[Poll. / 8.]
1,000—24-8-97.

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA AND INDIAN STATES.

Political (189 f) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 488

DATED 16-7-98

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Recording Proc Rev dept
Conveying to the Board Copies letter from the
Resident in Mysore stating that the
Mysore Durbar agrees to the Nilgiri—
Mysore Boundary line as settled & demarcated,
being inspected & reported on in alternate
years by the Nilgiri & Mysore Forest
Officers, respectively.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Political (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 927

To

7. A
Rw. This is, I presume, comm. to Pl. for information mfg &
Cmd
9. 7. 98
yes.

C.S.
Mrs

From

The Revenue Department.

Order No. 488, dt 16 July 1898

Recorded

No. 2839 mio

Dated 5. 7. 1898.

Received 7/7/98

Registered — do —

Enclosures 3.

Spare copies

Reply to the Chief Asst's query on the current below.

Yes.

The address was marked by the Secy. The paper has gone down to Madras

Forwarded Rowe Chief assistant P.D

RS
12-7-98

CS
11/7/98

Rec'd 13/7/98

SUBJECT.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue letter from the Resident in Mysore re: boundary line between Mysore and Nilgiri Wynaad.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Government {1897} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. } 1897. *Enclosures*

Regd. } *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 466, 17th June 1897.

JUNE.

Mysore-Nilgiri Boundary dispute.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue, with remarks, the decision arrived at by the Commissioners appointed to settle the —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—again G.O., No. 356, Revenue, dated 22nd May 1890.

Abstract.—Directing that the Resident in Mysore be addressed in the Political Department on the inconvenience which is likely to result if the question of permanently demarcating the Mysore and the Nilgiri-Wynaad boundary remains unsettled, and calling upon the Superintendent of Revenue Survey and the Conservator of Forests, Northern Circle, to report why the orders passed in 1878, regarding the setting up of permanent marks on the boundary line, have never been acted upon.

Read—again G.O., No. 1230, Revenue, dated 8th December 1892.

Abstract.—Agreeing with the Board of Revenue in its remarks that the boundary line was fixed in 1859 and that it was unnecessary therefore to reopen the dispute; and adressing the Resident in Mysore on the point regarding the disputed line of boundary between the Mysore State and the Nilgiri-Wynaad.

Read—again G.O., No. 2806, Revenue, dated 13th July 1895.

Abstract.—Stating that copies of certain papers, regarding the boundary dispute between the Nilgiri-Wynaad and the Mysore State, applied for by the Mysore Durbar cannot be granted.

Read—again letter No. 2807, dated 13th July 1895.

Abstract.—Letter to the Resident in Mysore on the above subject.

Read—again the following G.O., Mis. No. 555, Revenue, dated 8th February 1896 :—

Read—the following letter from W. M. YOUNG, Esq., Resident in Mysore, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated Bangalore, 31st December 1895, No. 5169 :—

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter, No. 2807, dated the 13th July last, regarding a boundary dispute between the Nilgiri district and the Mysore State, I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of a letter No. 30-D., of the 9th September 1895, from the Dewan of Mysore (with enclosures) on the subject.

2. I have ascertained that the Government of India will have no objection to settling the matter if the Madras Government agree, in the way proposed by the Durbar in paragraph 14 of the Dewan's letter. But as there seemed little advantage in the arrangement unless finality were secured, I have suggested to the Durbar that both sides should be bound to accept as final the decision of a majority of the committee, or if their votes are equally divided, of the Resident, and this suggestion has been accepted by the Durbar and by the Government of India, subject to the concurrence of the Madras Government.

3. I shall be glad to be favoured with the wishes of the Government of Madras in the matter.

Enclosure.

From Sir K. SHESHADRI IYER, K.C.S.I., Dewan of Mysore, to the Resident in Mysore, dated Bangalore, 9th September 1895, No. 30-D.

With reference to correspondence ending with your office letter No. 2917, dated 29th July 1895, regarding the boundary dispute between the Nilgiri district of the Madras Presidency and the territories of Mysore, I have the honour to forward herewith the accompanying printed file containing letter No. 3612—282, dated 7th May 1895, with 51 enclosures,* from the

* Maps separately put up.

Inspector-General of Forests. This letter contains a full statement of the claim of the Durbar to the tract in dispute based upon the evidence that is available up to date.

2. This tract forms an irregular four-sided figure, three sides of which are shown blue and the fourth pink and yellow in the accompanying map A, and is bounded on the north-east and west by the Berambadi and Bhandipur State Forests of Mysore, and on the south by the Mudumalai Forest belonging to the Tirumalpad of Nilambur in the Wynaad.

3. The disputed tract comprises thirteen square miles of territory combining the character of a prairie and a forest, with grass growing 6 feet high, lofty timber trees including the teak and varieties of the *Pterocarpus* and *Terminalia* and abounding in elephants, tigers, bears and bison. The difficulties of a survey of this unhealthy and practically unpeopled region have been again and again acknowledged by the various officers entrusted with the task to have been well-nigh insuperable.

4. Three surveys were made of this region, the first embodied in the Atlas sheet of 1833, the second in connection with the Madras Revenue Survey of 1875–76 entrusted to Captain Cloete, and the third the Topographical Survey of 1884–85 embodied in the Topo sheet No. 69. Both these latter maps profess to be based on the Atlas sheet of 1833, the former, however, taking the boundary along the blue line A B C D, and the latter along the pink and yellow line A D. Captain Cloete's boundary line thus adds the disputed tract to Malabar, while the Topo sheet gives the same to Mysore. The Topo Survey Officers worked in ignorance of the Revenue Survey that had gone before; both the surveys recognize the inaccuracies in detail of the Atlas sheet; both profess to be guided in regard to the main features of the boundary by the Atlas sheet. From the tri-junction of the Malabar, Nilgiri and Mysore districts, at Tippakadu up to point D, both the Revenue Survey and Topo boundary lines are identical; so too from point A towards the west to Rampur Ford, and the question is therefore,—which line, whether A B C D of the Revenue Survey, or A D of the Topo Survey is consistent with the land-marks indicated in the Atlas sheet of 1833, with the requirements of a natural boundary, with evidence as regards possession, and other available facts indicative of the ancient boundary between Mysore and the Wynaad?

Paragraph 13, page 11 of Mr. Ricketts' report.

Enclosure No. 46, paragraph 6, page 76. Paragraph 13 of Mr. Ricketts' report, page 11; enclosure No. 46, paragraph 6, page 76; enclosure No. 6, paragraph 2, page 23.

Enclosure Map A.

5. Before proceeding to discuss the relative correctness of the maps and the available evidence in regard to the true boundary line, it would be advantageous to clear the ground by removing certain misconceptions as to the previous history of the case. From 1875 to 1877 there were three controversies raging round three lines of boundary continuous with each other—one from the Tippakadu to Rampur Ford which had never been settled before, the second from Rampur Ford to the Yerramavan tree on the Shigebetta slope settled by Dr. Cleghorn in 1859, and the third from the Yerramavan tree to the Kabani river further west, settled by Messrs. Fullerton and Vansomeren in 1865. Captain Cloete first made the mistake of supposing that the whole of the line from Tippakadu to the Shigebetta tree had been settled by Dr. Cleghorn in 1859, but he subsequently corrected himself; and further in his memorandum, dated 4th August 1876, he describes succinctly the different lines, paragraphs 1 to 11 being devoted to the tri-junction-Rampur Ford line now under dispute and surveyed by him for the first time in accordance with the Atlas sheet of 1833, paragraphs 12 to 30 to Dr. Cleghorn's line from Rampur Ford to the Shigebetta tree, and paragraphs 31 to 38 to Fullerton's line from the Shigebetta tree to the Kabani river. The line from Tippakadu to Rampur had never been laid out before, the survey was so difficult and the tract so unhealthy that there was an unseemly squabble between the Forest and the Revenue Departments of Mysore as to whose duty it was to assist the Madras party in the survey. Captain Cloete was anxious to finish the survey before January when the jungle got unhealthy; and when the Chief Commissioner directed Assistant Conservator Mr. Jellicoe to inspect and report upon the alternative lines claimed by Mysore and Madras, this officer, who knew little of surveying and less of the locality, would not wait till March for the old boundary stones hidden in the rank grass to be exposed. Three old men whom he sent for and questioned, dreading the jungle at that deadly season, denied all knowledge of the stones which they had previously declared did exist, another old man contradicted his previous statement, and Mr. Jellicoe reported that the line surveyed by the Madras Forest officers was in accordance with the Atlas sheet of 1833 and might be accepted. The Chief Commissioner was not satisfied with this report, he would not hurriedly abandon the claims of Mysore, and directed *, on 6th April 1876, a fuller elucidation of the points in

Vide Captain Cloete's memorandum of 4th August 1876, pages 35 to 39 of printed file of enclosures.

Enclosure No. 1, page 21, paragraphs 1 and 2. Enclosure No. 2, page 21, paragraph 2. Enclosure No. 23, pages 35 to 39.

Enclosure No. 9, pages 25 and 26. Enclosure No. 7, paragraph 5, page 24. Enclosure No. 9, page 26.

Enclosure No. 16, paragraph 3, page 31. Enclosure No. 10, paragraph 3, page 27. Enclosure No. 14, page 30. Enclosure No. 10, page 27. Enclosure No. 10, paragraph 4, page 27. Enclosure No. 16, paragraph 3, page 31.

* Enclosure No. 19, page 34.

dispute and the preparation of a sketch-map showing the alternative lines of boundary as claimed by Mysore and Madras. But so entirely was the official mind dominated by the Rampur-Shigebetta dispute that, in reply to the above requisition, sketch-map was submitted to the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore in June 1876 (without a report), which brought out clearly the alternative lines in dispute between *Shigebetta and Rampur Ford, and even this sketch-map was not forwarded to the Chief Commissioner, and for a year and a half the Mysore authorities lost sight of the question altogether the correspondence thenceforward and up to almost the beginning of 1878 dealing solely with the boundary disputes to the west of Rampur Ford. In fact these latter disputes loom so largely in the correspondence of those years, there was so much acrimonious wrangling round Cleghorn's and Fullerton's lines between the Forest officers of Madras and Mysore, that it is no wonder that even at this distance of time Messrs. Cherry and Rees, and following them the Madras Board of Revenue, should fall into the error of supposing that the present dispute has anything to do with Dr. Cleghorn's line of 1859, except that the line now in dispute commences at one end of the line laid down by Dr. Cleghorn in 1859.

Enclosure No. 21, page 34.
* Dr. Cleghorn's line.

6. On 12th October 1877 the Madras Government asked whether the demarcation of the line may be accepted as final, the Superintendent of the Madras Revenue Survey having reported that there was no dispute regarding it. The allegation of absence of dispute referred to the concurrence of Mr. Jellicoe in January 1876 which had been repudiated by the Chief Commissioner and in respect of which the latter had called for a report and a sketch showing the alternative lines in question with the result already noted. The previous history of the line was not brought to the notice of the Chief Commissioner, but even thus, he directed Sub-Assistant Conservator Mr. Anthony to report on the line before accepting the demarcation as final. Mr. Anthony reported he could not make out the line; the Madras Deputy Superintendent Mr. Puckle retaliated by saying Mr. Anthony did not know what he had to look for. Captain Cloete explained that only such marks and clearings had been made as sufficed for survey purposes, that he had laid down the line three years before to the best of his ability from the old maps and the information available on the spot, after having vainly endeavoured to get a Mysore official to point out "how the boundary ran through the trackless forests on the borders." The end of all this was that the Mysore Government consented to pay half the demarcation charges when the demarcation was actually effected. This demarcation has not been effected up to date, the Collector of Nilgiris admits that the boundary admitted to be correct in 1876 had never been finally demarcated on the ground, the Madras Government entirely lost sight of the question for nearly twelve years, and the Board of Revenue state that even after the lapse of the short period of three years Mr. Anthony was unable in 1878 to trace Captain Cloete's line, and that it is probable that the latter's marks and clearings have entirely disappeared. The principal argument of the Madras Board of Revenue, which has been accepted by the Madras Government is that the boundary was laid out by Dr. Cleghorn in 1859, and that as Dr. Cleghorn was Conservator of Forests to both the Governments, the Mysore Government is estopped from questioning the correctness of the line. But Dr. Cleghorn never laid down the boundary. He never even went over the disputed boundary. Captain Cloete did not purport (as indeed he could not have purported) to find out Dr. Cleghorn's line, and even as regards the real Cleghorn line from Rampur Ford to the Shigebetta tree, a Commission had to sit nearly two decades after his settlement of 1859 to decide what was Dr. Cleghorn's line, Dr. Cleghorn's settlement of 1859 having itself been a re-settlement of Tod and Stephen's settlement of 1855. Similarly Fullerton's line of 1868 had to be re-settled eight years later.

Enclosure No. 27, page 43, paragraph 1.

Enclosure No. 28, page 43. Enclosure No. 29, page 43. Paragraph 3 of Captain Cloete's report, dated 13th September 1878, in Enclosure No. 30, page 56. Enclosure No. 30 paragraph 1, page 56. Enclosure No. 30, page 57, paragraph 4.

Paragraph 7, page 8 of Mr. Ricketts' report.

Vide letter No. 58, dated 10th April 1890, from the Collector of Nilgiris printed in Madras G.O., No. 356 of 22nd May 1890, page 8.

Madras G.O., No. 356, dated 22nd May 1890, page 8.

Vide Dr. Cleghorn's memorandum of 1859. Enclosure No. 48, page 81.

7. The Durbar are not in possession of the Madras G.O., No. 577, dated 28th April 1859, quoted by the Board of Revenue, but they are in possession of the previous correspondence relating to Dr. Cleghorn's settlement of 1859, which shows that the order quoted by the Board of Revenue could refer only to the disputed boundary between Rampur Ford and Shigebetta.

8. Before concluding this portion of the subject, the Durbar would offer a few remarks about the Tirumalpad of Nilambur who, it is stated, would doubtless produce evidence in favour of the Madras line of boundary, if necessary. It is admitted that he is vitally interested in the question, more interested

Paragraph 5 of Madras G.O., No. 1230, dated 8th December 1892, page 6, and Mr. Cherry's Endorsement No. 1729, dated 11th July 1892, printed in the same page 13, paragraph 2.

than the Madras Government, and it is noteworthy that he never attended the survey operations of 1875–76. Captain Cloete says in this connection—"No aid or information was received from the Nilambur Tirumalpad or his agents; though due warning was sent, they appear to be indifferent as to this boundary." It is further noteworthy from the reports of Mr. Jellicoe in 1875 and Amildar Mr. Abdul Khadar in 1876 that there was an extensive and surreptitious attempt to shift boundary stones by people from the Nilambur side so as to add to the Tirumalpad's property, and during all these years when, as Mr. Russell says, his department has been working the forests south of the Madras Revenue Survey line, the Tirumalpad has never offered to produce the evidence which, as a private proprietor, it was natural to expect him to possess and to produce. With 13 square miles of forest at stake the Tirumalpad's continued indifference is not accountable in reason.

Memorandum, dated 4th August 1876, paragraph 9, page 36, of the printed file.

Enclosure No. 13, page 29.

9. The philological argument advanced by Mr. Rees that the Vararai Katkamani of the lease deed of 1863 is a natural development of the Kara Kanavai of the Atlas sheet of 1833 is not based upon proper evidence, and is not entitled to any weight.

Paragraph 15, page 12 of Mr. Ricketts' report.

10. The boundary line followed by Captain Cloete is absolutely inconsistent with the geographical features indicated in the Atlas sheet which Captain Cloete professed to follow; and with regard to this portion of the subject, the Durbar would only refer to Colonel * McCullagh's exhaustive treatment of this question in his letter No. 249, dated 10th July 1893. This letter explains in full how the boundary of the Atlas sheet is more accurately exhibited in the Topo Survey than the Madras Revenue Survey, and I am unwilling to weaken its effect by reproducing the arguments used, and will solicit a careful study of the letter itself which most strongly supports the Durbar's claim.

Enclosure No. 46, paragraph 9, page 77.

* Superintendent, Survey of India, in charge of Madras Forest Surveys.
Enclosure No. 46, page 75.

11. There can be no reasonable doubt that Mysore has always had possession and enjoyment of the tract in dispute. Ancient boundary stones exist along the boundary claimed by Mysore. The line of these stones, it is true, continues beyond the disputed boundary into the Nilgiri district, but the State's possession has actually been restricted to the tract in dispute, at least since the Atlas Survey of 1833. The statement † of taluk boundary complied on 25th May 1850 contains valuable evidence proving the correctness of the boundary claimed, and the official records of 1869 point to the same conclusion. Mr. Russell's report No. 498, dated 11th December 1888, is important as showing that the Durbar were exercising full rights of ownership so late as 1888, as indeed they still continue to do notwithstanding the Madras Revenue Survey which, as already stated, has not as yet been completed by a proper demarcation, and has never been acted upon.

† Enclosure No. 40, page 72.
Enclosures Nos. 34 and 35, pages 60, 62. Enclosure No. 32, page 58.

12. Owing to the difficult nature of the country the southern boundary of the Province has always been the scene of frequent and protracted boundary disputes, each section (accepted by both sides) having been finally settled after more than one investigation by joint committees extending over a number of years. The section from Tippakadu to the Rampur Ford, the one now in dispute, is the most difficult of all, and when the Durbar found that even the Madras Board of Revenue fell into the error of supposing that the boundary in question was the one settled by Dr. Cleghorn in 1859, they ordered a most careful investigation of the tract by competent Forest Officers with the result that most valuable evidence has been obtained in regard to the ancient line of boundary between Mysore and Malabar. This evidence is embodied in pages 65—74 of the printed file.

13. Briefly stated, the present position of the question is as follows:—

There has as yet been no binding settlement of the disputed boundary.

The line proposed by the Madras Revenue Survey cannot (under the circumstances explained in paragraph 5) be regarded as having been accepted by the late Chief Commissioner of Mysore in a way which can be binding upon the Durbar.

Following the indications of the old Atlas sheet of 1833, the correct boundary is as shown in the Topo Survey map.

There is other strong evidence in support of this boundary.

The State has always had actual possession of the tract in dispute, and the Madras Government and the Nilambur Tirumalpad never exercised therein any rights of proprietorship.

14. Under such circumstances the Durbar are of opinion that, for the satisfactory settlement of this question, it is necessary to appoint a Joint Committee to investigate the question on the spot, and to pronounce a decision thereupon. The Committee may consist of two members nominated by the Madras Government and two by the Mysore Government, and the British Resident may act as umpire should the members of the Committee be equally divided in opinion.

Order—Mis. No. 555, Revenue, dated 8th February 1896.

The Board of Revenue will be requested to report the names of the officers whom it would recommend for nomination as the Madras members of the proposed Committee.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) E. GIBSON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).

Read—again the following G.O., Mis. No. 1083, Revenue, dated 17th March 1896 :—

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenne (Land Revenue), Forest Mis. No. 265, dated 21st February 1896 :—

Read—G.O., Mis. No. 555, Revenue, dated 8th February 1896.

Resolution—Forest Mis. No. 265, dated 21st February 1896.

The Board would recommend, for nomination as the Madras members of the proposed Committee, the Head Assistant Collector of Nilgiris for the time being, and a Forest officer who will be deputed when it is known at what period of the year the commission is likely to meet.

(True Copy and Extract.)

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

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with enclosures returned.

Copy to the Collector of Nilgiris, through the Conservator of Forests, Southern Circle.

Order—Mis. No. 1083, Revenue, dated 17th March 1896.

The Government considers that one of the officers nominated to represent Madras on the proposed Committee should be the Collector, for the time being, of the district of the Nilgiris and that the other should be Mr. G. Hadfield, the District Forest-officer of South Malabar. If, however, from any cause it is found that Mr. Hadfield's services cannot be made available for the purpose intended, the District Forest Officer, for the time being, of the Nilgiris may be nominated instead. The Board will issue the necessary instructions accordingly.

2. The following letter will be sent to the Resident in Mysore.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) E. GIBSON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue),
with one copy of the report of the Inspector-General of Forests, Mysore, for record.

Read—again the following letter from E. GIBSON, Esq., Secretary to the Government of Madras, Revenue Department, to the Resident in Mysore, dated 17th March 1896, No. 1084.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 5169, dated 31st December 1895, regarding the boundary dispute between the Mysore State and the Nilgiri district and to state, for your information and for communication to His Highness the Maharajah's Durbar, that His Excellency the Governor in Council accepts the proposals therein referred to, viz., that an arbitration Committee composed of two Mysore and two Madras members should be appointed to settle the dispute in question, and that to secure finality both sides should be bound to accept as final the decision of a majority of the Committee or if their votes are equally divided, of the Resident. I am to add that His Excellency in Council has accordingly nominated the Collector, for the time being, of the district of the Nilgiris and a Forest Officer to represent Madras on the proposed Committee and am to request that the names of the Mysore representatives as well as the time when and the place where the Committee can conveniently meet may be duly intimated to this Government.

2. The maps forwarded with your letter are herewith returned.

Read—again G.O., No. 2667, Revenue, dated 7th July 1897.

Abstract.—Referring to the Board of Revenue for early remarks letter from the Resident in Mysore stating that Colonels Grant and Campbell Walker have been nominated by the Durbar to represent Mysore on the Committee for the settlement of a disputed portion of the southern frontier of Mysore State.

Read—again G.O., No. 3504, Revenue, dated 1st September 1896.

Abstract.—Agreeing with the Board of Revenue in considering that it is preferable for the Committee to discuss and draw up its report on the disputed boundary between the southern frontier of Mysore and the Nilgiri-Wynaad.

Read—again G.O., No. 3691, Revenue, dated 15th September 1896.

Abstract.—Communicating to the Board of Revenue letter from the Resident in Mysore stating that there is no objection to the Committee, appointed to settle the disputed boundary between the southern frontier of Mysore and the Nilgiri-Wynaad, discussing and drawing up its report on the spot as proposed by the Madras Government.

Read—again G.O., No. 3837, Revenue, dated 26th September 1896.

Abstract.—Ordering that the Resident in Mysore be addressed about postponing the meeting of the Committee appointed to settle the boundary dispute between the Mysore State and the Nilgiri-Wynaad.

Read—again G.O., No. 4073, Revenue, dated 10th October 1896.

Abstract.—Ordering that a letter be despatched to the Resident in Mysore intimating that the Forest officer Mr. J. Hadfield has been nominated to serve on the Committee appointed to settle the disputed boundary between the Mysore State and the Nilgiri-Wynaad.

Read—again G.O., No. 4475, Revenue, dated 11th November 1896.

Abstract.—Issuing instructions regarding the conduct of the settlement of the boundary between the Nilgiri-Wynaad and Mysore.

Read—again G.O., No. 4976, Revenue, dated 5th December 1896.

Abstract.—Informing the Mysore Durbar that there is no objection to the Mysore Forest Departments collecting and holding in deposit the minor produce of the area lying between Colonel Cloete's and Colonel McCullagh's lines pending the settlement of the dispute connected with it.

Read—also the following letter from the Commissioners, Mysore-Nilgiri Boundary Dispute, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated Ootacamund, 26th May 1897 :—

We have the honor to submit our decision on the Mysore-Nilgiri boundary dispute referred to us in the marginally-noted papers.

(1) Mysore General Secretary's letter No. 2838.—Ft. F. 129-95 of 14th September 1896.
(2) G.O., Mis. No. 1083, dated 17th March 1896.

2. We are unanimous in accepting the Survey Descriptive Memoir * of the Malabar frontier, which is in reality a field-book of the Atlas, as distinctly and unmistakably supporting the line of boundary shown in the latter. The Atlas is wrong in certain details, but it is not materially wrong in its delineation of the boundary line.

* Ward and Connor's.

3. The effect of our settlement is to accept Colonel Cloete's line from the west to Karakanavai; thence to cut off a considerable angle † where he seems to have diverged from the proper line, this angle being added to Mysore; thence continuing along Colonel Cloete's line till it joins Colonel McCullagh's line.

† Area roughly 2 square miles.

4. Holding these views, the Commission did not go into the question of possession.

5. We beg to suggest that an officer deputed by each Government, accompanied by a surveyor, go over the line now settled and permanently demarcate it with a broad clearing and masonry pillars.

Enclosure.

Proceedings of the Boundary Commission appointed under G.O., Mis., No. 1083, dated 17th March 1896, to investigate Mysore-Nilgiri boundary dispute, dated 25th May 1897.

The Commission met at Ootacamund on the 10th, 18th, 24th and 25th of May 1897.

After full discussion of the points mentioned in paragraph 13 of the Dewan's letter to the British Resident in Mysore, dated 9th September 1895, the following resolutions were unanimously agreed to :—

(1) That McCullagh's line has been taken along the main stream which is shown in the Atlas sheet from the word "ruins" (of Editerracottah in ruins) to a point half an inch north of the last letter of the words "Esharun Pagoda" and about 4 miles to the north-east of Bellami.

(2) Resolved also that Colonel Cloete's survey may be accepted from where it leaves the Mavinahalla to where it joins Karakanavai.

(3) That to the east the line should run as shown in that map of Colonel McCullagh, which has been signed by all members of the Commission, till it reaches the Honnurhalla as shown; running down that river till it reaches the point of no dispute at A.

In arriving at the above settlement the Commissioners have been mainly guided by the original Survey Memoir by Messrs. Ward and Connor produced by the Madras Commissioners the *intention* of which they believe is fairly represented by the line now adopted.

Order—No. 466, Revenue, dated 17th June 1897.

Miscellaneous.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The decision of the Commissioners being final, the only question that has to be considered is what should be done to prevent a recurrence of disputes on the frontier now settled. The Commissioners suggest that an officer deputed by each Government should go over the whole line and permanently demarcate it with a broad clearing and masonry pillars. This suggestion meets with the approval of His Excellency the Governor in Council who also

considers that the cost of such demarcation should be borne by the two Governments concerned in equal proportions. If His Highness the Maharajah's Durbar agrees in the above views, Mr. C. G. Douglas, the District Forest-officer of the Nilgiris, will be deputed to represent British interests at the time of the demarcation and a competent surveyor should be found by the Superintendent, Madras Survey, to carry out the work, the details as to the time and manner in which it should be undertaken being left to be decided by Mr. Douglas and the officer that may be appointed by the Mysore Durbar in direct communication with each other.

3. With reference to the penultimate paper read above, the Collector of the Nilgiris will be requested to ascertain and report the approximate value of the forest produce which the Mysore authorities were allowed to collect and hold in deposit pending the settlement of the dispute in question.

4. The following letter will be despatched to the Resident in Mysore.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. STOKES,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), with two maps.
„ the Superintendent, Madras Survey.
Copy to the Collector of the Nilgiris.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

60 Copies.

1897.

RESIDENT IN MYSORE.

From

The Government of Fort St. George.

Recd. } 1897. *Enclosures*

Regd. } 1897. *Spare copies*

Letter, No. 467, 17th June 1897.

JUNE.

EXPRESSING the willingness of the Madras Government to make arrangements for the permanent demarcation of the Mysore-Nilgiri boundary line recently settled by the Commissioners appointed for the purpose, and requesting to be furnished with the views of the Mysore Durbar on the question.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

From

The Hon'ble Mr. G. STOKES, I.C.S.,
Acting Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Revenue Department,

To

The RESIDENT in MYSORE,
Dated Ootacamund, 17th June 1897.

Sir,

Miscellaneous.

Adverting to the Proceedings, dated 25th May 1897, of the Commissioners appointed to settle the Mysore-Nilgiri boundary dispute and to their letter dated the 26th *idem* forwarding the same, I am directed to address you on the subject of the suggestion made by them that, to prevent future disputes, an officer deputed by each Government should go over the whole line now settled and permanently demarcate it with a broad clearing and masonry pillars. This suggestion, I am to say, meets with the approval of His Excellency the Governor in Council, who also considers that the cost of such demarcation should be borne by the two Governments concerned in equal proportions. If His Highness the Maharajah's Durbar agrees in the above views, Mr. C. G. Douglas, the District Forest-officer of the Nilgiris, will be deputed to represent British interests at the time of the demarcation, and His Excellency in Council will also be prepared to send a competent surveyor to carry out the work. The time and manner in which it should be undertaken may be left to be decided by Mr. Douglas and the officer that may be appointed by the Mysore Durbar in direct communication with each other. I am to request that the Durbar may be moved to consider the question and to communicate its views through you to this Government at an early date.

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

(Signed) G. STOKES,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

25 Copies

Government {1898} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd.	} 1898.	*Enclosures*
Regd.		*Spare copies*

G.O., No. 244, 29th April 1898.

APRIL.

Nilgiri-Mysore Boundary Line.

Ordering, with remarks, that the — as settled and demarcated should be inspected and reported on in alternate years by the Nilgiri and Mysore Forest officers, respectively, and requesting the Resident in Mysore to ascertain if the Darbar has any objection to accepting the above proposal.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), Forest No. 75, dated 22nd February 1898 :—

Read—the following letter from C. G. DOUGLAS, Esq., District Forest-officer, Nilgiris, and G. E. RICKETTS, Esq., Assistant Conservator of Forests in Mysore on Special Duty, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue (through the Collector of Nilgiris and the Conservator of Forests, Southern Circle, Coimbatore), dated Camp, Denne, 13th December 1897, No. 135-B. :—

With reference to paragraph 2 of Government Order, No. 466, Revenue, dated 17th June 1897, and to the letter from the Resident in Mysore, to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Revenue Department, dated 11th October 1897, No. 4243, which forms the subject of Government Order, No. 892, Revenue, dated 26th October 1897, we have the honour to report the completion of the survey and demarcation of the Nilgiri-Mysore boundary as settled by the Boundary Commissioners, appointed under Government Order, Mis. No. 1083, dated 17th March 1896, whose decision is recorded in the first of the Government Orders above quoted.

2. We enclose a map showing the line demarcated in compliance with the Commissioners' award and showing also the boundary as originally surveyed by Colonel Cloete in 1875–76. For purposes of comparison we also enclose a tracing of the map dated 25th May 1897 on which the Commissioners laid down the line to be observed.

3. In its Proceedings, dated 25th May 1897, the Boundary Commission records its award as follows:—

* * * * *

"2. Resolved also that Colonel Cloete's survey may be accepted from where it leaves the Mavinhalla to where it joins Karakanavai.

"3. That to the east the line should run as shown in that map of Colonel McCullagh which has been signed by all members of the Commission, till it reaches the Honnurhalla as shown; running down that river till it reaches the point of no dispute at A."

4. On the map of Colonel McCullagh referred to above, tracing of which accompanies this report, the line is thus described.

"D represents Colonel Cloete's Karakanavai. West of D his line is accepted. South of B his line is accepted. From D the line shall be demarcated as shown by the line D, C, B."

5. Thus, working the line from east to west, which is the course we followed, as did Colonel Cloete, the Commissioners' award is defined by the points A, B, C, D, E, F, as shown on our map and on that of the Commissioners up to D.

A is the point of no dispute, between which and the confluence of the Kakanhalla and Mayar rivers, forming the old Nilgiri, Malabar and Mysore trijunction, where Colonel Cloete's survey began, the boundary has never been questioned by either side.

B is the point where the Commissioners' award diverges from Colonel Cloete's Honnurhalla line and assumes a north-westerly direction towards D.

C is a prominent point marking the line between B and D.

D is the well-known Karakanavai, as shown by the Atlas sheet of 1833 and by Colonel Cloete but not by Colonel McCullagh's topographical survey of 1884–85. Every hillman in the country side is familiar with this point.

E is a point we have added on Colonel Cloete's accepted line west of D where it takes an abrupt turn to the south on its way to the Mavinhalla.

F is the point where Colonel Cloete's line joins the Mavinhalla, also locally known at this part on the British side as the "Dodhalla."

The points A and F, at either extremity of the Commissioners' line, thus form points of "no dispute."

6. It will simplify matters if we now explain by what means we satisfied ourselves of the identity of the line now laid down with the boundary prescribed by the Commissioners' award.

Point A.—We had not much difficulty in verifying this. It is the point where Colonel McCullagh's Mavinhalla line, *vide* his map, strikes Colonel Cloete's Honnurhalla line and the spot is marked by a ridge running down to the Honnurhalla from the sources of the Mavinhalla. It is also marked by the Mysore fire line which by special agreement on both sides has, for some years past, followed Colonel McCullagh's boundary. The fire line was unmistakeable and was shown to us by Mr. B. Streenivasa Row, Sub-Assistant Conservator, in charge of the range. We further verified the point by measurements up and down the Honnurhalla to streams shown in Colonel McCullagh's map as tributaries the result in each case corresponding exactly with the distance given on the map, the topography of which we may here say, once for all, we found throughout unimpeachable.

Point B.—This we fixed by measurement from A and found the distance in exact agreement with that given on Colonel McCullagh's map signed by the Commissioners. We confirmed the position by a stream which as shown on that map here enters the Honnurhalla from the westward and bisects the circle by which the Commissioners indicate this point.

Point C.—We ascertained this by bearings and distances taken from the Commissioners' map. These followed up on the ground by chain and plane table led us exactly to point C which our surveyors were able to verify further by means of bearings taken of its position with reference to Gopalswamibetta and other important topographical points in Colonel McCullagh's map.

Point D.—This, as said above, is an already well-known point and was very clearly marked by Colonel Cloete in 1874–75 by a large flat stone and this point we fetched by following a line practically identical with that laid down on the Commissioners' map on which however the Kanovai is not shown by Colonel McCullagh who, it is understood, was not aware of its existence at the time of his survey.

7. Having reached D we found it impossible to continue the line from so great a distance as our camp on the Honnurhalla and we therefore came round *viâ* Bandipur, Mudumalai and Benne and pitched camp not far from where we hoped to pick up the other end of Colonel Cloete's line to the westward where it joins the Mavinhalla.

Point E.—We were now working from west to east and had to find F before we could fix E, but having accomplished that we had no further difficulty as we had only to follow Colonel Cloete's stones, and we fixed point E at one of these on the spot where it is shown on our map.

Point F.—This point gave us more trouble than any of the others owing to the unaccountable reticence of our Jain Kurumbar guide, who, however, as we afterwards discovered, knew the whole line from the Mavinhalla to Karakanavai, as did also the Berambadi Kurumbars on the Mysore side. In paragraph 7 of his descriptive memorandum, dated 4th August 1876, *vide* Government Order, No. 2132, dated 22nd December 1876, Colonel Cloete describes this point as being $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles from the junction of the Maragathe Tode with the "Dodhalla" or Mavinhalla. This junction we found easily. As will be seen from our map, it is the Mysore-Nilgiri and Malabar trijunction, but though we searched the banks of the Mavinhalla on both sides carefully for the distance stated, we could find no sign of the point F and our hill people would not help us. Next day we made straight across country for the place where we left off the day before and our Kurumbars, perhaps because they saw we meant business, took us at once to the Sipan tode or "Sipangadde" and showed

us where the first stone should be and there we found it buried in sand at the junction with the "Dodhalla" or Mavinhalla just about the distance from the trijunction stated by Colonel Cloete. There was no room for doubt, Colonel McCullagh's line followed the main stream (Mavinhalla) eastward, Colonel Cloete's line turned up the Sipan tode north-east and we had only to follow the pointers on his stone to find another with "M" and "N" clearly cut on it and, still further on, we reached the stone where we have fixed point E, whence the line follows the Sipanhalla to Karakanavai.

8. *Survey and Demarcation.*—Our instructions were to go over the whole line, that is, the disputed portion settled by the Commission of 1897, and demarcate it with a broad clearing and masonry pillars. We have cleared a line of 33 feet from B to D which no one who re-visits it can possibly mistake, and as it is understood that this will form the basis of the future Mysore fire line, there is a guarantee of its being kept permanently open. We found "masonry pillars" quite impracticable and as there was not time to make a reference, we decided to substitute pillars of dressed granite, 18 inches broad and about 8 or nine inches thick. These have been deeply planted and stand about 4 feet above the ground. On one side is cut "Nilgiris" and on the other "Mysore," while along the top is cut "1897". They are so placed of course as to indicate the direction of the line from and to each stone and are fixed close to survey stones at each of the points A, B, C, D, E, F. In addition to this, the points B, C, D are marked by the Mysore Revenue Survey "Bands", *i.e.*, cairns of turf and stone measuring about 6 feet × 3 feet × 3 feet and pointing up and down the course of the line; these are repaired annually. The Commissioners recommended the demarcation of the D, C, B line only, but we began at A and added E and F to make the line from Karakanavai to the Mavinhalla more definite on the ground. From the Nilgiri trijunction on the east up to A, where the line is water marked by the Kakanhulla and Honnurhalla streams and has moreover never been under dispute, we made no clearing, nor did we clear from A to B where the line also follows the Honnurhalla and has, moreover, been accepted. Again from Karakanavai westwards and southwards we did not clear the boundary, as it is already defined by streams and has been accepted, but we have erected pillars at E and F the principal points. Survey operations were confined to the line B, C, D, because up to B and from D to F the boundary has already been surveyed and the new line can easily be connected with the accepted portions of the old one.

9. *General remarks.*—The country through which this boundary has been laid has, more than once, been referred to in the voluminous correspondence which relates to the dispute as little known or frequented and very feverish. Amongst our chief difficulties were the want of labour and the prevalence of fever, supplies too were scanty and expensive and had far to come. Our people suffered many privations and much discomfort. Mr. D'Lima, Head Surveyor, Madras Survey, was compelled to return to Ootacamund before we finished, as he was completely prostrated by fever. He, however, stuck to his work manfully until point D was reached. Mr. Guru Row Bheemaji, Mysore Revenue Surveyor, deserves favourable mention for the plucky way in which, though an elderly man, he persevered till his services were no longer required. He too suffered much from fever. Mr. Streenivasa Iyengar, Surveyor, Mysore Forest Department, rendered invaluable service. He saw the work out to the end and from first to last, displayed the most praise worthy energy and zeal. The boundary pillars gave us some trouble. To set up masonry pillars in that country and with the labour available would have prolonged operations indefinitely. As it was, we had to get the pillars prepared at Gundulpet. We got them as far as our first camp without any serious difficulty, but there the trouble began and at times it seemed impossible that we should ever succeed in conveying them to the apparently inaccessible points of the boundary where we had to place them.* We succeeded however, and we think they are about as good and durable a form of demarcation as could well be found for the occasion.

* *Note by District Forest-officer, Nilgiris.*—It is only fair to Mr. Ricketts to say that the credit of this achievement is mainly due to his ingenuity and resourcefulness.

10. The services of the Mysore elephants were invaluable, but for them, perhaps, the work could not have been completed this year, certainly not before the most unhealthy season set in.

11. On a previous occasion in connection with this boundary, it was ordered that the District Forest-officer, Nilgiris, should inspect and report annually upon it after its permanent demarcation. This, however, was overlooked and the order has not on this occasion been repeated. We venture to submit that such an inspection would be by no means superfluous as the boundary lies in a distant part of the forest not likely to be regularly visited. We therefore suggest for consideration whether it would not be well to arrange that the boundary as now settled and demarcated be inspected and reported upon in alternate years by the Nilgiri and Mysore Forest-officers, respectively, it being distinctly understood that no controversial matters should be revived but that report should be made to the effect that the line now laid down from A to F has been inspected and found open and in good order or otherwise.

12. An account of all expenditure is in course of preparation and will be submitted as soon as possible.

Endorsement by H. A. STUART, Esq., Acting Collector of Nilgiris, dated 24th January 1898, Ref. on Cur. No. 135-B.

Forwarded.

2. The demarcation has been carried out most successfully and a long pending dispute has at last been settled.

3. Mr. Douglas has been put to heavy expenditure in connection with this special duty and it is recommended that he be granted a deputation allowance.

Endorsement by the Conservator of Forests, Southern Circle, dated Coimbatore, 12th February 1898, No. 3108.

Forwarded.

It is satisfactory, as the Collector remarks, that "a long pending dispute has at last been settled."

2. I hardly see the necessity for the proposed special annual inspection of this settled boundary as it has now been demarcated and surveyed, and will fall in with the rest of the Mysore boundary in that neighbourhood.

Resolution—Forest No. 75, dated 22nd February 1898.

Submitted to Government.

2. In its order No. 466, dated 17th June 1897, the Government accepted the suggestions of the Commissioners appointed in connection with the Mysore-Nilgiri boundary dispute, that the boundary line as settled by them should be permanently demarcated with a broad clearing and masonry pillars. The work was to be carried out by a surveyor to be deputed by the Superintendent, Madras Survey, the details being decided by Messrs. C. G. Douglas and G. E. Ricketts, representing the interests of the Madras Government and the Mysore Durbar respectively.

3. The paper read above contains the joint report of these two officers on the completion of the work in question. The line of the boundary adopted follows that settled by the Boundary Commissioners, but while the clearing of the line has been effected, it has not been found practicable to construct masonry pillars in pursuance of the suggestion of the Commissioners. Pillars of dressed granite are reported to have been fixed instead in such a manner as to indicate the direction of the line from point to point.

4. In paragraph 11 of the joint report it is suggested that the boundary as now settled and demarcated should be inspected and reported on in alternate years by the Nilgiri and Mysore Forest officers respectively. In offering this suggestion the officers refer to the direction given in Government Order, No. 1182, dated 27th July 1878. The Conservator states that, in his opinion, such an inspection is hardly necessary, but the Board agrees with Messrs. Douglas and Ricketts that it is eminently desirable to revive the rule regarding periodical inspections. The pillars are likely to be removed or damaged in various ways, and the cleared line is apt to be overgrown so as to render the discovery of the pillars difficult. It is however observed that the cleared boundary from B to D will probably "form the basis of the future Mysore fire line," and as the joint report indicates, this will provide a guarantee that the line is kept permanently open.

5. The Board notes that the officers and subordinates concerned in this arduous and important work of survey and demarcation have performed their duties very well, and the work has been accomplished with great expedition. The question of granting Mr. Douglas a deputation allowance is raised in the Collector's endorsement, but it has since formed the subject of a separate communication, and will be submitted to Government very shortly.

(True Copy and Extract.)

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

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with two sketch-maps to be returned.

Order—No. 244, Revenue, dated 29th April 1898.

Miscellaneous.

The Government concurs with the Board of Revenue in considering that the boundary line as now settled and demarcated should, as suggested by Messrs. Douglas and Ricketts, be inspected and reported on in alternate years by the Nilgiri and Mysore Forest officers, respectively. The Resident in Mysore will accordingly be requested to ascertain if the Darbar has any objection to accepting the above proposal.

2. The Government also agrees with the Board of Revenue that the work of surveying and demarcating the boundary line has been done well and expeditiously by the officers and subordinates concerned.

3. The following letter will be despatched to the Resident in Mysore.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue),
with two sketch maps returned.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

45 Copies

1898.

RESIDENT IN MYSORE.

From

The Government of Fort St. George.

Recd. } 1898. *Enclosures*

Regd. } *Spare copies*

Letter, No. 245, 29th April 1898.

APRIL.

Informing the Resident in Mysore of the completion of the survey and demarcation of the Nilgiri-Mysore boundary, and inquiring whether the Mysore Darbar has any objection to accepting the suggestion of Messrs. Douglas and Ricketts that the boundary as now settled and demarcated should be inspected and reported on in alternate years by the Nilgiri and Mysore Forest officers, respectively.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

From

The Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, I.C.S.,
Acting Secretary to the Government of Madras,

To

The RESIDENT IN MYSORE,

Dated Ootacamund, 29th April 1898.

Sir,

Adverting to the correspondence ending with your letter, No. 4243, dated 11th October 1897, on the subject of the demarcation of the boundary between Mysore and Nilgiri-Wynaad, I am directed to state that the officers deputed for the work, Messrs. C. G. Douglas and R. E. Ricketts, have, in a joint letter addressed to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated the 13th December 1897, reported the completion of the survey and demarcation of the boundary. It appears that it has not been found practicable to put up masonry pillars as suggested by the Commissioners who settled the line, and that pillars of dressed granite have been fixed instead so as to indicate the direction of the line from point to point.

Miscellaneous.

2. In their joint report, Messrs. Douglas and Ricketts have suggested that the boundary as now settled and demarcated should be inspected and reported on in alternate years by the Nilgiri and Mysore Forest officers, respectively. This suggestion commends itself to His Excellency the Governor in Council, and I am to inquire if the Mysore Darbar has any objection to accepting it. A copy of the marginally-noted Proceedings of this Government in which are embodied the joint report of Messrs. Douglas and Ricketts, and the resolutions of the Board of Revenue thereon, is herewith enclosed for your information.

G.O., No. 244, Revenue, dated 29th April 1898.

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

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

Ext. Shaik Karim.

20 Copies.

G.O. [F. 4] 2,000 – 5 3-98.

Circuit N°927

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following paper:–

Letter from the Resident in Mysore, No. 3058, dated 23rd June 1898:-

In reply to your letter No. 245 Revenue, dated the 29th April last, regarding the demarcation of the boundary between Mysore and Nilgiri Wynaad, I have the honour to state that the Mysore durbar agree to the boundary line as now settled, being inspected and reported on in alternate years by the Nilgiri and Mysore Forest Officers, respectively.

ORDER thereon, No. 2839 Mis., dated 5th July 1898.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue in continu-tion of G.O. No. 244 dated 29th April 1898.

(True Extract)

K Narayanaswamy

for Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue.

" Political Department, with copies of G.Os. 466-7 d/ 17/6/97 & 244-5 d/ 29/4/98.

I.P.R 6.7.98

When given for copying ——
When copied ——
When examined ——
When signed ——
} 189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No. , DATED
189 .

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. 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.