

1. No. of Vol. 38
2. Date of issue 1948
3. Name of the Editor

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

Government of Madras

Public Relations Department

Copy No. 123
Date of issue 1948

For 10 to 15 days of each month

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
30th May 1876.*

No. 315. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 11th April 1876, No. 983 :—

Read the following letter from Lieut.-Colonel W. H. HESSEY, Acting Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chopank, 9th February 1876, No. 420-14 :—

In G.O., No. 1,170, of the 2nd August 1875, the Government sanctioned the Board's recommendation that the Revenue Survey should demarcate and survey the boundary line between Coimbatore and Cochin as laid down in the Trigonometrical Survey map and decided by Government in 1854, leaving the Cochin Government to determine whether they will accept or contest that demarcation when the representatives of both Governments are able to meet on the spot.

2. I have the honor to enclose copy of reports from Lieutenant-Colonel Cloete, the Deputy Superintendent of No. 1 Revenue Survey, on the progress made in demarcating the line in question.

3. Commencing from Vengoli Peak 18½ miles of boundary line have been completed. Heavy clearing was required nearly the whole way; where rivers and streams were followed chain lines only were cut; where there was no natural boundary a clear way was felled through the forest, and the line of boundary marked permanently with stone. Lieutenant-Colonel Cloete draws attention to the great want of correctness in Ward and Connor's map and to the discrepancies between the recorded bearings and distances and the map supposed to have been compiled from them.

4. In explanation of these inaccuracies and discrepancies he suggests that the country was roughly sketched in, and that the bearings and distances were afterwards taken from the map so prepared and entered in the specification.

5. He has submitted a map marked A, showing the line according to Ward and Connor's survey and the actual state of the country according to the survey now made, together with the line as marked as far as Kallianipandal. The following places between Vengoli Peak and Kallianipandal have been identified :—Shaklakund, Palakadavu Amman, Palakadavu River, Sitakal, Palagumar stream, Chonikal, and Sholayar.

6. From Kallianipandal the features of the ground are reported to be so utterly misrepresented both in the old map and in the descriptive memoir that it was found impossible to proceed. It was not thought advisable to mark and survey an arbitrary line ending in a point that could not be identified.

7. Lieutenant-Colonel Cloete considers it improbable that any objection to the line now marked will be made by Cochin, as almost all the valuable timber has been included within the boundary of that State. He states, however, that there is a strong feeling among the resident hill tribes that a large tract of valuable country belonging to Coimbatore has, by the demarcation now performed, been given to Cochin.

8. Perhaps the proved incorrectness of the map, on the authority of which the Government decided the boundary (see G.O., No. 630, of 2nd June 1854), may be considered sufficient to warrant investigation into the Coimbatore claim.

9. If the line from Vengoli Peak up to Kalianipandal is to hold good it would, as Lieutenant Colonel Cloete suggests, be advisable that the representatives of Cochin and Travancore should meet an officer deputed by Government and decide on the tri-junction point of the three territories. That point once determined there would probably be no difficulty in agreeing on a line between it and Kalianipandal as there is no valuable timber near the line.

10. The Deputy Conservator of Forests is of opinion that that part of the Anamalais is healthy throughout the year, but that during the south-west monsoon work is impracticable in consequence of the severity of the weather. The south-west monsoon is the only healthy time in the lower ranges.

11. I have the honor to request that the orders of Government may be solicited regarding the completion of the demarcation during the later months of the year. I also beg that I may be informed whether the line already demarcated is to be considered permanent or not.

12. The work was commenced by Sub-Assistant Russell in August; Captain Freeth, 1st Assistant Superintendent, inspected the work in September, and again on the 12th October proceeded to the Hills and remained there sketching, triangulating, and generally supervising operations till the 20th December 1875.

13. Mr. Douglas, the Deputy Conservator of Forests, was with the party for the greater part of the time. He placed a Forester and a gang of Kadars at the disposal of the survey; without the assistance thus rendered by Mr. Douglas nothing in the way of demarcation could have been accomplished.

14. No representative of Cochin was present, nor was assistance of any kind given by that State.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From Lieutenant Colonel J. G. CLOETE, Deputy Superintendent No. 1 Revenue Survey, to Lieutenant Colonel W. H. HESSEY, Acting Superintendent of Revenue Survey, dated Coimbatore, 28th January 1876, No. 59-34.

I have the honor to submit report on the demarcation and survey of the Cochin-Coimbatore boundary on the Anamalais performed during the past season in accordance with the orders of Government, No. 1,170, of the 2nd August 1875.

1. Work was commenced by Sub-Assistant Mr. Russell in August; he returned from the Hills on the 16th December.

2. Captain Freeth, 1st Assistant Superintendent, inspected the work in September, and again proceeded to the Anamalais on the 12th October exploring, sketching, triangulating, and supervising till the 20th December.

3. Mr. Douglas, Deputy Conservator of Forests, was with the party for a great portion of the time, and he placed a Forester and a gang of Kadars and some axe-men at our entire disposal; without these we could have done nothing.

4. No Cochin representative was present at any time during the operations, nor did we receive assistance of any kind from that State.

5. Our orders were to "demarcate" and survey the line as laid down in the map and decided by Government in 1854.

6. These orders it was found extremely difficult to carry out, chiefly owing to the incorrectness of the map which we were ordered to follow. The accompanying plan shows Ward and Connor's boundary and that now surveyed by us, and the sketch attached shows how we were

forced to discontinue operations at the point called Kalianipandal; the sketching on the map, which was to be our guide, being absolutely wrong between that point and the Travancore tri-junction.

7. After Vengoli Peak the first two points identified were "Sheklakund," a small hill, and "Palakadavu Amman," an upright stone about four feet high near the bank of the river of that name and close to "Anamalaicheri." The two places are named by Ward and Connor, and the points shown by the hill-men as bearing those names agree with Ward and Connor's description. Further, the measured distance between these two points is about the same as that given in the old survey, although the bearing between them somewhat differs.

8. These two points having been satisfactorily identified, and the line between them cleared, the work was taken on from both ends of this line eastwards from the Amman stone along the Palakadavu river according to the map and description of the boundary, and northwards from "Sheklakund," following Ward and Connor's bearings and distances exactly and laying them down on the ground.

9. This northern line was thus carried on till within a mile of Vengoli, when it was found that if continued further it would pass Vengoli and end nearly a mile beyond and below it in the leased forest.

10. Ward and Connor had there to be abandoned, and the boundary was carried straight up a ridge to Vengoli (*Vide map*.)

11. Had we known in time how incorrect the specification of the boundary was we would probably not have attempted to follow it so closely.

12. Following the river from the Amman stone we find the old map and the specification widely wrong; this large river, the Palakadavu, being shown a mile to the north of its proper position, and the Palaginar stream which flows into it nearly a mile to the west.

13. From this and from other vast discrepancies afterwards discovered, seeing also that in some cases impossible straight lines of 1 or 1½ miles long were specified, Captain Freeth came to the conclusion that the country about there (details and boundaries) was roughly sketched and that the bearings and distances were afterwards taken from the map so prepared and entered in the specification. I think that this surmise is correct, and that it is in fact the only conclusion that can be arrived at.

14. One other remark regarding this specification or description of the boundary which we had attempted to follow. It says that two furlongs north-west from the Amman stone on the Palakadavu river we reach the point of union of these two taluqs with Foreign territory, is in a direct line nearly twenty miles south-east from the Amman and the nearest part of the taluq boundary is twelve miles away.

15. Eastwards from the Amman there was for some distance no doubt as the map clearly shows that the Palakadavu river forms the boundary, but the point where the line should leave the river and turn southwards was difficult to determine.

16. Sitakal, a point named by Ward and Connor, was shown by the hill-men, but some way further down the river than the position assigned to it by Ward and Connor.

The line is described as following a stream flowing into the Palakadavu, and from the description of the country it was determined to follow the stream named Palaginar in our map, that being the only one which flows into the Palakadavu near the end of Ward and Connor's river line.

17. This stream was followed to its source over the table-land described in the old memoir, along a foot-path down to Chorikal on the banks of the Sholayar.

18. Regarding the identification of the point called Chorikal there appears to be no doubt, though the old map places it a mile east of its proper position.

19. From Chorikal again there is no doubt, for the large river Sholayar is given as the boundary. (The very great difference between the correct flow of this river as now ascertained by the survey and as shown in the old map is noteworthy.)

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
30th May 1876.*

21. The river was followed from Chorikal to Kallianipandal, a point named by Ward and Connor and identified on the ground.

22. Beyond this the features of the country are so utterly misrepresented both in the old map and the descriptive memoir that it was found impossible to proceed; it was not thought advisable in the absence of a Cochin representative to mark and survey an arbitrary line ending in a point which could not be identified.

23. The country was well explored by Captain Froeth and Mr. Douglas, and a sketch made by the former officer is attached.

24. Ward and Connor say that from Kallianipandal the boundary is along a nullu (five miles up to a point called Paneymaidkutta or Udumantund, and the old map agrees with the description and shows the latter point as situated on a ridge overlooking the Vedamalaisar. Now there is no nullu more than half a mile long near Kallianipandal, and there is a high range of hills running east and west half-way between the Sholayar and the Vedamalaisar over which it is impossible any stream could run. Paneymaidkutta or Udumantund, said by Ward and Connor to be one and the same place, are assigned two distinct positions some distance apart by the local tribes, and the former, or Paneymaid, is pointed out as being close down on the banks of the Vedamalaisar instead of on a high ridge above.

25. Under these circumstances the orders of Government are required as to what further action should be taken.

26. It is improbable that any objection to the line now marked will be made by Cochin, almost all the valuable timber near having been included into that State; but on the part of Coimbatore there is a very strong feeling among the resident hill tribes that a large tract of valuable country belonging to Coimbatore has been by this demarcation given to Cochin.

The proved incorrectness of the map on which Government decided this boundary (No. 630, 27th June 1854) may be considered sufficient to justify a reconsideration of this order and to warrant an investigation into the Coimbatore claims.

27. But if the line we have marked up to Kallianipandal is to hold good, I would suggest that the representatives of Cochin and Travancore be requested to meet Coimbatore and decide on the junction point of the three territories; that determined there would probably be no difficulty in agreeing on a line between that point and Kallianipandal, as there is no valuable timber near the line.

28. The Deputy Conservator is of opinion that that part of the Anamalais is healthy throughout the year, and indeed that, owing to the severity of the weather and the leeches, we could not work there during the south-west monsoon, which is the only healthy time in the lower parts of the hills.

29. The whole length of line completed this season is 18½ miles, more than half of which has been checked by triangulation.

Heavy clearing was required nearly the whole way. Where rivers and streams were followed we only cut chain lines, but even this was hard work, the growth always being dense along the streams.

30. Where there was no natural boundary to follow a clear way was felled through the forest ten to thirty feet wide, and this can with very little trouble be kept open; these lines have also been marked permanently with stone.

* See Colonel Clarke's letter, No. 38-40, of 31st January 1875.

31. Rupees 2,358-11-2½ was expended by the Forest Department as below:—

	RS.	A.	P.
Clearing boundary line	1,238	13	8
Hutting	445	0	6
Machinists, Gunblades, Arrack, Pappalmen opening paths, pay of kadars, Mootars, &c.	674	4	0
Total	2,358	11	2½

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
30th May 1876.*

From Lieutenant-Colonel J. G. CLOETE, Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to Lieutenant-Colonel W. H. HESSEY, Acting Superintendent of Revenue Survey, dated Coonoor, 2nd February 1876, No. 101-46.

REFERENCE. Your Memorandum, No. 2,495-162, dated 30th August 1875, on the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 2,362, dated 23rd August 1875, directing to submit a statement showing the pay, &c., of the men that may be employed on Cochin frontiers at the end of each season.

In continuation of this office letter, No. 79-34, dated 28th January 1876, has the honor to enclose a statement showing the amount of pay, &c., of the men employed on Cochin frontiers.

Statement showing the Cost incurred in Surveying the District Boundary between Coimbatore and Cochin.

Particulars.	Amount.	Total.	Remarks.
	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	
Pay and batta of Mr. Russell and of his Peons from August to December 1875	1,293	1	4
Pay of Captain Froeth, Assistant Superintendent of Revenue Survey, from October to December 1875	1,958	15	8
	3,252	1	0
Pay of a Demarcation Peon	7	0	0
		3,259	1 0

(True Copies.)

CHEPAUK,
9th February 1876.

(Signed) W. H. HESSEY,
Ag. Supt., Revenue Survey.

Enclosure No. 2.—Korty Maps.

From A. WEDDERBURN, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 21st February 1876, No. 48.

I HAVE the honor to forward copy of a letter to my address, dated 16th February 1876, from Mr. Douglas, Deputy Conservator, Anamalai, regarding the recent demarcation of the sanctioned boundary between Coimbatore and the Cochin territory. Mr. Douglas has enclosed a copy of the Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey's letter to his official superior on the same subject—none having been sent to me by that department.

2. When Government ordered in 1854 a certain boundary to be observed, it was doubtless under the impression that that boundary had been correctly delineated, but so far from this being the case, it seems that in some parts eye sketches were substituted, and unmeasured points deduced therefrom, and that the line, in some cases, is simply impracticable.

3. Under such circumstances, the decision of Government seems to be open to reconsideration, based as it was on incorrect data.

4. When Mr. Douglas personally informed me of the valuable interests that were involved, I advised him to have a sketch made of the land, which local tradition and actual occupation might have assigned to Coimbatore, and which the following of the map might show to be otherwise apportioned—that Government might be aware of the extent of the land in dispute. This sketch appears to be referred to in paragraph 23 of the Deputy Superintendent's letter.

5. It would, therefore, seem just that the true or natural line of demarcation should be settled by arbitration, seeing that it is impossible of ascertainment by the prescribed mode of following the old map.

No. 313.

FORWARDED to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue.

Ootacamund, (Signed) R. H. BEDDOME, Lieut.-Colonel,
23th February 1876. Conservator of Forests.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From C. G. DOUGLAS, Esq., Deputy Conservator of Forests, Anamalai Range, to A. WEDDERBURN, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, dated 16th February 1876, No. 1.

You are already aware that the identification of the Coimbatore-Cochin boundary had to be abandoned at Kallianipandal, a place on the banks of the Sholayar about five miles north of Punnimadkuthu, the Cochin, Coimbatore, and Travancore tri-junction.

2. I have the honor to address you now on the subject, as the circumstances which induced me to take this step may appear of sufficient importance to warrant a reference to Government with the view of reviving the claims of Coimbatore to a magnificent stretch of forest assigned to the Cochin State in 1854.

3. A Cochin representative not being available, the commencement of work was sanctioned without one (*vide* G. O. No. 1170, dated 2nd August 1875, Revenue Department), and I was instructed to identify as clearly as possible the line shown in the map. I accordingly adopted for guidance Messrs. Ward and Connor's Memoir of the Survey of 1820, from which the map is supposed to be compiled, and resolved to adhere as closely as practicable to the description of the boundary which it contains. My reasons for so doing were, (1) because the memoir is one of the chief authorities quoted in the discussion which took place in 1854, (2) because on a previous occasion when employed on similar duty with Mr. Stevenson, the Conservator of Cochin Forests, it was evident that great reliance is placed on the document by the State, and (3) because I considered that by no other means could any inadequacy be so satisfactorily demonstrated.

4. From what follows it will be seen that in spite of grave discrepancies found in the memoir, the attempt to lay down a line as nearly as possible coinciding with the one shown in the map was persevered in, and only discontinued when an insurmountable difficulty presented itself.

5. I shall now proceed to explain the progress of the settlement and what led to its abrupt conclusion.

6. For the reasons given in my report which accompanies the accounts of expenditure, work began on the western portion of the line, between Vengoli Peak and the Palakadava River. Having identified the spot on the river bank where the boundary proceeds northwards to Vengoli a line was cleared in exact accordance with the bearings and distances specified in the memoir. This brought us to within a mile of Vengoli, when it became evident that if the memoir were followed further we should be led past that point, which by the way is the Cochin, Malabar and

Coimbatore tri-junction, and down into the forest leased from the Kolangode Nambdy, in Malabar, a mile and more beyond. Desiring to confer with the Cochin representative, I postponed closing this part of the line, but as no such officer ever made his appearance, I took it up to the Peak the nearest and easiest way, after all other work had been finished.

7. The memoir was next found to be in error as to the distance between the two points at which the boundary is said to quit the Palakadava River, in the one case for Vengoli Peak, and in the other for Chorical.

8. It was also found that the memoir described straight lines of a mile and upwards in length which from the nature of the country where they are supposed to have been surveyed are sheer impossibilities. Yet the memoir professes to give bearings and distances with precision.

9. The memoir also alludes to the taluk boundary of Pollachi and Oodumulpettah, and states that it meets the Cochin boundary at a spot which is 20 miles northwest of the real "point of union."

10. Finally, on reaching Kallianipandal and proceeding to explore the country carefully between the rivers Sholayar and Vedamalajar, we failed to discover the stream which, according to map and memoir, is supposed to connect Punnimadkuthu, near the latter, with Kallianipandal on the banks of the former stream. As might be expected, between two such large rivers, there is a lofty watershed which, it is evident, the Surveyors of 1820 never heard of, much less had the trouble of climbing, or they would not have fallen into such an error. I was at one time prepared to accept a line defined by two streams flowing from the watershed in opposite directions, if such could be found, and provided the line thus formed did not too widely differ from the one in the map. The search was fruitless, and I only mention it to show that "the general accuracy" of the map was not hastily impugned. A better description of this part of the country, supported by sketches drawn by Captain Prooth, will be found in Colonel Clere's official report to the Superintendent, Revenue Survey. Considering that my instructions had, so far, been fulfilled, and that I had no authority to lay down a line on my own responsibility, there seemed no help for it, but to abandon farther operations.

11. Briefly stated, the ground on which the award of 1854 rested was "the general accuracy" of the Great Trigonometrical map. There was no local investigation, and the decision is thus referred to by the Collector of Coimbatore in a letter, dated 11th November 1854, No. 140, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue: "Those best acquainted with the forest I believe regard as defective and unsatisfactory the conclusions arrived at by Captain Horsley with respect to the boundary line, by which a large tract hitherto considered to belong to Coimbatore was last year made over to the Cochin State."

12. The Board of Revenue in their Proceedings of 17th March 1853, thus sum up the case:—

"Possession of the tract appears in favor of Coimbatore supported both by local tradition and the testimony of the present inhabitants; the claim on the part of Cochin rests more prominently upon the Trigonometrical map and memoir having given the territory to that State."

"The general accuracy of this map has been established and deferred to in the boundary disputes with the Kolangode Nambdy and between Tanorelly and Travancore; and in a reference which the Board have made to the memoir of Captain Ward while employed on the survey, they are unable to find any mention of a dispute as to boundary in the locality now in question."

13. Under these circumstances, the Board would have at once recommended a surrender of Government claims, but for the existence of a dotted line which denoted in their opinion a doubtful boundary and gave much countenance to the Coimbatore claim, supported as it was by local testimony, actual possession, and the opinion of Captain Michael who from an intimate knowledge of the locality might be considered to possess peculiar advantages of arriving at a right conclusion. It was therefore suggested that an officer enjoying the confidence of both Governments should be appointed who should be empowered, if unable to assign the whole tract

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
30th May 1876.*

to either party, to fix a new boundary and give a portion to each. This proposal received the sanction of Government and Captain Horsley was selected as the fittest officer available.

14. The result of Captain Horsley's investigation is recorded in paragraph 2 of Extract from Minutes of Consultation of June 1854. He held no local inquiry, did not even visit the disputed tract, because it would have taken him away from his proper duties for six weeks at the busiest time of year instead of a fortnight as supposed by the Board.

15. The dotted line he pronounced to be no indication of a disputed boundary but the southern limit of the Nemarray Taluq in Cochin "as laid down in the great map of Cochin prepared from the Survey of Ward and Connor, and from which the printed map is reduced." He points out that while disputes in other places are noticed, no mention occurs in the memoir of a dispute near Anamalai Chary.

16. The Board agree with Captain Horsley's views, and the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, in consideration of previous correspondence on this subject, expressed himself amply satisfied in the conclusion at which that officer had arrived, and could not perceive that, under the circumstances, any advantage would result from Captain Horsley's personally inspecting the boundary, and so resolved to confirm the line laid down in the Great Trigonometrical map.

17. Thus, actual possession, local testimony, and the opinion of Captain Michael, who appears to have been the only European officer on the Coimbatore side possessed of any real local knowledge, were not considered of sufficient weight to counterbalance views which, so far as the Government order shows, were not derived from any special familiarity with the places or people concerned, but from a belief in the accuracy of the map.

18. But a searching investigation must have led to different results.

19. It could only be upon the assumption that the boundary had been laid down by Messrs. Ward and Connor on the spot, and that the details of the survey were substantially correct, that any importance could be attached to the fact that the memoir contains no record of the dispute, for it would only be by careful local inquiry, or while survey lines were being cleared, that Messrs. Ward and Connor could gain information of rival claims.

20. That the boundary line was never really surveyed by responsible officers has, I think, been clearly shown, and therefore our people remained in ignorance of the line claimed by Cochin.

21. The grave inaccuracies brought to notice are surely amply sufficient to invalidate the map and memoir as authorities in so important a dispute.

22. The fact of the line not forming subject of dispute before the Boundary Commission, appointed in 1815, is probably attributable to the general ignorance of the country in question. It is but little known or frequented even now, and, in 1815, must have been quite a *terra incognita*. Our own people in effect maintain, however, that the dispute is of comparatively recent origin, i.e., of twenty or thirty years standing, and if no formal settlement was conducted prior to the survey of 1820, by competent officers, no opportunity was given for discussion.

23. Owing to the want of a properly defined boundary, and in view of claims advanced on behalf of Malabar, timber cut by the Cochin Forest Department has twice been detained by the Deputy Conservator of the Anamalai Range, and still lies on the ground, yet the Cochin Government has not exerted itself to obtain settlement.

24. It may be observed, too, that until the Malabar claims have been regularly examined and disposed of, the recognition of Cochin as proprietor would seem incomplete, and that therefore, notwithstanding the time which has elapsed since the award of 1854, there would appear no objection to the restoration of Coimbatore as one of the claimants. Indeed, until such light as is derivable from evidence on behalf of Malabar be thrown on the whole case, it hardly appears fair to throw out Coimbatore.

25. To sum up:—In 1854, Cochin, Malabar and Coimbatore all claimed the tract under notice. Coimbatore was in actual possession and enjoyment and nothing appears in evidence irreconcilable with her always having been so. The claims of Cochin and Coimbatore only have been discussed, and those of Coimbatore were set aside upon the authority of documents which are

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
30th May 1876.*

now clearly proved to be untrustworthy, while those of Malabar remain undisposed of. Is it too much to ask that the whole case should be reconsidered?

26. I need not encumber this letter with a description of the tract in question, but I may observe that from all I learned while engaged on the boundary work, I suspect it has not hitherto been accurately described; the boundary claimed by Coimbatore is *beyond* the Noyecomid ridge. Whether the dotted line in the map was meant to indicate a doubtful boundary or the southern limit of the Nemarray Taluq does not much signify, considering the value which may be placed on the map as an authority. I was able to prosecute inquiries at the eastern portion of the line, and succeeded also in acquiring some knowledge of its bearings during a few days' trip before leaving the forest at the extreme western end; but a portion remains unvisited. It was already late in December when the survey was brought to a close, and I then had my own duties to attend to.

27. In conclusion, I may add that our Kadars are as firmly impressed with the strength of their claims as ever; they have not realized the results of the 1854 Order; I doubt if the order was even communicated to them; they profess entire ignorance of it; and in the absence of a demarcation it has not really been acted upon. It was only by assuring the Moopons (Headmen) that the clearance of a line was preliminary to a thorough investigation that they would consent to work, and I trust my promise to them may be kept. When they suspected it was to be a final settlement, they flatly refused to have anything to do with it, and what is more, vowed they would decapitate every Kadar in Cochin who should attempt to interfere. It should be borne in mind that the forest possesses a special importance for us owing to the value set upon it by the Kadars; it contains magnificent timber and many elephants, but is of even more consequence as the main source whence our Kadars obtain a living by the collection of hill products. The tribe will go with the land and we shall be left without a man. The effect of this upon forest conservancy, now of more importance than ever, would be disastrous, no imported labor would replace the Kadars.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) A. WEDDENBURN,
Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Copy of letter from Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey, dated 25th January 1876.

With the foregoing letters the Acting Superintendent of Revenue Survey, and Collector of Coimbatore, submit reports from the Deputy Superintendent No. 1 Party, and Deputy Conservator of Forests, Anamalai Range, regarding the progress made in the survey and demarcation of the boundary between Coimbatore and Cochin from Vengoh Peak to Kahanipandal, in accordance with G.O., dated 2nd August 1875, No. 1,170.

2. The decision of Government in 1854, that the boundary indicated in the Trigonometrical Survey Map should be adopted in settlement of the dispute between Coimbatore and Cochin was generally to rule the late demarcation. The Survey Department have endeavored to follow this line, but report that grave misrepresentations and discrepancies are found both in the old map and memoir, and that these records are irreconcilable with local features.

Colonel Hesse states that the line now demarcated will probably be accepted readily by Cochin, as almost all the valuable timber in the locality falls by it to that State. He suggests that if it is to hold good, representatives of Travancore and Cochin should meet a British Officer and decide on the tri-junction point of the three territories, when there would be little difficulty in deciding on the line

between Cochin and Coimbatore from that point to Kalianipandal, as there is little valuable timber in the neighbourhood of the line.

3. The Collector of Coimbatore and the Deputy Conservator of Forests, however, represent that by the adoption of the line now demarcated between Vengoli Peak and Kalianipandal, a considerable tract (it does not any where appear distinctly what the extent is) containing a large quantity of valuable timber will be made over to Cochin, and that the recently discovered inaccuracy of the map and memoir justifies a reconsideration of the decision of Government in 1854, and renders one eminently desirable, as the Forest Officer at least declares the balance of evidence and feeling of the hill-men of the locality to this day to be entirely in favor of Coimbatore.

4. Mr. Douglas puts his view of the case very strongly, but the Board are decidedly of opinion that no attempt should be made to reopen the question of claim to the tract under notice. Whatever may have been the rights of the case originally, Government deliberately and decidedly, in 1854, directed a boundary to be accepted which indisputably gave to Cochin a valuable forest tract, the British claims to which the local officers now wish to see revived. Rightly or wrongly the Cochin Sircar claimed the tract long before Government decided the dispute in favor of Cochin by waiving adverse claims. The fact that the Cochin claim was supported by the boundary as indicated on the Trigonometrical Map no doubt had much weight in leading Government to the conclusion then arrived at. But there were other considerations besides, and certainly the fact that the map is now found to be inaccurate would not satisfy Cochin that its claims were unfounded, or that after they have been deliberately conceded for some twenty years the question should be again reopened. It appears that the local officers attempted to reopen the question a year or two after the settlement, but Government administered a stern rebuke against the setting up of one-sided opinions against the deliberate decision of impartial judges—*viz.* Extract from Minutes of Consultation, dated 7th March 1856.

5. It may be observed that Colonel (then Lieutenant) Michael who knew the country thoroughly and who ably urged the claims of Coimbatore, when the disputed boundary was before under discussion, bore* testimony to the various localities named being properly laid

down in the Trigonometrical Survey and incidentally adverts to a circumstance which may perhaps, in some cases at least, tend to explain the differences found between present and former surveys. He says "the spot marked in the Government Maps as 'Annamalai Chary' cannot be taken as any fixed point for the village, for it is well known that all Kadars are in the habit of shifting the sites of their 'Charys' or 'Puddys' (hill villages) very frequently. They may have been located there when the surveys for the Grand Trigonometrical Survey were made, but since then 'Annamalai Chary' has probably been in a hundred different spots." (Lieutenant Michael to Collector of Coimbatore, dated 8th July 1852, forming an enclosure to Collector's letter of 25th August 1852, No. 77, recorded in Board's Proceedings, dated 24th January 1853, No. 219). Some of the differences between the former and present surveys may perhaps have their real origin in

causes of the nature just indicated. Some may be due to absolute error and carelessness when the previous operations were conducted. But be that as it may, the award of Government in 1854 cannot now be revised without the assumption of a position which it is undesirable Government should take, *viz.*, that of a powerful and interested party reopening a dispute long ago closed; and without giving great umbrage to the Cochin Sircar which would doubtless feel an attempt to reopen the question very keenly.

6. It seems unnecessary to go into the question of the Kolangode Nambidy's claims here. They can be settled on their merits in communication with the Sircar, when the boundary westward from Vengoli Peak comes to be demarcated.

7. The Board recommend therefore (1) that Cochin be invited formally to approve of the boundary now demarcated between Vengoli Peak and Kalianipandal, (2) that Cochin and Travancore be invited to send officers to fix, in communication with a British Officer, the tri-junction point between Cochin, Travancore and Coimbatore, (3) that the opportunity be taken of fixing the short boundary line between Coimbatore and Cochin from Kalianipandal to the said tri-junction, and, if possible, of settling the boundary eastward as far as may be between Coimbatore and Travancore. The boundary from Vengoli Peak westwards and northwards between Malabar and Cochin must also be definitely settled at some future period as circumstances admit.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Acting Secretary.

No. 316.

ORDER THEREON, 30th May 1876, No. 703.

Miscellaneous.

THE Government sanction the Board's proposals in paragraph 7 and agree with them that it is undesirable to reopen the question settled in 1854. The Resident in Travancore and Cochin will inform the Cochin Sircar of the decision of Government and request that State to formally approve of the boundary now demarcated between Vengoli Peak and Kalianipandal. He will also ascertain and report the names of the officers, whom the Sirkars may depute to fix, in communication with a British Officer to be hereafter named, the tri-junction point between Cochin, Travancore and Coimbatore. The Board of Revenue will state whom they will nominate on the Madras side.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. T. CARMICHAEL,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

- „ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin,
- „ the Political Department,
- „ the Superintendent of Revenue Survey,

Edw. W. French.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 11th April 1876.

Read the following letter from Lieut.-Colonel W. H. HESSEY, Acting Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chepauk, 9th February 1876, No. 420-14 :—

In G.O., No. 1,170, of the 2nd August 1875, the Government sanctioned the Board's recommendation that the Revenue Survey should demarcate and survey the boundary line between Coimbatore and Cochin as laid down in the Trigonometrical Survey map and decided by Government in 1854, leaving the Cochin Government to determine whether they will accept or contest that demarcation when the representatives of both Governments are able to meet on the spot.

2. I have the honor to enclose copy of reports from Lieutenant-Colonel Cloete, the Deputy Superintendent of No. 1 Revenue Survey, on the progress made in demarcating the line in question.

3. Commencing from Vengoli Peak $18\frac{1}{2}$ miles of boundary line have been completed. Heavy clearing was required nearly the whole way; where rivers and streams were followed chain lines only were cut; where there was no natural boundary a clear way was felled through the forest, and the line of boundary marked permanently with stone. Lieutenant-Colonel Cloete draws attention to the great want of correctness in Ward and Connor's map and to the discrepancies between the recorded bearings and distances and the map supposed to have been compiled from them.

4. In explanation of these inaccuracies and discrepancies he suggests that the country was roughly sketched in, and that the bearings and distances were afterwards taken from the map so prepared and entered in the specification.

5. He has submitted a map marked A, showing the line according to Ward and Connor's survey and the actual state of the country according to the survey now made, together with the line as marked as far as Kallianipandal. The following places between Vengoli Peak and Kallianipandal have been identified :—Sheklakund, Palakadavu Amman, Palakadavu River, Sitakal, Palaginur stream, Chovikal, and Sholayar.

6. From Kallianipandal the features of the ground are reported to be so utterly misrepresented both in the old map and in the descriptive memoir that it was found impossible to proceed. It was not thought advisable to mark and survey an arbitrary line ending in a point that could not be identified.

7. Lieutenant-Colonel Cloete considers it improbable that any objection to the line now marked will be made by Cochin, as almost all the valuable timber has been included within the boundary of that State. He states, however, that there is a strong feeling among the resident hill tribes that a large tract of valuable country belonging to Coimbatore has, by the demarcation now performed, been given to Cochin.

8. Perhaps the proved incorrectness of the map, on the authority of which the Government decided the boundary (see G.O., No. 630, of 27th June 1854), may be considered sufficient to warrant investigation into the Coimbatore claim.

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

11th April 1876

REVENUE

THE BOARD OF REVENUE

For A. S. G.

Dated 11th April 1876

For

C. A. GALTON, Esq.

M. A. I.

For Secretary

Secretary, Board of Revenue, Coimbatore. —
Enclosed for the Board of Revenue, Coimbatore, are two copies of a letter from the Deputy Superintendent of No. 1 Revenue Survey, Coimbatore, dated 9th February 1876, No. 420-14, and a copy of a letter from the Government, dated 2nd August 1875, No. 1,170, sanctioning the Board's recommendation that the Revenue Survey should demarcate and survey the boundary line between Coimbatore and Cochin as laid down in the Trigonometrical Survey map and decided by Government in 1854, leaving the Cochin Government to determine whether they will accept or contest that demarcation when the representatives of both Governments are able to meet on the spot.



9. If the line from Vengoli Peak up to Kalianipandal is to hold good it would, as Lieutenant-Colonel Cloete suggests, be advisable that the representatives of Cochin and Travancore should meet an officer deputed by Government and decide on the tri-junction point of the three territories. That point once determined there would probably be no difficulty in agreeing on a line between it and Kalianipandal as there is no valuable timber near the line.

10. The Deputy Conservator of Forests is of opinion that that part of the Anamalais is healthy throughout the year, but that during the south-west monsoon work is impracticable in consequence of the severity of the weather. The south-west monsoon is the only healthy time in the lower ranges.

11. I have the honor to request that the orders of Government may be solicited regarding the completion of the demarcation during the later months of the year. I also beg that I may be informed whether the line already demarcated is to be considered permanent or not.

12. The work was commenced by Sub-Assistant Russell in August; Captain Freeth, 1st Assistant Superintendent, inspected the work in September, and again on the 12th October proceeded to the Hills and remained there sketching, triangulating, and generally supervising operations till the 20th December 1875.

13. Mr. Douglas, the Deputy Conservator of Forests, was with the party for the greater part of the time. He placed a Forester and a gang of Kadars at the disposal of the survey; without the assistance thus rendered by Mr. Douglas nothing in the way of demarcation could have been accomplished.

14. No representative of Cochin was present, nor was assistance of any kind given by that State.

Enclosure No. 1.

From Lieutenant-Colonel J. G. CLORTE, Deputy Superintendent No. 1 Revenue Survey, to Lieutenant-Colonel W. H. HESSEY, Acting Superintendent of Revenue Survey, dated Coimbatore, 28th January 1876, No. 79-34.

I have the honor to submit report on the demarcation and survey of the Cochin, Coimbatore boundary on the Anamalais performed during the past season in accordance with the orders of Government, No. 1, 170, of the 2nd August 1875.

1. Work was commenced by Sub-Assistant Mr. Russell in August; he returned from the Hills on the 18th December.

2. Captain Freeth, 1st Assistant Superintendent, inspected the work in September and again proceeded to the Anamalais on the 12th October exploring, sketching, triangulating, and supervising till the 20th December.

3. Mr. Douglas, Deputy Conservator of Forests, was with the party for a great portion of the time, and he placed a Forester and a gang of Kadars and some axe men at our entire disposal; without these we could have done nothing.

4. No Cochin representative was present at any time during the operations, nor did we receive assistance of any kind from that State.

5. Our orders were to "demarcate" and survey the line as laid down in the map and decided by Government in 1854.

6. These orders it was found extremely difficult to carry out, chiefly owing to the incorrectness of the map which we were ordered to follow. The accompanying plan shows Ward and Connor's boundary and that now surveyed by us, and the sketch attached shows how we were

forced to discontinue operations at the point called Kalianipandal; the sketching on the map, which was to be our guide, being absolutely wrong between that point and the Travancore tri-junction.

7. After Vengoli Peak the first two points identified were "Sheklakund," a small hill, and "Palakadavu Amman," an upright stone about four feet high near the bank of the river of that name and close to "Anamalaicheri." The two places are named by Ward and Connor, and the points shown by the hill men as bearing those names agree with Ward and Connor's description. Further, the measured distance between these two points is about the same as that given in the old survey, although the bearing between them somewhat differs.

8. These two points having been satisfactorily identified, and the line between them cleared, the work was taken on from both ends of this line eastwards from the Amman stone along the Palakadavu river according to the map and description of the boundary, and northwards from "Sheklakund," following Ward and Connor's bearings and distances exactly and laying them down on the ground.

9. This northern line was thus carried on till within a mile of Vengoli, when it was found that if continued further it would pass Vengoli and end nearly a mile beyond and below it in the leased forest.

10. Ward and Connor had there to be abandoned and the boundary was carried straight up a ridge to Vengoli (*Vide map*).

11. Had we known in time how incorrect the specification of the boundary was we would probably not have attempted to follow it so closely.

12. Following the river from the Amman stone we find the old map and the specification widely wrong; this large river, the Palakadavu, being shown a mile to the north of its proper position, and the Palaginar stream which flows into it nearly a mile to the west.

13. From this and from other vast discrepancies afterwards discovered, seeing also that in some cases impossible, straight lines of 1 or 1½ miles long were specified, Captain Freeth came to the conclusion that the country about there (details and boundaries) was roughly sketched and that the bearings and distances were afterwards taken from the map so prepared and entered in the specification. I think that this surmise is correct and that it is in fact the only conclusion that can be arrived at.

14. One other remark regarding this specification or description of the boundary which we had attempted to follow. It says that two furlongs north-west from the Amman stone on the Palakadavu river we reach the point of union of these two taluqs with Foreign territory; is in a direct line nearly twenty miles south-east from the Amman and the nearest part of the taluq boundary is twelve miles away.

15. Eastwards from the Amman there was for some distance no doubt as the map clearly shows that the Palakadavu river forms the boundary, but the point where the line should leave the river and turn southwards was difficult to determine.

16. Sitakal, a point named by Ward and Connor, was shown by the hill men, but some way further down the river than the position assigned to it by Ward and Connor.

The line is described as following a stream flowing into the Palakadavu, and from the description of the country it was determined to follow the stream named Palaginar in our map, that being the only one which flows into the Palakadavu near the end of Ward and Connor's river line.

17. This stream was followed to its source over the table-land described in the old memoir, along a foot-path down to Chorikal on the banks of the Sholayar.

18. Regarding the identification of the point called Chorikal there appears to be no doubt, though the old map places it a mile east of its proper position.

19. From Chorikal again there is no doubt, for the large river Sholayar is given as the boundary. (The very great difference between the correct flow of this river as now ascertained by the survey and as shown in the old map is noteworthy.)

21. The river was followed from Chorikal to Kalianipandal, a point named by Ward and Connor and identified on the ground.

22. Beyond this the features of the country are so utterly misrepresented both in the old map and the descriptive memoir that it was found impossible to proceed; it was not thought advisable in the absence of a Cochin representative to mark and survey an arbitrary line ending in a point which could not be identified.

23. The country was well explored by Captain Freeth and Mr. Douglas, and a sketch made by the former officer is attached.

24. Ward and Connor say that from Kalianipandal the boundary is along a nulla (five miles up to a point called Paneymaidkuttu or Udumantund, and the old map agrees with the description and shows the latter point as situated on a ridge overlooking the Vadamalair. Now there is no nulla more than half a mile long near Kalianipandal, and there is a high range of hills running east and west half-way between the Sholayar and the Vadamalair over which it is impossible any stream could run. Paneymaidkuttu or Udumantund, said by Ward and Connor to be one and the same place, are assigned two distinct positions some distance apart by the local tribes, and the former, or Paneymaid, is pointed out as being close down on the banks of the Vadamalair instead of on a high ridge above.

25. Under these circumstances the orders of Government are required as to what further action should be taken.

26. It is improbable that any objection to the line now marked will be made by Cochin, almost all the valuable timber near having been included into that State; but on the part of Coimbatore there is a very strong feeling among the resident hill tribes that a large tract of valuable country belonging to Coimbatore has been by this demarcation given to Cochin.

The proved incorrectness of the map on which Government decided this boundary (No. 630, 27th June 1854) may be considered sufficient to justify a re-consideration of that order and to warrant an investigation into the Coimbatore claims.

27. But if the line we have marked up to Kalianipandal is to hold good, I would suggest that the representatives of Cochin and Travancore be requested to meet Coimbatore and decide on the termination point of the three territories, that determined there would probably be no difficulty in agreeing on a line between that point and Kalianipandal, as there is no valuable timber near the line.

28. The Deputy Conservator is of opinion that that part of the Anamalais is healthy throughout the year, and indeed that owing to the severity of the weather and the leeches, we could not work there during the southwest monsoon, which is the only healthy time in the lower parts of the hills.

29. The whole length of line completed this season is 18½ miles, more than half of which has been checked by triangulation.

Heavy clearing was required nearly the whole way. Where rivers and streams were followed we only cut chain lanes, but even this was hard work, the growth always being dense along the streams.

30. Where there was no natural boundary to follow a clear way was felled through the forest ten to thirty feet wide, and this can with very little trouble be kept open; these lines have also been marked permanently with stone.

* H. G. De Silva, Observer, Letter, No. 2240, of 11st January 1876.

31. Rupees 2,358-11-2* was expended by the Forest Department as below:—

	Rs.	A.	P.
Clearing boundary line...	1,233	13	8
Hutling...	445	9	6
Miscellaneous (Cumbies, Arrack, Tappalmen opening paths, pay of Kadars, Mopars, &c.)...	674	4	0
Total...	2,353	11	2

From Lieutenant-Colonel J. G. GLOETE, Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to Lieutenant-Colonel W. H. HESSEY, Acting Superintendent of Revenue Survey, dated Coonoor, 2nd February 1876, No. 101-46.

REFERENCE. Your Memorandum, No. 2,495-162, dated 30th August 1875, on the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 2,362, dated 23rd August 1875, directing to submit a statement showing the pay, &c., of the men that may be employed on Cochin frontiers at the end of each season.

In continuation of this office letter, No. 79-34, dated 28th January 1876, has the honor to enclose a statement showing the amount of pay, &c., of the men employed on Cochin frontiers.

Statement showing the Cost incurred in Surveying the District Boundary between Coimbatore and Cochin.

Particulars.	Amount.	Total.	Remarks.
	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	
Pay and batta of Mr. Russell and of his Peons from August to December 1875.....	1,293 1 4		
Pay of Captain Freeth, Assistant Superintendent of Revenue Survey, from October to December 1875	1,958 15 8		
	4,252 1 0	3,250 1 0	
Pay of a Demarcation Peon	7 0 0		

(True Copies.)

CHEPAUK,
9th February 1876.

(Signed) W. H. HESSEY,
Ag. Supt., Revenue Survey.

Enclosure No. 2.—Party Maps.

From A. WEDDERBURN, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 21st February 1876, No. 48.

I have the honor to forward copy of a letter to my address, dated 16th February 1876, from Mr. Douglas, Deputy Conservator, Anamalai, regarding the recent demarcation of the sanctioned boundary between Coimbatore and the Cochin territory. Mr. Douglas has enclosed a copy of the Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey's letter to his official superior on the same subject—none having been sent to me by that department.

2. When Government ordered in 1854 a certain boundary to be observed, it was doubtless under the impression that that boundary had been correctly delineated, but so far from this being the case, it seems that in some parts eye sketches were substituted, and unmeasured points deduced therefrom, and that the line in some cases is simply impracticable.

3. Under such circumstances, the decision of Government seems to be open to reconsideration, based as it was on incorrect data.

4. When Mr. Douglas personally informed me of the valuable interests that were involved, I advised him to have a sketch made of the land, which local tradition and actual occupation might have assigned to Coimbatore, and which the following of the map might show to be otherwise apportioned—that Government might be aware of the extent of the land in dispute. This sketch appears to be referred to in paragraph 23 of the Deputy Superintendent's letter.

5. It would, therefore, seem just that the true or natural line of demarcation should be settled by arbitration, seeing that it is impossible of ascertainment by the prescribed mode of following the old map.

No. 313.

FORWARDED to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue.

Ootacamund, (Signed) R. H. BEDDOME, Lieut. Colonel,
28th February 1876. Conservator of Forests.

Enclosure No. 1.

From C. G. DOUGLAS, Esq., Deputy Conservator of Forests, Anamalai Range, to A. WENDERHURN, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, dated 16th February 1876, No. 1.

You are already aware that the identification of the Coimbatore-Cochin boundary had to be abandoned at Kallanipandal, a place on the banks of the Sholayaur about five miles north of Punnimadkuthu, the Cochin, Coimbatore and Travancore tri-junction.

2. I have the honor to address you now on the subject, as the circumstances which induced me to take this step may appear of sufficient importance to warrant a reference to Government with the view of settling the claims of Coimbatore to a magnificent stretch of forest assigned to the Cochin State in 1854.

3. A Cochin representative not being available, the commencement of work was sanctioned without one (G.O. No. 477, dated 2nd August 1875, Revenue Department), and I was instructed to identify as clearly as possible the line shown in the map. I accordingly adopted for guidance Messrs. Ward and Connor's Memoir of the Survey of 1820, from which the map is supposed to be compiled, and resolved to adhere as closely as practicable to the description of the boundary which it contained. My reasons for so doing were, (1) because the memoir is one of the chief authorities quoted in the decision which took place in 1854, (2) because on a previous occasion when employed in similar duty with Mr. Stevenson, the Conservator of Cochin Forests, it was evident that great reliance is placed on the document by the State, and (3) because I considered that by no other means could any uncertainty be so satisfactorily demonstrated.

4. From what follows it will be seen that, in spite of grave discrepancies found in the memoir, the attempt to lay down a line as nearly as possible coinciding with the one shown in the map was persevered in, and only discontinued when an insurmountable difficulty presented itself.

5. I shall now proceed to explain the progress of the settlement and what led to its abrupt conclusion.

6. For the reasons given in my report which accompanies the accounts of expenditure, work began on the western portion of the line, between Vengoli Peak and the Palacadau River. Having reached the spot on the river bank where the boundary proceeds northwards to Vengoli, a line was cleared in strict accordance with the bearings and distances specified in the memoir. This brought us to within a mile of Vengoli, when it became evident that if the memoir were followed further we should be led past that point, which by the way is the Cochin, Malabar and Coimbatore tri-junction, and down into the forest leased from the Kalangode Nambiyar, in Malabar, a mile and more beyond. Desiring to confer with the Cochin representative, I postponed closing this part of the line, but as no such officer ever made his appearance, I took it up to the Peak the shortest and easiest way, after all other work had been finished.

7. The memoir was next found to be in error as to the distance between the two points at which the boundary is said to quit the Palacadau River, in the one case for Vengoli Peak, and in the other for Chorycal.

8. It was also found that the memoir described straight lines of a mile and upwards in length which from the nature of the country where they are supposed to have been surveyed are sheer impossibilities. Yet the memoir professes to give bearings and distances with precision.

9. The memoir also alludes to the taluk boundary of Pollachi and Oodumipettah, and states that it meets the Cochin boundary at a spot which is 20 miles northwest of the real "point of union."

10. Finally, on reaching Kallanipandal and proceeding to explore the country carefully between the rivers Sholayaur and Veddumalloor, we failed to discover the stream which, according to map and memoir, is supposed to connect Punnimadkuthu, near the latter, with Kallanipandal on the banks of the former stream. As might be expected, between two such large rivers, there is a lofty watershed which, it is evident, the Surveyors of 1820 never heard of, much less had the trouble of climbing, or they would not have fallen into such an error. I was at one time prepared to accept a line defined by two streams flowing from the watershed in opposite directions, if such could be found and provided; the line thus formed did not too widely differ from the one in the map. The search was fruitless, and I only mention it to show that "the general accuracy" of the map was not hastily impugned. A better description of this part of the country, supported by sketches drawn by Captain Prouth, will be found in Colonel Cluete's official report to the Superintendent, Revenue Survey. Considering that my instructions had, so far, been fulfilled, and that I had no authority to lay down a line on my own responsibility, there seemed no help for it, but to abandon further operations.

11. Briefly stated, the ground on which the award of 1854 rested was "the general accuracy" of the Great Trigonometrical map. There was no local investigation, and the decision is thus referred to by the Collector of Coimbatore in a letter, dated 11th November 1854, No. 140, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue: "Those best acquainted with the forest I believe regard as defective and unsatisfactory the conclusions arrived at by Captain Horsley with respect to the boundary line, by which a large tract hitherto considered as belonging to Coimbatore was last year made over to the Cochin State."

12. The Board of Revenue in their Proceedings of 17th March 1858, thus sum up the case:—

"Possession of the tract appears in favor of Coimbatore supported both by local tradition and the testimony of the present inhabitants; the claim on the part of Cochin rests more prominently upon the Trigonometrical map and memoir having given the territory to that State."

"The general accuracy of this map has been established and referred to in the boundary disputes with the Kalangode Nambiyar and between Tanjavely and Travancore; and in a reference which the Board have made to the memoir of Captain Ward while employed on the survey, they are unable to find any mention of a dispute as to boundary in the locality now in question."

13. Under these circumstances, the Board would have at once recommended a surrender of Government claims, but for the existence of a dotted line which denoted in their opinion a doubtful boundary and gave much countenance to the Coimbatore claim, supported as it was by local testimony, actual possession, and the opinion of Captain Michael who from an intimate knowledge of the locality might be considered to possess peculiar advantages of arriving at a right conclusion. It was therefore suggested that an officer enjoying the confidence of both Governments should be appointed who should be empowered to assist the whole tract to either party, to fix a new boundary and give a portion to each. This proposal received the sanction of Government and Captain Horsley was selected as the fittest officer available.

14. The result of Captain Horsley's investigation is recorded in paragraph 2 of Extract from Minutes of Consultation of June 1864. He held no local inquiry, did not even visit the disputed tract, because it would have taken him away from his proper duties for six weeks at the earliest time of year instead of a fortnight as supposed by the Board.

15. The dotted line he pronounced to be no indication of a disputed boundary but the southern limit of the Nemarry Taluq in Cochin "as laid down in the great map of Cochin prepared from the Survey of Ward and Connor, and from which the printed map is reduced". He points out that while disputes in other places are noticed, no mention occurs in the memoir of a dispute near Anamalai Chary.

16. The Board agree with Captain Horsley's views, and the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, in consideration of previous correspondence on the subject, expressed himself amply satisfied in the conclusion at which that officer had arrived, and could not perceive that, under the circumstances, any advantage would result from Captain Horsley's personally inspecting the boundary, and so resolved to confirm the line laid down in the Great Trigonometrical map.

17. Thus, actual possession, local testimony, and the opinion of Captain Michael, who appears to have been the only European officer on the Coimbatore side possessed of any real local knowledge, were not considered of sufficient weight to counterbalance views which, so far as the Government order shows, were not derived from any special familiarity with the places or people concerned, but from a belief in the accuracy of the map.

18. But a searching investigation must have led to different results.

19. It could only be upon the assumption that the boundary had been laid down by Messrs. Ward and Connor on the spot, and that the details of the survey were substantially correct, that any importance could be attached to the fact that the memoir contains no record of the dispute, for it would only be by careful local inquiry, or while survey lines were being cleared, that Messrs. Ward and Connor could gain information of rival claims.

20. That the boundary line was never really surveyed by responsible officers has, I think, been clearly shown, and therefore our people remained in ignorance of the line claimed by Cochin.

21. The grave inaccuracies brought to notice are surely amply sufficient to invalidate the map and memoir as authorities in so important a dispute.

22. The fact of the line not forming subject of dispute before the Boundary Commission, appointed in 1815, is probably attributable to the general ignorance of the country in question. It is but little known or frequented even now, and in 1815 must have been quite a terra incognita. Our own people resided mainly at Kozhikode, and the distance west of comparatively recent origin, of being in such a position, and if no formal settlement was conducted prior to the survey of 1839 by competent officers, no opportunity was given for discussion.

23. Owing to the want of a properly defined boundary, and in view of claims advanced on behalf of Malabar, timber cut by the Cochin Forest Department has twice been detained by the Deputy Conservator of the Anamalai Range, and still lies on the ground, yet the Cochin Government has not exerted itself to obtain settlement.

24. It may be observed, too, that until the Malabar claims have been regularly examined and disposed of, the recognition of Cochin as proprietor would seem incomplete, and that therefore, notwithstanding the time which has elapsed since the year of 1844, there would appear no objection to the restoration of Coimbatore as one of the claimants. Indeed until such light as is derivable from evidence on behalf of Malabar be thrown on the whole case, it hardly appears fair to throw out Coimbatore.

25. To sum up:—In 1801, Cochin, Malabar and Coimbatore all claimed the tract under notice. Coimbatore was in actual possession and enjoyment, and nothing appears in evidence reconcilable with her always having been so. The claims of Cochin and Coimbatore only have been discussed, and those of Coimbatore were set aside upon the authority of documents which are now clearly proved to be untrue, while those of Malabar remain undisposed of. Is it too much to ask that the whole case should be reconsidered?

26. I need not encumber this letter with a description of the tract in question, but I may observe that from all I learned while engaged on the boundary work, I suspect it has not hitherto been accurately described: the boundary claimed by Coimbatore is beyond the Neyyarad ridge. Whether the dotted line in the map was meant to indicate a doubtful boundary or the southern

limit of the Nemarry Taluq does not much signify, considering the value which may be placed on the map as an authority. I was able to prosecute inquiries at the eastern portion of the line, and succeeded also in acquiring some knowledge of its bearings during a few days' trip before leaving the forest at the extreme western end; but a portion remains unvisited. It was already late in December when the survey was brought to a close, and I then had my own duties to attend to.

27. In conclusion, I may add that our Kadars are as firmly impressed with the strength of their claims as ever; they have not realized the results of the 1854 Order; I doubt if the order was even communicated to them; they profess entire ignorance of it; and in the absence of a demarcation it has not really been acted upon. It was only by assuring the Moopens (Headmen) that the clearance of a line was preliminary to a thorough investigation that they would consent to work, and I trust my promise to them may be kept. When they suspected it was to be a final settlement, they flatly refused to have anything to do with it, and what is more, vowed they would decapitate every Kadar in Cochin who should attempt to interfere. It should be borne in mind that the forest possesses a special importance for us owing to the value set upon it by the Kadars; it contains magnificent timber and many elephants, but it is of even more consequence as the main source whence our Kadars obtain a living by the collection of hill products. The tribe will go with the land and we shall be left without a man. The effect of this upon forest conservancy, now of more importance than ever, would be disastrous, no imported labor would replace the Kadars.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) A. WEDDERBURN,
Collector.

Enclosure No. 2.—Copy of letter from Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey, dated 28th January 1876.

With the foregoing letters the Acting Superintendent of Revenue Survey, and Collector of Coimbatore, submit reports from the Deputy Superintendent No. 1 Party, and Deputy Conservator of Forests, Anamalai Range, regarding the progress made in the survey and demarcation of the boundary between Coimbatore and Cochin from Vengoli Peak to Kalianipandal, in accordance with G.O., dated 2nd August 1875, No. 1,170.

2. The decision of Government in 1854, that the boundary indicated in the Trigonometrical Survey Map should be adopted in settlement of the dispute between Coimbatore and Cochin was generally to rule the late demarcation. The Survey Department have endeavored to follow this line, but report that grave misrepresentations and discrepancies are found both in the old map and memoir, and that these records are irreconcilable with local features.

Colonel Hossey states that the line now demarcated will probably be accepted readily by Cochin, as almost all the valuable timber in the locality falls by it to that State. He suggests that if it is to hold good, representatives of Travancore and Cochin should meet a British Officer and decide on the tri-junction point of the three territories, when there would be little difficulty in deciding on the line between Cochin and Coimbatore from that point to Kalianipandal, as there is little valuable timber in the neighbourhood of the line.

3. The Collector of Coimbatore and the Deputy Conservator of Forests, however, represent that by the adoption of the line now demarcated between Vengoli Peak and Kalianipandal, a considerable tract (it does not any where

appear distinctly what the extent is) containing a large quantity of valuable timber will be made over to Cochin, and that the recently discovered inaccuracy of the map and memoir justifies a reconsideration of the decision of Government in 1854, and renders one eminently desirable, as the Forest Officer at least declares the balance of evidence and feeling of the hill-men of the locality to this day to be entirely in favor of Coimbatore.

4. Mr. Douglas puts his view of the case very strongly, but the Board are decidedly of opinion that no attempt should be made to reopen the question of claim to the tract under notice. Whatever may have been the rights of the case originally, Government deliberately and decidedly, in 1854, directed a boundary to be accepted which indisputably gave to Cochin a valuable forest tract, the British claims to which the local officers now wish to see revived. Rightly or wrongly the Cochin Sircar claimed the tract long before Government decided the dispute in favor of Cochin by waiving adverse claims. The fact that the Cochin claim was supported by the boundary as indicated on the Trigonometrical Map no doubt had much weight in leading Government to the conclusion then arrived at. But there were other considerations besides, and certainly the fact that the map is now found to be inaccurate would not satisfy Cochin that its claims were unfounded, or that after they have been deliberately conceded for some twenty years the question should be again reopened. It appears that the local officers attempted to reopen the question a year or two after the settlement, but Government administered a stern rebuke against the setting up of one-sided opinions against the deliberate decision of impartial judges—*vide* Extract from Minutes of Consultation, dated 7th March 1856.

5. It may be observed that Colonel (then Lieutenant) Michael, who knew the country thoroughly and who ably urged the claims of Coimbatore, when the disputed boundary was before under discussion, bore* testimony to the various localities named being properly laid down in the Trigonometrical Survey and incidentally adverts to a circumstance which may perhaps, in some cases at least, tend to explain the differences found between present and former surveys. He says, "the spot marked in the Government Maps as 'Annamalai Chary' cannot be taken as any fixed point for the village, for it is well known that all Raders are in the habit of shifting the sites of their 'Charys' or 'Paddys' (hill villages) very frequently. They may have been located there when the surveys for the Grand Trigonometrical Survey were made, but since then 'Annamalai Chary' has probably been in a hundred different spots." (Lieutenant Michael to Collector of Coimbatore, dated 8th July 1852, forming an enclosure to Collector's letter of 25th August 1852, No. 77, recorded in Board's Proceedings, dated 24th January 1853, No. 219.) Some of the differences between the former and present surveys may perhaps have their real origin in causes of the nature just indicated. Some may be due to absolute error and carelessness when the previous operations were conducted. But be that as it may, the award of Government in 1854 cannot now be revised without the assumption of a position which it is undesirable Government should take, *viz.*, that of a powerful and

interested party reopening a dispute long ago closed; and without giving great umbrage to the Cochin Sircar which would doubtless feel an attempt to reopen the question very keenly.

6. It seems unnecessary to go into the question of the Kolangode Nambidy's claims here. They can be settled on their merits in communication with the Sircar, when the boundary westward from Vengoli Peak comes to be demarcated.

7. The Board recommend therefore (1) that Cochin be invited formally to approve of the boundary now demarcated between Vengoli Peak and Kalianipandal, (2) that Cochin and Travancore be invited to send officers to fix, in communication with a British Officer, the tri-junction point between Cochin, Travancore and Coimbatore, (3) that the opportunity be taken of fixing the short boundary line between Coimbatore and Cochin from Kalianipandal to the said tri-junction, and, if possible, of settling the boundary eastward as far as may be between Coimbatore and Travancore. The boundary from Vengoli Peak westwards and northwards between Malabar and Cochin must also be definitely settled at some future period as circumstances admit.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with forty Maps to be returned.

- .. the Collector of Coimbatore.
- .. the Collector of Malabar.
- .. the Superintendent of Revenue Survey
- .. the Conservator of Forests.

Rd. W. H. French.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Boundary
Cochin

No.

Board

Dated

11th April

1876

FOR ORDERS.

of 18th Decr. 1875. The Commission
has been to the department
from the arrangement of 1875.
The Commission has been proposed
to be a permanent, for the
first adjustment of the
boundary.

May 1876.
A considerable part of the
country under consideration is known
to me as I settled the boundary between
Combarabore & Malabar in the north
of

BOARD OF REVENUE,
MADRAS.

11th April 1876.

PROCESSES, 11th April 1876 No. 983.

11th April 1876

11th April 1876

11th April 1876

11th April 1876

APRIL

No. 983

Boundary—between Combarabore and Malabar.
—Submitting to Government with certain
recommendations, reports of Collector and
Superintendent of Revenue Survey on the pro-
gress made in the survey and description of—
from Vengal Padi to Kallanpadi.

of the Vengolysk in 1860. I have
had occasion to consult the
correspondence between Ward
and Cameron by the Collector
of Malabar at the time of the
Survey as well as to examine
Mr. McMahon - Ward & Cameron's journals.

who was a clerk (a retired super-
cable old pensioner at 00 by) in
1850 to 1852. And I think that
the map is unduly impugned so
far as lies between Vengolysk
and the Poleas.

It is not so correct as I
ought have desired but several
marked features are sufficiently
defined to make it on the whole
a fair guide, and when I was
on the Hills in 1857 & 1858, the stretch
of the forest south-west of the hill
was in the hands of Cochin, although

some of our Kadis had some honey-rights
across the Palakad area.

The boundary as traced from
Vengolysk to Kalyanapada may and
should be occupied without hesitation
by us because of the resolution of Govt
in 1854 and because of occupation
such as it has been - Mr. Douglas's
assurances notwithstanding - and
the Cochin Govt. should be invited
to accept it.

The other recommendations
of the Board should be sanctioned.

24/5

W

Comparison of
the Cochin map
with the
all as from
Kalyanapada

STAMP
FROM Vengoli Park to Kallaripadu

FOR ORDER

No 708 27th Dec 1876

Recd Board's Resolutions of
11 April 1876 No 913.

The Government sanction
the Board's proposals in regard
to agree with them but it is
undecidable to resolve the
question settled in 1874.

The Resident in ^{Cochin} Travancore
inform the ^{Cochin} Government of the de-
cision of Government to require

the State to formally
approve of the boundary
has demarcated between
Vengoli Park & Kallaripadu
He will also submit a
report as manager of the
officer when the Survey

will dispute to be in
communication with a
British officer who named
the trigonometric point between
Cochin, Travancore & India.
The Board of Govt will state
when they will nominate
on the land side.

111 To the Order of the 13th June
11 The Order of the 13th June
11 The Order of the 13th June
11 The Order of the 13th June