M.R.O. 1—77,606—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 42

(2) Date of repair 4-5-43

(3) Initials of the Referencer

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1198 Press / Mis.

294-295

Dated 27 - 10 - 1873.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 29[illegible]. Read the following letter from H. W LESLEY, Esq., Officiating Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of My to the Hon. R. A. DALYELL, Acting Secretary to Government, Re Department, Fort St. George, dated Bangalore, 23rd August 1873, [illegible],737-23-R:—

In continuation of letter, No. 1,499-16, [illegible]th June 1873, in reply to your letter, dated 22nd May 1873, No. 519-162, I directed by the Chief Commissioner to make the following proposals.

2. From the correspondence of 1800—[illegible] it is clear the British Government had a right to reserve the passes from the low country to the table-land, that is to say, the lines of ascent with a reasonable area on each side; but it does not appear, either from the supplementary treaty or the correspondence which preceded it, that this right was ever exercised. Whether it is necessary or expedient that the passes should now, or at any future period, be [illegible]ed to the British Government is a political question, upon which the Chi[illegible]missioner is not competent to decide without reference to the Government [illegible].

3. The Chief Commissioner would, the[illegible] propose that the duty of the officers, forming the Commission, should b[illegible]ed to the settlement of the boundary by the light of the village accounts, a[illegible]o with reference to undisputed possession for a term of, say, twenty-five yea[illegible].

4. I am to request that Colonel Mc[illegible] be informed whether His Excellency in Council concurs in this vi[illegible].

No. 295. Order thereon, 27th [illegible] 1873, No. 1,198.

Miscellaneous.

[illegible]s Excellency the Governor in Coun[illegible]il resolves to inform the Chief Commissioner that this Government are unable to make over any territory reserved by treaty, and are not disposed to recommend any transfers, except by way of exchange, or to secure a convenient boundary, or for other good and sufficient reason.

2. He observes that the Chief Commissioner's proposals would appear to involve the transfer of reserved tracts without reference to the treaty in all cases in which such lands fall within the accounts of a Mysore village.

3. The letter above recorded will be communicated to the Board of Revenue, who will be requested to obtain and forward, w[illegible] an expression of their own views, any remarks that the Collector of South Cana[illegible]y desire to record on this matter. It will probably be desirable that all do[illegible]ints should be cleared up by inquiry on the spot before the meeting of t[illegible]issioners, and it would be well that the Collector should communicate w[illegible]at once on the subject, in view, if necessary, to the deputati[illegible]s Assistants to the locality for the purpose.

4. Under the foregoing circumst[illegible]roposed meeting of the Commissioners for[illegible]e determination of the b[illegible]st be deferred for the present.

(Tr[illegible]

[illegible]ed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
,, J. Sturrock, Esq.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

24/8/80 A

Nos. 294-295.

Boundary between Canara and Mysore.—Resolving to inform the Chief Commissioner that this Government are unable to make over any territory reserved by treaty, and are not disposed to recommend any transfers, except by way of exchange, etc., and requesting the Board of Revenue to obtain and forward the Collector's remarks on this matter.

CERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA AND INDIAN STATES.

Govt. of India,

REVENUE.

To

The Board of Revenue,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated October 27th.

Read.

Entd.

G. O., 27th October 1873, No. 1,199.

1

Revenue Department,
Ootacamund,
27th October 1873.

No. 1,199.

No. 296.

To

The CHIEF COMMISSIONER of MYSORE.

Miscellaneous.

Sir,—I am desired to acknowledge the receipt of your Officiating Secretary's letter, dated 23rd August 1873, No. 2,757-23-R, and to state that His Excellency the Governor in Council is unable to make over any territory reserved by treaty, and is not disposed to recommend any transfers, except by way of exchange, or to secure a convenient boundary, or for other good and sufficient reason.

2. I am to point out that the proposals contained in the letter under reply would appear to involve the transfer of reserved tracts without reference to the treaty in all cases in which such lands fall within the accounts of a Mysore village.

3. Under the foregoing circumstances, the meeting of the Commissioners for the determination of this boundary must be deferred.

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

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary to Government.

Engd. F. B. Bantleman.

Govt. of India 1873 Madras

REVENUE.

To

THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF MYSORE.

Dated October 27th.

Recd.

Read.

Letter, 27th October 1873, No. 1,192.

OCTOBER.

No. 296.

STATING, in reference to the boundary-dispute between Canara and Mysore, that this Government are unable to make over any territory reserved by treaty, and are not disposed to recommend any transfers, except by way of exchange, etc., and observing that the meeting of the Commissioners for the determination of the boundary must now be deferred.

N: 2757/23 C.

Mysore Chief Commissioner's office

From

The Offg. Secretary to the
Chief Commissioner of Mysore.

To

The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
Fort Saint George.

Dated Bangalore 23rd August 1873.

Sir,

1. In continuation of letter N: 1499/16 of 20th June 1873 in reply to your letter dated 22nd May 1873 N: 519-162, I am directed by the Chief Commissioner to make the following proposals.-

2. From the correspondence of 1800-1801 it is clear the British Government had a right to reserve the passes from the low Country to the table land that is to say the lines of ascent with a reasonable area on each side, but it does not appear either from the supplementary Treaty or the correspondence which preceded

preceded it that this right was ever exercised. Whether it is necessary or expedient that the passes should now or at any future period be ceded to the British Gouernment is a political question upon which the Chief Commissioner is not competent to decide without reference to the Gouernment of India.-

3. The Chief Commissioner would therefore propose that the duty of the officers forming the Commission should be confined to the settlement of the boundary by the light of the Village Accounts and also with reference to undisputed possession for a term of say 25 years.

4. I am to request that Colonel Meade may be informed whether His Excellency in Council concurs in this view.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant

A Wellesley
Offg: Secretary.

HC

G.O. 22 May 73 No 160-62
9 Aug — 44-45
9 — 52-53

Ref
Mysore
Boundary

No 294

From Revenue Dept
The Offg Secretary to Chief Comr.
To The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
Dated 23rd August Fort St George
Despatched No 2607
Received 27 August 73
Enclosures No.
General No. 2757 } 1873-74.
No 23 Rs }

Letter No 1198 - 27 Oct
G.O. No 1198
In continuation of
this Office letter No: 1499 dated
20th June last, states that
the duty of the Officers forming
the Commission should be
confined to the settlement
of the boundary.

C.6. Oct. 93 & 24 Oct
C.5 Sept. 73

No. 255. South Canara Collector's office,
Mangalore, 10th February 1874.

From
H. S. Thomas Esqre,
Collector of South Canara

To
J. Sturrock Esqre,
Ag. Under Secretary to Government.
Revenue Department,
Fort Saint George.

Sir,

In the Proceedings of Government, dated 27th October 1873, No. 1198, I was called upon to address you with reference to the Mysore and South Canara boundary. The main part of the question has however been since disposed of in the subsequent Proceedings of Government, dated 21st November 1873, No. 1286.

2. In support of the reasons assigned in that Order of Government, No. 1286, I may mention in passing that to have settled the boundary by means of village Accounts would have led to the surrender to Mysore of large areas belonging by treaty to the British, for I have had under notice recently a case in which two of the then Tahsildars from Mysore and Canara settled the boundary between them in direct opposition to the terms of the treaty and by the accident of the position of an inland Customs Station on the then Hydernhur Ghat, and the village Accounts have since run according to the Tahsildaree dictum. Other instances also might be enumerated, but they would only serve to shew how much we should be led astray by relying on such very unsatisfactory settlements in lieu of the well defined terms and rational

basis

basis of the treaty.

3. The necessity for a return to the terms of the treaty is the more apparent also in presence of the definite prospect of Mysore being handed over to Native rule.

4 The treaty not only dealt with the general boundary but also with exceptional cases for special purposes so that there is no room for doubt and it only remains to define and apply those terms.

5. Presuming then that the Madras Government Proceedings dated 21st November 873, No 1286, will be accepted as not open to question, I have the honor to state that where the sides of the Ghats are more or less precipitous and face the sea there should be no manner of difficulty in ascertaining the watershed by means of an aneroid barometer, and that this might be done and marked temporarily by a party consisting of an Assistant Collector and Engineering Overseer from Mysore and from South Canara.

6. The only cases in which there would be any room for the exercise of judgment would be where valleys intersect the line of Ghats or hill ridges and run more or less into the table land above them. The question then arises whether the watershed rule should be strictly applied to these valleys also or whether a line should be drawn across them from the summits of the Ghats or mountain ridges which they intersect. I think we can follow neither of these courses exactly.

7. My view is that these valleys are the passes specially pointed to in the treaty, and though they pass the general line of mountain ridge or Ghat, and run well into the table land above, it was specially intended not only that these valleys or passes should be retained in the hands of the British, but that they should be held up to their very heads so that they could not be commanded by a Military enemy or by his fortifications run up in time of peace, but might be kept open or closed by ourselves. It seems then that we should hold all these valleys, for they are obviously the passes through which roads can best be made and troops taken and that we should hold them also as far as ever they may be required for the safe passage of troops. How far this may be is a question for a military man of experience.

8. It should be borne in mind, I think, that the terms of the treaty were laid down by a Soldier for Military purposes; and the best interpreter of the local configuration embraced in those terms should, I think, be a soldier, and such an officer should, I would suggest, be on the Commission.

9. With a view to facilitate the Government Commissioners deciding the whole boundary, the Assistants and Engineer subordinate above proposed might go along it and lay before the Commissioners a map shewing the watershed about which they had no doubt and all the passes which were open questions.

10. But Assistants doing this would occupy all the healthy months of one year before they could

could submit their map and the Commission would be necessarily delayed thereby and the time is too far advanced for any thing to be done before this Monsoon.

11 It would be better perhaps that the Commissioners should themselves go over the line accompanied by Apestaun and others who would ascertain the watershed and mark and map their decision as they passed along.

12. In connection with the Mysore boundary question is the Coorg boundary matter, Coorg also being under the charge of the Commissioner of Mysore and the demarcation of both boundaries having been simultaneously commenced by the Mysore Authorities, and I take this opportunity to ascertain your views as to whether it is not time for us to demand the annexation of Coorg to the District of South Canara, and whether this will not be both the simplest and most satisfactory way of deciding the Coorg boundary question - I believe that because Mysore and Coorg were two adjoining native states at the commencement of the British Rule in India they were placed under the same commission which administered the territories under the direct orders of the Government of India - When Coorg was conquered it should properly have been annexed to the rest of the adjoining British territory, but as the country was previously under British officers

in

in the Mysore Commission and as the Madras Government probably did not move in the matter it still continued to be ruled by the same Commission - But this state of things cannot continue much longer, for when Mysore is made over to the Rajah on his attaining his age the small province of Coorg in the vicinity of the Madras Presidency cannot well be administered from Calcutta - The direct administration from Calcutta of a small detached area equal to about two of our ordinary Talukhs in the middle of the Madras Presidency would be too absurd.

13. Seeing then that the transfer of this little plot of territory to the Madras Presidency must be made shortly, the question arises whether the time for the transfer has not fully come.

14. I understand that in view to the transfer of Mysore to Native rule, measures have been taken to make the change of administration less abrupt.

15. On similar grounds the transfer of Coorg to Madras rule should I think be made under its present staff of officers some years prior to the change of administration in Mysore so that all references that might from time to time become necessary might be cleared up and exhausted before we had to deal with Native rulers, for much information about Coorg administration is doubtless at the Mysore Commissioner's head quarters and not only in the office of the Superintendent at Mercara.

16. Furthermore

16. Furthermore it is highly desirable that Madras rule should be thoroughly established in Coorg and the minds of the people habituated to it and at rest before we are liable to be in presence of disturbing elements arising out of the lax or corrupt rule of native neighbours.

17. That Coorg with its warlike inhabitants and a native governed neighbour will some day be a rather delicate charge I have little doubt- It is only prudent therefore that we should provide for it betimes.

18. This provision might be made by Coorg becoming the Sub Collectorate of South Canara which would not by the addition be made larger than other Collectorates or larger than it was before the transfer of North Canara to the Bombay Presidency and though part of it borders on Malabar, that District is already too large.

19. If Coorg were thus annexed to South Canara, the present Coorg boundary question which is being again pressed on me would disappear.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obed Servant

H. Thomas
Collector

No 11

1874 Dy 4th

From

The Collector of Canara

To

The Sr. Under Secretary to Govt.

Sir,

Dy Ext 10 } Feby 1874
Nos }

I have &c

(Sd) [illegible]

No 255-
Enclosure.

Re submitting certain papers connected with the demarcation of the disputed boundary between the Canara and Bijapore Districts.

RLM

Extract from a letter to C. R. Cotton Esqre, Commissioner, dated 26 November 1839, addressed by E. Maltby Esqre, Ag Principal Collector of Canara

20. In accordance with your request I forward separate accounts for the Magany of Jal Hannur in the Kundapur Taluk exhibiting its land assessment, its exports and the prices obtained by the Ryots for their garden produce. From this Taluk not having been under my superintendence, I am not personally acquainted with the state of the gardens, but the favorable circumstances in which the Hunnur Magany is placed give its inhabitants considerable advantage in the disposal of their produce and render their condition more prosperous than the generality of the betel nut cultivators

21. This Magany is properly a portion of the Sauger Ikery Taluk and was formerly granted in Inam by the Sovereigns of Nuggar to the Devasthan at Coloor below the Ghauts. Consequently when Canara came into our possession in 1799 and the Devasthan Enams were resumed, endowments of money being granted in their stead, a Kasdick was assigned from this Treasury to the Coloor Devasthan and the collection of the land revenue and the general management of Hunnur were undertaken by the Canara Authorities. The accounts of the province therefore shew the annual settlements from Faslky 1210 until the present year

The case is now very different. In commuting the Cash Jins

22. The Hawlet and Sayer duties remained however under the Mysore Government until Faslky 1234 when a correspondence commenced on the subject and these duties were finally made over to Canara. The loss of the Huzur records renders me unable to detail the correspondence, but it appears that a Custom House was not established, and the Canara System regularly introduced until Faslky 1237 since which period I am able to send an account of the yearly collections

23. The inhabitants state that their condition has deteriorated since the fall of the large neighbouring city of Nuggar which formerly afforded a market for their produce and contributed to

the

the prosperity of the surrounding country. But notwithstanding this circumstance which has doubtless had unfavorable results, the Magany exhibits a solitary instance of the cultivation of Betelnut having been encouraged by higher prices being now obtained, than at the commencement of our rule in Fasly 1210. The variation in the price are exhibited in the statement, and I attribute their increase to the transference of the Hawlut duties from Mysore to this District joined to the excellent quality of the Betelnut.

24. The Betelnut of Ilkey Sauger is of so superior a description that it successfully competes with the produce of Sonda and Bkelpe in the Bellary and Cuddapa markets notwithstanding that it is burthened in the first instance with a heavier Hawlut duty and has to pay custom a second time in entering a Company's district. The difference in the Nuggar and Canara Hawlut is exhibited in the margin and you will perceive that Hunnur has obtained considerable advantages to its pepper and betelnut by its annexation to Canara. These advantages are two fold, 1st the actual difference in the Canara and Mysore duties, and 2nd by the exemption from a second demand in Bellary and Cuddapa on the production of a Canara Rowannah, circumstances which are amply sufficient to account for the comparative high prices which these ryots obtain.

Duties on Betelnut &c. per candy of 560 lbs in Mysore & Canara

Article	Mysore duty Rs. As. P.	Canara duty Rs. As. P.
1st Sort Betelnut	15. 11. 11.	12. . .
2d — Ditto —	10. 9. 6.	10. 8. .
3d — Ditto —	5. 11. 6.	6. . .
Pepper —	19. 8. 7.	6. . .
Cardamoms (per maund)	2. 4. 8	5. 10. .

25. Under these favorable circumstances the cultivation of Betelnut has doubtless had a tendency to increase rather than diminish especially as the annual settlements have been made with much indulgence, but the absence of accounts puts it out of my power to forward any statements shewing the extent of land occupied by gardens at different periods. I regret this inability, as the extent of ground under cultivation cannot be judged of by the exports which vary according to the season, and the success with which smuggling is carried on from the neighbouring Mysore villages. The representations of the Nuggur authorities shew that large quantities of betelnut are clandestinely imported in order that it may be finally sold as the produce of Hunnur and subjected to the Canara instead of the Mysore Hawlut.

19

Comp'd

Extract from a letter to the Ag. Principal Collector of Canara from C. R. Cotton Esqre. Commissioner, dated Fort St. George 20th June 1839.

Sir,

1. With reference to Mr. Blair's letters of the 9th and 16th January last, I have the honor to request you to oblige me by furnishing the best information in your power on the following points

2. It is stated by Mr. Blair that there has been a great increase in the cultivation of Wet lands in Canara but on a reference to the statement of exports by sea the quantity of rice exported from the District in late years does not much exceed that exported at earlier periods. The statement does not distinguish the produce of Canara from that of Mysore or other Districts and I shall be obliged to you to complete the account in that respect if possible and to state the grounds of the opinion which has been formed regarding the extended cultivation of the District.

3. I am very anxious to receive from you a full report on the past and present condition of the garden Lands of the upper and lower Districts (of the Mogany of Yál Hannur in the Sundapur Taluk separately) together with Statements shewing their comparative extent land value and the quantities of produce exported by Land as well as by Sea and the rates of Land assessment and Sayer, now and at any former periods, distinguishing the amount of decreased Revenue which may be attributed to decrease of cultivation and produce, from that resulting from reduced rates of demand.

Comp. 21

No. 727. South Canara Collector's Office
Mangalore 21st April 1874.

27

From

H. S. Thomas Esqre
Collector of South Canara.

To

J. Sturrock Esqre
Ag Under Secretary to Government
Fort St. George.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No. 255 dated 10th February 1874, I should mention that I am not aware whether the Government has received or expects any further communication from the Commissioner of Mysore, on proposes that the correspondence on the Mysore and Canara boundary question should end with the Proceedings of Government No. 1198 dated 27th October 1873, because in the latter case the result will be that Mysore will continue to hold, only undemarcated, all the land which she wished to demarcate, because in her village accounts though against the treaty.

2. Mysore thus holds not a little land to the seaward of the watershed

and of the heads of the passes-
-land which should belong to
Canara and the Madras Govern-
=ment; and I would suggest
that the present discussion
should not be allowed to
drop with the above quoted
Proceedings but should be con-
=ducted to an issue in the
final settlement of the disputed
boundary.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obed.t Servt

H. Thomas.
Collector

No 2757
23 R.

Mysore Chief Commissioner's Office

From
The Offg. Secretary to the
Chief Commissioner of Mysore.

To
The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
Fort Saint George

Dated, Bangalore 23 August 1873.

Sir,

In continuation of letter No. 1499 of 20th June 1873 in reply to your letter dated 22 May 1873 No. 519-162, I am directed by the Chief Commissioner to make the following proposals.—

2. From the correspondence of 1800-1804, it is clear the British Govt had a right to reserve the passes from the low country to the table land, that is to say the lines of ascent with a reasonable area on each side, but it does not appear either from the Supplementary Treaty or the correspondence which preceded it that this right was ever exercised — Whether it is necessary or expedient that the passes should now or at any future period be ceded to the British Govt is a political question upon which the Chief Commissioner is not competent to decide without reference to the Govt of India.

The

1874 Sept 5

From
The Collector of South Canara
To
The Offg Secretary to Govt
Revenue Department

Dated 2nd Sept 1874
No 210

Enclosures Rec.

Copy of Secretary to Government's letter No. 2757 dated 23rd August 1873 with the proceedings of the Chief Commissioner of Mysore, & the Government Resolution thereon.

Submitted with a recommendation that the proposal of the Chief Commissioner of Mysore to cede to the Government of Madras the Pass of Palghaut be carried into effect.

[illegible]

3. The Chief Commr. would therefore propose that the duty of the officers forming the Commission should be confined to the settlement of the boundary by the light of the village accounts and also with reference to undisputed possession for a term of say 25 years.

4. I am to request that Col: Meade may be informed whether His Excellency in Council concurs in this view.

I have &c.

(signed) H. Wellesley

Offg. Secretary.

My dear Stamford

Pride has let me hear from
Weis about the Kootenai link
Came from Bryan - St Mark
also a letter from the Kootenai.

Yours

O. H. Baldwin

8/9/73

S. Stamford Esq
with the Pleasure

2607

Ja Nos 1198, 1199

No 2607

Circulated for notes with reference to No 2094
and the memorandum thereon recorded

It will be seen that
while the Chief Com. of
Inquiries admits that the
correspondence between 1803
1804 makes it clear that
the British Govt had a
right to reserve all the
passes from British Territory
to the Inquisne Table land,
but that he is of opinion
that as this right was
never acted upon, the
Boundary Commission should
determine the line between
the two countries with
reference to the village

We are in complete
to make an any
territory entered by
treaty - and I do
not see why we
should - & could by
way of Exchange
to secure a Conv.
ient boundary for
the Ci Kan post route.
Col Macleod has stated
would seem to involve

the

accounts and undisputed possession for say 25 years.

DLG

Perhaps before doing so however, it would be as well to hear the views of the Govt of India in the Political question of securing the Heads of the Passes. If this is to be done there is little chance of the Commission being able to get to work in first week

the transfer - with reference to the Treaty - in all cases - they may be few, or many - in which case a defined tract

for in this the accounts of a village that have fallen & Ground to long to this? I would GL put them first to

I DL

Paper with Mr Wilson - the "Hope Civil" was secured

33

Mem Relative
- and the territory required
& the Pleiad to secure the
head of the Passes and present
impression on our territory - I
to treat on this other basis for the
matter to be of great political
importance in future on the upper
line of Peers
DLG

Revenue Dept.

No. 1198.

35

Pros. of the Madras Govt.

Under date the 27th Octr. 1873.

Read the following letter from the Offg. Secy. to the Chf. Commr., Mysore.

Stating that the duty of the officers forming the Commission to settle the boundary dispute between Canara & Mysore should be confined to the settlement of the boundary.

H.G. 23 Augt. 1873. No. 2757/23 R.

His Excellency the Governor in Council resolves to inform the Chief Commr. that the Govt. are unable to make over any territory reserved by treaty and are not disposed to recommend any transfers except by way of exchange, or to secure a convenient boundary,

Memo for Orders

Boundary dispute between Mysore & Canara.

Circ

2607

Council with the original and the other Memo

Thanks for the special procedure in the 5th Instant

c. 5 Sept. 73 R. 14 Oct. 73

boundary or for other good and sufficient reason.

2. He observes that the Chief Commissioner's proposals would appear to involve the transfer of reserved tracts without reference to the treaty in all cases in which such lands fall within the accounts of a Mysore Village.

3. The letter above recorded will be communicated to the Board of Revenue who will be requested to obtain and forward with an expression of their own views any remarks that the Collector of South Canara may desire to record on this matter.

It will probably be desirable that all doubtful points should be cleared up by enquiry on the spot, before the meeting of the Comrs; and it would be well that the Colr should communicate with Mr Stuwart at once on ~~any such matters~~ the subject, in view, if necessary, to the deputation of one of his Assts to the locality for the purpose.

Under the foregoing circumstances the proposed meeting of the Comrs for the determination of the boundary must be deferred for the present.

The Board of Revenue.
J. Stuwart Esqr " "

Last from orders inserted.

He only memorandum to Mr J Stuwart sent to Mysore 30/8/60

G O 11

Boundary dispute between Mysore and Canara.

Council

Despatch under

Letter of 3rd July

Rev: Dept.

No 1199

To

The Chief Commissioner
of Mysore.

Sir,

I am desired to acknowledge the receipt of your Offg: Secretary's letter dated 23 Augt. 1873. No. 2757/23 R, and to state that His Excellency the Governor in Council is unable to make over any territory reserved by treaty and is not disposed to recommend any transfers except by way of exchange, or to secure a convenient

boundary

boundary, or for other good and sufficient reason.

2. I am to point out that the proposals contained in the letter under reply would appear to involve the transfer of reserved tracts without reference to the treaty in all cases in which such lands fall within the accounts of a Mysore village.

Jul *

* 3. Under the foregoing circumstances, the meeting of the Comrs for the determination of the boundary must be deferred

WMD.

Copied in Mrs Copy sent to Mrs

Acknowledged 29th October 73

42
21

To
The Chf. Comm.r
Mysore