10-5-07 ✓ 6-9-38 I.

20-5-23

16/16.

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA AND INDIAN STATES.

Political (1895) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No: 64-65

DATED 29th Jan. 1895

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

PERIYAR WORKS.

Directing that the Government of India be furnished with certain information regarding the criminal jurisdiction in that part of the -- which is situated in territory belonging to the state of Travancore.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

29th January 1895, No. 64, Political.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following paper :—

G.O., dated 22nd December 1894, No. 1057 I., Public Works.

Abstract.—Communicating to officers concerned, with remarks, letter from the Government of India conveying the sanction of the Secretary of State to the revised estimate of Rs. 87,50,000 connected with the Periyár Project and requesting information regarding the criminal jurisdiction in that part of the works situated in Travancore territory.

Order—dated 29th January 1895, No. 64, Political.

The following letter will be despatched to the Government of India, Public Works Department :—

[Here enter No. 65, dated 29th January 1895.]

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Public Works Department.

Exd. A. Raitt.

Govt. of {1895} Madras.

POLITICAL.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 29th January 1895, No. 64.

JANUARY.

Periyar Works.

Directing that the Government of India be furnished with certain information regarding the criminal jurisdiction in that part of the — which is situated in territory belonging to the State of Travancore.

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

LETTER—from THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF FORT ST. GEORGE,

To THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

I am directed to reply to Mr. Mackenzie's letter, dated 5th October 1894, No. 197 I., requesting to be furnished with certain information regarding the criminal jurisdiction in that part of the Periyár works which is situated in territory belonging to the State of Travancore.

2. The transfer to the British Government of the criminal and police jurisdiction over the camps was effected in 1892 (*vide* Government of India, Foreign Department, Notification, No. 755 I., dated 18th February 1892). The acquisition of this jurisdiction was at the time considered sufficient to safeguard the interests and welfare of the British subjects in the camps, but subsequent experience proved that the sale of liquor was a source of friction between the Travancore authorities and the British employés. After a lengthy discussion with the Travancore Darbar it has been decided to acquire the abkári jurisdiction also. This has been recently ceded by the Darbar, on the British Government consenting to pay the Travancore State the net revenue raised under the Madras Abkári Act after deducting the costs incurred in collecting this revenue and in administering criminal justice in the camps.

3. This Government has never shared the view of the Chief Engineer that the complete assumption of sovereign jurisdiction over the ground occupied during the construction of works was necessary or desirable; that officer now states that "since the original of the note of the 29th January 1894 was written, the most important defect of the then existing arrangements has been removed by the transfer of the abkári jurisdiction from Travancore to Madras."

4. I am to add that in March last this Government sanctioned an increase to the police force at the works.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
29th January 1895.

Exd. A. Raitt.

1895.

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

———

———

From the Government of
Fort St. George.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

Letter, 29th Jan. 1895, No. 65.

JANUARY.

Periyar Works.

Furnishing certain information regarding the criminal jurisdiction in that part of the — which is situated in territory belonging to the State of Travancore.

FROM CIRCULATION
WITH REMARKS.

Vide for the CS
The chief engineer's addition has been entered in red ink.
S.
27/1

Chief Secretariat
Fort St. George 22-10-94.

Office Note
No: 2039.

From The Chief Secretary.
To The Secretary to Govt:
P. W. D.

I regret that I cannot countersign the draft returns hereunto. All the orders of Government with respect to Magisterial and Police arrangements at the Periyar have been communicated to the P. W. Depts: and it is that Department and not the Political which should express an opinion as to the effect of them.

(Sd) J. T. Price
Chief Secretary

[6/9]

Current No. 1432

Fore DEPARTMENT.

office note.

From F.W.D

No. 3301.E.

Dated 25 } Oct 94
Received 26 }

Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Perijar

No. 3301C

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Madras, 25th October 1893

OFFICE NOTE.

From

The Secy: to Govt. P. W. Dept.

To

The Honorable the Chief Secretary to Govt.

Your office note of 22nd instant, No. 2039.

The draft order purposely referred the question of the Magisterial and Police arrangements to the Political Department, because all the orders regarding them had been passed in that Department, and because I (personally) am

Some have been passed in Jud. Pd acts as channel & common Staff

(48—1,000—11-8-93.)

[illegible] particularly anxious to
avoid having to express
an opinion on the matter.
2. If an opinion as to
the effect of the orders
in question has to be
expressed in the P. W. Dept.
it will be difficult, if
not impossible to avoid
any reference to the
opinion of the Chief
Engineer; my own opinion
which I have never
disguised or concealed
is that the measures
adopted have been
altogether inadequate;
but while I have not
hesitated to press this
view upon the Madras
Government, I am very
unwilling to have to
express it in any paper

which is likely to go to
the Government of
India, or in other words,
to put myself in the
position of a critic or
opponent of the
proceedings of this
Government.
3. If the matter be
dealt with in the Political
Department, you can no
doubt pay with a clear
conscience that satis-
factory measures have
been taken. I cannot
say so, nor shall I be
able to sign as Secretary
to Government without
remonstrating as Chief
Engineer, a letter to
that effect, though I
shall not think it

necessary to express
any opinion upon
any statement that
may be made in the
Political Dept.

4. This is the reason
why I wish the matter
to be dealt with in
the latter Department.

[signature]
Colonel R.E.
Secretary to Govt. P. W. D.

CHIEF SECRETARY
26 OCT 1894
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Your Office Note dated
25th inst.

You advert to the matter
as a misapprehension as
the practice of the
Jail Dept. will regard
the issue of orders
[illegible] the arrangements
for the Magistrates to
have control in the
Camps.

It was [illegible] 9.0
[illegible] No. 936 dated
18th June 1892 that
matters
an order during speed
were passed in the Prov.
This was the order under
which the arrangement
for a Magistrate [illegible]
the Camps and for
[illegible] Other Warrants
[illegible] orders in these
were made. The
[illegible] the Judicial Dept.
[illegible]
[illegible] It was
[illegible]
for H.E.
these arrangements
[illegible]

...ter in the Penyard Camps
...should be afforded.
...the writer is unfamiliar
...for Defence or any other
...purpose to comply
...of the General Regulations.

As far as I am aware
no complaint of any sort
or kind has for some
considerable time past
been brought before Govt.

...ment to the Govt
...General upon the
...matter and any other
...recent on the subject.
...permit of the accompanying
...he will show what the
...position of the Post Office
...was. It seemed as if
...will see no orders with
...regard to the Post
...or Police arrangements
...that there is no matter
...of the Penyard Camps was
...negotiating for the transfer
...of Jurisdiction over the
...latter, and if the Athens
...Local Authority is to
...Post Office.

But pointing that it is
...the Post Dept which should
...deal with the matter - a
...point which I brought
...to Chief Secretary's notice
...to-day - it is impossible
...for it to deal with this
...Annual Statement until
...the Police & Prisons
...Report & Returns
...& Hospital No. 28 Part D
...Office and to necessary
...hospital - a specific statement
...What ... was at the time of the
...Penyard Camps
...for the maintenance of law

Dept/D 36/13

Office Note

31st Octr 94, No. 2103

From Chief Secy

To Secy to Govt., P.W.D

Your office note dated 25 inst
you appear to be under a mis-
apprehension as to the position of t
Pol. Dept. with regard to the issue of
orders touching the arrangements
for mapl. and Police control in th
Periyar Camps.

G.O. Judicial No. 936, dated 18th
May 1892 is an order merely givin
effect to one passed in the P.W.D
This was the order under which
the arrangements for a maple for th
camps and for a force of police to
maintain law & order in them were
made. It was for the P.W.D if it
found these arrangements insufficie
or ineffective, to have represented
I do not find anything on re
on this subject. A perusal of
accompanying file will show
what the position of the Pol. Dept.
was. It issued as you will see n
orders with regard to either maple
Police arrangements. Its chief
share in the matter

[illegible]

Current No. 1657

Political Department.

Office note.

From P. W. D.

(8)

No. 3929. C.

Dated 6 } Dec 94.
Received 7 }

Enclosures P W Cno. 7818 with draft order for counter initials

SUBJECT.

Periyar criminal jurisdiction &c.

Note for Sec Ds

Subd for perusal before placing in the Council box

Seen H.O. 10/12/94

necessar[illegible]

[illegible] any [illegible] Periyar camps was negotiating for [illegible] any [illegible] cession of jurisdiction over the [illegible] any [illegible] tes t of the Abkari lease and acting [illegible] may be [illegible] a post office

But granting that it is the Politic[illegible] Dept which should deal with [illegible] the matter - a point which I, however,

4. [illegible] must be clearly understood not to why [illegible] admit - it is impossible for it to to be [illegible] deal with the very general statt made in para 6 of your note the [illegible] forming enclosure No: 1 to Govt of India's despatch No 28 P.W.D. of 94 and it is necessary therefore that [illegible] a specific statt of what was at the time of writing your note, Secret [illegible] wrong in the arrangements for the maintenance of law and order in the Periyar camps should be afforded. As far as I am aware no complaint of any sort [illegible] on this point has for some considerable time past been brought before Govt.

sd. J. T. Price
Chief Secy

[G/9]

Current No. 1696.

For. DEPARTMENT.

From The For. Dept

No. 4132-C.

Dated 18
Received 19 } Decr: 1894

Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Foreign Commercial jurisdiction

Note for CS

The draft order may now be communicated, it is sub

CS
20/12

draft cabled
to
Egypt

No. 252C.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Madras, 23rd January 1893.

OFFICE NOTE.

From The Public Works Secy:

To The Honorable
The Chief Secy:

—

Draft order on Political
dept Current No. 10.

—

I should prefer to
see para 3 pen
"His Government
has never shared the
view of the Chief Engineer
that the complete
assumption of sovereign
jurisdiction over the
ground occupied during

(48—1,000—11-8-93.)

the construction of the
dks was necessary or
desirable; that officer
now states "
But I do not wish
to press the point if the
existing wording is
preferred, and have
countersinitialed the
draft

Secretary to Govt. P.W.D.

Copy

29.1.95 BL

Lent- the folios of paper.

Abstract of CURRENT NO. 10

G09

22ND DECEMBER 1894, No. 1057 I., PUBLIC WORKS.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.

READ—the following paper :—

From N. F. MACKENZIE, Esq., Under Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department (Civil Works—Irrigation), to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Simla, 5th October 1894, No. 197 I.

With reference to the correspondence ending with your No. 97 I., dated the 3rd February 1894, I am directed to forward, herewith, a copy of the undernoted despatch from Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India communicating sanction to the revised estimate, amounting to Rs. 87,50,000, of the cost of the Periyár irrigation project in the Madras Presidency, together with a copy of the Government of India despatch replied to, and to request that the information referred to in paragraph 7 of the Secretary of State's despatch regarding the criminal jurisdiction in that part of the works which is situated in territory belonging to the State of Travancore may be furnished with as little delay as practicable.

2. The sanction above referred to has been registered as No. 10 I. of 1894–95 and is in supersession of all previous sanctions which are hereby cancelled.

ENCLOSURES.

Despatch from the Right Honorable Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, to His Excellency the Right Honorable the Governor-General of India in Council, dated India Office, London, 26th July 1894, No. 38, Public Works.

Revised estimate of cost of the Periyár Irrigation Project in the Madras Presidency.—I have received your Excellency's Public Works letter, No. 28, dated the 29th May 1894, stating that a revised estimate has now become necessary for the Periyár irrigation works in the Madras Presidency.

2. The original estimate sanctioned in Lord Kimberley's despatch of 18th September 1884, No. 53, Public Works, amounted to Rs. 64,39,913, and it is now proposed to increase this estimate to Rs. 87,50,000, of which Rs. 84,71,000 represent the direct and Rs. 2,79,000 the indirect charges. After allowing for the exclusion from the present estimate of the sum of Rs. 8,00,000 provided in the original estimate for the purchase from the Travancore State of land for the head works, the excess amounts to Rs. 31,10,087, or about 48 per cent. in advance of the original estimate of Rs. 64,39,913.

3. The reasons assigned in the note by the Chief Engineer which accompanies your letter for the large additions found necessary in the estimate have been accepted by your Government as sufficient, and you state as your opinion that it is very doubtful whether a correct estimate of a work of this description could in any case have been arrived at.

4. It is evident that in a work of such unusual character, carried out in the difficult circumstances referred to in the Chief Engineer's report, a considerable margin of error must be allowed to the estimate of cost. But the excess shown in the present case, which amounts to nearly 50 per cent. of the original estimate, is far beyond the limit which should be permissible in the case of works constructed from borrowed money to which the sanction of the Secretary of State is only accorded on the assumption that the estimates, both of capital outlay and revenue, have been carefully and thoroughly worked out, so that there is no reasonable doubt that further examination will throw any suspicion upon the productive character of the schemes submitted.

5. The project is now far advanced, and I observe that it is still expected to fulfil the conditions prescribed for production works. I accordingly give my sanction to the estimates now submitted, but I wish to draw your Excellency's attention to the remarks made in my Public Works despatch No. 34, dated the 19th July 1894, on the revised estimates submitted in the case of the Rushikulya project and to again impress upon your Government the necessity for insisting upon more careful preparation of the estimates for new schemes submitted for my approval.

6. It appears from paragraph 3 of your letter that "it was known some years ago that the estimate for the head works would be largely exceeded," though the Government of India did not then consider that sufficient experience had been gained to enable them to submit a trustworthy revised estimate in accordance with the regulations prescribed in my predecessor's despatch No. 1, dated the 6th January 1881. It appears to me, however, that an anticipation so well grounded should have been communicated to the Secretary of State before the lapse of so much time, even if it were not possible to prepare a revised estimate.

7. I wish further to draw your Excellency's attention to the remarks made by the Chief Engineer in the 5th paragraph of his report regarding the criminal jurisdiction in that part of the works which is situated in territory belonging to the Government of Travancore, and I shall be glad to be informed whether any steps have been taken for improving the arrangements for maintaining order and for the protection of life and property.

Despatch from the Government of India, Public Works Department (Civil Works—Irrigation), to the Right Honorable Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, dated Simla, 29th May 1894, No. 28, Public Works.

In Lord Kimberley's despatch No. 53, Public Works, dated 18th September 1884, sanction was accorded to an estimate for the Periyár irrigation project in the Madras Presidency, amounting to Rs. 64,39,913, of which Rs. 61,85,000 represented the direct and Rs. 2,54,913 the indirect charges.

2. We have now the honour to inform you that a revised estimate has become necessary owing to the sanction accorded in 1884 having proved insufficient to complete the works, and this estimate, which amounts to Rs. 87,50,000, of which Rs. 84,71,000 represent the direct and Rs. 2,79,000 the indirect charges, is now submitted for your sanction.

3. In statement A (enclosure No. 2 to this despatch) is shown the distribution of outlay between the various departmental heads in the original estimate sanctioned in 1884 and in the estimate now submitted; and in enclosure No. 3 a comparative statement (marked B), showing by main and sub heads the original and revised estimates for works only, is exhibited.

We should explain that the original estimate contained an item of Rs. 8,00,000 for the purchase from the Travancore State of land for the site of the head works reservoir, but that before work was begun it was decided to pay an annual rent for the land instead of purchasing it, so that the excess on works, which in statement A is shown as Rs. 11,26,000, becomes in reality Rs. 19,26,000. This excess is made up as follows:—

		Rs.
Periyár valley works—		
Main dam		15,40,000
Temporary dam		14,115
Right escape		1,15,000
Left escape		33,885
Water-shed cutting		1,10,000
Do. tunnel		1,99,000
Other works		55,000
	Total ...	20,67,000
Less savings on—	Rs.	
(2) Main canal and branches	1,03,000	
(3) Distributaries	38,000	
	—	1,41,000
	Net Total ...	19,26,000

As regards this large excess, the original project was without doubt prepared on imperfect data, but it is very doubtful whether a correct estimate of a work of this description could in any case have been arrived at. It was known some years ago that the estimate for the head works would be largely exceeded, but sufficient experience had not then been gained to allow of a trustworthy revised estimate being prepared at that time; this has now been done, and we accept as sufficient the explanations given by the Chief Engineer in his note which forms enclosure No. 1 to this despatch.

The excess under establishment follows on that under works, the charge for establishment being a percentage on the cost of works.

The excess under tools and plant is very considerable, but it is fully explained in paragraph 26 of the Chief Engineer's note, and we accept his explanations.

The excess under indirect charges is due to allowances for leave and pension charges on the higher cost of establishment which, as already explained, follows on that of works and which has been accepted by us.

4. The revised forecast statements (tables III and IV), enclosure No. 4, show that ten years after completion of the work there will be a net excess of charges amounting to Rs. 17,75,945 which, when added to Rs. 87,50,000, the total of the direct and indirect charges, makes the sum at charge of the project to be Rs. 1,05,25,945.

At that period the net revenue will be Rs. 5,58,776, which is equivalent to 5·31 per cent. on the sum at charge.

5. The forecasts of revenue receipts in table III, enclosure No. 4, are accepted by us, and as the revised estimates do not alter the character of the project as a Productive Public Works, we have the honour to submit them for sanction.

Order—dated 22nd December 1894, No. 1057 I., Public Works.

Communicated to officers concerned with reference to G.O., No. 97 I., dated 3rd February 1894.

2. The information referred to in paragraph 7 of the Secretary of State's despatch will be furnished in the Political Department to the Government of India.

(True Extract.)

~~Under~~ Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintendent of Works, Periyár Project.
" Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.
" Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" Political Department.
" Revenue "

Exd. C. A. Munisawmy.
Spare Copies

Political

CURRENT NO. 10

IRRIGATION.

Govt. of {1894} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated December, 22nd.

Read. 5.1.95 Encl. 6
Reap 7.1.95

G.O., 22nd Dec. 1894, No. 1057 I.

DECEMBER.

COPY
CHIEF SECRETARY'S
GOVERNMENT
JAN 1895
MADRAS

Periyar Project

Letter from the Government of India communicating sanction of the Secretary of State to the revised estimate of Rs. 87,50,000 of the cost of the — and requesting to be furnished with the information regarding the criminal jurisdiction in that part of the works which is situated in territory belonging to the State of Travancore, communicated to officers concerned with remarks.

memo for orgl. go

orgl go

Fo. 126 : 20. 2. 94 Pol.

28 Political Dept. (P.)

C. NO. 10.

ORDER, 29 Jan 1895 No. 64

The following letter will be despatched to the Government of India,

26 Jan P.W. Dept.

To.

The Public Works Department. (with copy of letter at p 65 and Dr. 3/2/95)

with Copy of letter at p 65
I see no objection to the C.E.'s addition to para 3.

LETTER, No. 65

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of India,
Public Works Department.

36 Copies Dr. 6/2/95

SIR,

I am directed to reply to Mr. Mackenzies letter dated 5th October 1894, No. 197, I, requesting to be furnished with certain information regarding the criminal jurisdiction in that part of the Periyar works which is situated in territory belonging to the State of Travancore.

2. The transfer to the British Government of the criminal and police jurisdiction over the camps was effected in 18[illegible] vide Government of India, Foreign Department Notification No. 755 I, dated 18th February 1892. The acquisition of this jurisdiction

jurisdiction was at the time considered sufficient to safe-guard the interests and welfare of the British subjects in the camps, but subsequent experience proved that the sale of liquor was a source of ~~constant~~ friction between the Travancore authorities and the British employés. After a lengthy discussion with the Travancore darbar it has been decided to acquire the abkari jurisdiction also. This has been recently ceded by the Darbar, on the British Government consenting to pay the Travancore State the net revenue raised under the Madras Abkari Act after deducting the ~~charges for collecting this~~ costs incurred in collecting the revenue and for administering ~~police~~ and criminal justice in the camps.

3. ~~The Chief Engineer now states~~ that "since the original of the note "of the 29th January 1894 was written, "the most important defect of the then "existing arrangements has been removed "by the transfer of the abkari juris- "diction from Travancore to Madras".

4. I am to add that in March last this Government sanctioned an increase to the Police force at the works.

This Govt. has never shared the view of the chief Engr. that the complete assumption of sovereign jurisdiction over the ground occupied during the construction of works was necessary or desirable; that officer now states.

G.O. dated 8th March 1894, No. 551.

Periyar

H.E. The Governor

Secy to Govt., P. W. Dept for favour of Countersignature.

29TH JANUARY 1895, No. 64, POLITICAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper :—

G.O., dated 22nd December 1894, No. 1057 I., Public Works.

ABSTRACT.—Communicating to officers concerned, with remarks, letter from the Government of India conveying the sanction of the Secretary of State to the revised estimate of Rs. 87,50,000 connected with the Periyár Project and requesting information regarding the criminal jurisdiction in that part of the works situated in Travancore territory.

ORDER—dated 29th January 1895, No. 64, Political.

The following letter will be despatched to the Government of India, Public Works Department :—

[Here enter No. 65, dated 29th January 1895.]

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Public Works Department.

Exd. A. Raitt.

Govt. of {1895} Madras.

POLITICAL.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 29th January 1895, No. 64.

JANUARY.

Periyar Works.

Directing that the Government of India be furnished with certain information regarding the criminal jurisdiction in that part of the — which is situated in territory belonging to the State of Travancore.

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

LETTER—from

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF FORT ST. GEORGE,

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

I am directed to reply to Mr. Mackenzie's letter, dated 5th October 1894, No. 197 I., requesting to be furnished with certain information regarding the criminal jurisdiction in that part of the Periyár works which is situated in territory belonging to the State of Travancore.

2. The transfer to the British Government of the criminal and police jurisdiction over the camps was effected in 1892 (*vide* Government of India, Foreign Department, Notification, No. 755 I., dated 18th February 1892). The acquisition of this jurisdiction was at the time considered sufficient to safeguard the interests and welfare of the British subjects in the camps, but subsequent experience proved that the sale of liquor was a source of friction between the Travancore authorities and the British employés. After a lengthy discussion with the Travancore Darbar it has been decided to acquire the abkári jurisdiction also. This has been recently ceded by the Darbar, on the British Government consenting to pay the Travancore State the net revenue raised under the Madras Abkári Act after deducting the costs incurred in collecting this revenue and in administering criminal justice in the camps.

3. This Government has never shared the view of the Chief Engineer that the complete assumption of sovereign jurisdiction over the ground occupied during the construction of works was necessary or desirable; that officer now states that "since the original of the note of the 29th January 1894 was written, the most important defect of the then existing arrangements has been removed by the transfer of the abkári jurisdiction from Travancore to Madras."

4. I am to add that in March last this Government sanctioned an increase to the police force at the works.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

FORT ST. GEORGE,
29*th January* 1895.

Chief Secretary.

Rvd. A. Raitt.

1895.

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

From the Government of
Fort St. George.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

Letter, 29th Jan. 1895, No. 65.

JANUARY.

Periyar Works.

Furnishing certain information regarding the criminal jurisdiction in that part of the — which is situated in territory belonging to the State of Travancore.

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED. Complete. 35
Letter only. 70
Order complete with Letter. 40

irst copy sent to Press.

eturned for signature.

spatched in print.

DATED

Letter G.O. No.
189 .

ENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

DER OF GOVERNMENT

TTER OF GOVERNMENT

TEMENT WITH DITTO.

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

N.B.—

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.