

Political (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 736

DATED 13th Nov. 1895

[Despatch Abstract.]

BOUNDARY DISPUTE.

Communicating to the Political Agent, Pudukkottai, Proceedings,
Revenue Department, passing orders on the question of -- between the
Pudukkottai State and the Sivaganga Zemindari in the Madurai district.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
184	27						

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
85/98	40						
219/99							

CURRENT No. 661

No. 661, REVENUE, 3RD OCTOBER 1895.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 9th July 1895, No. 227 :—

Read—again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 15th June 1893, Mis. No. 3563.

ABSTRACT.—Informing the Collector of Madura that the Board considers that both the villagers in British territory and the Lessees of Sivaganga should be allowed an opportunity of stating their case in regard to the boundary dispute with the Pudukkottai State.

Read—again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 4th July 1893, Mis. No. 3928.

ABSTRACT.—Communicating to the Collector of Madura Government Order agreeing with the Board in considering that both the villagers in British territory and the Lessees of Sivaganga should be allowed an opportunity of stating their case in regard to the boundary dispute with the Pudukkottai State.

Read—again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 28th March 1894, Mis. No. 1568.

ABSTRACT.—Passing orders on a reference from the Collector of Madura with regard to the boundary dispute between the Pudukkottai State and the Sivaganga zemindari now under consideration.

Read—also letter from the Collector of Madura, dated 31st January 1895, Ref. on C. No. 460-Genl.

ABSTRACT.—Submitting, with remarks, Head Assistant Collector's report on the result of his inspection of the boundary dispute between the Pudukkottai State and the British territory.

Resolution—dated 9th July 1895, No. 227.

The papers read above relate to the appeal preferred at the end of 1892 by the Pudukkottai State against two decisions, dated 14th August 1884 and 25th February 1885, passed by Mr. Archdale Pope, Assistant Superintendent, Madras Survey, as arbitrator in certain boundary disputes between the Sivaganga estate in British territory and the Pudukkottai State. In Government Order, No. 609, Political, dated 21st August 1883, Mr. Tomlinson was appointed as arbitrator in these disputes, and it was provided in the same Government Order, at the instance of the Pudukkottai State, that an appeal from the arbitrator's decisions should lie to Government. In 1884 when Mr. Tomlinson left India, Mr. Pope was appointed to succeed him as arbitrator.

2. Both Mr. Pope's decisions refer to contiguous portions of the boundary between Sivaganga and Pudukkottai and are contained in two documents, each of which is accompanied by an explanatory map. Both decisions were originally delivered on 14th August 1884; one of these, however, was subsequently cancelled and the award, substituted for it, dated 25th February 1885, may be first considered.

3. The disputed boundary in this case was that between the Kurungalur tank and fields in Pudukkottai and the Aramanavayal tank and fields in Sivaganga. The sketch-map accompanying the award, dated 25th February 1885, shows the boundary claimed by each party, and that fixed by Mr. Pope, who, not finding any

material assistance in the documentary and other evidence adduced on either side, "decided to divide the ground into almost equal portions, giving to Aramanavayal the portion which they claimed to have cultivated and the remainder to Kurungalur." This was the award No. I proper; but Mr. Pope added the following rider or observation:—"It must be understood that this decision does not affect the right of the villagers of Kurungalur to the supply channel or *vari* through which the surplus water of the Melaramanavayal tank flows into the Kurungalur tank; nor does it give to either side the right to damage the bund, which now forms an extension for the distance of 108 rods of the Kurungalur tank-bund and is claimed in the present dispute by both parties, and repairs to this portion of the bund should be effected in the same manner as heretofore." The two points in dispute to which the rider refers, viz., the *vari* or supply channel and the extended tank-bund, have to be borne in mind as the right to them forms the gist of the appeal preferred by Pudukkottai. Mr. Pope's provisos regarding the *vari* and the *tank-bund* of the Kurungalur tank were not in his first award, dated 14th August 1884, but were inserted in the revised award, dated 25th February 1885, which was pronounced after a second inspection of the tract in dispute. On receipt of this revised award the Dewan of Pudukkottai wrote to Mr. Pope asking for a fresh review of his award and for a declaration that Pudukkottai had not only a right to the continued existence of the *vari* and the extended bund, but that both *vari* and bund were within Pudukkottai territory. Mr. Pope declined to make this declaration.

4. The second award, delivered like the one subsequently cancelled, on the 14th August 1884, relates to the tract of boundary immediately to the west of that dealt with in the award, dated 25th February 1885. Here also Mr. Pope found the evidence to be conflicting, but in fixing the boundary he seems to have been guided to some extent by certain boundary and cultivation accounts of the years 1831 and 1834 which were produced by the Sivaganga ryots. A copy of the boundary account, dated 13th December 1834, forms enclosure 4 to the Pudukkottai appeal; the document is accompanied by an English translation and its evidential worth will be referred to later on.

5. The appeal preferred by the Pudukkottai State from the above decisions is dated 8th November 1892. It was forwarded to Government with the remarks of Mr. Welsh, Political Agent for Pudukkottai, and was referred by Government for the Board's remarks. At the request of the Collector of Madura, the Board in its Proceedings, dated 15th June 1893, Mis. No. 3563, directed that the ryots in British territory, as well as the Sivaganga Lessees, should be given an opportunity of re-stating their case. A copy of these Board's Proceedings having been forwarded to Mr. Miller, Political Agent for Pudukkottai, that officer submitted a memorandum drawn up by himself after inspection of the disputed boundary. The memorandum is dated 27th November 1893.

6. The question whether the Pudukkottai appeal is barred by limitation was raised by Mr. E. Turner, Collector of Madura, in his letter read in Board's Proceedings, dated 28th March 1894, Mis. No. 1568. The fact is mentioned here because the Board in the Proceedings last quoted promised to consider the point when the report of the Head Assistant Collector, Madura, regarding the dispute should have been received. As to this issue of limitation it has only to be observed that the Boundary Marks Act, on which Mr. Turner's contention is based, does not apply to a transaction in which a Native State is concerned; nor does the Advocate-General's opinion, referred to by Mr. Turner, allude to Native States but only to Proprietary estates in British India.

7. The report of Mr. Rajagopala Chariar, Head Assistant Collector of Ramnad, above referred to is contained in his letter, dated 21st January 1895, and is accompanied by a map of the disputed tract, signed by that officer. This map appears to the Board to be the best, as it is also the latest, of those bearing on the case, and need alone be referred to except where it has to be compared with Mr. Pope's maps. The Sivaganga map is only useful as showing the path of which mention is made in the punchayat award of 1846 (see below, paragraph 23).

8. The grounds of the appeal preferred by Pudukkottai may be summarized as follows:—

(i) Mr. Pope based his decision on incorrect boundary and cultivation accounts produced by Sivaganga and admitted the existence of two villages, Melaramanavayal and Noyanandi, at a time when they are shown by the records of the Madura Collectorate not to have existed.

(ii) Mr. Pope has given to Sivaganga all that they claimed, not merely one-half of the tract in dispute as stated by him.

(iii) The Kattai *urani* should be the southern boundary of Aramanavayal, whereas Mr. Pope has taken the boundary much further south than the Kattai *urani*.

(iv) The punchayat decision of 1846 gives to Pudukkottai the *vari* and the extended bund, not merely certain rights in respect of them, which concession was all that Mr. Pope was prepared to allow.

(v) The objection raised by Mr. Pope to the boundary claimed by Pudukkottai, that it would trench very close upon the site of the Aramanavayal village, is not valid.

(vi) A mark on the southern face of a boundary stone planted in 1877 at the western end of the old bund of the Aramanavayal tank has been since effaced by the Sivaganga ryots. The mark was intended to show that the territory facing it belonged to Pudukkottai.

(vii) The bund and the *vari* above referred to have been maliciously damaged by the Aramanavayal people to such an extent that very little water now flows into the Kurungalur tank, so that the Kurungalur ayacut, the beriz of which was at one time Rs. 1,000 per annum, now lies waste.

(viii) The *Akkapuli* tree referred to in Mr. Pope's award was not properly identified by him.

(ix) Mr. Pope has given to Sivaganga nunjah land which was paying a tax of Rs. 36 per annum to the Pudukkottai State.

9. It is not necessary to discuss *seriatim* the *pros* and *cons* of all these numerous grounds of appeal, but before dealing with the main arguments, the last plea noted above requires some brief notice. The Pudukkottai State has omitted to indicate on the map produced by it the nunjah land which is alleged to have been transferred from its possession to that of Sivaganga; Mr. Pope, on the other hand, observed that most of the land in dispute was either waterspread or scrub jungle. A comparison of the Pudukkottai map with that forwarded by Mr. Rajagopala Chariar shows that the nunjah land is probably the triangular piece of ground A B C at the south-east corner of the latter map. Mr. Miller recommended that this triangular piece might be made over to Pudukkottai, and stated that Sivaganga had agreed to surrender it. In these circumstances, the restoration of this ground to Pudukkottai appears to the Board to be unobjectionable.

10. Proceeding to the other grounds of appeal, it would appear that Pudukkottai would be satisfied if the *vari* and the extended bund of the Kurungalur tank were made over to it; but Mr. Pope's award, dated 25th February 1885, gave the site of the *vari*, as well as of the extended bund, to Sivaganga, only allowing to Pudukkottai certain rights of user in respect of those works.

11. Mr. Miller recommends that the *vari* and the extended bund may be included wholly within Pudukkottai territory. He would also give up to the same State the scrub jungle V₃ V₂ Q, coloured green on Mr. Rajagopala Chariar's map. Mr. Rajagopala Chariar's own recommendation is practically the same, except that he would draw the Pudukkottai line south of the *vari* or channel, instead of north of it.

12. In the endeavour to determine which of these recommendations should be given effect to, the Board must confess that it has derived little or no assistance, except in a single instance, from the exhibits which were produced by either side before the arbitrator. All the documents, especially those produced on the Sivaganga side, have been subjected to very careful examination by Mr. Miller, and the criticism of them contained in paragraphs 15 to 33 of his memorandum leaves no room to doubt that with the single exception above alluded to these documents are unreliable.

13. The exhibit in favour of which an exception must be made is a punchayat decision, dated 1st Arpisi, Prabhava (= 15th October 1846), referring to some of the very matters now in dispute. One of the punchayatdars, who signed this award in

1846, was Virappan Chetti, a well-to-do Nattukottayan who was still living in 1893 and who deposed before Mr. Miller to the fact that a punchayat had been assembled under his presidentship regarding certain disputes between Kurungalur and Aramanavayal, but who, being stricken in years, was unable to call to mind the details of his award. The genuineness of this punchayat award has not been seriously impugned by Sivaganga, which is the party interested in repudiating it, and is admitted both by Mr. Miller and by Mr. Rajagopala Chari. It is plain, too, from the provisions as to the *vari* and the extended tank-bund in Mr. Pope's award that that officer considered the award of 1846 to be binding to a certain extent on the parties, but when the Dewan of Pudukkottai pressed him to admit the award as evidence of *boundary*, Mr. Pope replied that, as the award had not been acted upon, it was inadmissible. If the award of 1846 has a real bearing on the boundary dispute, and if it is otherwise a reliable document, it will be for Government as the Court of Appeal to consider whether Mr. Pope was justified in refusing credence to it. The award may not have been acted upon (though in fact it seems to have been), but if genuine it shows in what light the two villages regarded their mutual rights and obligations in 1846.

14. A translation of the award is appended to these Proceedings. The award may be divided into three parts—

- (1) Rights to be enjoyed by Kurungalur people.
- (2) Rights to be enjoyed by Aramanavayal people.
- (3) Limits to cultivation by Kurungalur and Aramanavayal people, respectively.

N.B.—Clauses 1 to 4 belong to the first part, 5 to 10 to the second, and 11 to 13 to the third.

15. The first clause allows water to be let into the Kurungalur tank by cutting through (*i.e.*, lowering) the surplus weir of the Aramanavayal tank when full. The Aramanavayal ryots admit the existence of this arrangement.

16. The second clause provides that the northern bund of the Kurungalur tank should be joined on to the bund of the Aramanavayal tank. This is the extended bund, 108 rods in length, which the Aramanavayal ryots now assert to be a flood bank put up by themselves. Pudukkottai further complains * that this extended bund has been cut through at one place by the Aramanavayal ryots, so that the water flowing by the side of the bund instead of proceeding to the Kurungalur tank runs waste into the Pambaru (to the east of Aramanavayal village). The object of the extended Kurungalur bund was to secure to Kurungalur tank the water surplusing from the Aramanavayal tank as well as the water of the channel referred to below. The extended bund is shown clearly on Mr. Pope's sketch-map.

17. The third clause of the award is important. It says—"The drainage from Anjanvayal fields, the rain water falling into the same, and the water in the feeder channel to the north and west of Kurungalur tank, shall be directed along the channel last referred to and made to flow easily, deepening the channel where necessary with *mamooties*."

18. Now the question is, what is this feeder channel which is thus exclusively appropriated to the Kurungalur tank. Mr. Miller identifies it with the *vari* referred to in Mr. Pope's award and marked on his map as issuing out of a breach in the Melaramanavayal tank. The Melaramanavayal tank is not mentioned in the award of 1846, but the Sivaganga ryots themselves admit that Melaramanavayal tank has been in ruins for at least fifty years, *i.e.*, from before the award of 1846, and Mr. Miller notices that this "breach channel," as he calls it, receives water from Anjanvayal fields also, which circumstance is mentioned likewise in the third clause of the award. Mr. Rajagopala Chari, however, has put an entirely different construction on this third clause and believes that the feeder channel is that marked S S₁ S₂ S₃ on his map, not the one marked T₁ T₂ T₃ which is Mr. Pope's *vari*. His interpretation agrees with that put upon the clause by the Sivaganga party, but as they are the people who have diverted Mr. Pope's *vari* into the Aramanavayal tank (as shown on the Sivaganga map) they are, of course, interested in denying that that the said *vari* is the

Kurungalur feeder channel. Mr. Rajagopala Chari does not give his reasons for believing that the feeder channel referred to in the punchayat award of 1846 is S S₁ S₂, but his own translation of the award is against this interpretation; for this channel S S₁ S₂ is not to the "north-west of Kurungalur tank" as he himself translates clause 3.

19. The fourth and fifth clauses refer to precedence at temple festivals.

20. In the sixth clause the Aramanavayal people are given the right to take water to their fields through a sluice in the northern bund of Kurungalur tank.

21. The eighth clause, which Mr. Rajagopala Chari has given up for the reason that he cannot locate it on the ground, is nevertheless not meaningless. It provides that the Aramanavayal people should be at liberty to store water for their nunjah and punjah fields north of the "feeder channel which lies to the west of the Kurungalur tank." As Mr. Rajagopala Chari's feeder channel runs from north to south, it is impossible to say that any point lies to the north of it. But taking the feeder channel to be Mr. Pope's *vari*, as suggested above, and remembering that it was exclusively appropriated to the Kurungalur tank, it is not difficult to see why it should have been provided that if the Aramanavayal people wanted additional water storage, they should have it north of the Kurungalur feeder. As the Melaramanavayal tank was in ruins at the time of the award, the Aramanavayal people may have been anxious to restore it, but the award forbade them to use the Kurungalur feeder channel for the purpose of additional water storage. This seems to be the meaning of the eighth clause.

22. The ninth clause gives the Aramanavayal people the right to enjoy Kattayi's well. It may be presumed from this that the Kattayi's well was within the Kurungalur limits, and hence the recognition of the rights of the Aramanavayal people *in alieno solo*, and what follows confirms this presumption.

23. Leaving out the tenth clause which relates to mirasi rights in Nattucheri village, the Board would draw attention to the important eleventh clause which recites that the Kurungalur boundary lies to the south of the feeder channel "which is to the north of Kurungalur tank," to the east of Noyanandi jungle, to the north of Kattayi's well and of the path, and that no cultivation should be carried on by the Kurungalur people at the boundary. This fixes the northern limit of Kurungalur cultivation which was to stop at a spot or in a tract of ground south of the feeder channel and north of Kattayi's well and north of the path. Kattayi's well is shown on Mr. Rajagopala Chari's map. The path appears from the next clause to mean the path leading from Nattucheri to Aramanavayal. This path is shown on only one map, viz., that put in by Sivaganga.

24. The twelfth clause directs that the Aramanavayal people should cultivate north of the path and west of four mounds, not identified,—probably west of the point V₂ on Mr. Rajagopala Chari's map—and,

25. The thirteenth and last clause gives the Kurungalur people the right to cultivate south of the path.

26. On the whole it must be admitted that this award of 1846 is a singularly complete and self-consistent document, and it is to be regretted that Mr. Pope did not bestow more attention on it before proceeding to divide the land, which notwithstanding his reference to one or two documents, he appears to have done in a somewhat arbitrary manner. On the other hand, Mr. Miller's line agrees as closely as is possible at this distance of time with the land-marks set forth in the award of 1846. Mr. Rajagopala Chari has pointed out in paragraph 17 of his report, that the mention of Kattayi's well in the award of 1846 is a strong point in support of Mr. Miller's line; but it has been shown above that Mr. Miller is corroborated in many other particulars by the provisions of that award.

27. The Board can only conjecture what the immediate occasion was for the award of 1846, but complications seem to have arisen owing, amongst other things, to the Kattayi's "charity" to the south of the Kurungalur tank feeder being in the enjoyment of villagers of Aramanavayal, and the award declares (paragraph 8) that the Aramanavayal villagers generally shall cultivate to the north of the feeder channel, but (paragraphs 9 and 12) that certain of the villagers shall continue to enjoy Kattayi's

"charity," while (paragraphs 11 to 13) the Kurungalur people shall not cultivate any land on the boundary north of the path from Nattucheri to Aramanavayal. This the Board understands to have been a mere concession to certain Aramanavayal people who had established a charity within the Kurungalur territory, and the Board would therefore recommend Government to accept Mr. Miller's line, *i.e.*, the stream $T_1 T_2 T_3 T_4$, subject to Aramanavayal's right of enjoyment of the charity specified in the award of 1846. This involves a prohibition of the diversion of the feeder $T_1 T_2 T_3 T_4$ into the Aramanavayal tank.

28. Secondly, as regards the extended bund of the Kurungalur tank, it will follow from the adoption of Mr. Miller's line that that portion of the bund should form part of the boundary between Kurungalur and Aramanavayal villages. Should these points be conceded to Pudukkottai, that State will not be placed under the necessity, contemplated in Mr. Pope's award, of establishing its rights in a civil court.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) R. C. C. CARR,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with the enclosures received with Government endorsement, Mis. No. 1099, dated 17th March 1893, and Mis. No. 4549, dated 6th December 1893 (returned), with Madura Collector's letter, No. 501, dated 9th February 1894, with map and other records received with the Madura Collector's letter, dated 31st January 1895, and with Mr. Pope's decisions and sketches in original obtained from the Survey office (to be returned).

Copy to the Collector of Madura.

APPENDIX.

AWARD of a punchayat appointed to decide certain disputes between the villages of Kurungalur and Aramanavayal.

Date of the award—15th October 1846.

"Deed unanimously executed on the 1st day of Arpisi, Prabhava, in the presence of punchayats Arunachellam Chettiar, son of Karuppan Chettiar of Devakottai, and Veerappan Chettiar, son of Periakaruppan Chettiar of Seppavayal, by Ambalam Periaran Chettiar, son of Rakkappa Chettiar and Odayappen Chettiar and his men, of Kurungalur village, Pudukkottai State, of the one part, and Ambalam Veerappan Ambalam, son of Veerappan Ambalagaran and his men and Periakaruppan, son of Sami Ambalagaran of Nattucheri and Aramanavayal of Sivaganga zemun of the other part, for settling the dispute among themselves in regard to the boundaries of the above three villages and about the temples, tanks, holy water, and ashes of the temples, about tanks, channel, &c.

I. The rights to be enjoyed by Periaran Chettiar, Odayappa Chettiar and his men of Kurungalur are as follow:—

- (1) When the Aramanavayal Kammsi is full, the surplus weir should be cut open according to mamool on the south side and water allowed to flow into Kurungalur Kammai.
- (2) The northern bund of Kurungalur Kammai should be joined to the bund of Aramanavayal Kammai as it has been hitherto.
- (3) The rain water that falls from where the Anjanvayal escape is situated and the water of the feeder channels to the west of the surplus weir which lies to the north of Kurungalur tank should be made to flow readily into the above tank by deepening the said channel with mamooties (மண் வெட்டி வெட்டாய் வெட்டி).
- (4) Holy water, holy ashes, garland, sandal, cloth, &c., in Maruthamudayar Ayyanar temple and during festivals should be given first to the Kurungalur people.

II. (5) Rights to be enjoyed by Ambalam Veerappan Ambalagaran and Periakaruppan Ambalagaran and his men of Aramanavayal and Nattucheri villages are as follow: Chettiar (*i.e.*, of Kurungalur) is to be given garland, sandal, holy ashes, cloth, &c., first in the Maruthamudayar temple and during festivals and Periakaruppan Ambalagaran and his men afterwards.

(6) When the Aramanavayal tank is full, the sluice should be opened on the southern side and the water should be carried by the Aramanavayal villagers to their fields by a sluice on the northern bund of Kurungalur tank as was customary.

(7) When the Kurungalur tank is full, surplus weir should be opened to the south of the Aramanavayal Paracheri.

(8) Aramanavayal villagers should form a Kammai for themselves to the north of the feeder channel lying to the north of Kurungalur Kammai and therewith cultivate their nunjah and punjah lands.

(9) As Kattayi's charity situated to the north of Kovilan Kammai of Kurungalur village was established by the grandmother of Veerappan Ambalam and Sami Ambalam, that charity should be enjoyed as heretofore by them.

(10) The Ambalam miras and Kudikani right, &c., of Nattucheri village should be enjoyed by Veerappan Ambalagaran and his men as has all along been enjoyed.

III. (11) As Kurungalur boundary lies to the south of the feeder channel which is to the north of the Kurungalur Kammai, to the east of the mound forming the eastern boundary of Noyanandi jungle and to the north of Kattayi's charity and of the path, no cultivation should be carried on in it by Kurungalur people.

(12) Veerappan Ambalagaran and his men should carry on nunjah and punjah cultivation in the land to the west of the four small mounds newly put up in the eastern fence of the Paruthi kollai lying to the north of the path leading from Nattucheri to Aramanavayal.

(13) The Kurungalur villagers should carry on cultivation to the south of the above path. Both parties should enjoy for ever as stated above. Each party has been given a true copy of this deed showing the above, both in the same language and in the handwriting of the same person. This deed was written by Arunachellam, son of Maruthavanam Pillai, Kanakku of Sengondan Maganam."

ORDER—No. 661, Revenue, dated 3rd October 1895.

Miscellaneous.

Government considers that the boundary line proposed by Mr. Miller may be accepted except in so far as it passes to the north of the feeder channel marked as $T_1 T_2 T_3 T_4$ on Mr. Rajagopala Chari's map. Such a course would be at variance with the provisions of clause (11) of the Panchayat award, on the strength of which Mr. Pope's decision is called in question.

2. The revised boundary will therefore run from the point marked D on the abovementioned map northwards to the southern side of the Aramanavayal tank bund, just east of the surplus weir, which will thus discharge into the Kurungalur tank; thence along the said bund, and the southern bank of the channel (T_2-T_4) to the ruined Melaramanavayal tank; and thence as suggested by Mr. Miller.

(True Extract.)

Secretary to Government.

To the Political Department.
„ the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), with enclosures.

Exd. C. M. Brisson.

Govt. of {1895} Madras.
REVENUE.

Issued

Recd. 30 7 Oct 1895
Agd 105

4. S.C.

Encl.

G.O., No. 661, 3rd October 1895.

OCTOBER.



Boundary Dispute.

Passing orders on the question of — between
Pudukkottai State and Sivaganga Zemindari in
the Madura district.

Order. 1st November 1895 No 736.
This
Communicated to the
Political Agent for Pudukkottai

Cms
1. 11. 95

To
The Pol Agent Pudukkottai (Sro).
Cob 2/11
Sro 6/11

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed

189

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATES

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO O. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

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

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only