognized mother tongue of the district, has been foisted upon a population—who, stung with a deep sense of resentment at seeing their own traditional vernacular trampled by administration practically under foot find it next to impossible both from historical memories and social connexions to sympathize, much more to reconcile themselves with an alien tongue. This striking disparity of language accounts above everything else for the clear and close relation of ours with our sister district to the south in the matter of trade. It is no secret requiring to be preached to an observant spectator that prices here of foodstuffs and other articles throb in sympathy with the markets of Cannanore and other principal towns of Malabar decidedly more than with the market of any place in South Kanara. We may further endeavour to convince your Excellency of the countless troubles and inconveniences we are confronted with owing to the court tongue of the district being Kanarese. All procedures of revenue and law ranging upwards from a common summons are invariably couched in a language with which we cannot anywise pretend to be familiar. To feign respect for a vernacular which has been brought into relief by 'powers that be' in utter supersession of our own tongue is, we beg to submit, never in consonance with our humble sense of self-regard and honesty.

4. In this connexion we feel constrained to refer to the recent public meeting alleged to be convened at Kasaragod to voice the public protest against the drafted scheme of your Excellency's Government. It may be interesting to your Excellency to note from the reports submitted thereof that a handful of Malayalis had participated in the endeavour under colour of faithful mouthpieces. We respectfully beg to veto in meeting assembled both collectively and individually the false pretensions those few Malayalees assumed for themselves to speak the public voice and at the same time to convey to your Excellency our cry at once eloquent, emphatic and unanimous unreservedly favouring and loyally praying for a speedy crystalization of the beneficial project framed by your Excellency's Government. We may also state that the Kasaragod meeting referred to was all an ill-pieced play solely if not wholly engineered by a few Kanarase vakils practising there who, pinning the prospects of their professional success upon the local courts and fearing loss in their vocation from a readjustment of the district could only see the Government proposal gall and worm-wood. We cannot also forbear letting out the unhappy secret that the dissenting voice of a few Malayalees on the occasion, of whom the most prominent was Thayakkat Nilakanta Tirumumbu, the biggest estate owner in this place, was little or not at all cared for by those responsible for the holding of the meeting. We have had reason since to suspect that their voice had been fairly brushed aside, if not virtually hushed up.

5. We lastly beg to state that many of the signatories of this humble memorial are extensive property owners in the taluk who have had occasions, by virtue of their position, to test the true pulse of public opinion in the locality in regard to the scheme of your Excellency's Government.

May we earnestly hope and respectfully pray your Excellency to have our joint expression of full approval and support in this matter rightly valued and to have your Excellency's projected plan elevated as speedily as possible into *fait accomplis* which, at all events and at all times will be a thankful boon to the Malayali population of the district and will cause the memory of your Excellency's Presidency administration to be cherished by them with love, respect and gratitude.

IX

Memorandum No. 673-3, Home (Miscellaneous), dated 10th August 1916.

Adverting to the correspondence ending with its Reference No. 654/16-1, (Confdl. No. 44), dated 29th May 1916, the Board of Revenue is informed that the amalgamation of Coorg with the Madras Presidency is not immediately practicable; the possibility of this happening within a reasonable time should not however be lost sight of. If the Board has in view alternative schemes of redistribution, in one of which is contemplated the addition of Coorg to this Presidency at a comparatively early date, while in the other this eventuality is left out of account, it is requested to submit both proposals for the consideration of the Government. Memorials received as marginally-noted are forwarded to the Board for consideration along with the formulation of its proposals.

(1) Memorial, etc., from the public of Mangalore, dated 5th June 1916.
(2) Memorial from the inhabitants of Kasaragod, dated 30th May 1916.
(3) Memorial from the residents of Kasaragod, dated 10th July 1916.

P. Rajagopala Achariyar,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

X

Memorial—from the Malayalis of the Kasaragod taluk.
To—His Excellency the Governor.
Dated—the 15th January 1917.

May it please your Excellency,—We, the representatives of your Excellency's subjects assembled in various meetings held in different places of the Malayali portion of the Kasaragod taluk, South Kanara, beg leave to approach your Excellency with grateful hearts for having so graciously proposed to unite us with our Malabar brethren for administrative purposes and submit the proceedings of those meetings unanimously approving of the said proposal.

2. We, the Malayalis of this taluk, are socially and linguistically one with the people of Malabar. As such our customs and manners, language and nationality, and racial inclinations are quite different from those of the rest of South Kanara district.

3. But unfortunately for us we were politically united with Kanara more than a century ago, when the Government could not be in a position to get an insight into the needs and requirements of the subjects composing the district. Previous to that time we were in every respect part and parcel of Malabar. This longstanding political separation from our brethern of the south and the consequent association with the alien people of Kanara have made us what we are—an illiterate mass of mankind with no idea of progress or civilisation, while our neighbours on either side are advancing by leaps and bounds.

4. (*a*) (i) Kanarese language has been the medium of instruction in schools throughout till recently, when a few Malayalam elementary schools were opened in the extreme south of the taluk. While every nation has chosen its mother-tongue as the medium of instruction, while local vernacular is the recognized second language throughout India, it is unfortunate that we should be forced to study Kanarese alone.

(ii) Though a few boys now and then might have surmounted this linguistic difficulty by dint of hard struggle, the absence of Malayalam in schools has resulted in the entire neglect of female education.

(iii) In matters of litigation and in transactions with Government we have been subject to no less misery. All our records or documents are in Kanarese; and till very lately even court language was Kanarese. Though of late Malayalam has been recognized in Registration and Civil Departments, the recognition has been practically a dead letter with most of us, since Kanarese men alone monopolize the drafting work even at Hosdrug, a place 15 miles away from Kasaragod, on account of their longstanding advantageous position and the ignorance of the innocent villager whom they very easily coax into submission. Our difficulty in carrying on litigation with the aid of these documents and alien pleaders with their broken and mixed Malayalo-Kanarese language has been unbearable. The failure on the part of pleaders and Government officers to grasp the ideas expressed in Malayalam has very often resulted in serious loss or ruin to the parties concerned. Even in such simple affairs like drafting a darkhast petition or deciphering an ordinary court summons a well-educated Malayali is, due to ignorance of Kanarese, very often obliged to cover several miles in search of the fortunate possessor of the blessed Kanarese language and incur much expense and undergo many difficulties quite unequal to the work in hand.

(iv) In villages lying within the jurisdiction of Kasaragod and Hosdrug Sub-Registrars, 90 per cent of the documents are in Kanarese even at the present day, so that the people are unable to have direct acquaintance with the contents thereof. Consequently many an innocent man is very often mercilessly deprived of his lawful claims and put to heavy loss by the Law of Limitation. Then again every record in revenue matters is kept in Kanarese, to which therefore we have little or no access. Since even village accounts, pattas, assessment receipts, etc., are all in Kanarese, the innocent ryots suffer very much. It is monstrous again to see the whole affair of the Co-operative Credit Society of Nileshwar—a place almost on the verge of Malabar—managed in Kanarese.

(*b*) We belong to a nationality quite different from the inhabitants of the major portion of the district. The difficulties arising therefrom are very serious and deserve your Excellency's greatest consideration. Foremost among them is the natural *want of real sympathy* towards us by the Kanara men in general and our immediate neighbours in particular. They never show an inclination even to make an inquiry about our welfare and progress and much less to give us any encouragement towards our advancement. In short, they proclaim by their conduct and attitude towards us their profound satisfaction in allowing us to be where we are and were. Secondly there is the *absolute* impossibility of having any chance of social intercourse with anybody else of the district and the consequent want of opportunities for bettering our condition by following the progressive communities near us. We could have advanced as fast as our brethren of Malabar by mingling freely with them had not the Government kept us under this longstanding political separation.

(*c*) Your Excellency will be pleased to notice the various disabilities we are labouring under on account of the difference in social customs between us and the rest of the district. While social reforms have been affecting the time-honoured customs of the latter, there is no possibility of our borrowing those reforms from them; if only we had been kept united with Malabar, we could very easily have allowed the wave of reforms of the enlightened Malabaris to affect us in time. Now that we have little or no opportunity of coming into contact with progressive Malayalis, we could not but feel satisfied with isolated and conceited life like the proverbial frog in the well.

Our conservative spirit is being heightened by another potent factor, namely the time-honoured but meaningless custom that Nayar women lose their caste if they should cross a certain boundary running almost eastward from the mouth of the Chandragiri river. Respect for caste, which has a very powerful hold even on the educated few, is too strong to be overcome by this illiterate mass; and as longstanding custom overrides law, every attempt on the part of a few large-minded officials to remove it has been a failure. This pernicious custom has been a stumbling block to our progress and education; for none of us could settle down at Kasaragod or Mangalore or any other important place of the district. As all the secondary schools and colleges are situated towards the north of the said boundary, we could not leave

our little boys in towns to be messing in hotels, the only lodgings available for us beyond the river. Thus, while non-Malayali communities progressed in education under favourable situations, we became confirmed in our stay-at-home spirit and consequent want of education. This will be evident from the fact that we could produce but one graduate and about half a dozen matriculates and school finals, though we number nearly 100,000, occupying such a large area.

(*d*) We beg leave to submit a few of the administrative grievances under which we have been groaning due to our longstanding political union with non-Malayali people. First and foremost among them is the want of *efficient* men to represent us in district and taluk boards. While elsewhere eminent persons compete with each other for a seat in the board, our depth of ignorance is so great that our gentlemen, even when nominated, generally resign their places in the taluk board, for the simple reason that it is a bit inconvenient for them to attend the meetings. While a Booker T. Washington would think it a special privilege to address a representative assembly for *five* minutes and would cover not less than 3,000 miles at a stretch, our landlords are, for want of education, quite indifferent to their rights and responsibilities. The road and village cess collected at As. 1–6 per rupee and the Government grants for village improvements are being spent they know not where; they care not to realize that the amount is virtually going to improve other parts of the district. There is but one road, 'Panathadi road' in our parts.

Then again the Government officials who are all non-Malayalis, except a handful from Malabar, often bring into play their prejudice, social antipathy and indifference while dealing with us, your Excellency's passive subjects. Glaring instances of such ill-treatment are too many and too painful to be stated in this brief memorial. In short, we suffer very *much* under the yoke of these alien officers domineering over us in all possible ways.

When persons quite competent for the post of village karnams and village peons for instance are easily available from among ourselves, it is monstrous that these places should be monopolized by alien communities. In most cases, their offices are hereditary. These village karnams with their Kanarese records are a source of mischief to innocent villagers in many respects. Their natural antipathy towards us make them still more dangerous to the latter.

Equally important is the fact the Kanara officials are naturally unable to realize our social intricacies and requirements. Being followers of Hindu Law they are not in a position to understand the social complications and significance of claimants following Marumakkatayam Law. Their tardiness in doing justice to the parties concerned is felt by all. A Malayali officer on the other hand can grasp the situation quite easily, for he knows the ins and outs of our social organization.

Your Excellency's gracious attention may be drawn to the administrative difficulty arising out of the ignorance of Malayalam language on the part of most of the officers. They require translators to get at our thoughts. The pride that comes out of little knowledge prompts an ordinary Kanara clerk to declare himself equal to the task and in the course of translation commits blunders which not only provoke uncontrollable laughter in any Malayali, but often alters facts in a ridiculous manner. To quote an instance, among many, the wisdom of a translator has transferred the 'patta' from a Kuttamatthu gentleman to Kutta and another, for instead of reading 'Kuttamatthu' as one word meaning a certain place, the wonderful translator took it as two words 'Kutta' a proper name of a different family and 'Matthu' which means 'and' in Kanarese. So that he understood the whole to mean 'Mr. Kutta and another' whom he did not think worth while to mention. It is very hard to get on if such profound scholars undertake to discharge responsible duties of administration.

(*e*) More than all is the contemptuous way in which we are being treated by Kanara people in general. It is not in consonance with their so-called culture and our sense of justice and self-respect.

5. If your Excellency should be pleased to carry out the proposal, it shall be an everlasting boon to us in many ways. Once more could we be brought into close contact with those from whom we have been kept apart for a full century and more.

Free exchange of thoughts and ideas, free social intercourse day by day would elevate us from the quagmire in which we have been wallowing for years together. Brought into touch with the enlightened brethren of Malabar, we shall be receiving powerful impetus for education and self-improvement. Vernacular education in particular will revive and spread among boys and girls alike. We would soon give up our conservative spirit and engage ourselves in various industrial activities which at present are being considered below our dignity to follow.

6. We beg to remind your Excellency of the memorial submitted by us, your Excellency's devoted subjects, assembled at Kuttamathu on 9th July 1916, praying for our union with Malabar.

7. We may be permitted to refer to the protest meeting held at Kasaragod a few days previous to that. To the utter shame of those that took part in it, we cannot help remarking that it was not at all a genuine or representative meeting. If it were so, there are more convenient places than Kasaragod—a town not within the area populated by Malayalis; and there are ever so many more worthy chairmen available than a junior and uneducated member of Nileshwar Raja's family. Persons like the Zamindar of Kodoth, or Echikkanam or Talakkad or the first Raja of Nileshwar and many others would have been more suited to such a momentous occasion. That this is the work of a few selfish persons interested in keeping us yoked to them is patent from the above facts and well known to all of us here. Their conduct in having forced a Malayali gentleman to preside over a nominal meeting and their strain in obtaining signatories from markets and Hosdrug fair are nothing but fair and honest on their part. This is the first time we recollect of a Kasaragod Malayali presiding over any meeting in the town of Kasaragod.

8. We hear of the recent pronouncement of the District Board of Malabar about your Excellency's proposal. The fact that, while the majority voted against partition of Malabar, there was no mention made about the question of our union with Malabar, leads us to conclude that they were not against our union with them. Every patriotic Malayali ought to feel for his helpless brethren and we sincerely hope that the esteemed District Board Members are not an exception to this virtue.

9. To divide or not to divide the District of Malabar is left for your Excellency's Government to consider. But our grievances are so unbearable and the hope of improvement otherwise is so remote, that we most earnestly pray for the amalgamation of the Malayali portion of our taluk with Malabar. The said portion covers all the villages lying to the south of the Chandragiri river and a few villages to its north mostly peopled by Malayalis—in fact the whole area beyond which Nayar ladies cannot go without losing their caste. If your Excellency should graciously fulfil the cherished longings of our heart, the period of your Excellency's administration will be fresh in the memories of the Kasaragod Malayalis from generation to generation.

XI

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), Mis. No. 304, dated 27th February 1918.

The Hon'ble Mr. A. Butterworth, C.S.I., I.C.S.,
Commissioner of Land Revenue.

The Hon'ble Mr. Ll. E. Buckley, I.C.S.,
Commissioner of Revenue Settlement, Survey, Land Records and Agriculture.

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter, I.C.S.,
Commissioner of Salt, Abkari and Separate Revenue.

The Hon'ble Mr. M. E. Couchman, I.C.S.,
Commissioner of Land Revenue and Forests.

Read—the following papers :—

(i)

Memorandum—from Government, Public Department.
No.—673-2.
Dated—the 25th March 1916.

(ii)

Reference—from the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
No.—654-Gt./16-1, (Confdl. No. 44).
Dated—the 29th May 1916.

(iii)

Memorandum—from Government, Home (Miscellaneous) Department.
No.—673-3.
Dated—the 10th August 1916.

(iv)

Reference—from the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
No.—654-Gt./16-2, (Confdl. No. 71).
Dated—the 25th September 1916.

The papers read above, which relate to the division of Malabar into two revenue districts and other consequential changes are forwarded to the Collector of Malabar, for early report in personal consultation with the Collector of South Kanara. The Collector of Malabar is requested to prepare and submit two alternative sets of proposals, one based on the assumption that Coorg is to be added to this Presidency and the other leaving that contingency altogether out of account.

2. The report should deal specifically with the following questions :—

(i) whether in the event of Coorg being added to this Presidency, it should be attached to South Kanara or to North Malabar ;

(ii) whether the Kasaragod taluk should remain in South Kanara or whether this taluk, or the southern portion of it, should be transferred to North Malabar ;

(iii) whether the Laccadives can conveniently be attached to North Malabar ; and

(iv) whether the whole of the Wynad taluk should go to North or to South Malabar, or should be apportioned between these two districts.

3. In connexion with each set of proposals statistics under the heads specified below should as far as possible, be furnished for all taluks, or parts of taluks affected :—

(1) Area in square miles (with and without ghat forests, if ascertainable).
(2) Population.
(3) Number of municipalities.
(4) Number of unions.
(5) Land revenue.
(6) Number of revenue papers.
(7) Number of magisterial cases.

4. The report should also include proposals in regard to the divisional charges into which the districts may conveniently be divided.

5. The memorials received with the Government memorandum, dated 10th August 1916, are forwarded to the Collector of South Kanara for consideration.

(v)

Letter—from F. B. Evans, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of Malabar.
To—the Secretary to Government, Home (Miscellaneous) Department.
Dated—the 23rd December 1916.
No.—Dis. 96-Confdl. No. 16.

I have the honour to reply to Board's Reference No. 654-Gt./16-2, (Confdl. No. 71), dated 25th September 1916, on the subject of the suggested division of the Malabar district.

2. I have consulted Mr. Vibert as requested and we are in substantial agreement on the various questions in issue between the two districts. I am sending him a copy of this letter: and he has promised to address the Board separately if he wishes to add anything.

3. The object of the proposal is to relieve the Collector and District Magistrate of Malabar. The essential features of the problem were set out in Sir W. Meyer's report and it does not seem necessary to repeat them. The solution proposed by Sir W. Meyer and accepted by Government cannot be said to have worked unsatisfactorily and so far as my experience goes the Collector of Malabar can hardly be said

to be overburdened with work, now that he has an additional district magistrate and headquarter sub-Collector. The main defects of the present arrangement are in my opinion

(*a*) that the area over which the Collector and District Magistrate has to tour has not been diminished ; and

(*b*) that it is not easy to arrange for an entirely satisfactory distribution of work with the Additional District Magistrate and Headquarter Sub-Collector.

4. As to (*a*) though the area of the district is less than that of many other districts such as Ganjām, Vizagapatam, Nellore, Kurnool and Coimbatore there are more important places distributed over it than in most of the others, and my experience has been that even with a motor-car and without a wife it is not easy to visit the various parts of the district adequately without neglecting obligations to headquarters. I do not wish personally to make any complaint on this account ; but I know that my predecessor found it difficult to visit the Wynad in his last two years and I have been unable to tour there properly this year. Another consideration is that though the district is on the whole well supplied with roads the absence of villages probably involves more leisurely touring than in other districts if the touring officer is really to see the people. The statistics of population, mileage of roads and number of towns given in statement A will also, I think, justify the contention that Malabar is 'heavier' than many of the districts with larger area.

5. As to (*b*) two of the chief criticisms made against the system at first were that it would lead to friction and that there would be too many changes in the personnel of the appointment of Headquarter Sub-Collector. These criticisms are not valid so far as experience goes in this district. I also consider that much of the talk about the burden of routine work is exaggerated. I think however that it is essential in working the system to allow the Additional District Magistrate and Sub-Collector wide discretion and responsibility in dealing with distinct branches of work assigned to him, and the inevitable practical result of this is that the Collector is responsible for orders which he only sees after they have been passed. This is not altogether satisfactory. A further point is that in two of the main branches of work in which the assistance of the Additional District Magistrate and Headquarter Sub-Collector has usually been utilized, the magisterial and local fund branches, complete delegation is impossible and satisfactory division difficult.

6. I doubt however whether these drawbacks are sufficient to condemn the system. In the matter of touring the Collector could be relieved by the transfer of the Wynad to The Nilgiris, a proposal dealt with in a subsequent paragraph. While I personally am satisfied with the arrangement of work that I have made with the Headquarter Sub-Collector, there is also a good deal of sentimental objection to any general partition of the district and no desire for any substantial change. My district board, the members of which I consulted informally on the question, are practically unanimously opposed to it ; and though opinion as represented by correspondence in the newspapers is divided I think that the weight of it is against any proposal to divide Malabar. The main idea seems to be that the prestige of Malabar as one of the most important districts in the Presidency would suffer by division ; and it is also argued that there is intimate connexion in many ways between parts of North and South Malabar, and that division would tend to sever it. Such arguments no doubt lose a good deal of their force in face of the fact that the district has already been divided into two for judicial and police purposes ; but they deserve some consideration and I should be loathe to ignore them. No doubt from purely administrative considerations division would be some advantage, as it would probably be in many of the bigger districts of Madras ; but if the question of Malabar is considered by itself and without reference to other possible changes in the general scheme of the administration and manning of the Presidency, I hardly think that there are sufficient grounds for interfering with the present arrangements ; more especially as it is difficult to suggest any altogether satisfactory division.

7. In any division I think that the taluks of Calicut, Ernad, Walavanad, Palghat, Ponnāni and Cochin must be included in the district of South Malabar and that the headquarters must be at Calicut. It seems hardly necessary to elaborate these points. The Korapoya river which forms the north boundary of the Calicut

taluk is the traditional boundary between North and South Malabar and divides countries which to some extent at least follow different customs. For instance it is roughly true that the Mappillas and Tiyans of North Malabar follow the Marumakkattayam system and those of South Malabar the Makkattayam system, and the boundary line of this difference of custom is the Korapoya river. There are also differences in the details of land tenures which similarly roughly correspond with the local division made by the river. Then there is the practical consideration that Calicut is and has long been the headquarters of the District Judge and the District Superintendent of Police, South Malabar, as well as of the Collector and any change in the headquarters would be very expensive and inconvenient. For these reasons I think it unnecessary to discuss further a proposal which has been suggested in some quarters that Palghat should be made the headquarters of South Malabar, to include the taluks of Ernad, Walavanad, Ponnāni, Palghat and Cochin and Calicut the headquarters of North Malabar to include the taluks of Calicut, Kurumbranad, Kottayam and Chirakkal.

8. Whether the Wynad taluk should be included in North Malabar or South Malabar is a more difficult question. The south half of the Wynad of which Meppadi may be considered as the centre is at present far more important than the north from the planting point of view, and Calicut is a good deal nearer Meppadi than Tellicherry and a good deal easier of access. On the other hand Manantoddy is nearer Tellicherry with which it is connected by a good road; it is not a very long journey from Meppadi to Tellicherry either via Manantoddy or via Pudupadi and Quilandi, or via Calicut; and the Meppadi planters have no special objection to the whole of the Wynad taluk being put in the North Malabar district. At present it belongs to North Malabar for police and judicial purposes and geographically it belongs to the north half of the district rather than to the south half. Finally there is the important point for the present purposes that if the Wynad were included in the district of South Malabar that district would be unduly big for a Collector without the assistance of a Headquarter Sub-Collector. No satisfactory division of the taluk can be devised, any possible division would overweight South Malabar. For these reasons I would recommend that if there is to be division the whole of the Wynad taluk should be included in the North Malabar district.

9. The Laccadives and Minicoy should, I think, be added to North Malabar. Their traditional connexion is with Cannanore and I do not think that there would be any objection to attaching them to the northern district if it is formed. I would add that I use the term Laccadives as applying to the islands attached to Malabar and not including the Amindivis. The question of putting both the Amindivis and the Laccadives under one Collector was discussed and negatived in 1910 (see G.Os. No. 2547, Revenue, dated 14th September 1909, and No. 2662, Revenue, dated 13th August 1910).

10. The further question is whether any part of the present South Kanara district should be added to the North Malabar district. South Kanara as at present constituted is not in need of any relief and the only reason for suggesting interference with the district is apparently to give more work to the Collector of North Malabar district. For this purpose it has been suggested in the Government Order that the Kasaragod taluk should be added to the North Malabar district. It seems certainly inadvisable to detach the whole of the taluk from the South Kanara district; the northern end of it is very close to Mangalore and none of the people of the northern half of the taluk are Malayalis: the prevailing language there is Tulu. There are, I think, only two alternatives possible as regards the Kasaragod taluk:—

(*a*) to add to Malabar the twelve villages south of the Nileswaram river and make that river the boundary of Malabar and (*b*) to add to Malabar the half of the taluk which lies south of the Chandragiri river comprising 45 villages (including the twelve south of the Nileswaram river). Statistics about these areas are given in statement B. The smaller tract (*a*) is peopled entirely by Malayalis and both geographically, linguistically and ethnologically it belongs properly to Malabar, but its addition would obviously not appreciably affect the size of the North Malabar district and the small alteration would involve the inconvenience attendant on the revision of district boundaries as well as those involved in attaching villages settled on one system

to a taluk settled on another. The only proposal worth considering therefore is in my opinion—and Mr. Vibert agrees—that of adding to Malabar the half of the Kasaragod taluk which lies south of Chandragiri river. The population in this tract is mainly Malayali and the Chandragiri river is the old traditional boundary of Kerala; no Nayar woman should cross this river even at this day. On the other hand the proposal has excited controversy and both parties have memorialized Government about it. For division it is urged rightly that the majority of the people south of Chandragiri river belong linguistically and ethnologically to Malabar, and in proof of this it is significant that in a public meeting which Mr. Vibert held at Kasaragod to discuss the question every one on both sides spoke in Malayalam. Again the Nileswaram Raja, who is connected with some of the Malabar Rajas, pleads in support of division that it would enable him to recover his old position as an ancient janmi. *Against* division it is urged that the population of the country is mixed, that the tract has for a century formed part of the South Kanara district and has been settled on South Kanara and not on Malabar principles, while there has been no spontaneous demand for separation. The opposition to division is to some extent the voice of the vested interests of Kanarese Brahmans—and the weight of opinion amongst those that would be affected is in favour of the proposal; but if it is admitted that district boundaries should not be altered without strong positive reasons, I think that on the whole the weight of argument is against division. There is admittedly no special inconvenience to be remedied in the present constitution of the South Kanara district and the addition of 500 square miles of territory with a population of 125,000 and a revenue of $2\frac{1}{4}$ lakhs to the proposed district of North Malabar is not sufficient to be of much importance so far as regards the work of the proposed Collector of North Malabar. This appears to me to be the crucial point. There are other minor considerations. The area in question would be small for a separate taluk and if joined to the northern half of the Chirakkal taluk it would involve having two different revenue systems in one taluk and it would not be easy to find a suitable headquarters. These indeed are not points of great importance, but in the absence of good reasons for division I am opposed to it.

11. My proposal therefore, leaving Coorg out of account, would be to constitute the districts of North and South Malabar as shown in statement C. The statistics show that South Malabar would be twice as heavy as North Malabar so far as area, population, revenue and correspondence, but North Malabar would compare with South as four to five in the number of tahsildars and as three to four in the number of sub-magistrates; and it would comprise the special tracts of the Wynad and the Laccadives which for touring purposes must occupy a good deal of the Collector's time. North Malabar so constituted would no doubt be a light district; but it would be heavier than The Nilgiris, hardly lighter than Chittoor or South Kanara, so far as can be judged from statistics and probably not much lighter than Bellary and Kurnool. Statement D compares proposed South Malabar with North Arcot and proposed North Malabar with Chittoor and South Kanara.

12. The divisions of South Malabar should remain as they are. For the proposed district of North Malabar it is not easy to suggest suitable divisions. Wynad is not a heavy division; but for many reasons I think that it is necessary to have a divisional officer's headquarters situated in the Wynad. A proposal has recently been made by the District Judge to abolish the District Munsif's court at Vayittiri, as there is hardly sufficient work for a munsif; and to give civil powers to the divisional officer and perhaps to the tahsildar. These proposals which I am inclined to support constitute an additional reason for the divisional officer to have his headquarters in the Wynad. The nearest plain taluk geographically is the Kurumbranad taluk, but there is no road from Kurumbranad to Wynad—only a bridle-path beyond Kuttiadi. But for this fact I should have been inclined to recommend that the Wynad and Kurumbranad taluks be formed into one division as was suggested by Mr. Dance (see paragraph 288 of Sir William Meyer's report), Manantoddy is fairly close to the Kottayam taluk, but Vayittiri and Meppadi are not. and if as I propose Tellicherry were made the headquarters of the North Malabar district I doubt whether one deputy collector could manage charge of the Wynad taluk with charge of the headquarters taluk. On the whole I would recommend

that the Wynad be kept as a separate division as it now is; that the taluks of Chirakkal and Kurumbranad be made one division under one deputy collector with headquarters at Cannanore; and that there should be a headquarters deputy collector with charge of the Kottayam taluk. The obvious objection to this is that the Chirakkal and Kurumbranad taluks are separated by the Kottayam taluk, but I think that that would be of very little importance. Access to Kurumbranad is virtually confined to the coast road and the railway and the divisional officer with headquarters at Cannanore would be practically in as close touch with Kurumbranad as the present divisional officer with headquarters at Tellicherry.

A possible alternative arrangement to save the expense of an extra divisional officer would be to give the Collector direct charge of the Kottayam taluk. This was suggested amongst the proposals dealt with by Sir William Meyer (paragraph 288 of his report), but he took exception to "paying a man Collector's salary for work a large portion of which can be done by a divisional officer." The Collector of The Nilgiris has direct charge of the Gudalur taluk and apparently the arrangement works fairly satisfactorily, but the conditions there are of course different, and though the Kottayam taluk is a light one it involves much more divisional work than Gudalur. On the whole I would not recommend the unusual course of giving the Collector direct charge of a division even for the sake of meeting the criticism that he would not have enough work to do as Collector of the proposed new district. If the number of divisional officers must be kept at two, I would prefer to attach the Kottayam taluk to the Wynad division keeping the headquarters of the division at Manantoddy. This would deprive the Collector of the assistance of a headquarters divisional officer, but the Treasury Deputy Collector, who would have a comparatively light treasury, would probably be sufficient and might even be given some magisterial jurisdiction. The Collector of North Malabar should be in direct charge of the Laccadives as the Collector of Malabar is at present.

13. The headquarters of the district of North Malabar should, I think, be at Tellicherry. It is the headquarters of the District Judge and the Sub-Collector's house would do for the Collector with some alteration. The office would require extension, but I think it would be possible to accommodate the Collector and the Treasury Deputy Collector in the compound of the present office if the District Registrar and his office incorporated in the Huzur buildings were moved. The alternative would be to make Cannanore the headquarters; but so long as Cannanore is a military station and the question of its abandonment as such seems to be as far off solution as ever, there is little more accommodation available there than there is at Tellicherry. It has been necessary to build a new taluk office at Cannanore and I think it would be necessary to build a new Collector's office, if the headquarters were put there. For a Deputy Collector's office it would be less difficult to find a suitable building.

14. The extra cost involved in these proposals would not be great. The present Headquarters Sub-Collector and Tellicherry Sub-Collector would be replaced by a Collector and either one or two divisional officers according to the decision of the question of a headquarter division. The Headquarters Sub-Collector has no separate establishment, but some reduction in the present Collectorate establishment would be possible when it became the establishment of the Collector of South Malabar, and some reduction in the Tellicherry Sub-Collector's establishment if it became a Cannanore Deputy Collector's establishment. A new Treasury Deputy Collector would be necessary but his establishment could to some extent be filled from the present establishment of the Calicut Treasury Deputy Collector. Statement E exhibits roughly the extra cost involved so far as establishment is concerned.

15. The above proposals are based on the assumption that Coorg is not to be added to this presidency. If it were added I think that since the proposed North Malabar district would be rather lighter than South Kanara it would on the whole be advisable to attach Coorg to the former. Mr. Vibert agrees but Mr. Souter, whom I consulted demi-officially, considers that amalgamation with South Kanara would be less unsuitable. I enclose a copy of a note which he has sent containing some statistics and particulars about the administration. Mercara is about equi-distant from Mangalore and Tellicherry. The road to Tellicherry is at present the

better of the two and is bridged throughout while the road to Mangalore awaits the completion of one big bridge. Linguistically the affinity of Coorg is rather with South Kanara; ethnologically and historically it has little affinity either with South Kanara or with North Malabar and its laws and administration have always been on entirely different lines. To whichever district it were added I think it is clear that Coorg would require to be kept as a separate division; and I do not think that either the Collector of North Malabar or the Collector of South Kanara would be greatly overburdened by the addition of such a division to his district. Nor do I think that the addition of part of the Kasaragod taluk to North Malabar would be sufficient to turn the scale in either direction. But if Coorg were attached to North Malabar, I should be inclined to recommend that the Wynad taluk should be taken away from it and attached to the Nilgiris. This would prevent North Malabar from becoming unwieldy. The proposal was discussed in paragraph 289 of Sir William Meyer's report. It was supported by Mr. Winterbotham in 1887 but opposed by the Board and was again urged by Mr. Pinhey in 1905. The Wynad Planters Association is in favour of it now and Mr. Knapp is also in favour of it. I do not think that the objections put in Sir William Meyer's report are very cogent; the revenue staff of the Nilgiris as it is includes a good number of Malayalis and my experience is that Wynadians seldom have to come to Calicut to appear before me. It is anomalous that the Malabar and Nilgiri Wynads should be under different administration and the balance of convenience is in favour of transferring the former to the Nilgiris. Statement F gives statistics of the districts of North Malabar and South Kanara, as they would be with Coorg attached.

16. To sum up, I do not think that there is sufficient reason to divide Malabar into two districts, because I do not consider the present arrangement unsatisfactory; but I think it would be advisable to attach the Wynad to the Nilgiris in order mainly to relieve the Collector in touring. If the district is divided I am in favour of leaving South Kanara alone and composing North Malabar of Chirakkal, Kottayam, Kurumbranad and Wynad: and if Coorg is to be transferred to the Madras Presidency I would add it to North Malabar and transfer the Wynad to the Nilgiris.

Enclosures

(1)

Note about Coorg.

Area and population.—The area of the province is 1,582 square miles, having an average population of 111 per square mile, the total population according to the census of 1911 being 174,976.

Subordinate Revenue and Magisterial officers.— The province is divided into five taluks each presided over by a Sub-Magistrate locally known as the "Subedar Magistrate". This officer exercises both revenue and the magisterial functions within the taluk, the latter being confined to second-class powers. This officer is also the Sub-Treasury Officer of the taluk. These taluks are again subdivided into sixteen nads or hoblis, corresponding very roughly to the revenue inspectorate of the Madras Presidency controlled by officers locally known as "Parpatigars". These officials do not exercise any magisterial powers.

Superior Revenue and Magisterial officers.—Three of the five taluks are under the direct supervision of the First Assistant Commissioner, who is also District Magistrate, both as regards revenue and magisterial work arising therein. This post has always been permanently held by a European officer and ever since 1899–1900 by a member of the Indian Civil Service.

The remaining two taluks are under the direct supervision of an Indian Assistant Commissioner who also exercises the powers of a Subdivisional Magistrate within his jurisdiction.

Land Records and Survey Department.—This Department is under the control of a European officer styled the "Deputy Collector, Land Records and Agriculture". He is also the "Registrar of Co-operative Societies" in Coorg. It is proposed to confer this post in future on an Indian on a reduced rate of salary. This officer is also the head of the "veterinary staff."

Police.—The Police Department is under the direct control of an Assistant Superintendent of Police assisted by two Circle Inspectors and a number of Sub-Inspectors. Another Inspector is the office manager of the Assistant Superintendent of Police. The District Magistrate is the District Superintendent of Police.

Civil justice.—There are two munsifs who also exercise second-class magisterial powers within the two municipalities of Mercara and Virajpet where their courts are located. Next there is a Sub-Judge who also exercises first-class powers. He is also the District Treasury officer and Registrar of Assurances. His civil work is subject to the control of the District Judge who is the Commissioner of Coorg.

Education Department.—There is a High school in Mercara with a European Headmaster of the Indian Educational Service and a Lower Secondary school at Virajpet. A net work of primary schools is spread over the whole province. All these educational institutions are controlled by the Inspector of Schools, Ninth Circle, Bangalore, assisted by an Assistant Inspector of schools of the Provincial Educational Service with the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, as the supreme Educational Advisor to the Chief Commissioner.

Public Works Department and Forests.—The Public Works Department is under the control of an Executive Engineer. The Forest Department is under the control of a Deputy Conservator of Forests.

Medical Department.—The Medical Department is under the control of an Indian Medical Service officer who is also the Superintendent of the Central Jail at Mercara. There are an Assistant Surgeon and a Civil Apothecary stationed at Mercara and Virajpet respectively. Nine Sub-Assistant Surgeons are in charge of the hospitals and dispensaries in the town and mufassal.

Excise.—There is an Excise Inspector who is assisted by five Sub-Inspectors. The Commissioner is the direct head of this department.

Commissioner of Coorg.—The Commissioner has been a member of the Civil Service ever since 1902 and exercises supervision and appellate powers over all the departments mentioned above. In him are combined all the offices mentioned below :—

(1) Revenue Commissioner.
(2) District and Sessions Judge.
(3) Deputy Inspector-General of Police.
(4) Inspector-General of Registration and

complete supervision over all the other departments in Coorg.

The Chief Commissioner.—The Resident in Mysore is the Chief Commissioner of Coorg and he is also the Judicial Commissioner for Coorg. He is assisted by a Secretary on the executive side and a Registrar on the judicial side. He forms the 'Local Government' for Coorg.

Revenue.—The latest figures available show that the gross receipts for 1915–16 are as follows :—

	Rs.
Land revenue	3,64,741
Forest including revenue realized outside Coorg	4,49,156
Excise (spirits and drugs)	2,63,482
Local funds	1,34,071
Other heads	1,59,816
Total ...	13,71,266

Mr. Brigstocke's jurisdiction and work.—As already remarked, he is both the Magistrate of the district and the Superintendent of Police. He exercises his revenue powers over three taluks covering an area of 1,038 square miles. He is also Collector of Income-tax, Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages, and administers the affairs of the Virajpet Municipality as its president. In addition to this he is invested with sub-session powers. The remaining portion of the province comprising two taluks with an area of 544 square miles is administered by the Indian Assistant Commissioner. Mr. Brigstocke supervises the work of all the criminal courts in this area too.

Affinity of Coorgs with other races.—Coorgs are a race by themselves. Their manners and customs are peculiarly their own. Their national modes of dress (of both the sexes) are certainly not akin to those of any other sect of India. It is the same case with their language * which is a mixture of Canarese, Tamil, Malayalam and Tulu. Unlike other sects of India, they have no *gurus* (spiritual heads). As a rule they worship village deities of lesser divinity. There are also one or two temples of Siva which probably owe their genesis to the Saivite ruler of Coorg in pre-British days. Owing to the then sparseness of the population, the Coorg Raja imported several families of the Gowdugals from the adjoining South Kanara taluks which acknowledged the sway of the Raja at the time and allowed them the same privileges as Coorgs. Their long residence in the country has affected their customs, etc., to such an extent that except in the matter of speech they closely follow the Coorg customs in all respects. Regard being had to all the above circumstances, if the Coorgs can be said to have affinity with any other race of India, they may be said to have some affinity to the people of South Kanara. Considered from the point of view of the court language † which is Canarese and of the proximity to and convenience for the amalgamation of the province with any of the Madras districts there is no doubt that amalgamation with South Kanara would be the most suitable.

* It is not a written language.

† Indian.

It is quite true that there is a barrier of hills at present unpierced by any line of communication which will not admit of Coorg being amalgamated with the Malabar-Wynaad.

(2)

Statement A.

District.	Area in square miles.	Population as per last census.	Number of municipalities.	Number of towns.	Milage of roads.
Vizagapatam including Agency	17,221	3,189,821	4	15	(*d*) 1,886
Ganjam including Agency	(*a*) 8,379	(*b*) 2,221,292	(*b*) 3	(*b*) 9	(*c*) 761
Nellore	7,973	1,328,152	1	8	(*d*) 1,122
Kurnool	7,580	9,35,199	2	3	(*d*) 767
Coimbatore	7,196	2,116,564	2	13	(*d*) 1,532
Malabar	(*e*) 5,794	(*e*) 3,015,119	(*e*) 5	(*e*) 8	1,576

(*a*) B.P. No. 200, dated 24th May 1911 (D. No. 610/R. 11), and census volume XII, 1911.
(*b*) Census volume XII, 1911.
(*c*) Page 48 of volume II of District Gazetteer, 1905.
(*d*) Board's volume of District Gazetteer.
(*e*) Census volume XII, 1911.

(3)

Statement B.

Locality.	Area in square miles.	Population as per last census.	Revenue, fasli 1315.	Number of villages.	Number of Sub-Magistrates.
(1) Villages south of the Nileshwar river in the Kasaragod taluk.	65·9	34,517	70,946	12	1
(2) Villages south of the Chandragiri river in the Kasaragod taluk.	476·4	125,675	226,354	44	2

(4)

Statement C.

District.	Division.	Taluks.	Area in square miles.	Population as per last census.	Number of municipalities.	Number of unions.	Land revenue, fasli 1325.	Number of revenue papers received by Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars in 1915.	Number of magisterial cases by Tahsildars and Sub-Magistrates.	Number of Sub-Magistrates
North Malabar.	Cannanore ..	Chirakkal ..	681·3 (220)	338,579	1	..	361,400	13,416	1,756	3
		Kurumbranad ..	505·4 (110)	353,983	..	1	453,265	10,259	976	2
	Headquarters ..	Kottayam ..	481·3 (170)	226,682	1	..	223,823	10,147	1,205	2
	Wynad	Wynad	821·2 (220)	82,549	..	..	152,995	6,088	1,280	2
		Laccadive Islands.	7·3	10,600	..	..	..	..	..	..
		Total ..	2,496·5	1,012,393	2	1	1,191,483	39,910	5,217	9
South Malabar.	Headquarters ..	Calicut	378·8 (210)	271,032	1	..	224,742	10,682	3,064	2
	Malappuram ..	Ernad	966·4 (360)	392,607	..	..	424,077	9,749	1,380	2
		Walluvanad ..	881·8 (370)	373,954	..	..	507,977	10,382	670	2
	Palghat ..	Palghat	643·0 (300)	414,009	1	..	562,254	10,930	2,126	2
		Ponnani	425·9	529,383	..	1	611,430	15,976	1,512	3
	Cochin	Cochin	1·7	21,741	1	..	16,298	4,096	285	1
		Total ..	3,297·6	2,002,726	3	1	2,346,778	61,815	9,037	12

Remarks.—The total number of papers relating to North Malabar received in the Huzur office in 1915 was 11,44 0 (excluding papers from the Board and Government); those relating to South Malabar were 20,496.

2. The figures in column 4 are for the total area including ghat forests. A rough estimate of the forest area is given below each in brackets.

(5)

Statement D.

Districts.	Area in square miles.	Population as per census of 1911.	Land revenue, fasli 1325.	Towns.	Divisions.	Taluks.	Sub-Magistrates and Deputy Tahsildars.
	MLS.						
(a) South Malabar	3,297·6	2,002,726	2,346,778	5	4	6	13
North Arcot	4,920 (a)	1,960,960 (a)	3,035,641 (a)	18 (a)	5 (a)	9 (b)	15 (b)
(b) North Malabar	2,496·5	1,012,393	1,191,483	3	3	4	9
Chittoor	5,676 (a)	1,238,742 (a)	894,530 (a)	5 (a)	3 (a)	5 (b)	9 (b)
South Kanara	4,021 (a)	1,195,227 (a)	2,412,649 (a)	6 (a)	3 (a)	6 (b)	10 (b)

(a) B volumes of District Gazetteers.
(b) B.P. No. 219, dated 10th August 1912 (D. 1619/P.-12).

(6)

Statement E.—Cost per mensem of.

Existing establishment in Malabar. (1)		Proposed establishment for North Malabar. (2)		Proposed establishment for South Malabar. (3)	
	Rs.		Rs.		Rs.
Collector	1,900	Collector	1,500	Collector	1,900
Establishment	1,809	Establishment	1,087	Establishment	1,529
Total ..	3,709	Total ..	2,587	Total ..	3,429
Headquarters Sub-Collector ..	1,100	Headquarters Deputy Collector	300	Treasury Deputy Collector ..	400
....		Establishment	188	Establishment	1,061
Total ..	1,100	Total ..	488	Total ..	1,461
Sub-Collector, Tellicherry ..	1,152	Deputy Collector, Cannanore.	400	....	
Establishment	255	Establishment	188	....	
Total ..	1,407	Total ..	588		
Treasury Deputy Collector ..	500	Treasury Deputy Collector ..	300	....	
Establishment	1,369	Establishment	793	....	
Total ..	1,869	Total ..	1,093		
Grand total ..	8,085	Grand total ..	4,756	Grand total ..	4,890
Pay of gazetted officers .	4,652	Pay of gazetted officers ..	2,500	Pay of gazetted officers ..	2,300
Pay of establishment	3,433	Pay of establishment ..	2,256	Pay of establishment	2,590

Note.—Difference between column (1), and columns (2) and (3), grand total, Rs. 1,561. If the Divisional Officer of Cannanore is to be a Sub-Collector, the difference would be increased by about Rs. 500. If there is to be no Headquarters Deputy Collector, the total would be decreased by about Rs. 500.

(7)

Statement F.

District.	Division.	Taluks.	Area in square miles.	Population as per last census.	Number of municipalities.	Number of unions.	Land Revenue, fasli 1325.	Number of Sub-Magistrates.
			MLS.					
North Malabar.	Cannanore	Chirakkal	681·3	338,579	1	..	361,400	3
	Headquarters.	Kurumbranad ..	505·4	353,983	..	1	453,265	2
		Kottayam ..	481·3	226,682	1	..	223,823	2
		Laccadive Islands.	7·3	10,600	..	..	..	..
	Coorg ..	Mercara, Nanjarajpatnam, Padinalknad, Yedinalknad and Kiggatnad.	1,582·0	174,976 (a)	5	..	364,741 (b)	5
		Total A ..	3,275·3	1,104,820	7	1	1,403,229	12
	Wynad ..	Wynad	821·2	82,549	..	..	152,995	2
		Total B ..	4,078·5	1,187,369	7	1	1,556,224	14
South Kanara.	Three divisions.	Six taluks ..	4,021·0 (c)	1,195,227 (c)	1	..	2,412,649 (c)	10 (d)
	Coorg ..	Five taluks ..	1,582·0	174,976 (a)	5	..	364,741 (b)	5
		Total ..	5,603·0	1,370,203	6	..	2,777,390	15

(a) As per census of 1911.
(b) Figure supplied by the Commissioner.
(c) B volumes of District Gazetteers.
(d) B.P. No. 219, dated 10th August 1912 (D. 1619/P. 12).

(vi)

Letter—from L. Vibert, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of South Kanara.
To—the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue.
Dated—the 27th December 1916.
No.—D. Dis. 4504 Rev. (Confdl.)/47.

With reference to Mr. Evans' letter No. D. 96/Confdl./16, dated 23rd December 1916, regarding the question of redistribution in Malabar, I have the honour to state that I have nothing of importance to add to the discussion.

It does not appear whether the people of Coorg themselves have been consulted in the matter. The relative position of North Malabar, South Kanara and Coorg would seem at first glance to indicate that Coorg could be more conveniently attached to the former district.

There is one small verbal modification required in Mr. Evans' letter. The meeting I held at Kasaragod was not actually held for the purpose of discussing these proposals, but for talking over local affairs generally, forest, school and panchayat matters and the like.

(vii)

Letter—from L. Vibert, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of South Kanara.
To—the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue.
Dated—the 16th January 1917.
No.—D. Dis. 89-Rev.

(viii)

Reference from the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 654 Gt./16-4, dated 29th March 1917.

In paragraph 15 of his letter No. 96 D. Confdl., dated 23rd December 1916, the Collector of Malabar states that the Wynad Planters' Association is in favour of the transfer of the Wynad taluk to the Nilgiri district. He is requested to ascertain how the native population of the taluk would view the change and to favour the Board with his comments on any objections that may be urged.

To the Collector of Malabar.

(ix)

Reference from the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 654 Gt./16-5, dated 29th March 1917.

With a view to affording relief to the Collector of Malabar a proposal has been made to transfer to the Nilgiri district the Wynad taluk of the Malabar district. The figures entered below furnish some idea of the work of the taluk.

Area—821·2 square miles including 220 square miles of ghaut forests.

Population	82,549
Land revenue (fasli 1325)	1·54 lakhs.
Number of revenue papers	6,088
Number of magisterial cases	1,280
Number of Sub-Magistrates	2

The proposal is not new. It is discussed in paragraph 289 of Sir William Meyer's report. The Collector of Malabar reports that the Wynad Planters' Association are now in favour of the change and Mr. Knapp as Collector of the Nilgiris was also in favour of it. Mr. Evans writes: "I do not think that the objections put in Sir William Meyer's report are very cogent. The revenue staff of the Nilgiris, as it is, included a good number of Malayalis and my experience is that Wynadians seldom have to come to Calicut to appear before me. It is anomalous that the Malabar and Nilgiri Wynads should be under different administration and the balance of convenience is in favour of transferring the former to the Nilgiris." The Collector of the Nilgiris is requested to discuss the proposal in detail and submit his views. He is requested also to state how he would re-arrange his divisional and taluk charges, in case the Wynad taluk is added to his district.

To the Collector of Nilgiris.

(x)

Letter—from F. B. Evans, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of Malabar.
To—the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
Dated—the 24th April 1917.
No.—Dis. 26 (Confdl. 17).

In reply to Board's Reference No. 654-Gt./16-4, dated 29th March 1917, I have the honour to say that the native population of the Malabar-Wynad is generally opposed to the idea of attaching it to the Nilgiri district.

2. The chief reasons are—

(*a*) that most of the residents in the taluk have relations and connexions in the plain taluks of Malabar;

(*b*) that trade connexions are mostly with Malabar proper;

(*c*) that appellants would have to go to Ootacamund instead of Calicut and would find it expensive and difficult to get accommodation, or vakils;

(*d*) that the prevailing language is Malayalam, not Tamil.

3. None of these objections really amounts to very much. (*a*) and (*b*) Private and commercial intercourse would not be affected by the transfer; (*c*) The number of appeals that come to the Collector and District Magistrate is infinitesimal, while civil jurisdiction would not necessarily be affected; (*d*) Malayalam is the prevailing language of a considerable part of the Nilgiris as at present constituted, and a good deal of Tamil is spoken in the Malabar-Wynad. But I have no doubt that the change would be unpopular with the average Indian resident.

(xi)

Endorsement—from Government, Home (Miscellaneous) Department.
No.—356-1.
Dated—the 9th February 1917.

(xii)

Letter—from A. R. Cumming, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of the Nilgiris.
To—the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
Dated—the 15th December 1917.
No.—R. Dis. 180.

I have the honour to submit my reply to the Board's Reference No. 654-Gt./16-5, dated the 29th March 1917, regarding the proposal to transfer to the Nilgiri district the Wynad taluk of the Malabar district with a view to affording relief to the Collector of Malabar.

2. As observed by the Board, the proposal is not a new one. The reasons for and against the proposal were discussed in detail in Board's Resolution No. 279, dated the 19th March 1888; the proposal was then strongly opposed by the Board and the Board's views were accepted by Government. It is unnecessary, as without a knowledge of the country it would be difficult, for me to discuss the proposal from the Wynad point of view; that may be left to the Collector of Malabar. Suffice to say that when the proposal was mooted in 1887 it was strongly opposed by the Indian residents of the Wynad for reasons which are dealt with in Mr. (now Sir Henry) Winterbotham's report read in the Board's Proceedings above quoted. I understand the position still obtains that Wynadians have seldom or never to visit the district headquarters on revenue business. I note further that the Wynad Planters' Association has now definitely declared itself in favour of the proposed transfer.

3. I have consulted the Nilgiri Planters' Association as well as the principal planters of the district and have also informally discussed the proposal with the members of the Nilgiri District Board. There is a consensus of opinion in this district in favour of making the proposed change, on the score that it would bring the whole planting area under the control of a single Collector and thus secure uniformity of policy in dealing with planting questions.

4. Having stated the attitude of the non-official public to the proposal, I presume I may limit my remarks to the effect which, so far as I can foresee, the transfer, if effected, would have on the administration of this district, and I may at once say

that the only objections of this nature that I can see to the proposal are those dealt with in paragraphs 7 and 8 infra.

5. The grounds so far as they affect the district on which exception was taken to the proposal in 1888 were—

(*a*) that the language of the natives of Wynad is Malayalam and that it would be a real hardship to transfer them to a Tamil district, the revenue and judicial officers of which are unacquainted with their language and their native law and custom; and

(*b*) the difficulty of efficiently manning the Wynad from the Nilgiris.

6. On the first of these points, I would observe that Malayalam is one of the recognized vernaculars of the district and that out of 79 men at present in superior service in this district 29 know or have a fair working acquaintance with Malayalam. In the Gudalur taluk the court language is Malayalam, the village accounts are maintained in Malayalam and the bulk of the population speak Malayalam. So far as I can gather from officers who have served in the taluk, no particular difficulty has been experienced on the score of language in administering the Gudalur taluk as part of the Nilgiri district, and as the transfer of the Wynad taluk to this district would presumably involve the transfer from the Malabar district of the staff serving in the taluk, all of whom would know Malayalam, the language difficulty should not be an insuperable one. The native law and custom in Wynaad are the same as those obtaining in Gudalur and officials of this district have now had forty years' experience of them.

7. The second objection is a more formidable one and if, as appears from paragraph 4 of B.P. No. 279 (Land Revenue), dated the 19th March 1888, the greatest difficulty has been felt in manning the Wynad taluk from the large establishment employed in the Malabar district with eight revenue taluks besides the Wynad and British Cochin, that difficulty is bound to be felt with considerably increased force in this district where there are only two taluks outside the Wynad. I am unable at present to suggest any clear and definite solution of this difficulty. I believe, however, that it is generally recognized that West Coast men resort much more readily to the hills nowadays than they did thirty years ago, and it is possible that the preferential claim which officers who have served for five years in this district in the grade of deputy tahsildar or tahsildar to a transfer to a Tahsildari on the lowest or a corresponding grade in the plains will serve as an increasing inducement to West Coast men to take up service in this district.

8. Another factor which has to be considered in connexion with the proposed transfer is its effect on the local fund administration of the district. It is pointed out in Sir William Meyer's report referred to in the memorandum under reply that the Wynad is not self-supporting in regard to local fund expenditure, and that its transfer from Malabar to the 'impecunious' Nilgiri District Board would involve neglect of its roads, hospitals and schools or a grant from Provincial funds for their upkeep. If the Nilgiri District Board was impecunious at the time of Sir William Meyer's report, its position has not improved since; with the increased cost of labour and materials and the higher standard that the development of motor traffic and the special circumstances of the district as the summer headquarters of the Government and a sanatorium for all India and the Far East impose on the district board in the matter of road construction and maintenance, the board is unable to meet its responsibilities and can certainly not add to them by undertaking to make good any deficit in the budget of the Wynad Taluk Board. The financial position of the Nilgiri District Board is at present separately under the consideration of Government in connexion with a letter submitted by my predecessor Mr. Knapp, copy of which is enclosed. If the Wynad taluk were added to the Nilgiri district, it would probably be desirable to abolish the taluk board at present existing in that area and administer the tract directly under the district board as no taluk boards have hitherto been constituted for this district. If the shares of special grants made by Government to the District Board of Malabar and allotted by that Board to the Wynad Taluk Board were withdrawn by Government from the Malabar District Board and transferred to the Nilgiri District Board, the special subsidy at present granted to the Wynad Taluk Board (vide e.g., G.O. No. 1365 L., dated the 30th

September 1916) were continued to the taluk after its transfer to this district, the full amount of land-cess collected in the area were credited to the area instead of merely a moiety as at present, and the income from tolls and ferries in the taluk which the (Taluk Board's budget is not at present given credit for) were taken into consideration, the Wynad Local Fund budget would probably balance itself. I would suggest that the President, District Board, Malabar, be asked to report specifically on this point. Meanwhile, it is necessary that I should point out, as I have endeavoured to do, the probable effects of the proposed transfer on the local fund administration of this district, and urge that any additional financial burden, which the Nilgiri District Board may be called on to assume in consequence of that transfer, may be borne by Government by way of a special subsidy to the Board.

9. The proposed arrangement would improve the constitution of this district, for it would give the district another divisional officer and a more extensive cadre of posts than the somewhat limited one it now has, for I presume that the divisional and taluk staff at present employed in the Wynad taluk would be transferred *en bloc* to this district. So far as taluk charges in this district are concerned, I am not, on the information before me, prepared to say that any change would be possible ; in other words, Gudalur would have to remain a distinct revenue taluk as at present. As regards divisional charges, the obvious course would be to place Gudalur under the Divisional officer of the Wynad for revenue and magisterial purposes; at present the Collector and District Magistrate is the Divisional officer and Subdivisional Magistrate of Gudalur, though in practice criminal work from the taluk, requiring the attention of a first-class magistrate is dealt with by the Treasury Deputy Magistrate. The local Government has powers under section 8 (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code to constitute the proposed subdivision.

10. The question naturally arises of the headquarters of the Divisional Officer in the event of his having jurisdiction over both the Wynad and Gudalur. As may be seen from the map his present headquarters at Manantoddy would be right at one corner of his division. Various suggestions have been made to me by the gentlemen I have consulted, among the places proposed being Meppadi, Culpetta, Vayittiri and even Pandalur. In my opinion the question is not one which presses for an immediate settlement, and I would suggest that Manantody should continue to be the headquarters of the Revenue Divisional Officer, until some experience is gained of the working of the new division.

11. As regards the pay of the posts of tahsildar and deputy tahsildar, which would be added to the cadre of this district, I would propose that they be fixed at Rs. 200 and Rs. 150 respectively plus the usual Wynad allowances, corresponding to the emoluments attached to these posts when the pay was local and not personal. It is understood that the pay formerly attached to the post of Tahsildar of the Wynad was Rs. 200 and that to the post of Deputy Tahsildar of Vayittiri Rs. 125, i.e., the Deputy Tahsildar was of the first grade.

12. There is one point connected with the criminal jurisdiction of the proposed subdivision which requires to be noticed. At present Gudalur belongs to the Coimbatore Sessions * division, the southern part of Wynad to South Malabar, and the northern part to North Malabar (vide the notifications quoted in the margin)†. It would be anomalous to have sessions cases arising in the proposed subdivision committable, the judgments in first-class cases arising therein appealable to three separate sessions courts. So far as Gudalur is concerned, I would suggest, as Mr. Burrows did in 1888, that it be removed from the Coimbatore Sessions division and included in the South Malabar division. This would reduce the number of sessions courts having jurisdiction in the proposed subdivision to two: whether or not it would be possible or

* (1) Notification dated 22nd August 1873 on page 1343 of Gazette, dated 26th August 1873.
(2) Notification dated 13th March 1877, Gazette, page 173—Part 1, dated 13th March 1877.
(3) Sections 8 and 9 of Act I of 1868, Madras.

Malabar.

† (1) Notification No. 406, dated 14th October 1886, page 911, Part I, dated 15th October 1886.
(2) Notification No. 237, dated 22nd May 1906, page 542, Part I, dated 22nd May 1906.

desirable to give the Sessions Court of South Malabar jurisdiction over the whole of the Wynad is a matter on which the Collector of Malabar may, if necessary, be asked to advise. The local Government's powers in the matter are defined in section 7 (2) of the Criminal Procedure Code.

13. One effect of the proposed transfer would be that it should be possible to bring Gudalur within the jurisdiction of the District Munsif of Vayittiri, relieve the Deputy Tahsildar of Gudalur of the civil powers he now exercises under the arrangements sanctioned in G.O. No. 25, Revenue, dated the 8th January 1906, and do away in whole or in part with the establishment attached to his office for civil work. The file of the District Munsif of Vayittiri is, I believe, at present very light and if, so long as his headquarters remain at Vayittiri, he were required to spend three or four days in the month at Gudalur, no inconvenience is likely to be caused to civil litigants in that taluk. Vayittiri is 45 miles from Gudalur, but if a young and energetic officer who is able to motor cycle were posted to Vayittiri, the journey need not involve any unnecessary waste of his time. The question of the District Munsif's headquarters, if he is given jurisdiction over both the Wynad and Gudalur, may, as in the case of the Revenue Divisional Officer, be taken up later. I understand that civil jurisdiction over the Wynad taluk is at present distributed between the District Courts of North and South Malabar(vide the notifications quoted in the margin). Gudalur is at present under the civil jurisdiction of Coimbatore and if the District Munsif of Vayittiri is given jurisdiction over it, it may be transferred to South Malabar. The local Government's powers in the matter are defined in section 10 of the Civil Courts Act III of 1873.

(1) Notification 68, dated 22nd February 1886, Gazette page 158, Part I, dated 3rd March 1886.
(2) Notification No. 238, dated 22nd May 1906, Gazette page 542, Part I, dated 22nd May 1906.

14. As the proposal has been put forward with a view to relieve the Collector of Malabar, I have not thought it necessary to discuss in my report its effects on the Forest, Public Works Department, or Police Administration of the district.

Enclosure

Letter—from A. R. Knapp, Esq., I.C.S., President, District Board, The Nilgiris.
To—the Secretary to Government, Local and Municipal Department.
Dated—the 8th January 1917.
No.—R.C. 876/16.

I have the honour to submit a copy of Resolution No. 32, passed by the Nilgiri District Board at its meeting held on the 21st December 1916 in which it was decided to ask Government to take over the maintenance of the road from Ootacamund to Gudalur.

2. This road forms part of the through route from Mettupalaiyam to the Wynad, which consists of two sections :—

(*a*) Mettupalaiyam to Ootacamund and
(*b*) Ootacamund to Gudalur.

Both sections were at one time maintained by the Public Works Department under G.O. No. 1025, Financial, dated the 7th May 1884, but section (*b*) which is now in question was transferred to the district board at its own seeking in 1890 (G.O. Mis. No. 1916 L., dated the 2nd August 1890). A perusal of the correspondence connected with that Government order will show that the grounds put forward by the district board for undertaking the burden were neither very specific nor very convincing. Since then, moreover, the circumstances have undergone a considerable change, and the road, which in 1890 carried little but bullock traffic, has now become a motor route of some importance. It forms the direct connexion between Mysore and the West Coast and Ootacamund.

3. The Board as now constituted regards the maintenance of the road, in the condition in which modern requirements demand that it should be maintained, as beyond its powers. The board's income has been declining of late years, while the cost of labour and materials has been rapidly rising and its resources are no longer sufficient to meet the cost of maintaining its roads, many of which require thorough renewal. It is therefore faced with the alternative either of cutting down the allotment for the Gudalur road and allowing it to degenerate into a mere cart-road, or of asking the Government to take the road over. The existence of the road is a valuable addition to the amenities of Ootacamund ; the very roundabout route by rail from

Mysore makes this direct road route of considerable value and convenience and the road being thus of far more than local importance, the Board trusts that Government will, as a special case, recognize it as a suitable object for provincial maintenance.

4. I enclose a copy of a note which sets out in more detail the financial conditions which the Board has to face, and shows how urgent is the need for some relief if the Board's work generally is to be maintained in a state of efficiency.

5. The section of the road which the board desires to hand over is 278 miles. The annual maintenance grant is Rs. 12,510. There are two toll-gates, which in the current year fetched a rental of Rs 3,500. These, if Government so desire it, could be managed by the district board, as are those on the Ootacamund-Mettupalaiyam section, under the terms of paragraph 5 of Memorandum No. 680-E., dated the 16th September 1884, in G.O. No. 2352, Financial, dated the 3rd October 1884.

6. I request the favour of early orders, so that if possible the road may be taken over from 1st April 1917.

Resolution—Mis. No. 304, *dated 27th February* 1918.

The papers read above, which relate to the question of dividing Malabar into two revenue districts, will be submitted to Government with reference to their memorandum No. 673-2, Public, dated 25th March 1916, and Memorandum No. 673-3, Home (Miscellaneous), dated 10th August 1916.

2. In the memorandum, dated 25th March 1916, Government observed that the Malabar district with its area of 5,794 square miles and a population of over three millions was a very heavy charge and that the Mappilla element of the population added considerably to the difficulties of the administration. It was also pointed out that the question of dividing the district had been considered by Sir William Meyer in his report on the constitution of additional districts, divisions and taluks, and that the only objection to the division which was supposed to be insuperable was the lightness of the proposed North Malabar district. To meet this objection Government suggested that the Kasaragod taluk of South Kanara as well as the Laccadives might be included in the North Malabar district and the possibility of adding Coorg to the reduced South Kanara district might also be taken into account. The Board was instructed to examine the question in the light of these remarks and to submit proposals for the division of the district, in consultation with the Collector of Malabar, in case it considered the division practicable and desirable.

3. Before working out any scheme of division, the Board desired to know whether the Government of India would agree to the amalgamation of Coorg with the Madras Presidency and, on being informed that the settlement of this question was not immediately practicable, the Board called on the Collector to submit two alternative sets of proposals, one based on the assumption that Coorg was to be added to this Presidency and the other leaving that contingency altogether out of account. The recommendations of the Collector on the subject are embodied in his report No. 96-D. (Confdl. of 1916), dated 23rd December 1916, read above.

4. There is no doubt that the Malabar district is a very heavy charge for one officer, but relief has been provided for the Collector in recent years by the appointment of a headquarters Sub-Collector, who is also an additional District Magistrate. The arrangement has worked well and Mr. Evans himself admits that, with an officer of this kind to assist him, he cannot be said to be overburdened with work, except perhaps in the matter of touring. In many ways there is an intimate connexion between all parts of Malabar. By the peculiarity of its laws and customs and its land revenue system the Malabar district constitutes a very distinct entity. Malayalis as a whole possess a keen sense of local patriotism and would resent a division of territory which seemed to threaten a break-up of their unity. For all these reasons the Board is of opinion that it is as unnecessary as it would be inexpedient to divide the district, and it will refrain therefore from discussing the details of Mr. Evans' proposals.

5. While declaring himself opposed to any scheme of partition, the Collector has suggested that, in order to afford him relief in the matter of touring, the Wynad taluk might be transferred to the Nilgiri district.

The proposal is not a new one. In 1887 it found the support of both the Collector of the Nilgiris and the Collector of Malabar. The Board, however, as then

constituted was strongly opposed to the proposal, and recorded the following reasons in support of its view :—

(1) the language of the natives of the Wynad is Malayalam and it would be a real hardship to transfer them to a Tamil district, the revenue and judicial officers of which are unacquainted with Malayalam ;

(2) the Wynad is some distance from Ootacamund and the climate of Ootacamund is so distasteful to the natives of the Wynad, especially during the south-west monsoon, that great hardship would be inflicted on all natives obliged to travel thither ;

(3) the business connexion of the inhabitants (both European and Indian) of the Wynad are entirely with the West Coast ;

(4) the manning of the Wynad taluk establishment from the Nilgiris would be a difficult problem.

(5) the Wynad is not self-supporting in regard to local fund administration and its transfer to the impecunious Nilgiri district would involve the neglect of its roads, hospitals and schools, unless help were received from provincial revenues.

At the present day the revenue staff of the Nilgiri district contains a large number of Malayalis and the difficulty in regard to language would not amount to much ; moreover there are many immigrant Tamils in the Wynad. The objection based on the distance of Ootacamund and the difficulty of travelling is also in the opinion of the Board as now constituted, not a serious one, as the people of the Wynad have seldom to go to the district headquarters in person to appear before the Collector. With regard to the other objections, the Board agrees with the Collector of Malabar in considering that none of them are very cogent. The difficulty of manning the Wynad taluk establishment from the Nilgiris is no doubt real, but it is not insuperable. The Board believes that in these days men from the West Coast resort much more readily to the hills than they did thirty years ago and, as the Collector of the Nilgiris suggests, it is possible that the preferential claim allowed to officers who have served in that district for five years in the grade of Deputy Tahsildar or Tahsildar to a transfer to a Tahsildari in the plains would serve as an increasing inducement to West Coast men to take up service in the Nilgiris. Moreover, the Collector of Malabar would be able to spare men for the Nilgiris when required.

6. The Collector of the Nilgiris reports that, so far as his district is concerned, there is a consensus of opinion in favour of transferring the Malabar Wynad to that district, for the reason that the transfer would bring the whole planting area under the control of a single Collector and thus secure uniformity of policy in the treatment of questions affecting planters. The transfer would also improve the constitution of the Nilgiri district, as it would give the district another Divisional officer and a more extensive cadre of posts than the somewhat limited one it now has. The Collector however states that even under present conditions the Nilgiri District Board is unable to meet its responsibilities in the matter of local fund administration and that if the Wynad is to be added to its charge, the additional financial burden thus imposed on the District Board will necessitate a special grant from provincial funds. These are matters which the Board is not in a position to discuss, but it submits that, if the transfer of the Wynad to the Nilgiris otherwise commends itself to Government, the proposal should not be allowed to be defeated by the fact that the local fund receipts of the taluk are inadequate for its needs.

7. If the Wynad taluk is to be transferred to the Nilgiri district, the Gudalur taluk may be detached from the Collector's direct charge and Wynad and Gudalur formed into a division, the rest of the Nilgiri district retaining its present constitution. For a division composed of the Wynad and Gudalur taluks Manantoddy, which will lie in a corner of the area, will scarcely be a suitable headquarters. This question however is one of detail and need not be discussed at this stage.

8. For purposes of criminal jurisdiction the northern part of the Wynad is now attached to the North Malabar Sessions division and the southern part to the South Malabar division. Gudalur is included in the Coimbatore Sessions division. Under the changed conditions the simplest arrangement would probably be to include

the whole of the new Wynad division in one of the two Sessions divisions of the Malabar district, provided that this can be done without making either of the Malabar Sessions divisions too heavy.

9. If the practical difficulties in the way of transferring the Wynad to the Nilgiri district are not serious, the advantages of doing so are, nevertheless, comparatively slight. It is only the planting community of the taluk that is in favour of the transfer, while the native population are opposed to it. The removal of the Wynad from Malabar will no doubt afford the Collector welcome relief in the matter of touring; he will however lose his only upland taluk and will still need the assistance of a headquarters Sub-Collector. The Board has already stated the grounds on which it would deprecate anything in the nature of a partition of the district. On a careful review of the subject it is by no means convinced that any territorial readjustment is called for, but considers that, if Government consider that a change is needed in order to afford relief to the Collector of Malabar, the transfer of the Wynad to the Nilgiris would be the least objectionable course.

(True extract)

H. R. Pate,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Home (Miscellaneous) Department, with enclosures and a file of memorials returned.

Order—No. 647, Home (Miscellaneous), dated 10th September 1918.

Recorded.

(True extract)

R. Ramachandra Rao,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
Copy to the Revenue Department.
" Public Works Department (with copy of notes).

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 647, HOME (MISCELLANEOUS), DATED 10th SEPTEMBER 1918

[Subject.—*Bifurcation of the Malabar Revenue district.*]

Previous papers:

G.O.	692,	*Judicial,*	27*th Mar.*	1879	*G.O.*	378,	*Public,*	18*th May*	1906
"	2115	"	13*th Oct.*	1881	"	861,	*Judicial,*	22*nd* "	"
"	1114,	*Revenue,*	30*th Nov.*	1887	"	1772	"	31*st Oct.*	"
"	2920,	*Judicial,*	21*st Dec.*	"	"	2547,	*Revenue,*	14*th Sep.*	1909
Enclosures in report 26th March 1888 in Public 1268/1888					"	1780,	*Judicial,*	21*st Dec.*	"
					"	427,	*Public,*	28*th May*	1910
G.O.	210-11,	*Public,*	24*th Feb.*	1888	"	2662,	*Revenue,*	13*th Aug.*	"
"	522	"	15*th May*	"	"	517	*W.,*	5*th Mar.*	1914
"	4561,	*Revenue,*	4*th Aug.*	"	"	305,	*Revenue,*	10*th Feb.*	1916
"	876,	*Public,*	6*th Sep.*	"	"	1365	*L.,*	30*th Sep.*	"
"	470	"	31*st May*	1889	"	181,	*Revenue,*	11*th Jan.*	1918
"	813	"	24*th Oct.*	1905	*Report on the Administration of Coorg for 1914–15*				
"	25,	*Revenue,*	8*th Jan.*	1906					

Public Works Department.

[Subject.—*Construction of a house for the additional Sub-Collector, Calicut.*]

* * * * * *

The file may now be circulated to the Honourable Member.

R.K.—15-1-16.

D. Marshall—17-1-16.

Before sanctioning this I should like to know whether the question of subdividing Malabar into two districts has been considered recently. The area is not large (5,794 square miles) but the population is over three millions and Mr. Evans told me the other day that he thought the judicial district of North Malabar should be made a separate revenue district. That would be a very light district but Kasaragod taluk which is inhabited by Malayalam-speaking people could be included in it. Coorg should then be included in South Kanara. I suggest this question be examined before we sanction the building of a house for the additional Sub-Collector.

H. A. S[tuart]—18-1-16.

Public Department.

Submitted that the question of dividing the Malabar district and adding Coorg to this Presidency was discussed by Sir William Meyer in his report on the constitution of additional districts, divisions and taluks—vide paragraphs 281 to 290 of his report. The reasons against the transfer of Coorg to this Presidency will be found in paragraph 285 of the report. The other alternatives that were considered and rejected for giving relief to the Malabar Collector were—

(1) to transfer Wynad to The Nilgiris—paragraph 289;

(2) to create a North Malabar Collectorate, the Collector having direct charge of the Headquarters division—paragraph 288;

(3) to transfer Chirakkal taluk to South Kanara—paragraph 290.

Ultimately, however, the only changes made were the transfer of Anjengo and Tangasseri to the charge of the Resident in Travancore and Cochin and the appointment of a Personal Assistant Sub-Collector.

2. The area and population of Malabar, South Kanara and Coorg and of the districts redistributed as suggested by the Honourable Member (Judicial) are shown in the following statement :—

District.	Taluks.	Area in square miles.	Population.
Malabar ...	Calicut	379	271,032
	Chirakkal	682	338,579
	Cochin	2	21,741
	Ernad	966	392,607
	Kottayam	481	226,682
	Kurumbranad	505	353,983
	Laccadive islands	7	10,600
	Palghat	643	414,009
	Ponnani	426	529,383
	Walavanad	882	373,954
	Wynad	821	82,549
		5,794	3,015,119
South Kanara ...	Amindivi islands	3	3,955
	Coondapoor	619	139,599
	Kasaragod	762	247,467
	Mangalore	382	276,515
	Mudabidri	640	110,174
	Udipi	725	272,756
	Uppinangadi	890	144,761
		4,021	1,195,227
Coorg		1,582	174,976

Proposed.

Districts.	Area in square miles.	Population.
North Malabar—		
North Malabar Judicial district, Chirakkal, Kottayam, Kurumbranad and Kasaragod (from South Kanara).	2,430	1,166,711
South Malabar—		
Calicut, Ernad, Ponnani, Palghat, Walavanad, Cochin and Wynad.	4,126	2,095,875
South Kanara—		
South Kanara (minus Kasaragod) and Coorg ...	4,841	1,122,736

North Malabar is already a separate district for judicial, police and registration.

3. It is for consideration whether, in view of the previous discussions, the subject should be further examined. If so, the remarks of the Collectors of Malabar and South Kanara may perhaps be obtained in the first instance.

P.G.S.S.—11-2-16.

S.S.—12-2-16.

There is a strong case for the division of the Malabar district, as it now stands, on administrative grounds. The fact that it has been found necessary already to divide it into two for police, registration and judicial purposes is a strong indication that the severance will eventually become complete and that each half will be put under a separate Collector and District Magistrate. It cannot be said, in this department, that the amount of work and responsibility now devolving on the head of the district justifies the proposal; that must be left to the departments concerned to decide—Revenue and Judicial. It will be sufficient to say in this department that, as the case now presents itself, the proposal has many attractions and does not seem to be obnoxious to serious objection. Among the chief advantages involved in the

project are the ease and cheapness with which it can be accomplished, as the only important addition to the staff and buildings will be a collectorate and that on a small scale, and as it is presumed that the line of demarcation will be the same as that which now divides the jurisdiction of the two District Judges or of the two District Superintendents of Police, presumably the latter.

2. The reasons for which this line was fixed for police purposes are found clearly set out in G.O. No. 1772, Judicial, dated 31st October 1906, and they have even stronger force when it comes to dividing the magisterial jurisdictions also. Several objections to the division of the district were raised by Mr. Logan and recapitulated by Sir William Meyer in paragraph 287 of his report only, with one exception, to be summarily disposed of. Perusal will show that such weight as they once carried has since much diminished. The exception alluded to is the comparatively small size of the proposed North Malabar district. Sir William Meyer apparently regarded this as an insuperable objection, but when it is a matter of choice between two evils and these evils are, on the one hand, unwieldy size and consequent inefficiency, and the other, the formation, at no great expense and without difficulty, of a district the head of which will be less hardworked than the majority of Madras districts, one would simply plump for the latter. As a matter of fact, smallness of the area and population of a district does not necessarily involve lightness of work; it merely gives scope for more detailed work and closer supervision. Take Ceylon, for instance, where charges are extraordinarily small, but men do not seem to be underworked. Even in India, the proposed new Malabar district would, I understand, be a normal charge in another province. The *Madras Standard* referred to by Sir William Meyer is not necessarily a law of the Medes and Persians and may call for reconsideration and adjustment to modern conditions.

3. It has been assumed in the note that the southern taluk of South Kanara which is Malayali will be incorporated in the North Malabar district and there is much to be said for this. It is not worth discussing it at length until the Collectors concerned and the Board have had their say; it will be seen, however, that a district so composed will not be a negligible quantity containing, as it does, well over a million people and extending over nearly 3,000 square miles of country. It might also be possible to convey the Laccadives from Calicut to Cannanore, which would, I understand, afford appreciable relief to South Malabar. The following table compares the area and population of the proposed two districts with those of smaller charges in the Presidency including the proposed new Ellore district :—

Districts.	Area in square miles.	Population (census 1911).	Land revenue and cesses.
Anantapur	6,718	963,223	13·22
Chittoor	5,676	1,238,742	11·73
North Arcot	4,920	1,960,960	28·90
Bellary	5,714	969,436	19·99
Madura	4,916	1,932,832	28·50
Ramnad	4,834	1,658,453	15·71
Tinnevelly	4,353	1,790,619	31·13
Tanjore	3,727	2,362,689	66·22
New Kistna (without additions from Guntur).	3,559	1,023,173	35·27
New Ellore (without Polavaram)	2 348	974,362	39·72
Proposed North Malabar district	2,430	1,166,711	..
Proposed South Malabar district	4,126	2,095,875	..

Another great advantage with which this projected bifurcation starts is that the Government of India have already approved it in principle, and the delay in obtaining their sanction would not probably be great. As regards the line of demarcation of the proposed new district, there will be no hesitation in making it identical with that of the judicial and registration district but including the Wynad, that is to say, the same as for the police district of North Malabar—vide orders of 1906 forming the police district of Malabar referred to above (G.O. No 1772, Judicial, dated 31st October 1906). What has there been said of the duties of Superintendents of Police in Malabar applies with equal force to the duties of District Magistrates in Malabar. The essential is to keep the fanatic Mappilla zone in one jurisdiction and

this is affected by the present distribution. Calicut, the largest town in Malabar, must necessarily remain the seat of the head of the southern district, not only is it the most suitable centre from which to control the fanatical zone, part of which must necessarily fall in the southern district, but an alternative place as district headquarters is not forthcoming—Notes to G.O. No. 1772, Judicial, dated 31st October 1906 (vide discussion on the selection of police headquarters for the divided district).

4. Efforts have been made to trace the orders constituting North Malabar as a separate jurisdiction for Judge and Registrar, but they have not been discovered. The separate judicial districts of Tellicherry and Calicut appear to have existed at least from 1843—vide paragraph 3 of notification on page 112 of Part II, Local Rules and Orders, volume I. Orders have also been traced reconstituting North Malabar as a separate registration district (vide G.O. No. 2115, Judicial, dated 13th October 1881) after it had been for two years in abeyance, but papers relating to and explaining the original constitution of this charge have not been traced. It may be coeval with the Judges. The division is anyhow of long standing and precludes the possibility of there being any sentimental or factious agitation against the complete severance. Taking it all round, I submit that the subject deserves serious examination. I think the Board might be asked, in the first instance, to draw up proposals in conjunction with the Collector of Malabar and work them out in some detail, after consulting the District Magistrate, South Kanara, if they think fit. Or the two Collectors and District Magistrates may be asked to express their opinions on the proposal and submit them through the Board.

5. If the bifurcation becomes a fact, the post of Headquarters Sub-Collector, Calicut, will presumably be abolished and the pay of the post saved. It will then be unnecessary to build a house for this officer in Calicut [and the proposal may for the present lie over].

E. A. HARVEY—7-3-16.

I have nothing to add to Mr. Harvey's note. The proposals must as suggested go to the Board for careful examination.

H. A. B. VERNON—10-3-16.

Submitted for orders whether the case may, at this stage, be circulated to the Hon'ble Sir Harold Stuart (through the Honourable Member, Public) with reference to the Honourable Member's note on page 1 ante.

P.G.S.S.—10-3-16.

S.S.—10-3-16.

Had better be circulated to the Honourable Member (Public) first in any case, I think.

E.A.H.—10-3-16.

No, the Honourable Member wanted the question examined presumably by a responsible body such as the Board. After the Board's report is received, the file will go to the Honourable Member.

H.A.B.V.—11-3-16.

A draft official memorandum to the Board of Revenue is submitted for approval.

It may be sent to the Revenue Department for acceptance. (After issue of the reference, the case may be returned to Public Works Department through Revenue, an extract of the relevant notes being retained and started as a separate case.)

P.G.S.S.—16-3-16.

S.S.—16-3-16.

E.A.H.—21-3-16.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

The draft official memorandum may, it is submitted, be accepted in this department and the file returned to the Public Department.

S.R.—23-3-16.

H. A. B. VERNON—24-3-16.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

For orders whether the draft may now issue.

P.G.S.S.—24-3-16.

T.A.S.—24-3-16.

Yes.

E. A. HARVEY—24-3-16.

[Official Memorandum No. 673-2, Public, dated 25th March 1916—I.]

To the Honourable Member (Public) for perusal.

P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR—10-5-16.

Mr. Harvey was quite right in saying that this file should be circulated to me before the reference went to the Board and Mr. Vernon was, as usual, hopelessly wrong. Our experience of this officer's unfitness for Secretariat work should be noted as an illustration of the defects of the Deputy Secretaryship system.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—10-5-16.

To the Chief Secretary for perusal.

P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR—11-5-16.

Thank you. I am making a note of the case.

L. DAVIDSON—12-5-16.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

II

Reference from the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 654-Gt./16-1 (Confdl. No. 44), dated 29th May 1916.

Attention is solicited to the extract from the note by the Honourable Member (Public Works Department) on page 1 ante and paragraph 3 of Memorandum to the Board of Revenue, No. 673-2, dated 25th March 1916. The Board of Revenue invites attention to paragraph 285 of Sir William Meyer's report on the constitution of additional districts, etc., where it is remarked that the Government of India have steadfastly objected to the annexation of Coorg to this Presidency; and suggests that before working out a scheme for the partition of the Malabar district it should be ascertained from the Government of India whether they will reconsider their refusal to transfer Coorg to this Presidency.

2. A short previous history of the administration of Coorg and the changes proposed in its administration from time to time till 1886 (G.O. Nos. 210-11, Public, dated 24th February 1888) are contained in the note by the Hon'ble Rao Bahadur M. G. Ranade, one of the members of the Government of India Finance Committee of 1886. It will be seen therefrom that in 1881, when the rendition of Mysore took place, the question of amalgamation of Coorg with the Madras Presidency was raised but was dropped for the following main reasons (page 10 of G.O. Nos. 210-11, Public, dated 24th February 1888):—

(1) The Coorg people did not relish the proposal;
(2) The Coorg planters protested against it;
(3) the proposal had been negatived when made on two previous occasions;
(4) that greater administrative convenience resulted from the subordination of Coorg to Mysore than from its incorporation with a Madras district.

3. In his note dated 23rd December 1886 (pages 9–11 of G.O. Nos. 210–11, Public, dated 24th February 1888) the Hon'ble Mr. M. G. Ranade effectively criticized the above arguments against the amalgamation of Coorg with the Madras Presidency and suggested that the question of amalgamation of Coorg with the Nilgiri district should engage the attention of the Government of India in the interests of financial economy and administrative efficiency. The Financial Commissioners with the Government of India in their note dated 9th March 1887 (pages 1–2 of G.O. Nos. 210–11, Public, dated 24th February 1888) agreed in the recommendation that Coorg should be amalgamated with the Madras Presidency, but remarked that it would probably be found most convenient to make it a subdivision of South Kanara district. They also remarked that while political objections to the amalgamation of Coorg and Madras were not within their province to criticize, the amalgamation would certainly tend to economy and not injure the efficiency of administration (pages 1–2 of G.O. Nos. 210–11, Public, dated 24th February 1888).

4. The Government of India forwarded to this Government in December 1887 (Home Department letter No. 2852, dated 20th December 1887, on page 12 of G.O. Nos. 210–11, Public, dated 24th February 1888) an extract from the note by the Finance Commissioners above referred to and wanted the views of this Government on the proposal together with information as to the strength and cost of the establishments that would be required for the administration of Coorg under the Madras Government (1) as a separate district and (2) as a subdivision of the South Kanara district.

5. In G.O. No. 210, Public, dated 24th February 1888, Mr. Sturrock, Chief Secretary, was placed on special duty to report on the question. The report submitted by him will be found attached to letter No. 522, Public, dated 15th May 1888. For the reasons stated in paragraph 4 of his report he stated it as his opinion that, when Coorg was added to the Madras Presidency, it should be administered as a separate district. In paragraphs 3 and 4 of this Government's letter No. 522, Public, dated 15th May 1888, the Government of India were informed that the transfer of Coorg to this Government was eminently desirable but that "at all events—for several years to come—Coorg must be maintained as a separate district."

6. The Government of India in forwarding the proposals of this Government to the Secretary of State in Despatch No. 39, dated 5th February 1889 (G.O. No. 470, Public, dated 31st May 1889), proposed that the existing arrangements under which Coorg is administered directly by the Government of India should *not* be disturbed for the following reasons :—

(*a*) The inquiries made show that the financial saving to be anticipated from the transfer of Coorg to the Madras Presidency would, particularly if Coorg were to be administered as a separate district, be inconsiderable ;

(*b*) the transfer would be very distasteful to the inhabitants who appear to maintain that assurances have been given to them that their country should remain under the direct control of the Government of India. Though too much stress need not be placed upon this representation, the local opposition to the transfer outweighed the financial advantage which might be expected from disturbing existing arrangements.

The Secretary of State in Despatch No. 75, dated 4th April 1889 (G.O. No. 470, Public, dated the 31st May 1889), concurred in the opinion expressed by the Government of India that the existing arrangements should be maintained. The question of annexation of Coorg to the Madras Presidency has not been considered since then.

7. Since the Government of India expressed the opinion referred to in the foregoing paragraph, 27 years have elapsed and it is not known how far the circumstances which then stood in the way of amalgamation of Coorg with the Madras Presidency now retain their force. Orders are therefore solicited whether, as suggested by the Board, the Government of India may be addressed.

8. Under Act XIV of 1874 the Chief Commissionership of Coorg is a scheduled district, and the annexation of Coorg to Madras will involve legislative changes, but proposals in this regard will have to be worked out only later on in consultation with the departments of the Secretariat (paragraphs 101 and 105 of Mr. Sturrock's report on pages 21–22 of letter No. 522, Public, dated the 15th May 1888, and paragraph 9 of letter ibid.).

It would remain a scheduled district, of course ; and might be constituted an agency.

E.A.H.—10-6-16.

C.P.K.—9-6-16.

The question is whether the Government of India should be asked to reconsider their decision. It will undoubtedly simplify the problem of the re-arrangement of Malabar and South Kanara if Coorg be added to the latter. It is perhaps open to doubt whether the Government of India will be much influenced by considerations of administrative efficiency in this province ; still the anomalous position of Coorg, the expense of its administration and other reasons that are to be found in the papers above referred to (pages 9–11 of G.O. Nos. 210–11, Public, dated 24th February 1888) constitute a strong case for incorporating this little province in Madras and in the South Kanara district to which it naturally belongs ; and the Government of India may after 27 years be disposed to attach less importance to the considerations which guided them in 1889 and stated on pages 15–16 of their notes (G.O. No. 470, Public, dated 31st May 1889). I submit that a reference on the lines suggested by the Board may be made to India ; if so ordered, a full draft will be prepared.

E. A. HARVEY—13–6–16.

The Board wants the question of Coorg to be first settled. The past correspondence on the subject is summarized above. Should we now address India asking for the reopening of the question and suggesting that Coorg should be added to South Kanara as a subdivision of that district ? It is clear that people in Coorg attach importance to being under the Government of India direct : and the proposal to transfer Coorg to the South Kanara district, if widely known, is bound to cause agitation in Coorg and the chances are that in the end India will decide that the *status quo* need not be disturbed so far as Coorg is concerned.

P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR—14–6–16.

I agree with Mr. Rajagopala Achariyar. Perhaps the Hon'ble Sir Harold Stuart could ascertain informally whether there would be any prospect of the Government of India's consenting to the transfer of Coorg to this Presidency. I expect not as the Government of India will hardly want to raise a controversy just now.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—14–6–16.

I have written to Mr. Wheeler and place a copy of my letter below.

H. A. S[TUART]—16–6–16.

With regard to the feeling of the people of Coorg, I have reason to believe that that it is not really opposed to incorporation in this Presidency. It is the European planters who are opposed to this measure and not the natives of the province. When I visited Mercara in 1912, I spoke to Rao Bahadur C. Wadiah and other educated gentlemen on the subject. They resented their isolation and wished to become part of this Presidency.

P. S. S[IVASWAMI AYYAR]—17–6–16.

Mr. Wheeler's reply may be awaited. My impression is, from what passed in connexion with my visit to Coorg, that in the interests of Coorg the change is highly desirable, and that with certain conditions and safeguards preserving the individuality of Coorg in some measure, the people there—i.e., the various sections—would not seriously oppose. But this proviso will, I gather, be found to be cardinal.

P[ENTLAND]—18–6–16.

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.S.I., K.C.V.O., Member of Council.
To—the Hon'ble Mr. H. WHEELER, C.S.I., C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 16th June 1916.

We are now engaged in examining the question of dividing the Malabar district which is too large for one man to manage. It is under contemplation to add to the proposed district of North Malabar the adjoining part of the South Kanara district which is chiefly occupied by

people who speak the Malayalam language. With the transfer of this area, South Kanara will become a light charge and we should like to know whether the Government of India would view favourably a revival of the proposal to transfer Coorg to South Kanara. The transfer would not be popular among the Coorgs, but on many administrative grounds it would be a good arrangement. It is possible, however, that the Government of India may be unwilling to have this contentious question raised at the present time. Will you please let me have an answer as soon as possible?

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.S.I., K.C.V.O., Member of Council.
To—the Hon'ble Mr. L. DAVIDSON, C.S.I., I.C.S., Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 26th July 1916.

In connexion with the proposal to form a district of North Malabar, I wrote to Wheeler to ascertain the wishes of the Government of India on the subject of raising at the present time the amalgamation of Coorg with Madras. I enclose the reply from Hignell who is now acting as Home Secretary. I am not sure whether this subject is dealt with by you or Bedford. If it is not dealt with by you, please pass it on to Bedford.

Demi-official—from S. R. HIGNELL, Esq., I.C.S., Acting Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department.
To—the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.S.I., K.C.V.O., Member of Council.
Dated—Simla, the 21st July 1916.
No.—623, Public.

In reply to your demi-official letter to Wheeler, dated the 16th June 1916, I am desired to say that the Government of India would prefer that the question of the amalgamation of Coorg with the Madras Presidency should not be reopened at the present time.

The Government of India do not want the question of amalgamation of Coorg with this Presidency raised at the present time. The Board of Revenue has already stated that if Coorg is not added to South Kanara there is not much point in taking away Kasaragod taluk from South Kanara and thereby making the district still lighter, and that the formation of the new (Malabar) districts will have to proceed on other lines.

There is the point that the Malayalam-speaking population will be included in a Malayalam-speaking district.

E.A.H.—2-8-16.

2. Submitted that the proposed North Malabar district also would be light if Kasaragod taluk is not added to it as will be seen from the statement below :—

It seems inevitable that (minus Coorg) either South Kanara or North Malabar must be unduly light which is preferable?

E.A.H.—2-8-16.

Districts.	Area in square miles.	Population.
North Malabar (including Kasaragod)	2,430	1,166,711
North Malabar (excluding Kasaragod)	1,668	919,244
South Kanara (existing)	4,021	1,195,227
South Kanara (excluding Kasaragod)	3,259	947,760
South Malabar	4,126	2,095,875

3. Before the question is considered further, the Board of Revenue may perhaps be asked to submit suitable proposals for the formation of the new districts leaving out of account the question of amalgamation of Coorg with this Presidency. Memorials have been received protesting against the proposed transfer of Kasaragod to North Malabar. These, and a memorial which *advocates* the transfer of Kasaragod from South Kanara, may be referred to the Board of Revenue for consideration in formulating proposals for the bifurcation of the Malabar district. A draft memorandum is submitted for approval.

T.C.N.—28-7-16.
C.P.K.—31-7-16.

It seems better that the proposals to be considered by the Government should be so drawn as to allow for the eventual absorption of Coorg into South Kanara. It is possible that the Board have in view an entirely different scheme of redistribution

from the natural one that has been suggested in their notes and one that will not be conveniently adapted to the eventual absorption of Coorg. I submit that the Board may be requested to put up alternative schemes, one to suit the contingency of the fairly early amalgamation of Coorg with South Kanara and the other in which this eventuality is completely disregarded, as it appears from its letter that it has alternative schemes in view. I submit an alternative draft for consideration.

E. A. HARVEY—2-8-16.

I agree with Mr. Harvey. His draft may issue.

P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR—8-8-16.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—9-8-16.

Issue.

P.R.—9-8-16.

[Memorandum to the Board of Revenue, No. 673-3, dated 10th August 1916—**IX.**]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

From the Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor, Memorandum No. 425-*P., dated* 20*th January* 1917.

The petition relates to the amalgamation of the Malayali portion of the Kasaragod taluk of the South Kanara district with the Malabar district. Submitted that the subject—redistribution of districts—is for Home (Miscellaneous) Department to which the current may be transferred.

The Home (Miscellaneous) Department have a file pending with them.

A.S.R.—31-1-17.

V. A. ANANTARAMA AYYAR—3-2-17.

A. H. A. TODD—3-2-17.

HOME (MISCELLANEOUS) DEPARTMENT.

The memorial may, it is submitted, be forwarded to the Board of Revenue.

T.C.N.—7-2-17.
P.DER.—7-2-17.

Yes.

E.A.H.—8-2-17.

[Endorsement No. 356-1, Home (Miscellaneous), dated 9th February 1917.]

Extract from demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. H. V. Cobb, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., Chief Commissioner of Coorg.

* * * * * *

4. In conversation with the President of the association (Coorg Landholders') and with other Coorgs, I am surprised to find how strong is the feeling in favour of the present system of administration as opposed to Coorg becoming part of the Madras Presidency. On this point the Coorg national sentiment is practically unanimous. A recent leaderette in the *Madras Mail* suggesting the absorption of the province has evidently excited their suspicions.

Note by Sir Alexander Cardew.

An extract of paragraph 4 of Mr. Cobb's letter should be added to the file about redistribution of the Malabar and South Kanara districts which Mr. Vernon started.

D. N. STRATHIE—14-12-17.

Submitted for perusal. With reference to the Under Secretary's remarks in the arrears list suggesting that inquiries may be made in what stage the question is, a draft memorandum is submitted for approval.

T.C.N.—15-12-17.

P.DER.—15-12-17.

C. H. BROWN—16-12-17.

XI

From the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), Mis. No. 304, dated 27th February 1918.

The Board of Revenue submits its views on the question of the partition of the Malabar district into two new districts. The alternative proposals called for in Memorandum No. 673-3, Home (Miscellaneous), dated the 10th August 1917, have been worked out by the Collector of Malabar, but the Board of Revenue does not consider it necessary to deal with them as it is strongly opposed to the partition of the district.

2. The question of dividing the Malabar district into two districts on account of its large population, its liability to Moplah disturbances, etc., has engaged the attention of Government from time to time since 1857, but the proposals have been dropped on account of the necessity for dealing with the land tenures on some uniform plan and in view of the necessity for retaining an undivided control of the Moplah population. A full history of the question will be found set forth in paragraphs 282 to 291 of Sir William Meyer's report on the reconstitution of districts and divisions. The question was started afresh by Mr. Evans in 1916 in a conversation with Sir Harold Stuart (Sir Harold Stuart's note, dated the 18th January 1916, at page 1 ante).

3. The circumstances which, it was thought, would facilitate a division were—

(1) The possible amalgamation of Coorg with the Madras Presidency—Notes at pages 1-4 ante and Memorandum No. 673-2, dated 25th March 1916 (paper I);

(2) The transfer of the Kasaragod taluk of the South Kanara district to Malabar; and

(3) The already existing divisions of the district into two for police, registration and judicial purposes.

4. The Government of India who were consulted demi-officially on the question of amalgamation of Coorg stated that it should not be reopened at the present time (Mr. Hignell's demi-official letter at page 8 ante). The Chief Commissioner of Coorg has recently brought to the notice of Government that the feeling in Coorg is strongly in favour of the present system of administration. This part of the scheme has therefore to be dropped for the present.

5. As regards the proposal for the transfer of the Kasaragod taluk of South Kanara to Malabar, memorials have been received by Government both strongly objecting to and welcoming the proposal. The Malayali population of the taluk welcome it while others strongly resent the proposal. The Collector of Malabar (Mr. Evans) states that it is "certainly inadvisable to detach the whole of the taluk from the South Kanara district; the northern end of it is very close to Mangalore and none of the people of the northern half of the taluk are Malayalis; the prevailing language there is Tulu." Mr. Evans suggests two alternative proposals for a division of the taluk and the transfer of one division to the proposed North Malabar district. He dwells fully on this question in paragraph 10 (*a*) of his letter and comes to the conclusion that on the whole the weight of argument is against division. He is in short opposed to the transfer of any portion of the taluk to the North Malabar district. The Board of Revenue does not deal with this question as it is strongly opposed to any scheme of division of the Malabar district.

6. The existing division of the district into two for police, registration and judicial purposes does not count for much in the opinion of the Collector and the Board for partitioning the district into two districts. The Collector (Mr. Evans) who started the idea in 1916 of dividing the district into two is now of the opinion that

the present system of a Headquarter Sub-Collector and Additional District Magistrate giving relief to the Collector works satisfactorily and that the necessary drawbacks of the system are not sufficient to condemn it (vide Sir Harold Stuart's note, dated 18th January 1916, at page 1 ante). He points out that the only disadvantages of the present system are—

(1) It is not easy to visit the various parts of the district adequately without neglecting obligations to headquarters, and

(2) In allowing wide discretion and responsibility to the Headquarter Sub-Collector in dealing with distinct branches assigned to him, the inevitable result is that the Collector is responsible for orders which he only sees after they have been passed. In magisterial and local fund branches complete delegation is impossible and satisfactory division difficult.

But he states that he is personally satisfied with the arrangement of work that he has made with the Headquarter Sub-Collector, that there is a good deal of sentimental objection to any general partition of the district and no desire for substantial change. It is further pointed out that the main idea seems to be that the prestige of Malabar as one of the most important districts would suffer by division, that it is argued that there is intimate connexion in many ways between parts of North and South Malabar and that division would tend to sever it. On the whole he says that he hardly thinks "that there are sufficient grounds for interfering with the present arrangements; more especially as it is difficult to suggest any altogether satisfactory division." In addition to these arguments the Board of Revenue points out that by the peculiarity of its laws and customs and its land revenue system the Malabar district constitutes a very distinct entity and that Malayalis as a whole who "possess a keen sense of local patriotism" would resent a division which seem to threaten a break-up of their unity. For all these reasons the Board is against any division and refrains from discussing the details of the proposals of Mr. Evans for a division set out in Statement C. On the question of the system of a Headquarter Sub-Collector affording relief to a Collector, the opinions of select Collectors who have had experience of the system were consulted in 1914 and the general opinion of the Collectors was that the system was a success. The Hon'ble Mr. Gillman and Mr. Knapp strongly supported the system. In the circumstances the opinions of the Collector (Mr. Evans) and the Board that the system has worked well in Malabar need not perhaps be questioned.

7. In order to give relief to the Collector of Malabar in the matter of touring Mr. Evans proposes that the Wynad taluk should be taken away from Malabar and attached to The Nilgiris. The Board of Revenue in consultation with the District Magistrate of The Nilgiris supports the proposal. Paragraphs 5 to 6 of the Board's resolution sets out in brief the objections taken to the proposal in 1887 and how these objections have lost force now. It will be noticed that in The Nilgiris there is a consensus of opinion in favour of transferring the Malabar-Wynad to the Nilgiri district. The advantages claimed for the proposal are—

(1) That the whole planting area would be under the control of one Collector and that uniformity of policy would be secured in the treatment of questions affecting planters.

(2) The constitution of the Nilgiri district would be improved as it would give another divisional officer and a more extensive cadre of posts than the somewhat limited one it has.

(3) That it would give relief to the Collector of Malabar in the matter of touring.

The first two advantages do not seem to be of much moment. No inconvenience has ever been brought to the notice of Government by the planting areas being under the control of two Collectors. But that the proposal would afford relief to the Collector of Malabar in the matter of touring may be admitted. This is the only advantage. It is apparently for this reason that the Board points out that the advantages of the proposal are comparatively slight. The only disadvantage to which the proposal is open is that even under present conditions the Nilgiri District Board is unable to meet its responsibilities in the matter of local fund administration and

that if Wynad is added to its charge the additional financial burden will necessitate a special grant from Provincial funds. The Board of Revenue however states that the proposal should not be allowed to be defeated by this objection and that if Government consider that a change is needed to afford relief to the Collector of Malabar the transfer of the Wynad to The Nilgiris would be the least objectionable course.

8. If Wynad is to be transferred to The Nilgiris the Board recommends for purposes of criminal jurisdiction that the simplest arrangement would be to include the whole of the new Wynad division in one of the two sessions divisions of the Malabar district, provided that this can be done without making either of the Malabar sessions divisions too heavy.

9. It is for consideration whether the conclusions arrived at by the Board may be accepted. The remarks of Revenue, Local and Municipal, Judicial and Financial may be invited u.o. in the first instance.

T.C.N.—22-4-18.

P.DER.—30-4-18.

The case has now resolved itself into two questions—

(*a*) the bifurcation of Malabar;

(*b*) the absorption of the Wynad taluk in The Nilgiris with a view to relieving the Collector of Malabar.

(*a*) *Bifurcation of Malabar.*—The intimate connexion of this problem with the absorption or otherwise of Coorg into the Madras Presidency seems to have been realised as early as 1878 when the Madras Government wrote to India "the Malabar Collectorate . . . demands division but the question should be dealt with in connexion with the proposed transfer of Coorg." (Letter No. 680, Public, dated 18th April 1917.) After Mr. Sturrock's mission to Coorg the Government of India decided that Coorg should not be transferred (this was in 1889); and the question was not again raised until the present discussion. In his demi-official in reply to Sir Harold Stuart dated 21st July 1916, Mr. Hignell has briefly intimated that the question should not be reopened just now. The unwisdom of stirring up any unavoidable public excitement or of incurring any unnecessary expenditure during the war may be held sufficient reasons for not pushing the proposals as to Malabar either, but there may be no harm in clearing up the position a little further—or at least making up our minds whether the bifurcation scheme is worth going on with or not.

Paragraph 284 of Sir William Meyer's report.

2. Mr. Evans, at whose initiative the present discussion began, now definitely thinks it is not, and the Board agrees. The reasons are briefly—

(*a*) That Malabar is such a "very distinct entity" that it cannot properly or profitably be divided and

(*b*) That the existing arrangement by which a Headquarters Sub-Collector assists the Collector gives really adequate relief. This is Mr. Evans' later and considered opinion. The case for the bifurcation is set out in the late Mr. Harvey's note at pages 2-4 ante, but the main arguments seem to be that the change would be cheap and easy and readily put through as its principle has already been accepted by India. I venture to suggest that these would be excellent subsidiary arguments once the advisability of the change had been demonstrated, but are not primary arguments for the change as such. In the circumstances I think we shall have to agree with the Board and Mr. Evans who consider that not enough would be gained by the partition to make it worth while.

3. All this, however, leaves Coorg out of account. In the notes of Honourable Members and others above there is a decided balance of opinion tending towards a revival of the Coorg question. The most recent views on this subject are curiously conflicting. The last word is apparently Mr. Cobb's demi-official to Sir Alexander Cardew in December 1917, in which he has said that 'Coorg national sentiment' would be 'practically unanimous' against the change. Sir Sivaswami Ayyar, however, thought the educated populace at least 'resented their isolation'

and His Excellency did not anticipate serious opposition. If Coorg is ever to be incorporated with Madras it will no doubt be with reference to eventual absorption in some district of the Presidency it will at least be attached. The district contemplated by Sir Harold Stuart was South Kanara and it was in this respect also that Mr. Sturrock made his examination in 1888. From a study of the maps, however, it would seem more naturally attached to Malabar and this is what Mr. Evans now proposes. From all accounts Coorg and its people have little real affinity with either Kanara or Malabar—with Kanara, indeed, there is a definite tradition of enmity. Mr. Sturrock says in his report that the communications were best between Coorg and South Kanara and that may have been so in his day but is not so now. North Malabar with Coorg attached would make a district, South Malabar would make another and South Kanara would stand as it does—unless the Malayali country south of the Chandragiri river went into North Malabar—which would make little odds one way or another.

4. To sum up all this, I think the question of bifurcation of Malabar, never historically dissociated from the question of the transfer of Coorg, will lie over naturally until this latter can be taken up with a reasonable prospect of decision—the more so as the local officers and the Board profess themselves satisfied with the present arrangement.

(*b*) *Relief to the Collector of Malabar by transfer of the Wynad to the Nilgiri district.*

5. This is Mr. Evans' definite proposal—though, of course, it is as old as all the rest of this discussion and was quashed by the Board (against both the Collectors concerned) as long ago as 1887.

6. The other proposal for territorial relief to the Collector of Malabar was to hand over the Chirakkal taluk to South Kanara: but there were already languages enough in South Kanara and this would have meant a new Malayali division: and also it would have given little real relief. The Wynad has always been the difficulty—it is remote and touring in it is slow. If territorial relief is to be given it will apparently be the Wynad that must go and the only place it can go to is The Nilgiris.

7. The arguments *pro* and *con* are:—

Pro—(1) That all the local planting community would be under a single administration.

(2) That it would extend The Nilgiris' scanty cadre of posts.

(3) That it would give real relief to the Collector of Malabar.

Con—(1) That the Wynad does not pay its way and the Nilgiri District Board, already impecunious, is in no state to take on any more without assistance from Provincial funds.

(2) That the sessions divisions would become hopelessly entangled—part being Coimbatore, part North Malabar and part South Malabar. But this could be straightened out—all could go into South Malabar.

(3) That inconvenience would be caused to the natives and their traditional business connexions altered. But the natives would rarely have cause to visit Ooty or the high levels and even if they had, communications are tolerably good. Their private business concerns would be in no way affected.

It seems largely a question of pitting the first argument *con* against the third argument *pro*: the rest on either side do not come to very much.

8. The immediate transfer of the Wynad to The Nilgiris would have little effect on the possible future question of a bifurcation of Malabar with Coorg coming in to the northern half. North Malabar—the Wynad and Coorg would be quite a district; and the Wynad is cut off from Coorg by impenetrable or at any rate unpenetrated—hills.

C. H. BROWN—2-5-18.

Mr. Hilton Brown has admirably summarised the file above. No one really advocates the bifurcation of Malabar at the present day. The matter must lie over unless a decided call is made either by the district officials or the public or unless the transfer of Coorg to the Madras Presidency is decided.

2. Regarding the Wynad, I think that the arguments advanced are not sufficient to derange an existing system. In my opinion Wynad cannot efficiently be looked after from The Nilgiris where Ooty and its neighbourhood will, for obvious reasons, engage attention. And the trade outlets of the Wynad are all towards the west.

3. The proposals may be dropped.

Print up before circulation.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—3-5-18.

The notes have been printed and the file is submitted.

T.C.N.—18-5-18.

P.DER.—20-5-18.

For orders as to circulation.

C. H. BROWN—22-5-18.

R.R.—23-5-18.

Now that the addition of Coorg to the Madras Presidency has been ruled out by the Government of India and is not likely to be reconsidered, the question for consideration is whether the Malabar district needs to be divided on the ground that it is too heavy a charge for one Collector. Mr. Evans says that it is not, provided that the Collector is allowed a Headquarters Sub-Collector and makes him responsible for distinct branches of work. I am sure from my own experience that Mr. Evans is using his Headquarters Sub-Collector in the right way, and that there ought never to be friction between any two officers, if this arrangement is adopted.

I agree with the Board and Mr. Evans in deprecating the division of the district for the reasons given by them, and I would recognize that a Headquarters Sub-Collector is likely to be required in Malabar for a long time to come and order the provision of a house for this officer.

I think there is a fair supply of houses in Calicut. Just at present it would be difficult to regard this as imperatively urgent in this case.

A.G.C.—13-6-18.

In regard to the transfer of Malabar-Wynad from Malabar to Nilgiris, the main advantages are—

(i) that the Collector of Malabar cannot give adequate attention to the division, while the Collector of The Nilgiris could;

(ii) that the division formed of the Malabar and Nilgiris-Wynads offers many advantages over the present very light Malabar-Wynad division; and

(iii) that the planting interests favour the change.

The main objections are—

(1) the opposition of the people, and

(2) the difficulty about the District and Sessions Court jurisdiction over the new Nilgiri district.

Objection (1) counts for little, as explained by Mr. Evans; and further planting interests largely predominate in the area. Objection (2) is the real difficulty, for while it is desirable that only one court should have jurisdiction over the district, it is certain that grave inconvenience would be caused to the inhabitants of some portion of the district whether the Court is situated at Calicut, Tellicherry or Coimbatore. In the first place Mr. Evans may be asked for his opinion upon Mr. Cumming's suggestions and the High Court may be consulted afterwards.

I think that, if this difficulty can be overcome, the advantages of transferring Malabar-Wynad to The Nilgiris would outweigh the disadvantages.

H. F. W. G[ILLMAN]—8-6-18.

I agree.

P. R[AJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR]—11-6-18.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—13-6-18.

I have doubts as to the wisdom of these proposed arrangements: and should be disposed to await further time and experience before coming to a decision. Does the matter press? I hope to see Mr. Evans this week: and have delayed noting upon this account. I had hoped to see him earlier.

P[ENTLAND]—6-8-18.

Forwarded to Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor in case the file is required for reference during the visit to Malabar.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—7-8-18.

Mr. Evans' view is that at the present time there is no pressing need to proceed further in this matter. I have discussed it with him here (Calicut). There would certainly, he thinks, be some Malayali opposition to the transfer of the Malabar-Wynad to The Nilgiris district; and the trade outlets are no doubt to the west. It would be better to let the subject rest for the present. If it should be necessary later to re-examine it, this should, if possible, be done under normal conditions when these have returned. I agree.

Mr. Gillman should now see.

P[ENTLAND]—10-8-18.

Circulated.

R.R.—13-8-18.

I agree that the question of the transfer of the Malabar-Wynad to The Nilgiris may be dropped for the present.

H. F. W. G[ILLMAN]—13-8-18.

I agree.

P. R[AJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR]—15-8-18.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—16-8-18.

HOME (MISCELLANEOUS) DEPARTMENT.

A draft order recording the papers is submitted. Before its issue Public Works Department may perhaps see the case with reference to the remarks of Honourable Member (Financial) on page 14 ante as to the provision of a house for the Headquarters Sub-Collector at Calicut.

A.V.S.—20-8-18.

P.DER.—21-8-18.

C. H. BROWN—22-8-18.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

In connexion with the proposal to construct quarters for the Headquarters Sub-Collector at Calicut, Sir Harold Stuart (the then Honourable Member, Public Works Department) wanted the question of subdividing Malabar into two districts to be examined and pending consideration of this question the proposal was held in abeyance. The question has been examined in the foregoing notes and it has been decided to let it rest for the present. The provision of quarters for the Sub-Collector has, however, been considered to be unnecessary just at present—vide the marginal remarks of Honourable Member (Financial) on page 14 ante. The file may be perused and returned to the Home (Miscellaneous) Department.

A.M. -3-9-18.

K.B.—5-9-18.

D. MARSHALL—7-9-18.

HOME (MISCELLANEOUS) DEPARTMENT.

The draft order may issue.

A.V.S.—7-9-18.

P.DER.—7-9-18.

C.H.B.—10-9-18.

[G.O. No. 647, Home (Miscellaneous), dated 10th September 1918.]

Revd

Sectt. II—10 (*a*)—12-1-15. Bifurcation of the Malabar Dt Homeless DEPARTMENT.

Recording the correspondence on the subject of the proposed ——

23

READ AGAIN G.O. No. ....., dated ..... 191 .

" " " " ....., " ..... 191 .

READ ALSO:—

C. No. ....., From the ....., No. ....., dated ..... 191 .

Papers in file of.

" " ....., " " ....., " ....., " ..... 191 .

" " ....., " " ....., " ....., " ..... 191 .

ORDER. No. 647, dated 10.9. 1918.

Press

Recorded.

Revd 20.8.18

Pdcl 21.8.18

21.8.18

Recd 4 Cpys with 500 and a Cpy of Proceedings H. P. Dept 20/9/18

To

The Board of Revenue (L.R.)

Cpy to the Revenue dept.

P.W.D. with copy & Notes.

Pmt for approval

20-9-18

Please strike

Pmt 20/9/18

GOVERNMENT PRESS
30 SEP 1918
MADRAS.

G.O. No. 647, 10th September 1918

Bifurcation of the Malabar district

Recording the correspondence on the subject of the proposed —.

READ—the following papers :—

I

Official Memorandum No. 673-2, Public, dated 25th March 1916.

The Board of Revenue is requested to consider and report on the question of dividing Malabar into two revenue districts.

2. The district forms a very heavy charge at present, comprising as it does, an area of 5,794 square miles with a population of over three millions, while the Mappilla element of the population adds considerably to the difficulties of administration. The question of affording relief to the Collector and District Magistrate has already been discussed more than once. Several objections to the division of the district were considered by Sir William Meyer in paragraphs 287 and 288 of his report on the constitution of additional districts, divisions and taluks, but the only one which appears to have been considered insuperable was the lightness of the proposed North Malabar district. The Government are not convinced of the overwhelming importance of this objection; while on the other hand they observe that the district has already been divided into two for judicial, registration and police purposes. They consider that this fact is of considerable importance in deciding the question of division, as not only may the complete severance be effected without great expense, but no sentimental or factitious agitation against the partition need be anticipated.

3. The suggestion has been made to include in the proposed North Malabar district the Kasaragod taluk of South Kanara. The possibility of adding Coorg to the reduced South Kanara district and the inclusion of the Laccadives in the proposed North Malabar district should also be taken into account in this connexion.

4. The Board of Revenue is requested to examine the question in the light of the above observations and to report whether it finds that to give effect to the proposal is practicable and desirable. If it does, the Board is further requested to draw up proposals in conjunction with the Collector of Malabar, worked out in some detail, the District Magistrate of South Kanara should be consulted also if necessary.

5. Pending the consideration of this question, the construction of a residence for the Headquarters Sub-Collector at Calicut referred to in the correspondence ending with the Board's Reference No. 963-Gt./15-2, dated 5th July 1915, will be held in abeyance.

H. A. B. VERNON,
Special Officer.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
Copy to the Revenue Department.
" " Public Works Department.

II

Reference from the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 654-Gt./16-1/(Confdl. 44), dated 29th May 1916.

The Hon'ble Mr. R. B. CLEGG,
Commissioner of Land Revenue.
The Hon'ble Mr. N. S. BRODIE,
Commissioner of Salt, Abkāri and Separate Revenue.
The Hon'ble Mr. LL. E. BUCKLEY,
Commissioner of Revenue Settlement, Survey, Land Records and Agriculture.
The Hon'ble Mr. H. F. W. GILLMAN,
Commissioner of Land Revenue and Forests.

Read—the following paper :—

Memorandum No. 673-2, dated 25th March 1916.

Reference—*No.* 654-*Gt.*/16-1/(*Confdl.* 44), *dated* 29*th May* 1916.

With reference to Government Memorandum No. 673-2, dated the 25th March 1916, regarding the division of Malabar into two revenue districts the Board begs to submit that, if the Kasaragod taluk is to be included in the proposed North Malabar district, it is essential that Coorg should be added to the reduced South Kanara

district. The latter district is already a light one and if Coorg is not to be added to it there is not much point in taking away Kasaragod and thereby making the district still lighter. The Board observes from paragraph 285 of Sir William Meyer's report on the constitution of additional districts, divisions and taluks that the Government of India have steadfastly objected to the annexation of Coorg to this Presidency. If their objections still hold good, the formation of the new districts will have to proceed on other lines. Before working out a scheme, the Board considers it desirable that the question of Coorg should be settled. It accordingly requests that Government will be pleased to ascertain whether the Government of India will reconsider their refusal to transfer Coorg to the Madras Presidency and include it in one of our districts.

G. T. H. Bracken,
Secretary.

To the Chief Secretary to Government.

III

Memorial—from the Inhabitants of Kasaragod taluk, South Kanara district.
To—His Excellency the Right Hon'ble John Baron Pentland of Lyth, P.C., G.C.I.E., Governor of Madras.
Dated—the 30th May 1916.

May it please your Excellency,—That it is with feelings of regret and alarm that your memorialists learn that your Excellency's Government is now considering a proposal for the partition of the South Kanara district by separating the Kasaragod taluk from South Kanara and adding it on to North Malabar with the view of forming the latter into a separate district.

2. That your memorialists beg leave to submit that the scheme now under contemplation is calculated to cause much hardship and inconvenience to the people of Kasaragod taluk.

3. That the Kasaragod taluk which extends up to about seven miles to the south of Mangalore which is the headquarters of the district, is essentially a Kanarese tract with nothing in common with Malabar, which is purely a Malayalam country.

4. That the said taluk is inhabited chiefly by Kanarese and Tulu speaking people except a few villages on the Malabar border where Malayalam is spoken. Kanarese has also been the official vernacular of the district for several centuries and though Malayalam has recently been introduced as an additional language, the official records continue to be maintained in Kanarese. Even the Malayalee litigants for whose benefit apparently the new language was introduced are seldom having recourse to Malayalam.

5. That Kanarese is also the language taught in all the schools in the taluk except a few in the abovementioned villages on the Malabar border. Landlords and traders keep their records such as documents, tenants' leases and even their private correspondence in Kanarese and there are very few among the literate people of the taluk who do not understand Kanarese while the bulk of the population is unacquainted with Malayalam.

6. That the customs of the people, the systems of inheritance prevailing among them, and the land tenures obtaining in the district of South Kanara including Kasaragod taluk are different from those in Malabar and the amalgamation of the two will create confusion and disunion.

7. That your memorialists beg to observe that no administrative convenience will be promoted by the absorption of the taluk into Malabar as the people of Kasaragod taluk, most of whom know no language except their mother tongue, Tulu or Kanarese as the case may be, will be under a great disability if they have to resort to courts and offices in Malabar, where Malayalam is the only vernacular known.

8. That, besides the administrative separation that would be caused by the disruption of the district, there would also be the more important social separation between the two dismembered portions of the district. As a necessary consequence of the change, all business will be diverted to the new headquarters in Malabar, and with it will also cease all social intercourse with the old district. The people of this taluk will thereafter form fewer connexions with the rest of the district, and there being no scope for any social intercourse between the ordinary Hindus of the district, who form the majority of the population here, and the people of Malabar, the Hindu population of the district of South Kanara will suffer much on account of the proposed partition. Similar consequences that flowed from the partition of the old Kanara district into North and South Kanara are within the experience of the inhabitants of this district.

9. The fact that there are several ancient Royal families in Kasaragod taluk may further suggest that the Rajas living in Kasaragod taluk may have their sentimental objections to associate with the Rajas of Malabar where the former may not be allowed the position and rank which they may claim to belong to them.

10. Your memorialists humbly hope that your Excellency's Government will recognize that there is much in the sentiments of a people that should be regarded with sympathy. Kasaragod taluk has been an integral part of Kanara for centuries from the time of Native Rulers of whom Tippu Sultan was the last, and the people of the district instinctively cling to the system graciously continued by the benign British Government of administering the district from its chief town, Mangalore, and they naturally object to this ancient system being now abolished in respect of Kasaragod taluk by absorbing it into Malabar which is alien in race, customs and prejudices and placing it under the administration of its Collector who is naturally surrounded by Malabar environments and Malabar influences. Your memorialists are supported in this statement by the following opinion recorded by an eminent officer of the Indian Civil Service, viz., their late Collector Mr. M. E. Couchman. The said opinion was submitted by the people of Kasaragod in support of their memorial praying for a withdrawal or modification of the order of the Government abolishing Kanarese as the language of the Court of the District Munsif of Kasaragod and substituting Malayalam. On a consideration of the said opinion and the memorial the Government were pleased to modify their order and retain Kanarese as the Court language.

"In reply to your letter asking me for an expression of opinion as to the substitution of Malayalam for Kanarese in the Kasaragod taluk, I can say that I have travelled in every portion of the taluk including the Kumri villages and also the villages in the extreme south of the Malabar frontier. I found that the village officers were everywhere conversant with Kanarese. It is only south of Nileshwar that Malayalam is the sole language of the people. In the other parts Tulu and Kanarese are found and the relative proportion of these to Malayalam increases rapidly north of Hosdrug. In the interior near Coorg Kanarese is the most common language, and on the coast, Tulu. Few Tulu and Kanarese speaking people know Malayalam. Whereas most Malayalam people who have business in the taluk north of Nileshwar know either Tulu or Kanarese. Mappilla for instance who are usually petty traders generally know all three languages. As Kanarese has been the official language of the taluk for hundreds of years long before the advent of the British I think more inconvenience to the public would be caused by the use of Malayalam than by the continuance of Kanarese."

11. That your memorialists further submit that South Kanara is a moderate sized district and the loss of Kasaragod taluk would make it too small for a collectorate or a judicial district.

12. That the addition of Coorg to South Kanara, your memorialists submit, would be no compensation, as the country is still in a primitive condition, being mostly covered by hills and waste lands. The population of Coorg is also comparatively very small, being only a little more than one-half of that of Kasaragod taluk.

13. That, besides, the Coorgs with their peculiar ways and customs are not a people who can be easily absorbed into the Kanarese and Tulu speaking people of this district.

14. That in conclusion your memorialists pray that the proposal now before the Government of adding the Kasaragod taluk to Malabar may be abandoned.

For which act of kindness your memorialists shall ever be grateful.

IV

Telegram—from Diwan Bahadur A. Pinto, Chairman, Public meeting, Mangalore.
To—the Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—the 6th June 1916.

Public of Mangalore in meeting assembled respectfully protest against reported partition South Kanara by separating Kasaragod taluk. Pray postponement final orders until receipt of memorial being submitted through Collector.

V

Telegram—from Diwan Bahadur A. Pinto, Chairman, Public meeting, Mangalore.
To—the Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Revenue and Agriculture.
Dated—the 8th June 1916.

Public of Mangalore in meeting assembled respectfully protest against reported partition South Kanara by separating Kasaragod taluk. Pray postponment final orders until receipt of memorial being submitted through local Government.

VI

Letter—from M.R.Ry. Kodyamme Shiva Varma Arasu Avargal, Kumbla, South Kanara.
To—the Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—the 14th June 1916.

I beg to forward herewith a copy of the proceedings of a public meeting held in Kumbla on the 9th instant, protesting against the reported partition of South Kanara district and to request that the same may be placed before His Excellency the Governor of Madras in Council.

Enclosure

Proceedings of a meeting of the inhabitants of Kumbla and neighbouring villages held in the office of the Kumbla Co-operative Credit Society on the 9th June 1916.

Proposed by M.R.Ry. Kumbla Narasimha Lakshmana Nayak and seconded by M.R.Ry. Padmanabha Irnuraya that M.R.Ry. Kodyamme Shiva Varma Arasu do take the chair.

M.R.Ry. Panduranga Nayak then read the notice convening the meeting.

The chairman then briefly addressed the meeting pointing out the difficulties and hardships that would be caused to the people by the reported partition of the district and the adding of Kasaragod taluk to Malabar.

M.R.Ry. Padmanabha Irnuraya moved the following resolution :—

"That the inhabitants of Kumbla and neighbouriug villages in meeting assembled view with regret and alarm the reported partition of South Kanara district and the adding of Kasaragod taluk to Malabar and beg to protest emphatically against the partition as the proposed measure will cause considerable inconvenience and hardship to the people."

"That we do therefore join in the memorial proposed to be submitted to Government on behalf of the whole of the Kasaragod taluk and do take necessary action in the matter."

M.R.Ry. Bombrana Ramaya Alva seconded this resolution and M.R.Ry. Kumbla Sridhar Nayak supported the same which was finally carried *nemine contradicente*.

M.R.Ry. Konamme Mahalinga Bhatji proposed the following resolution :—

"That the President of this meeting be authorized to submit copies of the above resolution to the Collector of South Kanara and also to the Local Government."

This was seconded by M.R.Ry. Anantha Bhakta and carried unanimously.

The meeting then disbursed with a vote of thanks to the chair.

VII

Telegram—from THAYAKAT MANAYIL NEELAKANTAM TIRUPANPU, President, Public meeting, Nilashwar.
To—the Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor of Madras.
Dated—the 10th July 1916.

Malayalis of Kasaragod in meeting assembled yesterday unanimously resolved to request Madras Government to give early shape to its proposal to annex Kasaragod to North Malabar.

VIII

Memorial—from the Malayali Residents of Kasaragod taluk, South Kanara.
To—His Excellency the Governor (through the Collector of South Kanara).
Dated—the 9th July 1916.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—We, the residents of Kasaragod taluk, South Kanara, in meeting assembled, beg to approach your Excellency with this humble memorial calling your Excellency's gracious attention to our devout sense of approval of the proposal suggested by your Excellency's Government to add this taluk of the district of South Kanara to North Malabar.

2. We beg to avail ourselves of the occasion to ventilate the grievances of the large Malayalee population inhabiting Kasaragod which naturally accrue from the simple but stern fact of this Malayali area being for administration annexed to South Kanara, a district which adopts customs and manners indubitably divergent from those prevalent in this taluk. We may respectfully ask your Excellency's sympathetic attention to the last census records from which it can easily be gleaned that Kasaragod, the southernmost part of South Kanara hangs by itself in the district almost like an 'imperium in imperio' in respect of the language it speaks and customs it follows. It is also evident from the same authentic authority that the population of our taluk is pre-eminently Malayalee linked in myriads of ways to the population of North Malabar with which it is in very close touch.

3. The difficulties we have to encounter on the score of language to sustain ourselves as residents of South Kanara are too patent to call for exhaustive treatment. Kanarese, recognized mother tongue of the district, has been foisted upon a population—who, stung with a deep sense of resentment at seeing their own traditional vernacular trampled by administration practically under foot find it next to impossible both from historical memories and social connexions to sympathize, much more to reconcile themselves with an alien tongue. This striking disparity of language accounts above everything else for the clear and close relation of ours with our sister district to the south in the matter of trade. It is no secret requiring to be preached to an observant spectator that prices here of foodstuffs and other articles throb in sympathy with the markets of Cannanore and other principal towns of Malabar decidedly more than with the market of any place in South Kanara. We may further endeavour to convince your Excellency of the countless troubles and inconveniences we are confronted with owing to the court tongue of the district being Kanarese. All procedures of revenue and law ranging upwards from a common summons are invariably couched in a language with which we cannot anywise pretend to be familiar. To feign respect for a vernacular which has been brought into relief by 'powers that be' in utter supersession of our own tongue is, we beg to submit, never in consonance with our humble sense of self-regard and honesty.

4. In this connexion we feel constrained to refer to the recent public meeting alleged to be convened at Kasaragod to voice the public protest against the drafted scheme of your Excellency's Government. It may be interesting to your Excellency to note from the reports submitted thereof that a handful of Malayalis had participated in the endeavour under colour of faithful mouthpieces. We respectfully beg to veto in meeting assembled both collectively and individually the false pretensions those few Malayalees assumed for themselves to speak the public voice and at the same time to convey to your Excellency our cry at once eloquent, emphatic and

unanimous unreservedly favouring and loyally praying for a speedy crystalization of the beneficial project framed by your Excellency's Government. We may also state that the Kasaragod meeting referred to was all an ill-pieced play solely if not wholly engineered by a few Kanarase vakils practising there who, pinning the prospects of their professional success upon the local courts and fearing loss in their vocation from a re-adjustment of the district could only see the Government proposal gall and worm-wood. We cannot also forbear letting out the unhappy secret that the dissenting voice of a few Malayalees on the occasion of whom the most prominent was Thayakkat Nilakanta Tirumumbu, the biggest estate owner in this place was little or not at all cared for by those responsible for the holding of the meeting. We have had reason since to suspect that their voice had been airly brushed aside, if not virtually hushed up.

5. We lastly beg to state that many of the signatories of this humble memorial are extensive property owners in the taluk who have had occasions, by virtue of their position, to test the true pulse of public opinion in the locality in regard to the scheme of your Excellency's Government.

May we earnestly hope and respectfully pray your Excellency to have our joint expression of full approval and support in this matter rightly valued and to have your Excellency's projected plan elevated as speedily as possible into *fait accomplis* which, at all events and at all times will be a thankful boon to the Malayali population of the district and will cause the memory of your Excellency's Presidency administration to be cherished by them with love, respect and gratitude.

Memorial—from the Malayalis of the Kasaragod taluk.
To—His Excellency the Governor.
Dated—the 15th June 1917.

May it please your Excellency,—We, the representatives of your Excellency's subjects assembled in various meetings held in different places of the Malayali portion of the Kasaragod taluk, South Kanara, beg leave to approach your Excellency with grateful hearts for having so graciously proposed to unite us with our Malabar brethren for administrative purposes and submit the proceedings of those meetings unanimously approving of the said proposal.

2. We, the Malayalis of this taluk, are socially and linguistically one with the people of Malabar. As such our customs and manners, language and nationality, and racial inclinations are quite different from those of the rest of South Kanara district.

3. But unfortunately for us we were politically united with Kanara more than a century ago, when the Government could not be in a position to get an insight into the needs and requirements of the subjects composing the district. Previous to that time we were in every respect part and parcel of Malabar. This longstanding political separation from our brethern of the south and the consequent association with the alien people of Kanara have made us what we are—an illiterate mass of mankind with no idea of progress or civilisation, while our neighbours on either side are advancing by leaps and bounds.

4. (*a*) (i) Kanarese language has been the medium of instruction in schools throughout till recently, when a few Malayalam elementary schools were opened in the extreme south of the taluk. While every nation has chosen its mother-tongue as the medium of instruction, while local vernacular is the recognized second language throughout India, it is unfortunate that we should be forced to study Kanarese alone.

(ii) Though a few boys now and then might have surmounted this linguistic difficulty by dint of hard struggle, the absence of Malayalam in schools has resulted in the entire neglect of female education.

(iii) In matters of litigation and in transactions with Government we have been subject to no less misery. All our records or documents are in Kanarese; and

till very lately even court language was Kanarese. Though of late Malayalam has been recognized in Registration and Civil Departments, the recognition has been practically a dead letter with most of us, since Kanarese men alone monopolize the drafting work even at Hosdrug, a place 15 miles away from Kasaragod, on account of their longstanding advantageous position and the ignorance of the innocent villager whom they very easily coax into submission. Our difficulty in carrying on litigation with the aid of these documents and alien pleaders with their broken and mixed Malayalo-Kanarese language has been unbearable. The failure on the part of pleaders and Government officers to grasp the ideas expressed in Malayalam has very often resulted in serious loss or ruin to the parties concerned. Even in such simple affairs like drafting a darkhast petition or deciphering an ordinary court summons a well-educated Malayali is, due to ignorance of Kanarese, very often obliged to cover several miles in search of the fortunate possessor of the blessed Kanarese language and incur much expense and undergo many difficulties quite unequal to the work in hand.

(iv) In villages lying within the jurisdiction of Kasaragod and Hosdrug Sub-Registrars, 90 per cent of the documents are in Kanarese even at the present day, so that the people are unable to have direct acquaintance with the contents thereof. Consequently many an innocent man is very often mercilessly deprived of his lawful claims and put to heavy loss by the Law of Limitation. Then again every record in revenue matters is kept in Kanarese, to which therefore we have little or no access. Since even village accounts, pattas, assessment receipts, etc., are all in Kanarese, the innocent ryots suffer very much. It is monstrous again to see the whole affair of the Co-operative Credit Society of Nileshwar—a place almost on the verge of Malabar—managed in Kanarese.

(*b*) We belong to a nationality quite different from the inhabitants of the major portion of the district. The difficulties arising therefrom are very serious and deserve your Excellency's greatest consideration. Foremost among them is the natural *want of real sympathy* towards us by the Kanara men in general and our immediate neighbours in particular. They never show an inclination even to make an inquiry about our welfare and progress and much less to give us any encouragement towards our advancement. In short, they proclaim by their conduct and attitude towards us their profound satisfaction in allowing us to be where we are and were. Secondly there is the *absolute* impossibility of having any chance of social intercourse with anybody else of the district and the consequent want of opportunities for bettering our condition by following the progressive communities near us. We could have advanced as fast as our brethren of Malabar by mingling freely with them had not the Government kept us under this longstanding political separation.

(*c*) Your Excellency will be pleased to notice the various disabilities we are labouring under on account of the difference in social customs between us and the rest of the district. While social reforms have been affecting the time-honoured customs of the latter, there is no possibility of our borrowing those reforms from them; if only we had been kept united with Malabar, we could very easily have allowed the wave of reforms of the enlightened Malabaris to affect us in time. Now that we have little or no opportunity of coming into contact with progressive Malayalis, we could not but feel satisfied with isolated and conceited life like the proverbial frog in the well.

Our conservative spirit is being heightened by another potent factor, namely the time-honoured but meaningless custom that Nayar women lose their caste if they should cross a certain boundary running almost eastward from the mouth of the Chandragiri river. Respect for caste, which has a very powerful hold even on the educated few, is too strong to be overcome by this illiterate mass; and as longstanding custom overrides law, every attempt on the part of a few large-minded officials to remove it has been a failure. This pernicious custom has been a stumbling block to our progress and education; for none of us could settle down at Kasaragod or

Mangalore or any other important place of the district. As all the secondary schools and colleges are situated towards the north of the said boundary, we could not leave our little boys in towns to be messing in hotels, the only lodgings available for us beyond the river. Thus, while non-Malayali communities progressed in education under favourable situations, we became confirmed in our stay-at-home spirit and consequent want of education. This will be evident from the fact that we could produce but one graduate and about half a dozen matriculates and school finals, though we number nearly 100,000, occupying such a large area.

(*d*) We beg leave to submit a few of the administrative grievances under which we have been groaning due to our longstanding political union with non-Malayali people. First and foremost among them is the want of *efficient* men to represent us in district and taluk boards. While elsewhere eminent persons compete with each other for a seat in the board, our depth of ignorance is so great that our gentlemen, even when nominated, generally resign their places in the taluk board, for the simple reason that it is a bit inconvenient for them to attend the meetings. While a Booker T. Washington would think it a special privilege to address a representative assembly for *five* minutes and would cover not less than 3,000 miles at a stretch, our landlords are, for want of education, quite indifferent to their rights and responsibilities. The road and village cess collected at As. 1–6 per rupee and the Government grants for village improvements are being spent they know not where; they care not to realize that the amount is virtually going to improve other parts of the district. There is but one road, 'Panathadi road' in our parts.

Then again the Government officials who are all non-Malayalis, excepta handful from Malabar, often bring into play their prejudice, social antipathy and indifference while dealing with us, your Excellency's passive subjects. Glaring instances of such ill-treatment are too many and too painful to be stated in this brief memorial. In short, we suffer very *much* under the yoke of these alien officers domineering over us in all possible ways.

When persons quite competent for the post of village karnams and village peons for instance are easily available from among ourselves, it is monstrous that these places should be monopolized by alien communities. In most cases, their offices are hereditary. These village karnams with their Kanarese records are a source of mischief to innocent villagers in many respects. Their natural antipathy towards us make them still more dangerous to the latter.

Equally important is the fact the Kanara officials are naturally unable to realize our social intricacies and requirements. Being followers of Hindu Law they are not in a position to understand the social complications and significance of claim-auts following Marumakkatayam Law. Their tardiness in doing justice to the parties concerned is felt by all. A Malayali officer on the other hand can grasp the situation quite easily, for he knows the ins and outs of our social organization.

Your Excellency's gracious attention may be drawn to the administrative difficulty arising out of the ignorance of Malayalam language on the part of most of the officers. They require translators to get at our thoughts. The pride that comes out of little knowledge prompts an ordinary Kanara clerk to declare himself equal to the task and in the course of translation commits blunders which not only provoke uncontrollable laughter in any Malayali, but often alters facts in a ridiculous manner. To quote an instance, among many, the wisdom of a translator has transferred the 'patta' from a Kuttamatthu gentleman to Kutta and another, for instead of reading 'Kuttamatthu' as one word meaning a certain place, the wonderful translator took it as two words 'Kutta' a proper name of a different family and 'Matthu' which means 'and' in Kanarese. So that he understood the whole to mean 'Mr. Kutta and another' whom he did not think worth while to mention. It is very hard to get on if such profound scholars undertake to discharge responsible duties of administration.

(*e*) More than all is the contemptuous way in which we are being treated by Kanara people in general. It is not in consonance with their so-called culture and our sense of justice and self-respect.

5. If your Excellency should be pleased to carry out the proposal, it shall be an everlasting boon to us in many ways. Once more could we be brought into close contact with those from whom we have been kept apart for a full century and more. Free exchange of thoughts and ideas, free social intercourse day by day would elevate us from the quagmire in which we have been wallowing for years together. Brought into touch with the enlightened brethren of Malabar, we shall be receiving powerful impetus for education and self-improvement. Vernacular education in particular will revive and spread among boys and girls alike. We would soon give up our conservative spirit and engage ourselves in various industrial activities which at present are being considered below our dignity to follow.

6. We beg to remind your Excellency of the memorial submitted by us, your Excellency's devoted subjects, assembled at Kuttamathu on 9th July 1916, praying for our union with Malabar.

7. We may be permitted to refer to the protest meeting held at Kasaragod a few days previous to that. To the utter shame of those that took part in it, we cannot help remarking that it was not at all a genuine or representative meeting. If it were so, there are more convenient places than Kasaragod—a town not within the area populated by Malayalis; and there are ever so many more worthy chairmen available than a junior and uneducated member of Nileshwar Raja's family. Persons like the Zamindar of Kodoth, or Echikkanam or Talakkad or the first Raja of Nileshwar and many others would have been more suited to such a momentous occasion. That this is the work of a few selfish persons interested in keeping us yoked to them is patent from the above facts and well known to all of us here. Their conduct in having forced a Malayali gentleman to preside over a nominal meeting and their strain in obtaining signatories from markets and Hosdrug fair are nothing but fair and honest on their part. This is the first time we recollect of a Kasaragod Malayali presiding over any meeting in the town of Kasaragod.

8. We hear of the recent pronouncement of the District Board of Malabar about your Excellency's proposal. The fact that, while the majority voted against partition of Malabar, there was no mention made about the question of our union with Malabar, leads us to conclude that they were not against our union with them. Every patriotic Malayali ought to feel for his helpless brethren and we sincerely hope that the esteemed District Board Members are not an exception to this virtue.

9. To divide or not to divide the District of Malabar is left for your Excellency's Government to consider. But our grievances are so unbearable and the hope of improvement otherwise is so remote, that we most earnestly pray for the amalgamation of the Malayali portion of our taluk with Malabar. The said portion covers all the villages lying to the south of the Chandragiri river and a few villages to its north mostly peopled by Malayalis—in fact the whole area beyond which Nayar ladies cannot go without losing their caste. If your Excellency should graciously fulfil the cherished longings of our heart, the period of your Excellency's administration will be fresh in the memories of the Kasaragod Malayalis from generation to generation.

Memorandum No. 673-3, Home (Miscellaneous), dated 10th August 1917.

Adverting to the correspondence ending with its Reference No. 654–16–1, Confdl. 44, dated 29th May 1916, the Board of Revenue is informed that the amalgamation of Coorg with the Madras Presidency is not immediately practicable; the possibility of this happening within a reasonable time should not however be lost sight of. If the Board has in view alternative schemes of redistribution, in one of which is

contemplated the addition of Coorg to this Presidency at a comparatively early date, while in the other this eventuality is left out of account, it is requested to submit both proposals for the consideration of the Government. Memorials received as marginally-noted are forwarded to the Board for consideration along with the formulation of its proposals.

(1) Memorial, etc., from the public of Mangalore, dated 5th June 1916.
(2) Memorial from the inhabitants of Kasaragod, dated 30th May 1916.
(3) Memorial from the residents of Kasaragod dated 10th July 1916.

P. Rajagopala Achariyar,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

X

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), Mis. No. 304, dated 27th February 1918.

The Hon'ble Mr. A. Butterworth, C.S.I., I.C.S.,
Commissioner of Land Revenue.
The Hon'ble Mr. Ll. E. Buckley, I.C.S ,
Commissioner of Revenue Settlement, Survey, Land Records and Agriculture.
The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter, I.C.S.,
Commissioner of Salt, Abkâri and Separate Revenue.
The Hon'ble Mr. M. E. Couchman, I.C.S.,
Commissioner of Land Revenue and Forests.

Read—the following papers :—

(i)
Memorandum—from Government, Public Department.
No.—673-2.
Dated—the 25th March 1916.

(ii)
Reference—from the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
No.—654 Gt./16-1, Confdl. 44.
Dated—the 29th May 1916.

(iii)
Memorandum—from Government, Home (Miscellaneous) Department.
No.—673-3.
Dated—the 10th August 1916.

(iv)
Reference—from the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
No.—654 Gt./16-2, Confdl. 71.
Dated—the 25th September 1916.

The papers read above, which relate to the division of Malabar into two revenue districts and other consequential changes are forwarded to the Collector of Malabar, for early report in personal consultation with the Collector of South Kanara. The Collector of Malabar is requested to prepare and submit two alternative sets of proposals, one based on the assumption that Coorg is to be added to this Presidency and the other leaving that contingency altogether out of account.

2. The report should deal specifically with the following questions :—

(i) whether in the event of Coorg being added to this Presidency, it should be attached to South Kanara or to North Malabar ;

(ii) whether the Kasaragod taluk should remain in South Kanara or whether this taluk, or the southern portion of it, should be transferred to North Malabar ;

(iii) whether the Laccadives can conveniently be attached to North Malabar ; and

(iv) whether the whole of the Wynad taluk should go to North or to South Malabar, or should be apportioned between these two districts.

3. In connexion with each set of proposals statistics under the heads specified below should as far as possible, be furnished for all taluks, or parts of taluks affected :—

(1) Area in square miles (with and without ghat forests, if ascertainable).
(2) Population.
(3) Number of municipalities.
(4) Number of unions.
(5) Land revenue.
(6) Number of revenue papers.
(7) Number of magisterial cases.

4. The report should also include proposals in regard to the divisional charges into which the districts may conveniently be divided.

5. The memorials received with the Government memorandum, dated 10th August 1916, are forwarded to the Collector of South Kanara for consideration.

(v)

Letter—from F. B. Evans, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of Malabar.
To—the Secretary to Government, Home (Miscellaneous) Department.
Dated—the 23rd December 1916.
No.—Dis. 96-Confdl. No. 16.

I have the honour to reply to Board's Reference No. 654-Gt./16-71, dated 25th September 1916, on the subject of the suggested division of the Malabar district.

2. I have consulted Mr. Vibert as requested and we are in substantial agreement on the various questions in issue between the two districts. I am sending him a copy of this letter: and he has promised to address the Board separately if he wishes to add anything.

3. The object of the proposal is to relieve the Collector and District Magistrate of Malabar. The essential features of the problem were set out in Sir W. Meyer's report and it does not seem necessary to repeat them. The solution proposed by Sir W. Meyer and accepted by Government cannot be said to have worked unsatisfactorily and so far as my experience goes the Collector of Malabar can hardly be said to be overburdened with work, now that he has an additional district magistrate and headquarter sub-Collector. The main defects of the present arrangement are in my opinion

(*a*) that the area over which the Collector and District Magistrate has to tour has not been diminished; and

(*b*) that it is not easy to arrange for an entirely satisfactory distribution of work with the Additional District Magistrate and Headquarter Sub-Collector.

4. As to (*a*) though the area of the district is less than that of many other districts such as Ganjām, Vizagapatam, Nellore, Kurnool and Coimbatore there are more important places distributed over it than in most of the others, and my experience has been that even with a motor-car and without a wife it is not easy to visit the various parts of the district adequately without neglecting obligations to headquarters. I do not wish personally to make any complaint on this account; but I know that my predecessor found it difficult to visit the Wynad in his last two years and I have been unable to tour there properly this year. Another consideration is that though the district is on the whole well supplied with roads the absence of villages probably involves more leisurely touring than in other districts if the touring officer is really to see the people. The statistics of population, mileage of roads and number of towns given in statement A will also, I think, justify the contention that Malabar is 'heavier' than many of the districts with larger area.

5. As to (*b*) two of the chief criticisms made against the system at first were that it would lead to friction and that there would be too many changes in the personnel of the appointment of Headquarter Sub-Collector. These criticisms are not valid so far as experience goes in this district. I also consider that much of the talk about the burden of routine work is exaggerated. I think however that it is essential in working the system to allow the Additional District Magistrate and Sub-Collector wide discretion and responsibility in dealing with distinct branches of work assigned to him, and the inevitable practical result of this is that the Collector is responsible for orders which he only sees after they have been passed. This is not altogether satisfactory. A further point is that in two of the main branches of work in which the assistance of the Additional District Magistrate and Headquarter Sub-Collector has usually been utilized, the magisterial and local fund branches, complete delegation is impossible and satisfactory division difficult.

6. I doubt however whether these drawbacks are sufficient to condemn the system. In the matter of touring the Collector could be relieved by the transfer of the Wynad to the Nilgiris, a proposal dealt with in a subsequent paragraph. While I personally am satisfied with the arrangement of work that I have made with the Headquarter Sub-Collector, there is also a good deal of sentimental objection to any general partition of the district and no desire for any substantial change. My district board, the members of which I consulted informally on the question, are practically unanimously opposed to it; and though opinion as represented by correspondence in the newspapers is divided I think that the weight of it is against any proposal to divide Malabar. The main idea seems to be that the prestige of Malabar as one of the most important districts in the Presidency would suffer by division; and it is also argued that there is intimate connexion in many ways between parts of North and South Malabar, and that division would tend to sever it. Such arguments no doubt lose a good deal of their force in face of the fact that the district has already been divided into two for judicial and police purposes; but they deserve some consideration and I should be loathe to ignore them. No doubt from purely administrative considerations division would be some advantage, as it would probably be in many of the bigger districts of Madras; but if the question of Malabar is considered by itself and without reference to other possible changes in the general scheme of the administration and manning of the Presidency, I hardly think that there are sufficient grounds for interfering with the present arrangements; more especially as it is difficult to suggest any altogether satisfactory division.

7. In any division I think that the taluks of Calicut, Ernad, Walavanad, Palghat, Ponnāni and Cochin must be included in the district of South Malabar and that the headquarters must be at Calicut. It seems hardly necessary to elaborate these points. The Korapoya river which forms the north boundary of the Calicut taluk is the traditional boundary between North and South Malabar and divides countries which to some extent at least follow different customs. For instance it is roughly true that the Mappillas and Tiyans of North Malabar follow the Marumakkattayam system and those of South Malabar the Makkattayam system, and the boundary line of this difference of custom is the Korapoya river. There are also differences in the details of land tenures which similarly roughly correspond with the local division made by the river. Then there is the practical consideration that Calicut is and has long been the headquarters of the District Judge and the District Superintendent of Police, South Malabar, as well as of the Collector and any change in the headquarters would be very expensive and inconvenient. For these reasons I think it unnecessary to discuss further a proposal which has been suggested in some quarters that Palghat should be made the headquarters of South Malabar, to include the taluks of Ernad, Walavanad, Ponnāni, Palghat and Cochin and Calicut the headquarters of North Malabar to include the taluks of Calicut, Kurumbranad, Kottayam and Chirakkal.

8. Whether the Wynad taluk should be included in North Malabar or South Malabar is a more difficult question. The south half of the Wynad of which Meppadi may be considered as the centre is at present far more important than the north from the planting point of view, and Calicut is a good deal nearer Meppadi than Tellicherry and a good deal easier of access. On the other hand Manantoddy is nearer Tellicherry with which it is connected by a good road; it is not a very long journey from Meppadi to Tellicherry either via Manantoddy or via Pudupadi and Quilandi, or via Calicut; and the Meppadi planters have no special objection to the whole of the Wynad taluk being put in the North Malabar district. At present it belongs to North Malabar for police and judicial purposes and geographically it belongs to the north half of the district rather than to the south half. Finally there is the important point for the present purposes that if the Wynad were included in the district of South Malabar that district would be unduly big for a Collector without the assistance of a Headquarter Sub-Collector. No satisfactory division of the taluk can be devised, any possible division would overweight South

Malabar. For these reasons I would recommend that if there is to be division the whole of the Wynad taluk should be included in the North Malabar district.

9. The Laccadives and Minicoy should, I think, be added to North Malabar. Their traditional connexion is with Cannanore and I do not think that there would be any objection to attaching them to the northern district if it is formed. I would add that I use the term Laccadives as applying to the islands attached to Malabar and not including the Amindivis. The question of putting both the Amindivis and the Laccadives under one Collector was discussed and negatived in 1910 (see G.Os. No. 2547, Revenue, dated 14th September 1909, and No. 2662, Revenue, dated 13th August 1910).

10. The further question is whether any part of the present South Kanara district should be added to the North Malabar district. South Kanara as at present constituted is not in need of any relief and the only reason for suggesting interference with the district is apparently to give more work to the Collector of North Malabar district. For this purpose it has been suggested in the Government Order that the Kasaragod taluk should be added to the North Malabar district. It seems certainly inadvisable to detach the whole of the taluk from the South Kanara district; the northern end of it is very close to Mangalore and none of the people of the northern half of the taluk are Malayalis: the prevailing language there is Tulu. There are, I think, only two alternatives possible as regards the Kasaragod taluk:—

(*a*) to add to Malabar the twelve villages south of the Nileswaram river and make that river the boundary of Malabar and (*b*) to add to Malabar the half of the taluk which lies south of the Chandragiri river comprising 45 villages (including the twelve south of the Nileswaram river). Statistics about these areas are given in statement B. The smaller tract (*a*) is peopled entirely by Malayalis and both geographically, linguistically and ethnologically it belongs properly to Malabar, but its addition would obviously not appreciably affect the size of the North Malabar district and the small alteration would involve the inconvenience attendant on the revision of district boundaries as well as those involved in attaching villages settled on one system to a taluk settled on another. The only proposal worth considering therefore is in my opinion—and Mr. Vibert agrees—that of adding to Malabar the half of the Kasaragod taluk which lies south of Chandragiri river. The population in this tract is mainly Malayali and the Chandragiri river is the old traditional boundary of Kerala; no Nayar woman should cross this river even at this day. On the other hand the proposal has excited controversy and both parties have memorialized Government about it. For division it is urged rightly that the majority of the people south of Chandragiri river belong linguistically and ethnologically to Malabar, and in proof of this it is significant that in a public meeting which Mr. Vibert held at Kasaragod to discuss the question every one on both sides spoke in Malayalam. Again the Nileswaram Raja, who is connected with some of the Malabar Rajas, pleads in support of division that it would enable him to recover his old position as an ancient janmi. *Against* division it is urged that the population of the country is mixed, that the tract has for a century formed part of the South Kanara district and has been settled on South Kanara and not on Malabar principles, while there has been no spontaneous demand for separation. The opposition to division is to some extent the voice of the vested interests of Kanarese Brahmans—and the weight of opinion amongst those that would be affected is in favour of the proposal; but if it is admitted that district boundaries should not be altered without strong positive reasons, I think that on the whole the weight of argument is against division. There is admittedly no special inconvenience to be remedied in the present constitution of the South Kanara district and the addition of 500 square miles of territory with a population of 125,000 and a revenue of $2\frac{1}{4}$ lakhs to the proposed district of North Malabar is not sufficient to be of much importance so far as regards the work of the proposed Collector of North Malabar. This appears to me to be the crucial point. There are other minor considerations. The area in question would be small for a separate talu, and if

joined to the northern half of the Chirakkal taluk it would involve having two different revenue systems in one taluk and it would not be easy to find a suitable headquarters. These indeed are not points of great importance, but in the absence of good reasons for division I am opposed to it.

11. My proposal therefore, leaving Coorg out of account, would be to constitute the districts of North and South Malabar as shown in statement C. The statistics show that South Malabar would be twice as heavy as North Malabar so far as area, population, revenue and correspondence, but North Malabar would compare with South as four to five in the number of tahsildars and as three to four in the number of sub-magistrates; and it would comprise the special tracts of the Wynad and the Laccadives which for touring purposes must occupy a good deal of the Collector's time. North Malabar so constituted would no doubt be a light district; but it would be heavier than The Nilgiris, hardly lighter than Chittoor or South Kanara, so far as can be judged from statistics and probably not much lighter than Bellary and Kurnool. Statement D compares proposed South Malabar with North Arcot and proposed North Malabar with Chittoor and South Kanara.

12. The divisions of South Malabar should remain as they are. For the proposed district of North Malabar it is not easy to suggest suitable divisions. Wynad is not a heavy division; but for many reasons I think that it is necessary to have a divisional officer's headquarters situated in the Wynad. A proposal has recently been made by the District Judge to abolish the District Munsif's court at Vayittiri, as there is hardly sufficient work for a munsif; and to give civil powers to the divisional officer and perhaps to the tahsildar. These proposals which I am inclined to support constitute an additional reason for the divisional officer to have his headquarters in the Wynad. The nearest plain taluk geographically is the Kurumbranad taluk, but there is no road from Kurumbranad to Wynad—only a bridle-path beyond Kuttiadi. But for this fact I should have been inclined to recommend that the Wynad and Kurumbranad taluks be formed into one division as was suggested by Mr. Dance (see paragraph 288 of Sir William Meyer's report), Manantoddy is fairly close to the Kottayam taluk, but Vayittiri and Meppadi are not. and if as I propose Tellicherry were made the headquarters of the North Malabar district I doubt whether one deputy collector could manage charge of the Wynad taluk with charge of the headquarters taluk. On the whole I would recommend that the Wynad be kept as a separate division as it now is; that the taluks of Chirakkal and Kurumbranad be made one division under one deputy collector with headquarters at Cannanore; and that there should be a headquarters deputy collector with charge of the Kottayam taluk. The obvious objection to this is that the Chirakkal and Kurumbranad taluks are separated by the Kottayam taluk, but I think that that would be of very little importance. Access to Kurumbranad is virtually confined to the coast road and the railway and the divisional officer with headquarters at Cannanore would be practically in as close touch with Kurumbranad as the present divisional officer with headquarters at Tellicherry.

A possible alternative arrangement to save the expense of an extra divisional officer would be to give the Collector direct charge of the Kottayam taluk. This was suggested amongst the proposals dealt with by Sir William Meyer (paragraph 288 of his report), but he took exception to "paying a man Collector's salary for work a large portion of which can be done by a divisional officer." The Collector of The Nilgiris has direct charge of the Gudalur taluk and apparently the arrangement works fairly satisfactorily, but the conditions there are of course different, and though the Kottayam taluk is a light one it involves much more divisional work than Gudalur. On the whole I would not recommend the unusual course of giving the Collector direct charge of a division even for the sake of meeting the criticism that he would not have enough work to do as Collector of the proposed new district. If the number of divisional officers must be kept at two, I would prefer to attach the

Kottayam taluk to the Wynad division keeping the headquarters of the division at Manantoddy. This would deprive the Collector of the assistance of a headquarters divisional officer, but the Treasury Deputy Collector, who would have a comparatively light treasury, would probably be sufficient and might even be given some magisterial jurisdiction. The Collector of North Malabar should be in direct charge of the Laccadives as the Collector of Malabar is at present.

13. The headquarters of the district of North Malabar should, I think, be at Tellicherry. It is the headquarters of the District Judge and the Sub-Collector's house would do for the Collector with some alteration. The office would require extension, but I think it would be possible to accommodate the Collector and the Treasury Deputy Collector in the compound of the present office if the District Registrar and his office incorporated in the Huzur buildings were moved. The alternative would be to make Cannanore the headquarters; but so long as Cannanore is a military station and the question of its abandonment as such seems to be as far off solution as ever, there is little more accommodation available there than there is at Tellicherry. It has been necessary to build a new taluk office at Cannanore and I think it would be necessary to build a new Collector's office, if the headquarters were put there. For a Deputy Collector's office it would be less difficult to find a suitable building.

14. The extra cost involved in these proposals would not be great. The present Headquarters Sub-Collector and Tellicherry Sub-Collector would be replaced by a Collector and either one or two divisional officers according to the decision of the question of a headquarter division. The Headquarters Sub-Collector has no separate establishment, but some reduction in the present Collectorate establishment would be possible when it became the establishment of the Collector of South Malabar, and some reduction in the Tellicherry Sub-Collector's establishment if it became a Cannanore Deputy Collector's establishment. A new Treasury Deputy Collector would be necessary but his establishment could to some extent be filled from the present establishment of the Calicut Treasury Deputy Collector. Statement E exhibits roughly the extra cost involved so far as establishment is concerned.

15. The above proposals are based on the assumption that Coorg is not to be added to this presidency. If it were added I think that since the proposed North Malabar district would be rather lighter than South Kanara it would on the whole be advisable to attach Coorg to the former. Mr. Vibert agrees but Mr. Souter, whom I consulted demi-officially, considers that amalgamation with South Kanara would be less unsuitable. I enclose a copy of a note which he has sent containing some statistics and particulars about the administration. Mercara is about equi-distant from Mangalore and Tellicherry. The road to Tellicherry is at present the better of the two and is bridged throughout while the road to Mangalore awaits the completion of one big bridge. Linguistically the affinity of Coorg is rather with South Kanara; ethnologically and historically it has little affinity either with South Kanara or with North Malabar and its laws and administration have always been on entirely different lines. To whichever district it were added I think it is clear that Coorg would require to be kept as a separate division; and I do not think that either the Collector of North Malabar or the Collector of South Kanara would be greatly overburdened by the addition of such a division to his district. Nor do I think that the addition of part of the Kasaragod taluk to North Malabar would be sufficient to turn the scale in either direction. But if Coorg were attached to North Malabar, I should be inclined to recommend that the Wynad taluk should be taken away from it and attached to the Nilgiris. This would prevent North Malabar from becoming unwieldy. The proposal was discussed in paragraph 289 of Sir William Meyer's report. It was supported by Mr. Winterbotham in 1887 but opposed by the Board and was again urged by Mr. Pinhey in 1905. The Wynad Planters Association is in favour of it now and Mr. Knapp is also in favour of it. I

do not think that the objections put in Sir William Meyer's report are very cogent; the revenue staff of the Nilgiris as it is includes a good number of Malayalis and my experience is that Wynadians seldom have to come to Calicut to appear before me. It is anomalous that the Malabar and Nilgiri Wynads should be under different administration and the balance of convenience is in favour of transferring the former to the Nilgiris. Statement F gives statistics of the districts of North Malabar and South Kanara, as they would be with Coorg attached.

16. To sum up, I do not think that there is sufficient reason to divide Malabar into two districts, because I do not consider the present arrangement unsatisfactory; but I think it would be advisable to attach the Wynad to the Nilgiris in order mainly to relieve the Collector in touring. If the district is divided I am in favour of leaving South Kanara alone and composing North Malabar of Chirakkal, Kottayam, Kurumbranad and Wynad: and if Coorg is to be transferred to the Madras Presidency I would add it to North Malabar and transfer the Wynad to the Nilgiris.

Enclosures.

(1)

Note about Coorg.

Area and population.—The area of the province is 1,582 square miles, having an average population of 111 per square mile, the total population according to the census of 1911 being 174,976.

Subordinate Revenue and Magisterial officers.— The province is divided into five taluks each presided over by a Sub-Magistrate locally known as the "Subedar Magistrate". This officer exercises both revenue and the magisterial functions within the taluk, the latter being confined to second-class powers. This officer is also the Sub-Treasury Officer of the taluk. These taluks are again subdivided into sixteen nads or hoblis, corresponding very roughly to the revenue inspectorate of the Madras Presidency controlled by officers locally known as "Parpatigars". These officials do not exercise any magisterial powers.

Superior Revenue and Magisterial officers.—Three of the five taluks are under the direct supervision of the First Assistant Commissioner, who is also District Magistrate, both as regards revenue and magisterial work arising therein. This post has always been permanently held by a European officer and ever since 1899–1900 by a member of the Indian Civil Service.

The remaining two taluks are under the direct supervision of an Indian Assistant Commissioner who also exercises the powers of a Subdivisional Magistrate within his jurisdiction.

Land Records and Survey Department.—This Department is under the control of a European officer styled the "Deputy Collector, Land Records and Agriculture". He is also the "Registrar of Co-operative Societies" in Coorg. It is proposed to confer this post in future on an Indian on a reduced rate of salary. This officer is also the head of the "veterinary staff."

Police.—The Police Department is under the direct control of an Assistant Superintendent of Police assisted by two Circle Inspectors and a number of Sub-Inspectors. Another Inspector is the office manager of the Assistant Superintendent of Police. The District Magistrate is the District Superintendent of Police.

Civil justice.—There are two munsifs who also exercise second-class magisterial powers within the two municipalities of Mercara and Virajpet where their courts are located. Next there is a Sub-Judge who also exercises first-class powers. He is also the District Treasury officer and Registrar of Assurances. His civil work is subject to the control of the District Judge who is the Commissioner of Coorg.

Education Department.—There is a High school in Mercara with a European Headmaster of the Indian Educational Service and a Lower Secondary school at Virajpet. A net work of primary schools is spread over the whole province. All these educational institutions are controlled by the Inspector of Schools, Ninth Circle, Bangalore, assisted by an Assistant Inspector of schools of the Provincial Educational Service with the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, as the supreme Educational Advisor to the Chief Commissioner.

Public Works Department and Forests.—The Public Works Department is under the control of an Executive Engineer. The Forest Department is under the control of a Deputy Conservator of Forests.

Medical Department.—The Medical Department is under the control of an Indian Medical Service officer who is also the Superintendent of the Central Jail at Mercara. There are an Assistant Surgeon and a Civil Apothecary stationed at Mercara and Virajpet respectively. Nine Sub-Assistant Surgeons are in charge of the hospitals and dispensaries in the town and mufassal.

Excise.—There is an Excise Inspector who is assisted by five Sub-Inspectors. The Commissioner is the direct head of this department.

Commissioner of Coorg.—The Commissioner has been a member of the Civil Service ever since 1902 and exercises supervision and appellate powers over all the departments mentioned above. In him are combined all the offices mentioned below :—

(1) Revenue Commissioner.
(2) District and Sessions Judge.
(3) Deputy Inspector-General of Police.
(4) Inspector-General of Registration and

complete supervision over all the other departments in Coorg.

The Chief Commissioner.—The Resident in Mysore is the Chief Commissioner of Coorg and he is also the Judicial Commissioner for Coorg. He is assisted by a Secretary on the executive side and a Registrar on the judicial side. He forms the 'Local Government' for Coorg.

Revenue.—The latest figures available show that the gross receipts for 1915–16 are as follows :—

	Rs.
Land revenue	3,64,741
Forest including revenue realized outside Coorg	4,49,156
Excise (spirits and drugs)	2,63,482
Local funds	1,34,071
Other heads	1,59,816
Total ...	13,71,266

Mr. Brigstocke's jurisdiction and work.—As already remarked, he is both the Magistrate of the district and the Superintendent of Police. He exercises his revenue powers over three taluks covering an area of 1,038 square miles. He is also Collector of Income-tax, Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages, and administers the affairs of the Virajpet Municipality as its president. In addition to this he is invested with sub-session powers. The remaining portion of the province comprising two taluks with an area of 544 square miles is administered by the Indian Assistant Commissioner. Mr. Brigstocke supervises the work of all the criminal courts in this area too.

Affinity of Coorgs with other races.—Coorgs are a race by themselves. Their manners and customs are peculiarly their own. Their national modes of dress (of both the sexes) are certainly not akin to those of any other sect of India. It is the same case with their language * which is a mixture of Canarese, Tamil, Malayalam and Tulu. Unlike other sects of India, they have no *gurus* (spiritual heads). As a rule they worship village deities of lesser divinity. There are also one or two temples of Siva which probably owe their genesis to the Saivite ruler of Coorg in pre-British days. Owing to the then sparseness of the population, the Coorg Raja imported several families of the Gowdugals from the adjoining South Kanara taluks which acknowledged the sway of the Raja at the time and allowed them the same privileges as Coorgs. Their long residence in the country has affected their customs, etc., to such an extent that except in the matter of speech they closely follow the Coorg customs in all respects. Regard being had to all the above circumstances, if the Coorgs can be said to have affinity with any other race of India, they may be said to have some affinity to the people of South Kanara. Considered from the point of view of the court language † which is Canarese and of the proximity to and convenience for the amalgamation of the province with any of the Madras districts there is no doubt that amalgamation with South Kanara would be the most suitable.

* It is not a written language.

† Indian.

It is quite true that there is a barrier of hills at present unpierced by any line of communication which will not admit of Coorg being amalgamated with the Malabar-Wynaad.

(2)

Statement A.

District.	Area in square miles.	Population as per last census.	Number of municipalities.	Number of towns.	Milage of roads.
Vizagapatam including Agency	17,221	3,189,821	4	15	(*d*) 1,886
Ganjam including Agency	(*a*) 8,379	(*b*) 2,221,292	(*b*) 3	(*b*) 9	(*c*) 761
Nellore	7,973	1,328,152	1	8	(*d*) 1,122
Kurnool	7,580	9,35,199	2	3	(*d*) 767
Coimbatore	7,196	2,116,564	2	13	(*d*) 1,532
Malabar	(*e*) 5,794	(*e*) 3,015,119	(*e*) 5	(*e*) 8	1,576

(*a*) B.P. No. 200, dated 24th May 1911 (D. No. 610/R. 11) and census volume XII, 1911.
(*b*) Census volume XII, 1911.
(*c*) Page 48 of volume II of District Gazetteer, 1905.
(*d*) Board's volume of District Gazetteer.
(*e*) Census volume XII, 1911.

(3)

Statement B.

Locality.	Area in square miles.	Population as per last census.	Revenue, fasli 1315.	Number of villages.	Number of Sub-Magistrates.
(1) Villages south of the Nileshwar river in the Kasaragod taluk.	65·9	34,517	70,946	12	1
(2) Villages south of the Chandragiri river in the Kasaragod taluk.	476·4	125,675	226,354	44	2

(4)

Statement C.

District.	Division.	Taluks.	Area in square miles.	Population as per last census.	Number of municipalities.	Number of unions.	Land revenue, fasli 1325.	Number of revenue papers received by Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars in 1915.	Number of magisterial cases by Tahsildars and Sub-Magistrates.	Number of Sub-Magistrates.
North Malabar.	Cannanore ..	Chirakkal ..	681·3 (220)	338,579	1	..	361,400	13,416	1,756	3
		Kurumbranad ..	505·4 (110)	353,983	..	1	453,265	10,259	976	2
	Headquarters ..	Kottayam ..	481·3 (170)	226,682	1	..	223,823	10,147	1,205	2
		Wynad	821·2 (220)	82,549	..	..	152,995	6,088	1,280	2
	Wynad	Laccadive Islands.	7·3	10,600	..	..	..	..	..	..
		Total ..	2,496·5	1,012,393	2	1	1,191,483	39,910	5,217	9
South Malabar.	Headquarters ..	Calicut	378·8 (210)	271,032	1	..	224,742	10,682	3,067	2
		Ernad	966·4 (360)	392,607	..	..	424,077	9,749	1,380	2
	Malappuram ..	Walluvanad ..	881·8 (370)	373,954	..	..	507,977	10,382	670	2
		Palghat	643·0 (300)	414,009	1	..	562,254	10,930	2,126	2
	Palghat ..	Ponnani	425·9	529,383	..	1	611,430	15,976	1,512	3
	Cochin	Cochin	1·7	21,741	1	..	16,298	4,096	285	1
		Total ..	3,297·6	2,002,726	3	1	2,346,778	61,815	9,037	12

Remarks.—The total number of papers relating to North Malabar received in the Huzur office in 1915 was 11,440 (excluding papers from the Board and Government); those relating to South Malabar were 20,496.

2. The figures in column 4 are for the total area including ghat forests. A rough estimate of the forest area is given below each in brackets.

(5)

Statement D.

Districts.	Area in square miles.	Population as per census of 1911.	Land revenue, fasli 1325.	Towns.	Divisions.	Taluks.	Sub-Magistrates and Deputy Tahsildars.
	MLS.						
(*a*) South Malabar	3,297·6	2,002,726	2,346,778	5	4	6	13
North Arcot	4,920 (*a*)	1,960,960 (*a*)	3,035,641 (*a*)	18 (*a*)	5 (*a*)	9 (*b*)	15 (*b*)
(*b*) North Malabar	2,496·5	1,012,393	1,191,483	3	3	4	9
Chittoor	5,676 (*a*)	1,238,742 (*a*)	824,530 (*a*)	5 (*a*)	3 (*a*)	5 (*b*)	9 (*b*)
South Kanara	4,021 (*a*)	1,195,227 (*a*)	2,412,649 (*a*)	6 (*a*)	3 (*a*)	6 (*b*)	10 (*b*)

(*a*) B. Volumes of District Gazetteers.
(*b*) B.P. No. 219, dated 10th August 1912 (D. 1619/P.-12).

(6)

Statement E.—Cost per mensem of.

Existing establishment in Malabar. (1)	Rs.	Proposed establishment for North Malabar. (2)	Rs.	Proposed establishment for South Malabar. (3)	Rs.
Collector	1,900	Collector	1,500	Collector	1,900
Establishment	1,809	Establishment	1,087	Establishment	1,529
Total ..	3,709	Total ..	2,587	Total ..	3,429
Headquarters Sub-Collector ..	1,100	Headquarters Deputy Collector	300	Treasury Deputy Collector ..	400
....		Establishment	188	Establishment	1,061
		Total ..	488	Total ..	1,461
Sub-Collector, Tellicherry ..	1,152	Deputy Collector, Cannanore.	400	....	
Establishment	255	Establishment	188	....	
Total ..	1,407	Total ..	588		
Treasury Deputy Collector ..	500	Treasury Deputy Collector ..	300	....	
Establishment	1,369	Establishment	793	....	
Total ..	1,869	Total ..	1,093		
Grand total ..	8,085	Grand total ..	4,756	Grand total ..	4,890
Pay of gazetted officers ..	4,652	Pay of gazetted officers ..	2,500	Pay of gazetted officers ..	2,300
Pay of establishment	3,433	Pay of establishment ..	2,256	Pay of establishment	2,590

Note.—Difference between column (1), and columns (2) and (3), grand total, Rs. 1,561. If the Divisional Officer of Cannanore is to be a Sub-Collector, the difference would be increased by about Rs. 500. If there is to be no Headquarters Deputy Collector, the total would be decreased by about Rs. 500.

(7)

Statement F.

District.	Division.	Taluks.	Area in square miles.	Population as per last census.	Number of municipalities.	Number of unions.	Land Revenue, fasli 1325.	Number of Sub-Magistrates.
			MLS.				Rs.	
North Malabar.	Cannanore	Chirakkal	681·3	328,579	1	..	3,61,400	3
	Headquarters.	Kurumbranad ..	505·4	353,983	..	1	4,53,265	2
		Kottayam ..	481·3	226,682	1	..	2,23,823	2
		Laccadive Islands.	7·3	10,600	..	..	..	..
	Coorg ..	Mercara, Nanjarajpatnam, Padinalknad, Yedinalknad and Kiggatnad.	1,582·0	174,976 (*a*)	5	..	3,64,741 (*b*)	5
		Total A ..	3,275·3	1,104,820	7	1	14,03,229	12
	Wynad ..	Wynad	821·2	82,549	..	..	1,52,995	2
		Total B ..	4,078·5	1,187,369	7	1	15,56,224	14
South Kanara.	Three divisions.	Six taluks ..	4,021·0 (*c*)	1,195,227 (*c*)	1	..	24,12,649 (*c*)	10 (*d*)
	Coorg ..	Five taluks ..	1,582·0	174,976 (*a*)	5	..	3,64,741 (*b*)	5
		Total ..	5,603·0	1,370,203	6	..	27,77,390	15

(*a*) As per census of 1911.
(*b*) Figure supplied by the Commissioner.
(*c*) B. Volumes of district gazetteers.
(*d*) B.P. No. 219, dated 10th August 1912 (D. 1619/P. 12).

(vi)

Letter—from L. Vibert, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of South Kanara.
To—the Secretary to Commissioner of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
Dated—the 27th December 1916.
No.—D. Dis. 4504 Rev. (Confdl.)/47.

With reference to Mr. Evans' letter No. D. 96/Confdl./16, dated 23rd December 1916, regarding the question of redistribution in Malabar, I have the honour to state that I have nothing of importance to add to the discussion.

It does not appear whether the people of Coorg themselves have been consulted in the matter. The relative position of North Malabar, South Kanara and Coorg would seem at first glance to indicate that Coorg could be more conveniently attached to the former district.

There is one small verbal modification required in Mr. Evans' letter. The meeting I held at Kasaragod was not actually held for the purpose of discussing these proposals, but for talking over local affairs generally, forest, school and panchayat matters and the like.

(vii)

Letter—from L. Vibert, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of South Kanara.
To—the Secretary to the Commissioner of Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
Dated—the 16th January 1917.
No.—D. Dis. 89-Rev.

(viii)

Reference from the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 654 Gt./16–4, dated 29th March 1917.

In paragraph 15 of his letter No. 96 D. Confdl., dated 23rd December 1916, the Collector of Malabar states that the Wynad Planters' Association is in favour of the transfer of the Wynad taluk to the Nilgiri district. He is requested to ascertain how the native population of the taluk would view the change and to favour the Board with his comments on any objections that may be urged.

To the Collector of Malabar.

(ix)

Reference from the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 654 Gt./16–5, dated 29th March 1917.

With a view to affording relief to the Collector of Malabar a proposal has been made to transfer to the Nilgiri district the Wynad taluk of the Malabar district. The figures entered below furnish some idea of the work of the taluk.

Area—821·2 square miles including 220 square miles of ghaut forests.

Population	82,549
Land revenue (Fasli 1325)	1·53 lakhs.
Number of revenue papers	6,088
Number of magisterial cases	1,280
Number of Sub-Magistrates	2

The proposal is not new. It is discussed in paragraph 289 of Sir William Meyer's report. The Collector of Malabar reports that the Wynad Planters Association are now in favour of the change and Mr. Knapp as Collector of the Nilgiris was also in favour of it. Mr. Evans writes: "I do not think that the objections put in Sir William Meyer's report are very cogent. The revenue staff of the Nilgiris, as it is, included a good number of Malayalis and my experience is that Wynadians seldom have to come to Calicut to appear before me. It is anomalous that the Malabar and Nilgiri Wynads should be under different administration and the balance of convenience is in favour of transferring the former to the Nilgiris." The Collector of the Nilgiris is requested to discuss the proposal in detail and submit his views. He is requested also to state how he would re-arrange his divisional and taluk charges, in case the Wynad taluk is added to his district.

To the Collector of Nilgiris.

(x)

Letter—from F. B. Evans, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of Malabar.
To—the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
Dated—the 24th April 1917.
No.—Dis. 26 (Confdl. 17).

In reply to Board's Reference No. 654-Gt./16-4, dated 29th March 1917, I have the honour to say that the native population of the Malabar-Wynad is generally opposed to the idea of attaching it to the Nilgiri district.

2. The chief reasons are—

(*a*) that most of the residents in the taluk have relations and connexions in the plain taluks of Malabar;

(*b*) that trade connexions are mostly with Malabar proper;

(*c*) that appellants would have to go to Ooty instead of Calicut and would find it expensive and difficult to get accommodation, or vakils;

(*d*) that the prevailing language is Malayalam, not Tamil.

3. None of these objections really amounts to very much. (*a*) and (*b*) Private and commercial intercourse would not be affected by the transfer; (*c*) The number of appeals that come to the Collector and District Magistrate is infinitesimal, while civil jurisdiction would not necessarily be affected; (*d*) Malayalam is the prevailing language of a considerable part of the Nilgiris as at present constituted, and a good deal of Tamil is spoken in the Malabar-Wynad. But I have no doubt that the change would be unpopular with the average Indian resident.

(xi)

Endorsement—from Government, Home (Miscellaneous) Department.
No.—356-1.
Dated—the 9th February 1917.

(xii)

Letter—from A. R. Cumming, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of the Nilgiris.
To—Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
Dated—the 15th December 1917.
No.—R. Dis. 180.

I have the honour to submit my reply to the Board's Reference No. 654-Gt./16-5, dated the 29th March 1917, regarding the proposal to transfer to the Nilgiri district the Wynad taluk of the Malabar district with a view to affording relief to the Collector of Malabar.

2. As observed by the Board, the proposal is not a new one. The reasons for and against the proposal were discussed in detail in Board's Resolution No. 279, dated the 19th March 1888; the proposal was then strongly opposed by the Board and the Board's views were accepted by Government. It is unnecessary, as without a knowledge of the country it would be difficult, for me to discuss the proposal from the Wynad point of view; that may be left to the Collector of Malabar. Suffice to say that when the proposal was mooted in 1887 it was strongly opposed by the Indian residents of the Wynad for reasons which are dealt with in Mr. (now Sir Henry) Winterbotham's report read in the Board's Proceedings above quoted. I understand the position still obtains that Wynadians have seldom or never to visit the district headquarters on revenue business. I note further that the Wynad Planters Association has now definitely declared itself in favour of the proposed transfer.

3. I have consulted the Nilgiri Planters Association as well as the principal planters of the district and have also informally discussed the proposal with the members of the Nilgiri District Board. There is a consensus of opinion in this district in favour of making the proposed change, on the score that it would bring the whole planting area under the control of a single Collector and thus secure uniformity of policy in dealing with planting questions.

4. Having stated the attitude of the non-official public to the proposal, I presume I may limit my remarks to the effect which, so far as I can foresee, the transfer, if effected, would have on the administration of this district, and I may at once say

that the only objections of this nature that I can see to the proposal are those dealt with in paragraphs 7 and 8 infra.

5. The grounds so far as they affect the district on which exception was taken to the proposal in 1888 were—

(*a*) that the language of the natives of Wynad is Malayalam and that it would be a real hardship to transfer them to a Tamil district, the revenue and judicial officers of which are unacquainted with their language and their native law and custom ; and

(*b*) the difficulty of efficiently manning the Wynad from the Nilgiris.

6. On the first of these points, I would observe that Malayalam is one of the recognized vernaculars of the district and that out of 79 men at present in superior service in this district 29 know or have a fair working acquaintance with Malayalam. In the Gudalur taluk the court language is Malayalam, the village accounts are maintained in Malayalam and the bulk of the population speak Malayalam. So far as I can gather from officers who have served in the taluk, no particular difficulty has been experienced on the score of language in administering the Gudalur taluk as part of the Nilgiri district, and as the transfer of the Wynad taluk to this district would presumably involve the transfer from the Malabar district of the staff serving in the taluk, all of whom would know Malayalam, the language difficulty should not be an insuperable one. The native law and custom in Wynaad are the same as those obtaining in Gudalur and officials of this district have now had forty years' experience of them.

7. The second objection is a more formidable one and if, as appears from paragraph 4 of B.P. No. 279 (Land Revenue), dated the 19th March 1888, the greatest difficulty has been felt in manning the Wynad taluk from the large establishment employed in the Malabar district with eight revenue taluks besides the Wynad and British Cochin, that difficulty is bound to be felt with considerably increased force in this district where there are only two taluks outside the Wynad. I am unable at present to suggest any clear and definite solution of this difficulty. I believe, however, that it is generally recognized that West Coast men resort much more readily to the hills nowadays than they did thirty years ago, and it is possible that the preferential claim which officers who have served for five years in this district in the grade of deputy tahsildar or tahsildar to a transfer to a Tahsildari on the lowest or a corresponding grade in the plains will serve as an increasing inducement to West Coast men to take up service in this district.

8. Another factor which has to be considered in connexion with the proposed transfer is its effect on the local fund administration of the district. It is pointed out in Sir William Meyer's report referred to in the memorandum under reply that the Wynad is not self-supporting in regard to local fund expenditure, and that its transfer from Malabar to the 'impecunious' Nilgiri District Board would involve neglect of its roads, hospitals and schools or a grant from Provincial funds for their upkeep. If the Nilgiri District Board was impecunious at the time of Sir William Meyer's report, its position has not improved since ; with the increased cost of labour and materials and the higher standard that the development of motor traffic and the special circumstances of the district as the summer headquarters of the Government and a sanatorium for all India and the Far East impose on the district board in the matter of road construction and maintenance, the board is unable to meet its responsibilities and can certainly not add to them by undertaking to make good any deficit in the budget of the Wynad Taluk Board. The financial position of the Nilgiri District Board is at present separately under the consideration of Government in connexion with a letter submitted by my predecessor Mr. Knapp, copy of which is enclosed. If the Wynad taluk were added to the Nilgiri district, it would probably be desirable to abolish the taluk board at present existing in that area and administer the tract directly under the district board as no taluk boards have hitherto been constituted for this district. If the shares of special grants made by

Government to the District Board of Malabar and allotted by that Board to the Wynad Taluk Board were withdrawn by Government from the Malabar District Board and transferred to the Nilgiri District Board, the special subsidy at present granted to the Wynad Taluk Board (vide e.g., G.O. No. 1365 L., dated the 30th September 1916) were continued to the taluk after its transfer to this district, the full amount of land-cess collected in the area were credited to the area instead of merely a moiety as at present, and the income from tolls and ferries in the taluk which the (Taluk Board's budget is not at present given credit for) were taken into consideration, the Wynad Local Fund Budget would probably balance itself. I would suggest that the President, District Board, Malabar, be asked to report specifically on this point. Meanwhile, it is necessary that I should point out, as I have endeavoured to do, the probable effects of the proposed transfer on the local fund administration of this district, and urge that any additional financial burden, which the Nilgiri District Board may be called on to assume in consequence of that transfer, may be borne by Government by way of a special subsidy to the Board.

9. The proposed arrangement would improve the constitution of this district, for it would give the district another divisional officer and a more extensive cadre of posts than the somewhat limited one it now has, for I presume that the divisional and taluk staff at present employed in the Wynad taluk would be transferred *en bloc* to this district. So far as taluk charges in this district are concerned, I am not, on the information before me, prepared to say that any change would be possible; in other words, Gudalur would have to remain a distinct revenue taluk as at present. As regards divisional charges, the obvious course would be to place Gudalur under the Divisional officer of the Wynad for revenue and magisterial purposes; at present the Collector and District Magistrate is the Divisional officer and Subdivisional Magistrate of Gudalur, though in practice criminal work from the taluk, requiring the attention of a first-class magistrate is dealt with by the Treasury Deputy Magistrate. The local Government has powers under section 8 (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code to constitute the proposed subdivision.

10. The question naturally arises of the headquarters of the Divisional Officer in the event of his having jurisdiction over both the Wynad and Gudalur. As may be seen from the map his present headquarters at Manantoddy would be right at one corner of his division. Various suggestions have been made to me by the gentlemen I have consulted, among the places proposed being Meppadi, Culpetta, Vayittiri and even Pandalur. In my opinion the question is not one which presses for an immediate settlement, and I would suggest that Manantody should continue to be the headquarters of the Revenue Divisional Officer, until some experience is gained of the working of the new division.

11. As regards the pay of the posts of tahsildar and deputy tahsildar, which would be added to the cadre of this district, I would propose that they be fixed at Rs. 200 and 150 respectively plus the usual Wynad allowances, corresponding to the emoluments attached to these posts when the pay was local and not personal. It is understood that the pay formerly attached to the post of tahsildar of the Wynad was Rs. 200 and that to the post of Deputy Tahsildar of Vayitiri Rs. 125, i.e., the Deputy Tahsildar was of the first grade.

12. There is one point connected with the criminal jurisdiction of the proposed subdivision which requires to be noticed. At present Gudalur belongs to the Coimbatore Sessions* Division, the southern part of Wynad to South Malabar, and the northern part of North Malabar (vide the notifications quoted in the margin)†. It would be anomalous to have sessions cases arising in the proposed subdivision committable, the judgments in first-class cases arising therein appealable to three separate sessions courts. So far as Gudalur is concerned, I would suggest, as Mr. Burrows did in 1888, that it be removed from the Coimbatore Sessions Division and included in the South Malabar Division. This would reduce the number of sessions courts having jurisdiction in the proposed subdivision to two: whether or not it would be possible or

*(1) Notification dated 22nd August 1873 on page 1343 of Gazette, dated 26th August 1873.
(2) Notification dated 13th March 1877, Gazette, page 173—Part 1, dated 13th March 1877.
(3) Sections 8 and 9 of Act I of 1868, Madras.

Malabar.

†(1) Notification No. 406, dated 14th October 1886, page 911, Part I, dated 15th October 1886.
(2) Notification No. 237, dated 22nd May 1906, page 542, Part I, dated 22nd May 1906.

desirable to give the Sessions Court of South Malabar jurisdiction over the whole of the Wynad is a matter on which the Collector of Malabar may, if necessary, be asked to advise. The local Government's powers in the matter are defined in section 7 (2) of the Criminal Procedure Code.

13. One effect of the proposed transfer would be that it should be possible to bring Gudalur within the jurisdiction of the District Munsif of Vayittiri, relieve the Deputy Tahsildar of Gudalur of the civil powers he now exercises under the arrangements sanctioned in G.O. No. 25, Revenue, dated the 8th January 1906, and do away in whole or in part with the establishment attached to his office for civil work. The file of the District Munsif of Vayittiri is, I believe, at present very light and if, so long as his headquarters remain at Vayittiri, he were required to spend three or four days in the month at Gudalur, no inconvenience is likely to be caused to civil litigants in that taluk. Vayittiri is 45 miles from Gudalur, but if a young and energetic officer who is able to motor cycle were posted to Vayitiri, the journey need not involve any unnecessary waste of his time. The question of the District Munsif's headquarters, if he is given jurisdiction over both the Wynad and Gudalur, may, as in the case of the Revenue Divisional Officer, be taken up later. I understand that civil jurisdiction over the Wynad taluk is at present distributed between the District Courts of North and South Malabar(vide the notifications quoted in the margin). Gudalur is at present under the civil jurisdiction of Coimbatore and if the District Munsif of Vayitiri is given jurisdiction over it, it may be transferred to South Malabar. The local Government's powers in the matter are defined in section 10 of the Civil Courts Act III of 1873.

(1) Notification 68, dated 22nd February 1886, Gazette page 158, Part I, dated 3rd March 1886.

(2) Notification No. 238, dated 22nd May 1906, Gazette page 542, Part I, dated 22nd May 1906.

14. As the proposal has been put forward with a view to relieve the Collector of Malabar, I have not thought it necessary to discuss in my report its effects on the Forest, Public Works Department, or Police Administration of the district.

Enclosure

Letter—from A. R. Knapp, Esq, I.C.S., President, District Board, The Nilgiris.
To—the Secretary to Government, Local and Municipal Department.
Dated—the 8th January 1917.
No.—R.C. 876/16.

I have the honour to submit a copy of Resolution No. 32, passed by the Nilgiri District Board at its meeting held on the 21st December 1916 in which it was decided to ask Government to take over the maintenance of the road from Ootacamund to Gudalur.

2. This road forms part of the through route from Mettupalaiyam to the Wynad, which consists of two sections:—

(*a*) Mēttupālaiyam to Ootacamund and
(*b*) Ootacamund to Gudalur.

Both sections were at one time maintained by the Public Works Department under G.O. No. 1025, Financial, dated the 7th May 1884, but section (*b*) which is now in question was transferred to the district board at its own seeking in 1890 (G.O. Mis. No 1916 L., dated the 2nd August 1890). A perusal of the correspondence connected with that Government order will show that the grounds put forward by the district board for undertaking the burden were neither very specific nor very convincing. Since then, moreover, the circumstances have undergone a considerable change, and the road, which in 1890 carried little but bullock traffic, has now become a motor route of some importance. It forms the direct connexion between Mysore and the West Coast and Ootacamund.

3. The Board as now constituted regards the maintenance of the road, in the condition in which modern requirements demand that it should be maintained, as beyond its powers. The board's income has been declining of late years, while the cost of labour and materials has been rapidly rising and its resources are no longer sufficient to meet the cost of maintaining its roads, many of which require thorough renewal. It is therefore faced with the alternative either of cutting down the allotment for the Gudalūr road and allowing it to degenerate into a mere cart-road, or of asking the Government to take the road over. The existence of the road is a valuable addition to the amenities of Ootacamund; the very roundabout route by rail from Mysore makes this direct road route of considerable value and convenience and the road being thus of far more than local importance, the Board trusts that Government will, as a special case, recognize it as a suitable object for provincial maintenance.

4. I enclose a copy of a note which sets out in more detail the financial conditions which the Board has to face, and shows how urgent is the need for some relief if the Board's work generally is to be maintained in a state of efficiency.

5. The section of the road which the board desires to hand over is 278 miles. The annual maintenance grant is Rs. 12,510. There are two toll-gates, which in the current year fetched a rental of Rs. 3,500. These, if Government so desire it, could be managed by the district board, as are those on the Ootacamund-Mēttupālaiyam section, under the terms of paragraph 5 of Memorandum No. 680-E., dated the 16th September 1884, in G.O. No. 2352, Financial, dated the 3rd October 1884.

6. I request the favour of early orders, so that if possible the road may be taken over from 1st April 1917.

Resolution—Mis. No. 304, *dated* 27*th February* 1918.

The papers read above, which relate to the question of dividing Malabar into two revenue districts, will be submitted to Government with reference to their memorandum No. 673-2, Public, dated 25th March 1916, and Memorandum No. 673-3, Home (Miscellaneous), dated 10th August 1916.

2. In the memorandum, dated 25th March 1916, Government observed that the Malabar district with its area of 5,794 square miles and a population of over three millions was a very heavy charge and that the Mappilla element of the population added considerably to the difficulties of the administration. It was also pointed out that the question of dividing the district had been considered by Sir William Meyer in his report on the constitution of additional districts, divisions and taluks, and that the only objection to the division which was supposed to be insuperable was the lightness of the proposed North Malabar district. To meet this objection Government suggested that the Kasaragod taluk of South Kanara as well as the Laccadives might be included in the North Malabar district and the possibility of adding Coorg to the reduced South Kanara district might also be taken into account. The Board was instructed to examine the question in the light of these remarks and to submit proposals for the division of the district, in consultation with the Collector of Malabar, in case it considered the division practicable and desirable.

3. Before working out any scheme of division, the Board desired to know whether the Government of India would agree to the amalgamation of Coorg with the Madras Presidency and, on being informed that the settlement of this question was not immediately practicable, the Board called on the Collector to submit two alternative sets of proposals, one based on the assumption that Coorg was to be added to this Presidency and the other leaving that contingency altogether out of account. The recommendations of the Collector on the subject are embodied in his report No. 96-D. (Confdl. of 1916), dated 23rd December 1916, read above.

4. There is no doubt that the Malabar district is a very heavy charge for one officer, but relief has been provided for the Collector in recent years by the appointment of a headquarters Sub-Collector, who is also an additional District Magistrate. The arrangement has worked well and Mr. Evans himself admits that, with an officer of this kind to assist him, he cannot be said to be overburdened with work, except perhaps in the matter of touring. In many ways there is an intimate connexion between all parts of Malabar. By the peculiarity of its laws and customs and its land revenue system the Malabar district constitutes a very distinct entity. Malayalis as a whole possess a keen sense of local patriotism and would resent a division of territory which seemed to threaten a break-up of their unity. For all these reasons the Board is of opinion that it is as unnecessary as it would be inexpedient to divide the district, and it will refrain therefore from discussing the details of Mr. Evans' proposals.

5. While declaring himself opposed to any scheme of partition, the Collector has suggested that, in order to afford him relief in the matter of touring, the Wynad taluk might be transferred to the Nilgiri district.

The proposal is not a new one. In 1887 it found the support of both the Collector of the Nilgiris and the Collector of Malabar. The Board, however, as then constituted was strongly opposed to the proposal, and recorded the following reasons in support of its view :—

(1) the language of the natives of the Wynad is Malayalam and it would be a real hardship to transfer them to a Tamil district, the revenue and judicial officers of which are unacquainted with Malayalam ;

(2) the Wynad is some distance from Ootacamund and the climate of Ootacamund is so distasteful to the natives of the Wynad, especially during the south-west monsoon, that great hardship would be inflicted on all natives obliged to travel thither ;

(3) the business connexion of the inhabitants (both European and Indian) of the Wynad are entirely with the West Coast ;

(4) the manning of the Wynad taluk establishment from the Nilgiris would be a difficult problem.

(5) the Wynad is not self-supporting in regard to local fund administration and its transfer to the impecunious Nilgiri district would involve the neglect of its roads, hospitals and schools, unless help were received from provincial revenues.

At the present day the revenue staff of the Nilgiri district contains a large number of Malayalis and the difficulty in regard to language would not amount to much; moreover there are many immigrant Tamils in the Wynad. The objection based on the distance of Ootacamund and the difficulty of travelling is also in the opinion of the Board as now constituted, not a serious one, as the people of the Wynad have seldom to go to the district headquarters in person to appear before the Collector. With regard to the other objections, the Board agrees with the Collector of Malabar in considering that none of them are very cogent. The difficulty of manning the Wynaad taluk establishment from the Nilgiris is no doubt real, but it is not insuperable. The Board believes that in these days men from the West Coast resort much more readily to the hills than they did thirty years ago and, as the Collector of the Nilgiris suggests, it is possible that the preferential claim allowed to officers who have served in that district for five years in the grade of Deputy Tahsildar or Tahsildar to a transfer to a Tahsildari in the plains would serve as an increasing inducement to West Coast men to take up service in the Nilgiris. Moreover, the Collector of Malabar would be able to spare men for the Nilgiris when required.

6. The Collector of the Nilgiris reports that, so far as his district is concerned, there is a consensus of opinion in favour of transferring the Malabar Wynad to that district, for the reason that the transfer would bring the whole planting area under the control of a single Collector and thus secure uniformity of policy in the treatment of questions affecting planters. The transfer would also improve the constitution of the Nilgiri district, as it would give the district another Divisional officer and a more extensive cadre of posts than the somewhat limited one it now has. The Collector however states that even under present conditions the Nilgiri District Board is unable to meet its responsibilities in the matter of local fund administration and that if the Wynad is to be added to its charge, the additional financial burden thus imposed on the District Board will necessitate a special grant from provincial funds. These are matters which the Board is not in a position to discuss, but it submits that, if the transfer of the Wynad to the Nilgiris otherwise commends itself to Government, the proposal should not be allowed to be defeated by the fact that the local fund receipts of the taluk are inadequate for its needs.

7. If the Wynad taluk is to be transferred to the Nilgiri district, the Gudalur taluk may be detached from the Collector's direct charge and Wynad and Gudalur formed into a division, the rest of the Nilgiri district retaining its present constitution. For a division composed of the Wynad and Gudalur taluks Manantoddy, which will lie in a corner of the area, will scarcely be a suitable headquarters. This question however is one of detail and need not be discussed at this stage.

8. For purposes of criminal jurisdiction the northern part of the Wynad is now attached to the North Malabar Sessions division and the southern part to the South Malabar division. Gudalur is included in the Coimbatore Sessions division. Under the changed conditions the simplest arrangement would probably be to include the whole of the new Wynad division in one of the two Sessions divisions of the Malabar district, provided that this can be done without making either of the Malabar Sessions divisions too heavy.

9. If the practical difficulties in the way of transferring the Wynad to the Nilgiri district are not serious, the advantages of doing so are, nevertheless, comparatively slight. It is only the planting community of the taluk that is in favour of the transfer, while the native population are opposed to it. The removal of the Wynad from Malabar will no doubt afford the Collector welcome relief in the matter of touring; he will however lose his only upland taluk and will still need the assistance of a headquarters Sub-Collector. The Board has already stated the grounds on which it would deprecate anything in the nature of a partition of the district. On a careful review of the subject it is by no means convinced that any territorial readjustment is called for, but considers that, if Government consider that a change is needed in order to afford relief to the Collector of Malabar, the transfer of the Wynad to the Nilgiris would be the least objectionable course.

(True extract)

H. R. Pate,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Home (Miscellaneous) Department, with enclosures and a file of memorials returned.

Order—No. 647, Home (Miscellaneous), dated 10th September 1918.

Recorded.

(True extract)

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO,
Secretary to Government.

With Copy of note.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
Copy to the Revenue Department.
" Public Works Department.

Supl

Put up for approval
Please see the
last page

DB
2098

GOVERNMENT PRESS
30 SEP 1918
MADRAS.

15/9

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 647, HOME (MISCELLANEOUS), DATED 10TH SEPTEMBER 1918

[SUBJECT.—*Bifurcation of the Malabar Revenue district.*]

Previous papers:

G.O.	692,	*Judicial,*	27*th Mar.*	1879	G.O.	378,	*Public,*	18*th May* 1906
,,	2115	,,	13*th Oct.*	1881	,,	861,	*Judicial,*	22*nd* ,, ,,
,,	1114,	*Revenue,*	30*th Nov.*	1887	,,	1772	,,	31*st Oct.* ,,
,,	2920,	*Judicial,*	21*st Dec.*	,,	,,	2547,	*Revenue,*	14*th Sep.* 1909
Enclosures in report 26th March 1888 in Public No. 1268/1888					,,	1780,	*Judicial,*	21*st Dec.* ,,
					,,	427,	*Public,*	28*th May* 1910
G.O.	210-11,	*Public,*	24*th Feb.*	1888	,,	2662,	*Revenue,*	13*th Aug.* ,,
,,	522	,,	15*th May*	,,	,,	517,	*P.W.D.,*	5*th Mar.* 1914
,,	4561,	*Revenue,*	4*th Aug.*	,,	,,	305,	*Revenue,*	10*th Feb.* 1916
,,	876,	*Public,*	6*th Sep.*	,,	,,	365	*L.,*	30*th Sep.* ,,
,,	470	,,	31*st May*	1889	,,	181,	*Revenue,*	11*th Jan.* 1918
,,	813	,,	24*th Oct.*	1905	*Report on the Administration of Coorg for 1914-15*			
,,	25,	*Revenue,*	8*th Jan.*	1906				

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

[SUBJECT.—*Construction of a house for the additional Sub-Collector, Calicut.*]

* * * * * *

The file may now be circulated to the Honourable Member.

R.K.—15-1-16.

D. MARSHALL—17-1-16.

Before sanctioning this I should like to know whether the question of subdividing Malabar into two districts has been considered recently. The area is not large (5,794 square miles) but the population is over three millions and Mr. Evans told me the other day that he thought the judicial district of North Malabar should be made a separate revenue district. That would be a very light district but Kasaragod taluk which is inhabited by Malayalam-speaking people could be included in it. Coorg should then be included in South Kanara. I suggest this question be examined before we sanction the building of a house for the additional Sub-Collector.

H. A. S[TUART]—18-1-16.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

Submitted that the question of dividing the Malabar district and adding Coorg to this Presidency was discussed by Sir William Meyer in his report on the constitution of additional districts, divisions and taluks—vide paragraphs 281 to 290 of his report. The reasons against the transfer of Coorg to this Presidency will be found in paragraph 285 of the report. The other alternatives that were considered and rejected for giving relief to the Malabar Collector were—

(1) to transfer Wynad to The Nilgiris—paragraph 289;

(2) to create a North Malabar Collectorate, the Collector having direct charge of the Headquarters division—paragraph 288;

(3) to transfer Chirakkal taluk to South Kanara—paragraph 290.

Ultimately, however, the only changes made were the transfer of Anjengo and Tangasseri to the charge of the Resident in Travancore and Cochin and the appointment of a Personal Assistant Sub-Collector.

2. The area and population of Malabar, South Kanara and Coorg and of the districts redistributed as suggested by the Honourable Member (Judicial) are shown in the following statement:—

District.	Taluks.	Area in square miles.	Population.
Malabar ...	Calicut	379	271,032
	Chirakkal	682	338,579
	Cochin	2	21,741
	Ernad	966	392,607
	Kottayam	481	226,682
	Kurumbranad	505	353,983
	Laccadive islands	7	10,600
	Palghat	643	414,009
	Ponnani	426	529,383
	Walavanad	882	373,954
	Wynad	821	82,549
		5,794	3,015,119
South Kanara ...	Amindivi islands	3	3,955
	Coondapoor	619	139,599
	Kasaragod	762	247,467
	Mangalore	382	276,515
	Mudabidri	640	110,174
	Udipi	725	272,756
	Uppinangadi	890	144,761
		4,021	1,195,227
Coorg		1,582	174,976

Proposed.

Districts.	Area in square miles.	Population.
North Malabar—		
North Malabar Judicial district, Chirakkal, Kottayam, Kurumbranad and Kasaragod (from South Kanara).	2,430	1,166,711
South Malabar—		
Calicut, Ernad, Ponnani, Palghat, Walavanad, Cochin and Wynad.	4,126	2,095,875
South Kanara—		
South Kanara (minus Kasaragod) and Coorg ...	4,841	1,122,736

North Malabar is already a separate district for judicial, police and registration.

3. It is for consideration whether, in view of the previous discussions, the subject should be further examined. If so, the remarks of the Collectors of Malabar and South Kanara may perhaps be obtained in the first instance.

P.G.S.S.—11-2-16.

S.S.—12-2-16.

There is a strong case for the division of the Malabar district, as it now stands, on administrative grounds. The fact that it has been found necessary already to divide it into two for police, registration and judicial purposes is a strong indication that the severance will eventually become complete and that each half will be put under a separate Collector and District Magistrate. It cannot be said, in this department, that the amount of work and responsibility now devolving on the head of the district justifies the proposal; that must be left to the departments concerned to decide—Revenue and Judicial. It will be sufficient to say in this department that, as the case now presents itself, the proposal has many attractions and does not seem to be obnoxious to serious objection. Among the chief advantages involved in the project are the ease and cheapness with which it can be accomplished, as the only important addition to the staff and buildings will be a collectorate and that on a small scale, and as it is presumed that the line of demarcation will be the same as that which now divides the jurisdiction of the two District Judges or of the two District Superintendents of Police, presumably the latter.

2. The reasons for which this line was fixed for police purposes are found clearly set out in G.O. No. 1772, Judicial, dated 31st October 1906, and they have even stronger force when it comes to dividing the magisterial jurisdictions also. Several objections to the division of the district were raised by Mr. Logan and recapitulated by Sir William Meyer in paragraph 287 of his report only, with one exception, to be summarily disposed of. Perusal will show that such weight as they once carried has since much diminished. The exception alluded to is the comparatively small

size of the proposed North Malabar district. Sir William Meyer apparently regarded this as an insuperable objection, but when it is a matter of choice between two evils, and these evils are, on the one hand, unwieldy size and consequent inefficiency, and the other, the formation, at no great expense and without difficulty, of a district the head of which will be less hardworked than the majority of Madras districts, one would simply plump for the latter. As a matter of fact, smallness of the area and population of a district does not necessarily involve lightness of work; it merely gives scope for more detailed work and closer supervision. Take Ceylon, for instance, where charges are extraordinarily small, but men do not seem to be underworked. Even in India, the proposed new Malabar district would, I understand, be a normal charge in another province. The *Madras Standard* referred to by Sir William Meyer is not necessarily a law of the Medes and Persians and may call for reconsideration and adjustment to modern conditions.

3. It has been assumed in the note that the southern taluk of South Kanara which is Malayali will be incorporated in the North Malabar district and there is much to be said for this. It is not worth discussing it at length until the Collectors concerned and the Board have had their say; it will be seen, however, that a district so composed will not be a negligible quantity containing, as it does, well over a million people and extending over nearly 3,000 square miles of country. It might also be possible to convey the Laccadives from Calicut to Cannanore, which would, I understand, afford appreciable relief to South Malabar. The following table compares the area and population of the proposed two districts with those of smaller charges in the Presidency including the proposed new Ellore district:—

Districts.	Area in square miles.	Population (census 1911).	Land revenue and cesses.
Anantapur	6,718	963,223	13·22
Chittoor	5,676	1,238,742	11·73
North Arcot	4,920	1,960,960	28·90
Bellary	5,714	969,436	19·99
Madura	4,916	1,932,832	28·50
Ramnad	4,834	1,658,453	15·71
Tinnevelly	4,353	1,790,619	31·13
Tanjore	3,727	2,362,689	66·22
New Kistna (without additions from Guntur).	3,559	1,023,173	35·27
New Ellore (without Polavaram)	2,348	974,362	39·72
Proposed North Malabar district	2,430	1,166,711	..
Proposed South Malabar district	4,126	2,025,875	..

Another great advantage with which this projected bifurcation starts is that the Government of India have already approved it in principle, and the delay in obtaining their sanction would not probably be great. As regards the line of demarcation of the proposed new district, there will be no hesitation in making it identical with that of the judicial and registration district but including the Wynad, that is to say, the same as for the police district of North Malabar—vide orders of 1906 forming the police district of Malabar referred to above (G.O. No. 1772, Judicial, dated 31st October 1906). What has there been said of the duties of Superintendents of Police in Malabar applies with equal force to the duties of District Magistrates in Malabar. The essential is to keep the fanatic Mappilla zone in one jurisdiction and this is affected by the present distribution. Calicut, the largest town in Malabar, must necessarily remain the seat of the head of the southern district, not only is it the most suitable centre from which to control the fanatical zone, part of which must necessarily fall in the southern district, but an alternative place as district headquarters is not forthcoming—Notes to G.O. No. 1772, Judicial, dated 31st October 1906 (vide discussion on the selection of police headquarters for the divided district).

4. Efforts have been made to trace the orders constituting North Malabar as a separate jurisdiction for Judge and Registrar, but they have not been discovered. The separate judicial districts of Tellicherry and Calicut appear to have existed at least from 1843—vide paragraph 3 of notification on page 112 of Part II, Local Rules and Orders, volume I. Orders have also been traced reconstituting North Malabar as a separate registration district (vide G.O. No. 2115, Judicial, dated 13th October 1881) after it had been for two years in abeyance, but papers relating to and explaining the original constitution of this charge have not been traced. It may be coeval with the Judges. The division is anyhow of long standing and precludes the possibility of there being any sentimental or factious agitation against the complete severance. Taking it all round, I submit that the subject deserves serious examination. I think the Board might be asked, in the first instance, to draw up proposals in conjunction with the Collector of Malabar and work them out in some detail, after consulting the District Magistrate, South Kanara, if they think fit. Or the two Collectors and District Magistrates may be asked to express their opinions on the proposal and submit them through the Board.

5. If the bifurcation becomes a fact, the post of Headquarters Sub-Collector, Calicut, will presumably be abolished and the pay of the post saved. It will then be unnecessary to build a house for this officer in Calicut [and the proposal may for the present lie over].

E. A. HARVEY—7-3-16.

I have nothing to add to Mr. Harvey's note. The proposals must as suggested go to the Board for careful examination.

H. A. B. VERNON—10-3-16.

Submitted for orders whether the case may, at this stage, be circulated to the Hon'ble Sir Harold Stuart (through the Honourable Member, Public) with reference to the Honourable Member's note on page 1 ante).

P.G.S.S.—10-3-16.

S.S.—10-3-16.

Had better be circulated to the Honourable Member (Public) first in any case, I think.

E.A.H.—10-3-16.

No, Honourable Member wanted the question examined presumably by a responsible body such as the Board. After the Board's report is received, the file will go to the Honourable Member.

H.A.B.V.—11-3-16.

A draft official memorandum to the Board of Revenue is submitted for approval.

It may be sent to the Revenue Department for acceptance. (After issue of the reference, the case may be returned to Public Works Department through Revenue, an extract of the relevant notes being retained and started as a separate case.)

P.G.S.S.—16-3-16.

S.S.—16-3-16.

E.A.H.—21-3-16.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

The draft official memorandum may, it is submitted, be accepted in this department and the file returned to the Public Department.

S.R.—23-3-16.

H.A.B.V.—24-3-16.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

For orders whether the draft may now issue.

P.G.S.S.—24-3-16.

T.A.S.—24-3-16.

Yes.

E.A.H.—24-3-16.

[Official Memorandum No. 673-2, Public, dated 25th March 1916.]

To the Honourable Member (Public) for perusal.

P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR—10-5-16.

Mr. Harvey was quite right in saying that this file should be circulated to me before the reference went to the Board and Mr. Vernon was, as usual, hopelessly wrong. Our experience of this officer's unfitness for Secretariat work should be noted as an illustration of the defects of the Deputy Secretaryship system.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—10-5-16.

To the Chief Secretary for perusal.

P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR—11-5-16.

Thank you. I am making a note of the case.

L. DAVIDSON—12-5-16.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

Reference from the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 654-Gt./16-1 (Confdl. No. 44), dated 29th May 1916.

Attention is solicited to the extract from the note by the Honourable Member (Public Works Department) on page 1 ante, and paragraph 3 of Memorandum to the Board of Revenue, No. 673-2, dated 25th March 1916. The Board of Revenue invites attention to paragraph 285 of Sir William Meyer's report on the constitution of additional districts, etc., where it is remarked that the Government of India have steadfastly objected to the annexation of Coorg to this Presidency; and suggests that before working out a scheme for the partition of the Malabar district it should be ascertained from the Government of India whether they will reconsider their refusal to transfer Coorg to this Presidency.

2. A short previous history of the administration of Coorg and the changes proposed in its administration from time to time till 1886 (G.O. Nos. 210-11, Public, dated 24th February 1888) are contained in the note by the Hon'ble Rao Bahadur M. G. Ranade, one of the members of the Government of India, Finance Committee of 1886. It will be seen therefrom that in 1881, when the rendition of Mysore took place, the question of amalgamation of Coorg with the Madras Presidency was raised but was dropped for the following main reasons (page 10 of G.O. Nos. 210-11, Public, dated 24th February 1888):—

(1) the Coorg people did not relish the proposal;
(2) the Coorg planters protested against it;
(3) the proposal had been negatived when made on two previous occasions;
(4) that greater administrative convenience resulted from the subordination of Coorg to Mysore than from its incorporation with a Madras district.

3. In his note dated 23rd December 1886 (pages 9-11 of G.O. Nos. 210-11, Public, dated 24th February 1888) the Hon'ble Mr. M. G. Ranade effectively criticized the above arguments against the amalgamation of Coorg with the Madras Presidency and suggested that the question of amalgamation of Coorg with the Nilgiri district should engage the attention of the Government of India in the interests of financial economy and administrative efficiency. The Financial Commissioners with the Government of India in their note dated 9th March 1887 (pages 1-2 of G.O. Nos. 210-11, Public, dated 24th February 1888) agreed in the recommendation that Coorg should be amalgamated with the Madras Presidency, but remarked that it would probably be found most convenient to make it a subdivision of South Kanara district. They also remarked that while political objections to the amalgamation of Coorg and Madras were not within their province to criticize, the amalgamation would certainly tend to economy and not injure the efficiency of administration (pages 1-2 of G.O. Nos. 210-11, Public, dated 24th February 1888).

4. The Government of India forwarded to this Government in December 1887 (Home Department letter No. 2852, dated 20th December 1887, on page 12 of G.O. Nos. 210-11, Public, dated 24th February 1888) an extract from the note by the Finance Commissioners above referred to and wanted the views of this Government on the proposal together with information as to the strength and cost of the establishments that would be required for the administration of Coorg under the Madras

Government (1) as a separate district and (2) as a subdivision of the South Kanara district.

5. In G.O. No. 210, Public, dated 24th February 1888, Mr. Sturrock, Chief Secretary, was placed on special duty to report on the question. The report submitted by him will be found attached to letter No. 522, Public, dated 15th May 1888. For the reasons stated in paragraph 4 of his report he stated it as his opinion that, when Coorg was added to the Madras Presidency, it should be administered as a separate district. In paragraphs 3 and 4 of this Government's letter No. 522, Public, dated 15th May 1888, the Government of India were informed that the transfer of Coorg to this Government was eminently desirable but that "at all events—for several years to come—Coorg must be maintained as a separate district."

6. The Government of India in forwarding the proposals of this Government to the Secretary of State in Dispatch No. 39, dated 5th February 1889 (G.O. No. 470, Public, dated 31st May 1889), proposed that the existing arrangements under which Coorg is administered directly by the Government of India should *not* be disturbed for the following reasons :—

(*a*) the inquiries made show that the financial saving to be anticipated from the transfer of Coorg to the Madras Presidency would, particularly if Coorg were to be administered as a separate district, be inconsiderable ;

(*b*) the transfer would be very distasteful to the inhabitants who appear to maintain that assurances have been given to them that their country should remain under the direct control of the Government of India. Though too much stress need not be placed upon this representation, the local opposition to the transfer outweighed the financial advantage which might be expected from disturbing existing arrangements.

The Secretary of State in Dispatch No. 75, dated 4th April 1889 (G.O. No. 470, Public, dated the 31st May 1889), concurred in the opinion expressed by the Government of India that the existing arrangements should be maintained. The question of annexation of Coorg to the Madras Presidency has not been considered since then.

7. Since the Government of India expressed the opinion referred to in the foregoing paragraph, 27 years have elapsed and it is not known how far the circumstances which then stood in the way of amalgamation of Coorg with the Madras Presidency now retain their force. Orders are therefore solicited whether, as suggested by the Board, the Government of India may be addressed.

8. Under Act XIV of 1874 the Chief Commissionership of Coorg is a scheduled district, and the annexation of Coorg to Madras will involve legislative changes, but proposals in this regard will have to be worked out only later on in consultation with the departments of the Secretariat (paragraphs 101 and 105 of Mr. Sturrock's report on pages 21–22 of letter No. 522, Public, dated the 15th May 1888, and paragraph 9 of letter ibid.).

It would remain a scheduled district, of course ; and might be constituted an agency.

E.A.H.—10-6-16.

C.P.K.—9–6–16.

The question is whether the Government of India should be asked to reconsider their decision. It will undoubtedly simplify the problem of the re-arrangement of Malabar and South Kanara if Coorg be added to the latter. It is perhaps open to doubt whether the Government of India will be much influenced by considerations of administrative efficiency in this province ; still the anomalous position of Coorg, the expense of its administration and other reasons that are to be found in the papers above referred to (pages 9–11 of G.O. Nos. 210–11, Public, dated 24th February 1888) constitute a strong case for incorporating this little province in Madras and in the South Kanara district to which it naturally belongs ; and the Government of India may after 27 years be disposed to attach less importance to the considerations which guided them in 1889 and stated on pages 15–16 of their notes (G.O. No. 470,

Public, dated 31st May 1889). I submit that a reference on the lines suggested by the Board may be made to India; if so ordered, a full draft will be prepared.

E. A. HARVEY—13-6-16.

The Board wants the question of Coorg to be first settled. The past correspondence on the subject is summarized above. Should we now address India asking for the reopening of the question and suggesting that Coorg should be added to South Kanara as a subdivision of that district? It is clear that people in Coorg attach importance to being under the Government of India direct: and the proposal to transfer Coorg to the South Kanara district, if widely known, is bound to cause agitation in Coorg and the chances are that in the end India will decide that the *status quo* need not be disturbed so far as Coorg is concerned.

P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR—14-6-16.

I agree with Mr. Rajagopala Achariyar. Perhaps the Hon'ble Sir Harold Stuart could ascertain informally whether there would be any prospect of the Government of India's consenting to the transfer of Coorg to this Presidency. I expect not as the Government of India will hardly want to raise a controversy just now.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—14-6-16.

I have written to Mr. Wheeler and place a copy of my letter below.

H. A. S[TUART]—16-6-16.

With regard to the feeling of the people of Coorg, I have reason to believe that that it is not really opposed to incorporation in this Presidency. It is the European planters who are opposed to this measure and not the natives of the province. When I visited Mercara in 1912, I spoke to Rao Bahadur C. Wadiah and other educated gentlemen on the subject. They resented their isolation and wished to become part of this Presidency.

P. S. S[IVASWAMI AYYAR]—17-6-16.

Mr. Wheeler's reply may be awaited. My impression is, from what passed in connexion with my visit to Coorg, that in the interests of Coorg the change is highly desirable, and that with certain conditions and safeguards preserving the individuality of Coorg in some measure, the people there—i.e., the various sections—would not seriously oppose. But this proviso will, I gather, be found to be cardinal.

P[ENTLAND]—18-6-16.

Demi-official—from Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.S.I., K.C.V.O., Member of Council.
To—the Hon'ble Mr. H. WHEELER, C.S.I., C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 16th June 1916.

We are now engaged in examining the question of dividing the Malabar district which is too large for one man to manage. It is under contemplation to add to the proposed district of North Malabar the adjoining part of the South Kanara district which is chiefly occupied by people who speak the Malayalam language. With the transfer of this area, South Kanara will become a light charge and we should like to know whether the Government of India would view favourably a revival of the proposal to transfer Coorg to South Kanara. The transfer would not be popular among the Coorgs, but on many administrative grounds it would be a good arrangement. It is possible, however, that the Government of India may be unwilling to have this contentious question raised at the present time. Will you please let me have an answer as soon as possible?

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.S.I., K.C.V.O., Member of Council.
To—the Hon'ble Mr. L. DAVIDSON, C.S.I, I.C.S., Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 26th July 1916.

In connexion with the proposal to form a district of North Malabar, I wrote to Wheeler to ascertain the wishes of the Government of India on the subject of raising at the present time

the amalgamation of Coorg with Madras. I enclose the reply from Hignell who is now acting as Home Secretary. I am not sure whether this subject is dealt with by you or Bedford. If it is not dealt with by you, please pass it on to Bedford.

Demi-official—from S. R. HIGNELL, Esq., I.C.S., Acting Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department.
To—the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.S.I., K.C.V.O., Member of Council.
Dated—Simla, the 21st July 1916.
No.—623, Public.

In reply to your demi-official letter to Wheeler, dated the 16th June 1916, I am desired to say that the Government of India would prefer that the question of the amalgamation of Coorg with the Madras Presidency should not be reopened at the present time.

The Government of India do not want the question of amalgamation of Coorg with this Presidency raised at the present time. The Board of Revenue has already stated that if Coorg is not added to South Kanara there is not much point in taking away Kasaragod taluk from South Kanara and thereby making the district still lighter, and that the formation of the new (Malabar) districts will have to proceed on other lines.

2. Submitted that the proposed North Malabar district also would be light if Kasaragod taluk is not added to it as will be seen from the statement below :—

Districts.	Area in square miles.	Population.
North Malabar (including Kasaragod)	2,430	1,166,711
North Malabar (excluding Kasaragod)	1,668	919,244
South Kanara (existing)	4,021	1,195,227
South Kanara (excluding Kasaragod)	3,259	947,760
South Malabar	4,126	2,095,875

3. Before the question is considered further, the Board of Revenue may perhaps be asked to submit suitable proposals for the formation of the new districts leaving out of account the question of amalgamation of Coorg with this Presidency. Memorials have been received protesting against the proposed transfer of Kasaragod to North Malabar. These, and a memorial which *advocates* the transfer of Kasaragod from South Kanara, may be referred to the Board of Revenue for consideration in formulating proposals for the bifurcation of the Malabar district. A draft memorandum is submitted for approval.

T.C.N.—28-7-16.
C.P.K.—31-7-16.

It seems better that the proposals to be considered by the Government should be so drawn as to allow for the eventual absorption of Coorg into South Kanara. It is possible that the Board have in view an entirely different scheme of redistribution from the natural one that has been suggested in their notes and one that will not be conveniently adapted to the eventual absorption of Coorg. I submit that the Board may be requested to put up alternative schemes, one to suit the contingency of the fairly early amalgamation of Coorg with South Kanara and the other in which this eventuality is completely disregarded, as it appears from its letter that it has alternative schemes in view. I submit an alternative draft for consideration.

E. A. HARVEY—2-8-16.

There is the point that the Malayalam-speaking population will be included in a Malayalam-speaking district.

E.A.H.—2-8-16.

It seems inevitable that (minus Coorg) either South Kanara or North Malabar must be unduly light which is preferable?

E.A.H.—2-8-16.

I agree with Mr. Harvey. His draft may issue. ~~Please see the note file from page 7 onwards.~~

P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR—8-8-16.
A. G. C[ARDEW]—9-8-16.

Issue.

P.R.—9-8-16.

[Memorandum to the Board of Revenue, No. 673-3, dated 10th August 1916.]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

From the Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor, Memorandum No. 425-*P., dated* 20*th January* 1917.

The petition relates to the amalgamation of the Malayali portion of the Kasaragod taluk of the South Kanara district with the Malabar district. Submitted that the subject—redistribution of districts—is for Home (Miscellaneous) Department to which the current may be transferred.

The Home (Miscellaneous) Department have a file pending with them.

A.S.R.—31-1-17.

V. A. ANANTARAMA AYYAR—3-2-17.
A. H. A. TODD—3-2-17.

HOME (MISCELLANEOUS) DEPARTMENT.

The memorial may, it is submitted, be forwarded to the Board of Revenue ~~in continuation of Memorandum No. 673-3, Home (Miscellaneous), dated the 10th August 1916. A draft endorsement is submitted for approval.~~

T.C.N.—7-2-17.
P.DER.—7-2-17.

Yes.

E. A. HARVEY—8-2-17.

[Endorsement No. 356-1, Home (Miscellaneous), dated 9th February 1917.]

Extract from demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. H. V. Cobb, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., Chief Commissioner of Coorg.

* * * * * *

4. In conversation with the President of the association (Coorg Landholders') and with other Coorgs, I am surprised to find how strong is the feeling in favour of the present system of administration as opposed to Coorg becoming part of the Madras Presidency. On this point the Coorg national sentiment is practically unanimous. A recent leaderette in the *Madras Mail* suggesting the absorption of the province has evidently excited their suspicions.

Note by Sir Alexander Cardew.

An extract of paragraph 4 of Mr. Cobb's letter should be added to the file about redistribution of the Malabar and South Kanara districts which Mr. Vernon started.

D. N. STRATHIE—14-12-17.

Submitted for perusal. With reference to the Under Secretary's remarks in the arrears list suggesting that inquiries may be made in what stage the question is, a draft memorandum is submitted for approval.

T.C.N.—15-12-17.

P.DER.—15-12-17.

C. H. BROWN—16-12-17.

From the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), Mis. No. 304, *dated* 27*th February* 1918.

The Board of Revenue submits its views on the question of the partition of the Malabar district into two new districts. The alternative proposals called for in Memorandum No. 673-3, Home (Miscellaneous), dated the 10th August 1917, have been worked out by the Collector of Malabar, but the Board of Revenue does not consider it necessary to deal with them as it is strongly opposed to the partition of the district.

2. The question of dividing the Malabar district into two districts on account of its large population, its liability to Moplah disturbances, etc., has engaged the attention of Government from time to time since 1857, but the proposals have been dropped on account of the necessity for dealing with the land tenures on some uniform plan and in view of the necessity for retaining an undivided control of the Moplah population. A full history of the question will be found set forth in paragraphs 282 to 291 of Sir William Meyer's report on the reconstitution of districts and divisions. The question was started afresh by Mr. Evans in 1916 in a conversation with Sir Harold Stuart (Sir Harold Stuart's note, dated the 18th January 1916, at page 1 ante).

3. The circumstances which, it was thought, would facilitate a division were—

(1) The possible amalgamation of Coorg with the Madras Presidency—Notes at pages 1-4 ante and Memorandum No. 673-2, dated 25th March 1916 (paper I), ~~page 1, current file~~;

(2) The transfer of the Kasaragod taluk of the South Kanara district to Malabar; and

(3) The already existing divisions of the district into two for police, registration and judicial purposes.

4. The Government of India who were consulted demi-officially on the question of amalgamation of Coorg stated that it should not be reopened at the present time (Mr. Hignell's demi-official letter at page 8 ante.) The Chief Commissioner of Coorg has recently brought to the notice of Government that the feeling in Coorg is strongly in favour of the present system of administration. This part of the scheme has therefore to be dropped for the present.

5. As regards the proposal for the transfer of the Kasaragod taluk of South Kanara to Malabar, memorials have been received by Government both strongly objecting to and welcoming the proposal. The Malayali population of the taluk welcome it while others strongly resent the proposal. The Collector of Malabar (Mr. Evans) states that it is "certainly inadvisable to detach the whole of the taluk from the South Kanara district; the northern end of it is very close to Mangalore and none of the people of the northern half of the taluk are Malayalis; the prevailing language there is Tulu." Mr. Evans suggests two alternative proposals for a division of the taluk and the transfer of one division to the proposed North Malabar district. He dwells fully on this question in paragraph 10 (*a*) of his letter ~~at page 13, current file,~~ and comes to the conclusion that on the whole the weight of argument is against division. He is in short opposed to the transfer of any portion of the taluk to the North Malabar district. The Board of Revenue does not deal with this question as it is strongly opposed to any scheme of division of the Malabar district.

6. The existing division of the district into two for police, registration and judicial purposes does not count for much in the opinion of the Collector and the Board for partitioning the district into two districts. The Collector (Mr. Evans) who started the idea in 1916 of dividing the district into two is now of the opinion that the present system of a Headquarter Sub-Collector and Additional District Magistrate giving relief to the Collector works satisfactorily and that the necessary drawbacks of the system are not sufficient to condemn it (vide Sir Harold Stuart's note, dated 18th January 1916, at page 1 ante). He points out that the only disadvantages of the present system are—

(1) It is not easy to visit the various parts of the district adequately without neglecting obligations to headquarters, and

(2) In allowing wide discretion and responsibility to the Headquarter Sub-Collector in dealing with distinct branches assigned to him, the inevitable result is that the Collector is responsible for orders which he only sees after they have been passed. In magisterial and local fund branches complete delegation is impossible and satisfactory division difficult.

But he states that he is personally satisfied with the arrangement of work that he has made with the Headquarter Sub-Collector, that there is a good deal of sentimental objection to any general partition of the district and no desire for substantial change. It is further pointed out that the main idea seems to be that the prestige of Malabar as one of the most important districts would suffer by division, that it is argued that there is intimate connexion in many ways between parts of North and South Malabar and that division would tend to sever it. On the whole he says that he hardly thinks "that there are sufficient grounds for interfering with the present arrangements; more especially as it is difficult to suggest any altogether satisfactory division." In addition to these arguments the Board of Revenue points out that by the peculiarity of its laws and customs and its land revenue system the Malabar district constitutes a very distinct entity and that Malayalis as a whole who "possess a keen sense of local patriotism" would resent a division which seem to threaten a break-up of their unity. For all these reasons the Board is against any division and refrains from discussing the details of the proposals of Mr. Evans for a division set out in Statement C ~~at page 18, current file~~. On the question of the system of a Headquarter Sub-Collector affording relief to a Collector, the opinions of select Collectors who have had experience of the system were consulted in 1914 and the general opinion of the Collectors was that the system was a success. The Hon'ble Mr. Gillman and Mr. Knapp strongly supported the system. In the circumstances the opinions of the Collector (Mr. Evans) and the Board that the system has worked well in Malabar need not perhaps be questioned.

7. In order to give relief to the Collector of Malabar in the matter of touring Mr. Evans proposes that the Wynad taluk should be taken away from Malabar and attached to The Nilgiris. The Board of Revenue in consultation with the District Magistrate of The Nilgiris supports the proposal. Paragraphs 5 to 6 of the Board's resolution ~~at pages 25-26, current file~~, set out in brief the objections taken to the proposal in 1887 and how these objections have lost force now. It will be noticed that in The Nilgiris there is a consensus of opinion in favour of transferring the Malabar-Wynad to the Nilgiri district. The advantages claimed for the proposal are—

(1) That the whole planting area would be under the control of one Collector and that uniformity of policy would be secured in the treatment of questions affecting planters.

(2) The constitution of the Nilgiri district would be improved as it would give another divisional officer and a more extensive cadre of posts than the somewhat limited one it has.

(3) That it would give relief to the Collector of Malabar in the matter of touring.

The first two advantages do not seem to be of much moment. No inconvenience has ever been brought to the notice of Government by the planting areas being under the control of two Collectors. But that the proposal would afford relief to the Collector of Malabar in the matter of touring may be admitted. This is the only advantage. It is apparently for this reason that the Board points out that the advantages of the proposal are comparatively slight. The only disadvantage to which the proposal is open is that even under present conditions the Nilgiri District Board is unable to meet its responsibilities in the matter of local fund administration and

that if Wynad is added to its charge the additional financial burden will necessitate a special grant from Provincial funds. The Board of Revenue however states that the proposal should not be allowed to be defeated by this objection and that if Government consider that a change is needed to afford relief to the Collector of Malabar the transfer of the Wynad to The Nilgiris would be the least objectionable course.

8. If Wynad is to be transferred to the Nilgiris the Board recommends for purposes of criminal jurisdiction that the simplest arrangement would be to include the whole of the new Wynad division in one of the two sessions divisions of the Malabar district, provided that this can be done without making either of the Malabar sessions divisions too heavy.

9. It is for consideration whether the conclusions arrived at by the Board may be accepted. The remarks of Revenue, Local and Municipal, Judicial and Financial may be invited u.o. in the first instance.

T.C.N.—22-4-18.

P.DER.—30-4-18.

The case has now resolved itself into two questions—

(*a*) the bifurcation of Malabar;

(*b*) the absorption of the Wynad taluk in The Nilgiris with a view to relieving the Collector of Malabar.

(*a*) *Bifurcation of Malabar.*—The intimate connexion of this problem with the absorption or otherwise of Coorg into the Madras Presidency seems to have been realised as early as 1878 when the Madras Government wrote to India "the Malabar Collectorate . . . demands division but the question should be dealt with in connexion with the proposed transfer of Coorg." (Letter No. 680, Public, dated 18th April 1917.) After Mr. Sturrock's mission to Coorg the Government of India decided that Coorg should not be transferred (this was in 1859); and the question was not again raised until the present discussion. In his demi-official in reply to Sir Harold Stuart dated 21st July 1916, Mr. Hignell has briefly intimated that the question should not be reopened just now. The unwisdom of stirring up any unavoidable public excitement or of incurring any unnecessary expenditure during the war may be held sufficient reasons for not pushing the proposals as to Malabar either, but there may be no harm in clearing up the position a little further—or at least making up our minds whether the bifurcation scheme is worth going on with or not.

Paragraph 284 of Sir William Meyer's report.

2. Mr. Evans, at whose initiative the present discussion began, now definitely thinks it is not, and the Board agrees. The reasons are briefly—

(*a*) That Malabar is such a "very distinct entity" that it cannot properly or profitably be divided and

(*b*) That the existing arrangement by which a Headquarters Sub-Collector assists the Collector gives really adequate relief. This is Mr. Evans' later and considered opinion. The case for the bifurcation is set out in the late Mr. Harvey's note at pages 2–4 ante, but the main arguments seem to be that the change would be cheap and easy and readily put through as its principle has already been accepted by India. I venture to suggest that these would be excellent subsidiary arguments once the advisability of the change had been demonstrated, but are not primary arguments for the change as such. In the circumstances I think we shall have to agree with the Board and Mr. Evans who consider that not enough would be gained by the partition to make it worth while.

3. All this, however, leaves Coorg out of account. In the notes of Honourable Members and others above there is a decided balance of opinion tending towards a revival of the Coorg question. The most recent views on this subject are curiously conflicting. The last word is apparently Mr. Cobb's demi-official to Sir

Alexander Cardew in December 1917, in which he has said that 'Coorg national sentiment' would be 'practically unanimous' against the change. Sir Sivaswami Ayyar, however, thought the educated populace at least 'resented their isolation' and His Excellency did not anticipate serious opposition. If Coorg is ever to be incorporated with Madras it will no doubt be with reference to eventual absorption in some district of the Presidency it will at least be attached. The district contemplated by Sir Harold Stuart was South Kanara and it was in this respect also that Mr. Sturrock made his examination in 1888. From a study of the maps, however, it would seem more naturally attached to Malabar and this is what Mr. Evans now proposes. From all accounts Coorg and its people have little real affinity with either Kanara or Malabar—with Kanara, indeed, there is a definite tradition of enmity. Mr. Sturrock says in his report that the communications were best between Coorg and South Kanara and that may have been so in his day but is not so now. North Malabar with Coorg attached would make a district, South Malabar would make another and South Kanara would stand as it does—unless the Malayali country south of the Chandragiri river went into North Malabar—which would make little odds one way or another.

4. To sum up all this, I think the question of bifurcation of Malabar, never historically dissociated from the question of the transfer of Coorg, will lie over naturally until this latter can be taken up with a reasonable prospect of decision—the more so as the local officers and the Board profess themselves satisfied with the present arrangement.

(*b*) *Relief to the Collector of Malabar by transfer of the Wynad to the Nilgiri district.*

5. This is Mr. Evans' definite proposal—though, of course, it is as old as all the rest of this discussion and was quashed by the Board (against both the Collectors concerned) as long ago as 1887.

6. The other proposal for territorial relief to the Collector of Malabar was to hand over the Chirakkal taluk to South Kanara: but there were already languages enough in South Kanara and this would have meant a new Malayali division : and also it would have given little real relief. The Wynad has always been the difficulty—it is remote and touring in it is slow. If territorial relief is to be given it will apparently be the Wynad that must go and the only place it can go to is The Nilgiris.

7. The arguments *pro* and *con* are :—

Pro—(1) That all the local planting community would be under a single administration.

(2) That it would extend The Nilgiris' scanty cadre of posts.

(3) That it would give real relief to the Collector of Malabar.

Con—(1) That the Wynad does not pay its way and the Nilgiri District Board, already impecunious, is in no state to take on any more without assistance from Provincial funds.

(2) That the sessions divisions would become hopelessly entangled—part being Coimbatore, part North Malabar and part South Malabar. But this could be straightened out—all could go into South Malabar.

(3) That inconvenience would be caused to the natives and their traditional business connexions altered. But the natives would rarely have cause to visit Ooty or the high levels and even if they had, communications are tolerably good. Their private business concerns would be in no way affected.

It seems largely a question of pitting the first argument *con* against the third argument *pro* : the rest on either side do not come to very much.

8. The immediate transfer of the Wynad to The Nilgiris would have little effect on the possible future question of a bifurcation of Malabar with Coorg coming in to the northern half. North Malabar—the Wynad and Coorg would be quite a district; and the Wynad is cut off from Coorg by impenetrable or at any rate ~~im~~penetrated—hills.

C. H. BROWN—2-5-18.

Mr. Hilton Brown has admirably summarised the file above. No one really advocates the bifurcation of Malabar at the present day. The matter must lie over unless a decided call is made either by the district officials or the public or unless the transfer of Coorg to the Madras Presidency is decided.

2. Regarding the Wynad, I think that the arguments advanced are not sufficient to derange an existing system. In my opinion Wynad cannot efficiently be looked after from The Nilgiris where Ooty and its neighbourhood will, for obvious reasons, engage attention. And the trade outlets of the Wynad are all towards the west.

3. The proposals may be dropped.

Print up before circulation.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—3-5-18.

The notes have been printed and the file is submitted.

T.C.N.—18-5-18.
P.DER.—20-5-18.

For orders as to circulation.

C. H. BROWN—22-5-18.
R.R.—23-5-18.

Now that the addition of Coorg to the Madras Presidency has been ruled out by the Government of India and is not likely to be reconsidered, the question for consideration is whether the Malabar district needs to be divided on the ground that it is too heavy a charge for one Collector. Mr. Evans says that it is not, provided that the Collector is allowed a Headquarters Sub-Collector and makes him responsible for distinct branches of work. I am sure from my own experience that Mr. Evans is using his Headquarters Sub-Collector in the right way, and that there ought never to be friction between any two officers, if this arrangement is adopted.

I agree with the Board and Mr. Evans in deprecating the division of the district for the reasons given by them, and I would recognize that a Headquarters Sub-Collector is likely to be required in Malabar for a long time to come and order the provision of a house for this officer.

I think there is a fair supply of houses in Calicut. Just at present it would be difficult to regard this as imperatively urgent in this case.

A.G.C.—13-6-18.

In regard to the transfer of Malabar-Wynad from Malabar to Nilgiris, the main advantages are—

(i) that the Collector of Malabar cannot give adequate attention to the division, while the Collector of The Nilgiris could ;

(ii) that the division formed of the Malabar and Nilgiris-Wynads offers many advantages over the present very light Malabar-Wynad division ; and

(iii) that the planting interests favour the change.

The main objections are—

(1) the opposition of the people, and

(2) the difficulty about the District and Sessions Court jurisdiction over the new Nilgiri district.

Objection (1) counts for little, as explained by Mr. Evans ; and further planting interests largely predominate in the area. Objection (2) is the real difficulty, for while it is desirable that only one court should have jurisdiction over the district, it is certain that grave inconvenience would be caused to the inhabitants of some portion of the district whether the Court is situated at Calicut, Tellicherry or Coimbatore. In the first place Mr. Evans may be asked for his opinion upon Mr. Cumming's suggestions and the High Court may be consulted afterwards.

I think that, if this difficulty can be overcome, the advantages of transferring Malabar-Wynad to The Nilgiris would outweigh the disadvantages.

H. F. W. G[ILLMAN]—8-6-18.

I agree.

P. R[AJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR]—11-6-18.
A. G. C[ARDEW]—13-6-18.

I have doubts as to the wisdom of these proposed arrangements: and should be disposed to await further time and experience before coming to a decision. Does the matter press? I hope to see Mr. Evans this week. and have delayed noting upon this account. I had hoped to see him earlier.

P[ENTLAND]—6-8-18.

Forwarded to Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor in case the file is required for reference during the visit to Malabar.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—7-8-18.

Mr. Evans' view is that at the present time there is no pressing need to proceed further in this matter. I have discussed it with him here (Calicut). There would certainly, he thinks, be some Malayali opposition to the transfer of the Malabar-Wynad to The Nilgiris district; and the trade outlets are no doubt to the west. It would be better to let the subject rest for the present. If it should be necessary later to re-examine it, this should, if possible, be done under normal conditions when these have returned. I agree.

Mr. Gillman should now see.

P[ENTLAND]—10-8-18.

Circulated.

R.R.—13-8-18.

I agree that the question of the transfer of the Malabar-Wynad to The Nilgiris may be dropped for the present.

H. F. W. G[ILLMAN]—13-8-18.

I agree.

P. R[AJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR]—15-8-18.

A. G. C[ARDEW]—16-8-18.

HOME (MISCELLANEOUS) DEPARTMENT.

A draft order recording the papers is submitted. Before its issue Public Works Department may perhaps see the case with reference to the remarks of Honourable Member (Financial) on page 15 ante as to the provision of a house for the Headquarters Sub-Collector at Calicut.

C.V.S.—20-8-18.

P.DER.—21-8-18.

C. H. BROWN—22-8-18.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

In connexion with the proposal to construct quarters for the Headquarters Sub-Collector at Calicut, Sir Harold Stuart (the then Honourable Member, Public Works Department) wanted the question of subdividing Malabar into two districts to be examined and pending consideration of this question the proposal was held in abeyance—vide Sir Harold Stuart's note on page 1 ante and paragraph 5 of the official memorandum on page 1, current file. The question has been examined in the foregoing notes and it has been decided to let it rest for the present. The provision of quarters for the Sub-Collector has, however, been considered to be unnecessary just at present—vide the marginal remarks of Honourable Member (Financial) on page 15 ante. The file may be perused and returned to the Home (Miscellaneous) Department.

A.M.—3-9-18.

K.B.—5-9-18.

D. MARSHALL—7-9-18.

HOME (MISCELLANEOUS) DEPARTMENT.

The draft order may issue.

C.V.S.—7-9-18.

P.DER.—7-9-18.

C.H.B.—10-9-18.

[G.O. No. 647, Home (Miscellaneous), dated 10th September 1918.]

Sectt. II-38—1,703—.

PRESS SLIP.

~~ORDINARY~~. **PREFERENCE.** ~~URGENT (a)~~.

Home (Political) Department.

GOVERNMENT PRESS 30 SEP 1918

Current No ....., dated..... 191 .

G.O. No. 647, dated 10 9 1918

Number of MS. pages sent (b) Correspondence..... 27
(b1) Notes.....

Brief subject. Bfuncalim ghee Malabar &c

(c) Number of copies required when struck off (*not including copies for volumes and editors' table which are retained in the Press*).	E. T. copies to supply requisitions for purchase by the public.	Complete correspondence and orders.	Notes.
FOR RECORD.*			
Madras Records	4	25	25
Ooty Records		3	3
For filing with original ...		1	1
Total ..		29	29

FOR ISSUE.†	Letter only.	Complete G.O.	(b) Special issue copies of G.O. No.	Special issue copies of G.O. Papers.	Notes.
Signature copies		3			
India Office					
Govt. of India ..... Dept.					
Revenue Department					
Public Works Department		*			
Local and Municipal Department					
Educational Department					
..... Dept.					
Public Dept.					
Judicial Dept					
Political					
Financial Dept. } Total					
Marine Dept.					
Ecclesiastical Dept.					
				Total ...	
Spare copies. The All other addresses		22			
The		25			
The Extras					
The					
The					
The					
The					
The					
The					
The					
The					
The					
The					
The					
Total ...		50			

Copies distributed on ..... ‡(Press Clerk)

† Copies distributed on ..... ‡(Press Despatcher).

‡ *To be initialled and dated.*

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SECRETARIAT.

(*a*) If a paper is marked to be printed urgently, the Superintendent of the section concerned should sign the Press slip. The Superintendent should exercise a careful discretion in the matter.

(*b*) Each letter, memorandum, or order or set of orders, in the file of correspondence should be headed in succession with the Roman numeral I. II, III, etc., the number being written in red ink or blue chalk above the item. The particular papers to be printed in the special issue-copies should be indicated by the Roman numeral (I, II, etc.) by which that item has been headed in the correspondence file. All matter, including marginal remarks or references, to be printed should be written in ink and matter which should not be printed should be encircled. Initials and signatures that are not quite legible should be re-written distinctly.

(*b*1) For rules regarding printing of notes, see rule 315 of the office Manual.

(*c*) The number of copies and the details of distribution should be filled in by the Superintendent or Referencer concerned.

(*d*) In the absence of special instructions to the Press to keep matter standing for a specified period, ordinary papers of 8 pages and under will be kept standing for *one* week, and larger papers for *two* weeks only. *The type of notes and of all confidential papers is distributed immediately after striking.*

(*e*) This slip, properly and completely filled in, should accompany every paper sent to Press; it will be returned by the Press when proofs are furnished; it should be sent to the Press when a call is made for revised proofs or when a corrected proof is sent for striking. When finally returned by Press it should be filed with the original order or letter.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PRESS.

(*a*) If, in the opinion of the Superintendent of the Press, a paper has been marked urgent unnecessarily, he should send the Press slip to the Registrar with a remark to that effect.

(*b*) Unless a note to the contrary is made against the matter, pencil entries should not be printed. The Superintendent of the Press may bring to the notice of the Registrar any instance of incomplete or careless editing.

(*c*) Signature copies of letters to the Secretary of State or to the Government of India should be printed on hand-made paper.

(*d*) This slip should be returned by the Press to the Secretariat when proofs are furnished; it will be sent back to the Press when proofs are returned corrected and should be finally returned to the Secretariat when struck-off copies are supplied.

(*e*) The names of the Secretary and Members should be printed in full when they occur on the right hand side, only the first time when they appear on the left side, the initials alone being printed later.

[P.T.O.

TO PRESS, MADRAS OOTY.

A

...ee send proof in duplicate. The ...apers have been carefully edited.

...Referencer.
...Clerk.

...Supt.

B

Proof returned corrected. Please strike off and send number of copies as indicated.

Type may be released after usual interval / at once.

...Referencer.
...Clerk.

...Supt.

C

As the matter is clear manuscript and has been carefully edited, (*b*) proof need not be sent. Please print and supply number of copies as indicated.

Type may be released after usual interval.

...Referencer.
...Clerk.

...Supt.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS.

TO BE FILLED IN BY THE PRESS.

Diary.	Initials of Press official.
Received in Press on ... 12/5	...
First proof furnished on ... 15/5	...
Call for revised proof received on ...	...
Revised proof furnished on ...	...
Corrected proof received for striking on ... 30/5	...
Final copies supplied on ... 8/6/W	...

Account of copies.	Complete copies.	Notes.	Issue copies.	Special E.T. edition.
Supplied to Secretariat for Record ...	...	...	...	...
„ „ „ Issue ...	...	...	...	...
„ „ „ for Extra E.T. copies to supply requisitions for sale to the public.	...	...	...	4
For Volumes ...	...	...	...	...
For supply to newspapers and institutions admitted to the privileges of the E.T.	...	...	...	...
Total ...				