M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 68

(2) Date of repair 22-5-43

(3) Initials of the Referencer

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 975 Press ~~Mis.~~

197-200

Dated 18. 8. 1880.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

18th August 1880, No. 975.

READ THE FOLLOWING PAPERS:—

No. 197. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 10th February 1880, No. 209.

ABSTRACT.—Submitting to Government, with Board's remarks, letter from Collector regarding settlement of boundary line between Travancore and Tinnevelly.

No. 198. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 24th February 1880, No. 275.

ABSTRACT.—Passing orders on letter from Collector of Tinnevelly forwarding report of Mr. Hayne on the final completion of the Tinnevelly-Travancore watershed boundary.

No. 199. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 27th April 1880, Miscellaneous No. 4,559.

Read Official Memorandum from the Under Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated 22nd April 1880, No. 140, requesting that Ward and Connor's Descriptive Memoir of Tinnevelly, referred to, may be submitted, as also the Map, showing the course of Connor and Ward's line, under preparation by the Superintendent, Revenue Survey.

THE Descriptive Memoir received from the Collector will be submitted for the information of Government.

2. The Superintendent, Revenue Survey, will be requested to expedite the completion of the Map showing Ward and Connor's line.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary.

No. 200. ORDER THEREON, 18th August 1880, No. 975.

Miscellaneous.

THE Tinnevelly-Travancore boundary may conveniently be divided into two portions:

(1) Cape Comorin to Mahendragiri mountain.

(2) Mahendragiri to the Madura, Tinnevelly and Travancore trijunction.

2. The (1) was finally settled in 1871, and the settlement approved by the Secretary of State. The line was divided into two tracts and the settlement was made on the "uti possidetis" principle. In one the British claim was abandoned; in the other that of Travancore—in favor of actual possession.

G.O., 8th August 1871, No. 240, Political Department.

G.O., 19th February 1872, No. 315, Revenue Department.

G.O., 29th June 1871, No. 1,123, Revenue Department.

3. In first discussing the question as to the method of settlement, this Government suggested that "the watershed on the ghât range should be accepted as the boundary line wherever Travancore marches with Tinnevelly, the question of compensation for actual loss of revenue being reserved for distinct settlement by equivalent cession elsewhere."

G.O., 10th May 1871, No. 816, paragraph 24, Revenue Department.

4. This principle was, as shown above, not rigidly observed in settling the line south of Mahendragiri, but when the question of the boundary north of that mountain towards the Madura trijunction was raised in 1872, the Government pointed out that the Resident had "stated that the Travancore Government were willing to accept the watershed on the ghât range as the boundary between the two States," and he was directed to ask the Travancore Government "to notify that this natural boundary defines the line of separation between the States by the mutual agreement of the Governments."

G.O., 24th October 1872, No. 1,475, Revenue Department.
G.O., 26th October 1872, No. 1,491, Revenue Department.

5. It does not appear that the Travancore Government ever issued any such notification, but in 1874, the Resident (Mr. Ballard) suggested that the whole boundary between Travancore, Cochin and British territory should be permanently settled and demarcated.

Memorandum in G.O., 10th June 1874, No. 712, Revenue Department.

This was agreed to, and eventually officers were appointed by the two States to work with the British officers.

G.O., 22nd September 1874, No. 1,199, Revenue Department.

Briefly the principle to be followed in the settlement was stated by the Resident to be "that the crest of the watershed generally should be the boundary, but that the officers appointed should work together on the give-and-take principle to fix and mark the best and most convenient line in detail as near the crest line as might be, without disputing about trifles."

Paragraph 12 of memorandum in G.O., 10th June 1874, No. 712, Revenue Department.

6. Operations on the Tinnevelly-Travancore frontier commenced from Mahendragiri in October 1874, were continued in 1876 and 1877, and finished in 1879 up to the Madura trijunction, as stated in the paper now under consideration.

7. In the first season 38½ miles of boundary were settled without dispute, but the Collector pointed out that in the following season "tracts of forest of considerable value, which have always been and are still admittedly in actual British possession and enjoyment, but which lie on the western or Travancore side of the watershed," would come under demarcation, and that the Travancore Government manifested no inclination to yield any lands on the eastern side "which are in their possession."

G.O., 21st December 1875, No. 1,828, Revenue Department.

8. The Acting Collector (Mr. Stuart) thought that the terms laid down by Government in May 1871 should be adhered to, and that the watershed should be taken "as the boundary in such a manner as to reserve for future settlement by exchange of lands elsewhere, all questions of proved actual possession by either State, of lands which will, after the new boundary is recognised, be made over to the other."

The Board on this remarked that "those proposals were not agreed to by Travancore in their entirety—and indeed would be very difficult to give practical effect to—as involving extensive exchanges of lands."

The Board thought that "where the boundaries are undisputed and marked * * *, although Travancore lands may be east of the general line, the present operations should not affect them in any way. If there is undisputed Tinnevelly land unmarked on the western side of the watershed * * *, it should be marked to Tinnevelly. If extensive tracts are involved or the officers cannot agree, the matter must be referred for orders."

The Government approved these views.

9. In the second season the demarcation party began at Courtallum, far north of the place they left off at in the previous season, and worked south. They completed upwards of twenty-four miles, but did not reach the scene of their former labors. Of the distance gone over upwards of five miles was in dispute, and two lines were cut—

G.O., 17th January 1877, No. 179, Revenue Department.

(1) along the boundary claimed by Tinnevelly; and

(2) along the watershed to which the Travancore Agent adhered "under instructions."

The tract was known as the Alwarkurichi block, and the British representative (Mr. Hayne) computed its area "to be not less than 20 square miles, and containing some of the finest forest land in the Tinnevelly Division."

Paragraph 9 of report in G.O., 17th January 1877, No. 179, Revenue Department.

This block had formed the subject of correspondence between the Board and Government in previous years, and had "undoubtedly been attached to the village of Alwarkurichi for more than sixty years."

10. In the mean time it had transpired that another piece of land near Courtallum, but on the west of the watershed which had been given away by the Tinnevelly authorities to a Mr. Cocq, had subsequently been sold by Travancore to a Mr. Miller. Correspondence ensued, but eventually* Government gave up the land and left Mr. Cocq to settle with the Travancore authorities.

*G.O., 5th December 1877, No. 3,358.

11. As regards the Alwarkurichi tract and other instances in which, in their future course north of Courtallum or Shenkota, the demarcation party might find the watershed line departed from, the Board thought the "cases should be investigated, and at the conclusion of the work the conflicting claims * * * may perhaps admit of adjustment by mutual concessions of territory."

The Government ruled that the best course to pursue will be to run the boundary line from end to end continuously, care being taken, wherever a dispute which cannot be at once settled exists, to map both lines * * *. Such disputes, if not in the meanwhile adjusted, can be disposed of, * * * when the old boundary line has been completed.

12. In the third season sixteen miles were accomplished, and the line south of Shenkota (Courtallum), which had been left unfinished, was completed, but no fresh dispute was reported.

G.O., 4th September 1877, No. 2,638, Revenue Department.

13. In the fourth season, as now reported on, some forty-three miles from Shenkota northwards to the Madura trijunction were gone over, and several claims by British (including Zemindari) villages to land west of the watershed, have come to notice in this portion of the boundary, as well as one claim by Travancore to land east of the ghâts.

14. After full consideration, the Governor in Council resolves to direct the Resident to inform the Travancore Sirkar of the willingness of this Government to accept throughout, the watershed boundary as followed and defined by the Commissioners, and to invite an expression of the Sirkar's views.

This settlement will involve the cession of the Alwarkurichi tract, but will in no way prejudice the rights and claims of British Zemindars or villages over or to lands on the west side of the watershed. Private proprietary rights are not necessarily compromised by recognition of Travancore State authority rather than British.

15. The Government do not understand that there are any where on the west of the watershed boundary north of Mahendragiri any cultivated lands hitherto paying revenue to Government; but, if so, the question of their disposal will be reserved until their extent and assessment are reported.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
" the Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
" the Superintendent of Revenue Surveys.

Exd. W. H. French.

60 Copies.

9-5-07 N
3/12/08
2-11-14
22-12-14

Boundary Line—between Travancore and Tinnevelly.—Passing orders on Revenue Board's Proceedings regarding the settlement of the —.

AUGUST.

Nos. 197—200.

G.O., 19th August 1880, No. 975.

Dated August 18th.
Rec'd 23th.

From

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

&c., &c., &c.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

&c., &c., &c.

REVENUE

Copy of (1880)

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA AND INDIAN STATES.

No. 43.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 8th January 1880.

Read the following letter from J. B. PENNINGTON, Esq., Collector of Tinnevelly, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 12th November 1879, No. 747:—

I HAVE the honor to forward, for the information and orders of the Board, a copy of a letter from Mr. Hayne (on special duty), in which he suggests that the Travancore boundary line traced by the Commissioners in the first season will probably have to be corrected with reference to Ward and Connor's survey of the Travancore boundary in 1817—21.

2. It seems strange that no reference was made to this old survey and descriptive memoir at the time the present Commission was started, but probably the existence of such a clear account of the boundary was not suspected. It is not alluded to, I think, in all the correspondence that took place as to the boundary south of Mahendragiri, though it describes that boundary also with the utmost minuteness.

3. I presume the Travancore Government would admit the line laid down by Messrs. Ward and Connor, and all that would be necessary would be to send a trained Surveyor to trace it out from the angles given in the description. It will be observed that as a general rule wherever the boundary is not actually laid down in detail it is described as passing "*along the summit of the hills*," "along the ridge" &c., until it reaches the hills north of Shenkotta where it becomes an "imaginary course supposed to run on the ridge of the high ghats which up to Sivagiri have not been ascertained in the course of survey, the wildness of the country precluding the possibility of exploring it." Thence it is described as running "on the ghats" (evidently the water-shed) up to the Madura frontier.

4. If this description is accepted by both Governments now it will save the trouble of inquiring into an immense number of disputes north of Shenkotta, and the Survey Department should be instructed to follow up the line traced this year *as soon as ever the weather is favorable*, that is, in January next. The line has not been demarcated this year on account of the innumerable claims set up by both sides.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From W. C. HAYNE, Esq., Deputy Conservator of Forests, to J. B. PENNINGTON, Esq., Collector of Tinnevelly, dated Sivagiri, 3rd November 1879, No. 357.

I HAVE the honor to inform you that I have recently received G.O., No. 1,839, of the 8th September 1879, and observe that the Conservator in paragraph 4 of his letter embodied therein, No. 792, of the 1st September 1879, advocates the immediate settlement of the Singampatti Zemindar's Forest boundaries, and therefore deem it incumbent on me to bring to your notice at once officially that since submitting my first season's report on the Tinnevelly-Travancore boundary, No. 64, of the 1st June 1875, embodied in G.O., No. 1,828, dated 21st December 1875, I have discovered and obtained from your records (*vide* extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 5th January 1852,) the copy of a tabular statement of Captain Ward and Lieutenant Connor's giving the course of the boundary with the angles headed "Description of the boundaries of Travancore, being extract from the memoir accompanying the survey of Travancore by Captain Ward and Lieutenant Connor, 1817—21."

2. By their course I feel confident that Muthukuli Vayal and the surrounding country to Motachi Peak would be included in British territory as is shown in the Trigonometrical map. This could probably be clearly shown by the Survey Department were they called on to put down on paper a tracing of the boundary line as shown in the Trigonometrical map and the course of the water-shed as surveyed by them in 1875.

3. It is desirable that some such test should be made at once; for, if I prove correct in my conjecture, the matter will have to be brought to the notice of Government that it may be adjusted at the final settlement of the boundary by them.

4. As the south-western boundary of Singampatti will touch this portion it may be found desirable in settling his bounds to take a line avoiding this portion; and hence I have deemed it necessary to bring the matter to your notice now.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. B. PENNINGTON,
Collector.

THE Board are unable to arrive at any conclusion on the subject in the absence of maps; a sketch should be furnished exhibiting the boundary as now traced and that alluded to by Mr. Hayne.

2. The Government of Madras have, however, expressed themselves willing "to accept the water-shed on the ghat range as the boundary wherever Travancore marches with Tinnevelly" and very good reason must be shown to enable the Board to recommend that an arrangement which has been acceded to by the Travancore Circar and on which the operations of the past five years have been based should be set aside in favor of claims derivable from a rough survey of fifty years back in a mountain region then unexplored and in some parts quite inaccessible.

Para. 24, G.O. of May 10th, 1871, No. 816.

(True Copies and Extract.)

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

To the Collector of Tinnevelly.

Exd. A. Grubert.

1880.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

To

THE COLLECTOR OF TINNEVELLY.

Dated January 8th.

Printed 22nd.

Received

PROCEEDINGS, 8TH JANUARY 1880, No. 43.

JANUARY.

No. 43.

Boundary Line — between Travancore and Tinnevelly, traced by the Commissioners in the first season.—Passing orders on letter from Collector forwarding one from Mr. Hayne suggesting that the — will probably have to be corrected with reference to Messrs. Ward and Connor's survey of the boundary in 1817—21.

No. 209.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 10th February 1880.

Read the following letter from J. B. PENNINGTON, Esq., Collector of Tinnevelly, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Courtallam, 22nd January 1880, No. 33:—

IN reply to the Board's Miscellaneous Proceedings, No. 43, dated 8th January 1880, I have the honor to state that I will have the sketch of the boundary lines south of Kuttálam prepared, as directed in paragraph 1, for the information of the Board, although on further consideration (and after actually seeing the Muttukulivayal), I am not inclined to press for the recognition of Ward and Connor's line *except* in the Ayankovil Pass, where the British boundary has always been recognized as running far down the western slopes and has been carefully surveyed accordingly. If it is proposed to accept the water-shed as the boundary here also, I trust I may be allowed an opportunity of stating my objections.

2. With reference, however, to the boundary *north* of Shenkotta, it is of *immediate* importance that it should be decided whether the water-shed line is to be taken as the boundary or not, as it will be seen from the enclosed copy of a letter from the Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey that he will be ready to begin the survey of that part of the line in the middle of next month.

3. When I wrote last I was much inclined to take Ward and Connor's line as the boundary, especially as it agreed with the decision of Government to accept the water-shed as a general rule; but it appears now, from Mr. Hayne's report (which will be submitted very shortly), and from his sketch map, which I shall forward immediately for reference, that besides a claim on behalf of the villages of Kadaiyanallur and Krishnapuram to a considerable tract in the southern part, both the Zemindars of Sivagiri and Sétúr assert that their boundaries extend *to the Periyàr river* and are not affected by the water-shed at all. If it should turn out that the evidence in support of these claims is trustworthy, I doubt if the Government of Madras, or even the Supreme Government, would be competent to surrender such integral portions of British India to a foreign State.

4. It is, of course, easy for the Travancore Sircar to agree to take the water-shed as the boundary now that all their claims to territory on this side have been conceded. They have nothing to lose and everything to gain by the arrangement.

5. With reference to the Board's remark that the water-shed has been accepted as the boundary line *everywhere*, I venture to refer the Board to their Proceedings, dated 8th December 1876, No. 3,111, paragraphs 3 and 5, and the Government Order thereon, paragraphs 3 and 6.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From Major A. O. H. CLAY, Acting Deputy Superintendent, No. 4 Revenue Survey Party, to J. B. PENNINGTON, Esq., Collector of Tinnevelly, dated Madura, 17th January 1880, No. 39-30.

WITH reference to correspondence as per margin, I have the honor to inform you that the Head Surveyor employed on the Tinnevelly-Travancore boundary reports that he will be able to take up the survey of the line north of Shenkotta about the middle of February. I therefore request that you will be so good as to urge the Board of Revenue to pass early orders on your letter, No. 747, of 11th November 1879, as it is highly desirable that the survey of the entire boundary should be completed this season.

Your letter, No. 879, of 3rd May 1879.
My reply, No. 1,654.491, of 28th October 1879.
Your letter, No. 2,346, of 14th November 1879, enclosing copy of a letter, No. —, dated 7th November 1879.

2. If the water-shed is not to be considered the boundary, I think it would be a waste of time, labor, and money to trace out and survey the water-shed as suggested in the Deputy Conservator's letter, No. —, paragraphs 9 and 10, of 7th November 1879.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. B. PENNINGTON,
Collector.

SUBMITTED to Government with copy of Board's Proceedings, dated 8th January 1880, No. 43.

2. The Collector of Tinnevelly brings to notice that Ward and Connor's survey is not alluded to in the recent correspondence regarding the settlement of the Travancore boundary and points out that if its authority be admitted by this Government and the Travancore Sircar the work of the Survey Department will be simplified as they will simply have to demarcate and survey the water-shed on that part of the line north of Shenkotta where they are about to commence work and will be saved the trouble of inquiring into a large number of disputes. If the water-shed, which is apparently in accordance with Ward and Connor's description, is followed, however, certain tracts on the west of it claimed by Government villages and Zemindars will be assigned to Travancore, and the Collector questions the right of Government to surrender any land to which the Zemindars interested can make good their claims.

3. The orders of Government, as the Board understand them, are that the water-shed should be accepted as the boundary where such line is not disputed, that undisputed occupation by either party beyond the water-shed should be admitted and the line marked accordingly, and that where there are disputes which cannot be settled at once both lines should be mapped, leaving disputes for settlement hereafter when the whole boundary line has been completed. The question was fully discussed in the Board's Proceedings, dated 23rd March 1877, No. 1,312, and as the Government did not dissent from the Board's view that the "water-shed line was not intended to be rigidly adhered to irrespective of proved possession inconsistent with its adoption" but impliedly accepted their conclusions by communicating the Proceedings to the Resident in Travancore without remark, it is presumed that all claims on the part of Government or Zemindars to land on the western side of the water-shed which can be established by satisfactory evidence will form the subject of negotiation hereafter. Ward and Connor's descriptive Memoir evidently throws no light on the question of the proper boundary line north of Shenkotta; it speaks of it as an imaginary course supposed to run on the ridge of the high ghâts; under the Order of the 17th January 1877, the tracts claimed by the Zemindars and Government villages should have been separately marked with a view to their future determination; this apparently has not been done. The Board think these tracts should be separately demarcated and surveyed; the Zemindari boundaries are about to be investigated, and if the claims of the Zemindars are substantiated they must be recognized by arrangement with the Travancore Sircar or compensation in some form must be granted.

G.O., dated 10th May 1871, No. 816.

G.O., dated 21st December 1875, No. 1,828.

G.O., dated 17th January 1877, No. 179.

4. As regards the boundary south of Shenkotta, Ward and Connor's line should be mapped as well as that traced by Mr. Hayne; to admit of this being done the Collector should forward the descriptive Memoir, of which no copy is available in the Board's office, whereupon the Superintendent, Revenue Survey, will be requested to show the course of Ward and Connor's line in comparison with that recently demarcated. It appears from Extracts Minutes of Consultation, dated 5th December 1851, No. 1,207, Revenue Department, that the survey map of Travancore was

prepared from the survey made by Messrs. Ward and Connor from 1817 to 1820, and that it was recognized as authoritative in the settlement of certain disputes then pending. The evidence afforded by the descriptive Memoir would therefore be of weight.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with map to be returned, and copy of Board's Proceedings,
dated 8th January 1880, No. 43.

„ Collector of Tinnevelly.

Copy to the Superintendent, Revenue Survey,
with copy of Board's Proceedings, dated 8th January 1880, No. 43.

Exd. A. S. Rodgers.

No. 275.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 24th February 1880.

Read the following letter from J. B. PENNINGTON, Esq., Collector of Tinnevelly, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 29th January 1880, No. 53:—

I HAVE the honor to forward, for the information of the Board and Government, copy of a letter (No. 438, dated 22nd January 1880) from Mr. Hayne, in which he reports the final completion of the Tinnevelly-Travancore watershed boundary.

2. The cost of the work has been slightly greater than during the last season owing to a variety of circumstances detailed by Mr. Hayne, the chief of which of course is the fact that much of it was done in very bad weather when little or no progress could be made. It would probably have been a little cheaper to have spread the work over two working seasons, but it was of great importance to get it finished without any avoidable delay.

3. Mr. Hayne's report contains a great deal of interesting information about a tract of country which has hitherto been almost unknown, and especially about a remarkable series of old irrigation works which seem to show that the irrigation of the northern taluks of Tinnevelly received a good deal of attention in former times. I am inclined to think that these old hill irrigation works are worthy of professional investigation, notwithstanding the fact that an equally promising old work of a similar character above Tirukkurangudi (known as Kumarasami Pillai's anicut) was formally condemned by the late District Engineer.

4. For convenience of reference I will add a few remarks on Mr. Hayne's report paragraph by paragraph.

5. *Paragraph* 5.—Arrangements are being made by the Forest Committee for the conservancy of the head waters of the Hanumanadi. It would be a great advantage if the small block of hills belonging to Travancore in this locality could be acquired by our Government; but if this is impossible, some arrangement should be made with the Travancore Sirkar by which all felling on the eastern slopes of the hills belonging to Travancore should be put a stop to.

6. *Paragraphs* 12 *to* 18.—The great feature of the present report is the claim to extensive tracts of land on the western side of the watershed to which allusion has been made in my letter, No. 33, dated 23rd January 1880. I have already* forwarded the sketch map showing roughly the extent of these claims, and it is necessary now to decide how they (and other claims further south) are to be disposed of.

* 25th January 1880.

7. With reference to the Alwarkurichi block, the Board observed that it had been "rightly marked to Tinnevelly as it has been attached to Alwarkurichi for more than sixty years." The evidence as to the tracts now reported on may not be so conclusive, but, as already observed in my letter noted above, the British subjects interested are clearly entitled to have their claims fully heard and disposed of by some competent authority before the land can be handed over to a foreign State. It does not appear that the Travancore Sirkar has ever manifested any inclination to yield such lands when in their possession, and, unless there is to be at least reciprocity in the transaction, it does not seem reasonable to abandon British territory, even if it were equitable to transfer land belonging to private proprietors to another State.

Revenue Board
1880. No. 253
Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated February 10*th.*
Printed 16*th.*
Received " 18 —

PROCEEDINGS, 10TH FEBRUARY 1880, No. 209.

FEBRUARY.
No. 209.

Boundary line — between Travancore and Tinnevelly.—Submitting to Government, with Board's remarks, letter from Collector regarding settlement of —.

8. *Paragraph* 19.—It will be seen from this that the Travancore Commissioner lays claim to a part of Sivagiri situated apparently in the plains. It is not likely that such a claim could hold good against undisputed adverse possession for so many years, but it goes to show the necessity for the appointment of a Commissioner by both Governments with full powers to determine *all claims to land on either side which have not yet been disposed of.* Even the Shenkottah boundary appears to have been settled only in the plains, and there are at least three points in which an authoritative boundary requires to be laid down and *permanently demarcated.*

9. *Paragraph* 27.—I am inclined to agree with Mr. Hayne in thinking that the boundary need not be cleared more than once in three years, but it should certainly be carefully inspected every three years at least, and all the marks, &c, renewed if necessary. They should also, I think, be cut more deeply and either tarred or painted as Mr. Hayne suggests. I do not think it necessary for village officers to peram-

Paragraph 31.

bulate the boundary, as the line itself will always be the best evidence of its own existence, and may in course of time be permanently and effectually marked out by trees of some kind.

10. *Paragraph* 33.—The tract of land called Muttukuli vayal is so obviously on the western side of the watershed, and the old survey is so clearly wrong as to the course of the Kodayar that I do not consider it desirable to make any claim in that quarter.

11. I have lately had an opportunity of inspecting part of the watershed line cut through heavy jungle and elephant grass some five years ago in company with Major Campbell Walker, and we both agreed that the work had been admirably done, and that it is very creditable to Mr. Hayne that he should have persevered so conscientiously with a task which must often have been trying and irksome to the last degree. No one who has not had some experience of it can imagine the difficulties and discomforts that must be encountered when work has to be done in the wet and the cold in a jungle swarming with leeches and with servants and coolies constantly succumbing to attacks of fever.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From W. C. HAYNE, Esq., Deputy Conservator of Forests, in charge of Boundary Commission, Tinnevelly, to J. B. PENNINGTON, Esq., Collector of Tinnevelly, dated Kuttálam, 22nd January 1880, No. 438.

I HAVE the honor to submit my report on the demarcation of the Tinnevelly-Travancore hill boundary for the fourth season.

2. The work has now been brought to a termination, having reached Kottai or Pulvarangan peak where the Madura demarcation party apparently commenced their work, it being a prominent point at an elevation of some 6,400 feet above the sea and close to the Tinnevelly, Madura and Travancore tri-junction, the latter being only 1,560 feet further to the north and 350 feet lower on an insignificant hill. I had three cairns raised on this spot to denote the locality as I found no distinguishing mark of any sort had been placed there.

3. This season's work was commenced north of Shenkottah at the Kammanadi river. It should have been begun a little further south where the boundary leaves the plains and ascends the hills and runs down to the plains again forming two sides of a triangle and comprising an area of some 2 square miles; but as this was difficult of identification owing to varied opinions as to its course, and as the line is laid down in Messrs. Ward and Connor's course accompanying their memoir, I did not consider it worthwhile wasting time over the matter, but left it to be determined by the survey party with their instruments when they reached the locality. The survey of this together with the rest of the watershed line will probably be completed this season, as officers have already been deputed for the work.

4. To get to the head of the Hanumanadi river I had to cut my way for some 3 miles through dense forest. At the head is to be found a large swamp at an elevation of 4,000 feet which almost touched the line forming the eastern and western drainage, and near to it is the peak shown in the map as Shairmalai which reads 4,200 feet above the sea.

5. As the Hanumanadi irrigates a considerable area on the east both of Travancore and British Territory, it is desirable that further denudation of the forests contained within its

8

drainage should be prohibited. The whole drainage of the stream is to the *east* of the watershed, but on the Travancore portion of it there is much cultivation going on, and the Urkad Zemindar has a coffee estate on it. There are also small native holdings on the Tinnevelly portion, but all further extension has been prohibited for some years past.

6. This season's demarcation may be said to have commenced from the swamp at the head of the Hanumanadi river, and carried on along the watershed to Kottai peak, making a distance, by surface measurement, of 43 miles and 3,657 feet. The work was started soon after the middle of January 1879 and closed by the middle of December of the same year. It took much longer accomplishing than was ever anticipated owing to many difficulties in the way of weather, inefficient and untrustworthy officials and the want of hill-men.

7. One official had to be reported and punished for the submission of false accounts.

8. The work was carried on through the south-west and north-east monsoons, during which periods but little work could be accomplished, and the progress was consequently very slow. The south-west monsoon was, contrary to all expectation, an unprecedentedly wet one; so much so that the Zemindars were rejoiced at it and attributed it to the advent of the Commission. They had suffered from inadequate south-west monsoons for some years past.

9. Besides bad weather and inefficient hands the work had to be conducted without the aid of any hill-men as there were none to be had in these parts. One of these men is equal to two, if not three, low country coolies for rapid and good work.

10. The expenditure for the season amounts to Rs. 5,991-0-8 (which gives an average of Rs. 136 per mile including establishments, &c.) The unseasonable weather, together with the extended period over which the work was carried on, has added considerably to the cost of the work.

11. The accounts will be submitted separately.

12. As anticipated in my second season's report (paragraphs 10 and 11 of letter, No. 159, of the 27th October 1876, embodied in G.O., No. 179, dated 17th January 1877) claims have been put in for territory to the most of the watershed, by the villagers of Kadayanallur and Krishnapuram, by the Vairavankulam Mittah, and by the Zemindars of Sivagiri and Sétúr, which claims have been laid before the Travancore Commissioner on behalf of the British Government.

13. A tracing of the Travancore map of the scale of one inch to one mile is forwarded showing approximately the area claimed by the different parties and the various channels found on the watershed boundary.

14. The map was found inaccurate, and many of the names therein obsolete and unknown to the villagers below.

15. The villagers of Kadayanallur and Krishnapuram and the Vairavankulam Mittah assert claims to nearly the same territory, amounting to some 15 (5×3) square miles.

16. The Sivagiri Zemindar claims territory to the extent of some 22 (11×2) square miles, while the Sétúr Zemindar's claim amounts to 14 (7×2) square miles. These areas are all computed on map measurement, but the actual quantity of land by surface measurement would give double or treble the area.

17. Owing to these claims the Commission was precluded from cutting any marks on rocks as it proceeded with the work lest it should be found necessary to erase them on the final adjustment of the claims.

18. No demarcation of the claims to the west has been made owing to the weather being too wet and misty to accomplish it when in the locality, besides it was deemed unnecessary to undertake it until after a final adjustment of the claims.

19. The Travancore Commissioner has informed me by letter, No. 59, of 15th December 1879 (a copy of which is herewith forwarded) of the existence of a dispute between the Travancore Government and the Sivagiri and Sétúr Zemindaries regarding a tract of land to the east of the watershed. This tract apparently lies altogether in the plains and does not affect the hills. Particulars regarding the matter will, I am informed, be brought to the notice of Government through the Resident of Travancore.

20. One peculiarity with regard to this season's work has been the number of channels of various sizes that have been met with on the crest of the hills turning water from the western slopes. There were no less than nine of them, all of which have been marked in the map and the names given. Most of them are now in disuse from want of repair.

21. The channel of most importance, and down which water now flows, is the Talaiyanaikal above the Vasudevanallur hills, which is said to have been cut by the grand-father of the present Zemindar of Sivagiri. It diverts two streams and runs for 4,400 feet, or between three-fourths of a mile, and a mile before it discharges its waters on the eastern side, and is 6 feet deep and wide on an average.

22. The channels in the order met with are as follows :—

Name of Channel.	Position.	Object.	In what condition found.
1. Kolangaraiteri Channel.	Above the Vairavankulam Mittah hills.	Diversion of the head of a small stream.	Blocked.
2. Urnikut	Above Krishnapuram hills.	Diversion of water from artificial lake fed by a small stream.	Blocked and bund broken.
3. Shembuttu	Above Chintamani hills.	Diversion of a swamp fed by a rivulet.	Bund broken.
4. Talaiyanai	Above Vasudevanallur hills.	Diversion of the heads of two streams.	In fair order and water flowing.
5. Udumbuteri	On the Sivagiri Zemin hills.	Diversion of a small stream.	Bank broken.
6. Sengalmalai	Do.	Do.	Leaky and choked.
7. Attaikadi Mettu ...	On the Sétúr Zemin hills.	Diversion of the water of a swamp.	Bund broken.
8. Pachi Mettu	Do.	Diversion of the head of a small steam.	Dam broken.
9. Surikal	Do.	Diversion of a spring.	Bund carried away.

23. I have laid before the Travancore Commissioner a claim (letter of 21st April 1879) for the free use of the water diverted by these channels should the territory to the west be conceded to Travancore on the final adjustment of claims.

24. The lines of through communications to the west met with north of Shenkottah are the Achenkovil and Sivigiri ghats. There are other paths which come up to the summit of the hills and go down for some distance on the western side, but are not through communications.

25. All along the line the eastern slopes are very steep and rugged and run but a short distance before they reach the plains, while the land to the west consists of extensive undulating forests or grass land stretching across country for many miles. The large block of grazing country commences from about the junction of the Sivagiri and Sétúr Zemindaries and extends for many miles west and north.

26. The Pœciloneuron or Puthemgalli is to be found in abundance above the Kadayanallur hills.

27. It has, I believe, been proposed that the boundary lines should be cleared annually, but this I think hardly necessary after what I have seen of the Madura and Travancore boundary which had been cleared for about a twelve month. It might perhaps be cleared with advantage annually for the first year or two until all obstructions between the theodolite stations have been removed and the elephant reed and grass rooted out to a width of four or five feet (not wider for the elephant reed, otherwise it would fall and block the way), after that I am of opinion that a clearing every three years would be sufficient.

28. I observed that many of the theodolite stations had become invisible having turned the exterior color of the stone. And it struck me that, if they were tarred or painted, they would be discerned a much longer period afterwards. The same would apply to the insignia or any other marks cut on the rocks in connection with the boundary.

29. I advocate strongly a reclearance of the boundary at stated periods to be settled hereafter on experience having been gained as to whether a biennial or triennial clearing or a longer period still is best.

30. Another advantage to be gained by the repeated reclearance of the line is that it will always be kept in view and not be buried amongst records and allow of fictitious claims being brought forward when all has been forgotten.

31. It would also be a good plan if village officers were caused to inspect and walk round the different hill boundaries once a year in conjunction with a forest official as they appear to know nothing of the *actual* position of hill boundaries, but are dependent on old and infirm men who are past hill-climbing almost for information.

32. There is one other point I think desirable to bring to notice and which I have observed in looking up documents with reference to claims, and that is that on the final settlement of the present boundary all claimants should be made to produce every document they have in connection with the claim, and that these should be effaced in some way by stamping the

cancelling order on them or some other effectual method to prevent them or any one particular document being raked up at some subsequent date to suit the ends of the individuals who may bring them forward when the whole matter has been buried and forgotten and all the officials in the district changed or passed away and all ignorant of the matter.

33. Before closing this report I would draw attention to paragraph 16 of my letter on the first season's report, No. 64, dated 1st June 1875, embodied in G.O., No. 1,828, dated 21st December 1875, in which I state that Mutukuli vayal is undeniably in Travancore Territory. This is so by the watershed line, but not so by the ordnance map and in all probability by Messrs. Ward and Connor's course also.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. B. PENNINGTON,
Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From W. T. A. COSBY, Esq., Travancore Boundary Commissioner, to W. C HAYNE, Esq., British Boundary Commissioner, dated Devadanam, 15th December 1879, No. 59.

I HAVE the honor to inform you of the existence of a dispute between the Travancore Government and the Sivagiri and Sétúr Zemindars regarding the possession of a tract of land belonging to Travancore but now in the enjoyment of the Zemindars.

2. As far as I am able to ascertain from the documents in my possession, the land in dispute lies to the east of the ghats with the Karuppiar for its southern, Ayana Nagarukulam to the north of Natchathalinga Swami Pagoda for its northern, Velloikal Uttu at the foot of the hills for its western, and the road running from south to north to the west of Chokanampudur for its eastern boundary.

3. A claim to this land will probably be submitted by His Highness the Maharajah's Government through the British Resident in due course.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. B. PENNINGTON,
Collector.

WITH the foregoing letter the Collector of Tinnevelly submits Mr. Hayne's report on the fourth season's operations in connection with the demarcation of the boundary between Tinnevelly and Travancore; work commenced at the Hanumanadi river in Tenkasi Taluk and was carried up to Kottai peak close to the Madura, Tinnevelly, and Travancore tri-junction a distance of about 44 miles. The expenditure amounted to Rs. 5,991, or Rs. 136 per mile on an average. The tracing of the boundary along the watershed is now complete, the whole distance from the neighbourhood of the Mahendragherry peak in the Nángunéri Taluk, where work commenced, being about 135 miles. The Collector has seen a portion of the line and testifies to the admirable manner in which the work has been done; the Board consider that Mr. Hayne is entitled to great credit for his share of the task.

2. It still remains to be determined whether the boundary traced by the Commissioners is to be accepted; on the portion of the line which has recently been marked claims have been put forward by Government villages and Zemindars to land on the west of the watershed, and the Travancore Government prefer a claim to a tract on the east. These claims have been brought to the notice of Government in the Board's Proceedings, dated 10th February 1880, No. 209, and it was suggested that they should be separately demarcated and surveyed with a view to a determination of the disputes after the evidence in support of the claims has been considered; it does not appear that any investigation has been made so far and the claims have not been demarcated—*vide* paragraph 18 of Mr. Hayne's report. The Alwarkurichi dispute also awaits settlement. The orders of Government are requested as to the course to be adopted. In the case of a dispute on the Madura frontier, which the Commissioners were unable to settle the Resident in Travancore was appointed arbitrator, and as that officer has the requisite local knowledge and possesses the confidence of both

G.O., dated 17th January 1877, No. 179.

G.O., dated 24th January 1879, No. 192.

Governments this arrangement seems the best which can be made. Until some decision has been arrived at, the boundary cannot be finally marked.

3. As regards the periodical clearance of the boundary the Board in their Proceedings, dated 15th September last, No. 2,621, expressed the opinion that the cost of an annual clearance would be disproportionate to the advantage to be secured thereby, but the Government took a different view. The theodilite stations should, however, be more durably marked as pointed out by Mr. Hayne. His suggestion as to the marking of documents produced in support of claims is also deserving of consideration.

G.O., dated 5th September 1879, No. 1,825.
Paragraph 28.
Paragraph 32.

G.O., dated 22nd July 1879, No. 1,537.

4. Vested rights to water from the old irrigation channels referred to must of course be maintained.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
Copy to the Collector of Tinnevelly.
" " Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

Exd. A. Grubert.

10

Revenue Department

Miscellaneous No. 4,559

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

Dated 24th March 1880.

Read Official Memorandum
from the Under Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department, dated
24th March 1880, calling for
the Annual Statement of
Returns of Surrendered, Registered &
Re-Registered Arms, and also the Estimate
showing the Number of Persons likely
to require Arms
during the year 1880-81.

Revenue Secretary.

The Proceedings of the Board of
Revenue dated 2nd March
1880 are submitted herewith.

Revenue Department

Revenue Dept
No. 1363.

1880.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Dated February 24th.
Printed th.
Received March 3

PROCEEDINGS, 24TH FEBRUARY 1880, No. 275.

Dept 2/3/80

FEBRUARY.

No. 275.

Tinnevelly-Travancore Watershed Boundary. —Passing orders on letter from Collector of Tinnevelly forwarding report of Mr. Hayne on the final completion of the —.

Back No. 198

N.A. Sept.
Cl. for Reply

of Government.

The Superintendent, Revenue Survey will be requested to expedite the completion of the map shewing Ward and Conner's line.

/True Extract/

Secretary

To

The Under Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department,

with Original Enclosure in Lr. 1806/80
Mahe returned.

Edit

D.a.

Letter No. 8 of

15

My dear Lamplugh

Petition of J. O. Allen

for 2 original Warrants.

for Plans.

I think the J. O Allen

is off very well + the terms

of Warrant & Warrant in 20

and that I have settled

matter the thing with

Birkbeck is [illegible]

Received 1880 ... dept

No 23555

Copy of the Board

of Revenue

Minute No 4659.

Dated 27th of April 1880.

Read 4th ——— "

Ent.

Recorded by

[illegible]

Entered

Submitting for

information of Govern

ment Ward & Hammond

descriptive Memoir

received from the

Collector of Bijnor

relative.

C 20. 5 do
R 3. 6 do
C 1. 6
Plan
R 10. 2 do
R 17. 0

Book Pt. 199.

I beg pardon if I first
disturb you in my time.
Could you kindly tell
them at the Post Office to
send letters more quick
here. instead of 8 Tremont

Yours truly
A Lincoln

C. O. No 970

Y&N
25.8.80

Under Secretary's instructions are requested as to printing the enclosure to C No 2535. If it is not to be printed, there seems to be no object in printing or at all noticing the C No which does little more than give cover to it. The best plan perhaps is to exclude both from the C.O. (the C No is read in it) ~~merely~~ recording the C No in Mgs Ware & Commrs memoir of the

Shawcore boundaries as no where referred to in the F.O or any of the other documents referred in it.

JV
21-8-80

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Nos 1053 and 1363. 16

From Board of Revenue.

Dated 10th and 24th February 1880.

FOR ORDERS.

These two papers may be taken together.

The Dimmerally-Shawcore boundary line along the watershed has been completed.

The questions now are (1) is this line to be accepted where there are no disputes (2) how are the disputes to be settled.

As to the (2) the Board suggest the Resident nominating Shawcore being appointed Arbitrator as in a dispute on the Medina-Shawcore boundary.

In the present case though

though much land is encroached and also as shown in the earlier of the above Proceedings land claimed by Zamindars. Ward and Connor's survey which is referred to cannot be accepted as authentative and in parts it fails altogether.

The whole boundary line seems to require fresh settlement in accordance with the instructions of Govt. which in para 3 of their Proceedings of the 10th Feby. the Board have apparently completely misinterpreted.

Lack of Govt. Records further to enable arbitrator to arbitrate in settlement of the claims. and so to tell him ascertain Victor the J. Collector will agree to abide by his decision -

As regards the Zamindars claims can neither justify - of the land they claim is in British territory he can affirm a Boundary & title select Govt. to make a fresh decision - the Govt. Records & the Civil Court -

Unless proving our Arbitrator decides the land claimed by our Zamindars is in Travancore territory

Ward & Connor's Survey is not final & cannot be considered by us - We think it should be pointed out before any decision is arrived to - The Collector calls it instrument in order to description of the boundary line of the Zamindaris which about 30 miles from Cape Comorin - If the finality of the survey is not insisted on before any decision is arrived at the Zamindars will be entitled to dispute its correctness & claim compensation for the alienation

T/3/80

Until our Zamindars are put before the question will not arise at present -

The two States alone can settle the common boundary; if they do settling it, our Zamindars can come forward & complain of their ceding as Travancore territory land included in our engagements with them; and prove it - they will be entitled to compensation from us -

DS - 3/4/80.

our acceptance of the Arbitrial boundary can not encroach the Zamindaris practically it will not claim on the Govt. as regards the claims of private property.

Perhaps before the Govt. first settle the State boundary question the private property question of the Zamindaris should be settled. Govt. Records should be obtained & with Govt. Records in hand if there is any claim on the Govt. it will be authentative.

7/3/80.

FOR ORDERS.

Rev. Dept.

No. 18

C. Nos. 1053. — 1363. — 2555.

Whereas by the boundary award communicated by the divided tribe portion (1) Corps Commorin to Mahendra giri mountain (2) Mahendragiri to the Mandira Swamy hill and Travancore boundary.

2. The (1) was generally settled in 1871 and the settlement approved by the Secretary of State. The line was divided into two tracts and the settlement was made on the "sole possession principle." In one the Brahmin claim was abandoned in the Meer Wal of Travancore in favor of actual possession.

3. In part discovering the question as to the exact method of settlement the Govt suggested that the evidence should be accepted as

the

G.O. 5th August 1871 No 240 Pol. Dept.
— 19th May 1873 No 315 Rev. Dept.

G.O. 29th June 1871 No 1123 Rev. Dept.

G.O. 10th May 1871 No 816 Separate Rev. Dept.

I think we can send the Watershed Survey. But we in fact have not in the file. The Copy of Travancore in part? I do not see that the Zem. matter need cause indefinite delay with new detailed plan with regard to lands (Copy in Travancore) by evidence as agrees with Boundary - if in time when circumstances will ascertain. May then proceed the real line settled in opposite sides - May need not be disturbed + Travancore in the mean and when the plan should be surveyed recognise then decisions - Watson matter -

The W. shed is the natural Boundary - Has been disputed by us - + accepted as the guiding principle - Has

C. 13/3/80 R. 7/4/80.

Ist Notes
Alterations to be made
as in Travancore
as one Travancore
Boundary
Settlement

been surveyed + divided - + Travancore at one might - it - no object - it is. Just as well to be just - + nothing will so effectually do it - as to take the Boundary now cleared by mutual survey - and then the question of the pecuniary value of the hill in question - can just with discussion as between this Govt + Travancore

Govt

being regarded

Ist Notes

4

the boundary line wherever Sierra Leone ceases and the Timmanee country, the question of compensation for actual loss of Revenue being reserved for distinct settlement by equivalent cession elsewhere"

4. This principle goes as shown above, (as indicated in) settling the line South of Rhodamagaia, but below the question of the boundary North of Rhodamagaia towards the Mandara territories was reserved in 1872 the Count pointed out that the President based" stated that the Sierra Leone Government were willing to accept the water-shed on the shortest range as the boundary between the two "states" and he was directed to write the Sierra Leone Govt. "to notify that this natural boundary defines the line of separation between the States by the mutual agreement of

C.O. 24th October 1872 No 475 R.C.
" 26th " " " 1491 R.C.

the Governments."

5. It does not appear that the Sierra Leone Government ever issued any such Notification, but in 1874 the President (Col. Ballard) suggested that the suitable boundary between Sierra Leone Colony and Protectorate being permanently settled and demarcated.

This was agreed to, and Provincially Officers were appointed by the two States to work with the Imperial Officers.

Briefly the principle to be followed in the settlement was stated by the President to be "that the coast of the inhabited country should be the boundary that the officers appointed should meet together on the spot and take the principle to give and receive the land most convenient line in detail. The coast line as it were the coast line must be without dispute about the title."

Separation

See Memo in C.O. 10th June 1874 No 712 R.C.

C.O. 24th Oct 1874 No 1199 Protect.

Paras 12 of Memo in C.O. 10th June 1874 No 712 Receipt.

6. Operations on the Travancore frontier, commenced from Mahendragiri in October 1874, were continued in 1876 and 1877 and finished in 1878, up to the Madura boundary as stated in the paper now under consideration.

7. In the 1st season 1874 the boundary were settled in that disputed, but the Collector pointed out that in the following season "tracts of forest of considerable value which have always been and are still admittedly in actual British possession and enjoyment but which lie on the Western or Travancore side of the watershed," would come under demarcation and that the Travancore Government manifested no inclination to yield any lands on the Eastern side "which are in their possession."

G.O. 21st December 1878 No 1416

8. The Collector of Madura thought that the terms laid down by Government in May 1877 should be adhered to and that the watershed should be taken "as the boundary in such a manner as to reserve for future settlement by exchange of lands elsewhere, all question of proved actual possession by either State, of lands which will, as far as the main boundary is recognized, be outside one or the other."

The Board on this remarked that "these proposals were not agreed to by Travancore in their entirety – and indeed would be very difficult to give practical effect to – as involving exchanges of land."

The Board thought that "where the boundaries are undisputed and undisputed and undisputed, all the Travancore lands

xxx, all the

may

6. Operations on the Travancore frontier, commenced from Mahendragiri in October 1874, were continued in 1876 and 1877 and finished in 1878, up to the Madura boundary as stated in the paper now under consideration.

7. In the 1st season 1874 the boundary were settled in that disputed, but the Collector pointed out that in the following season "tracts of forest of considerable value which have always been and are still admittedly in actual British possession and enjoyment but which lie on the Western or Travancore side of the watershed," would come under demarcation and that the Travancore Government manifested no inclination to yield any lands on the Eastern side "which are in their possession."

G.O. 21st December 1878 No 1416

8. The Collector of Madura thought that the terms laid down by Government in May 1877 should be adhered to and that the watershed should be taken "as the boundary in such a manner as to reserve for future settlement by exchange of lands elsewhere, all question of proved actual possession by either State, of lands which will, as far as the main boundary is recognized, be outside one or the other."

The Board on this remarked that "these proposals were not agreed to by Travancore in their entirety – and indeed would be very difficult to give practical effect to – as involving exclusive exchanges of land."

The Board thought that "where the boundaries are undisputed and undefined xxx, all the Travancore lands

may

may be East of the general line the forward operations should not affect them in any way. If there is undisputed Timiravelly land immediately on the Western side of the watershed x x x, it should be marked to Tinnivelly. If extensive tracts are involved, or the officers cannot agree, the matter must be referred for orders."

The Government approved these views.

9. In the 2nd season the party began at Courtallum four North of the place they left off at in the previous season and worked South. They completed upwards of 24 miles but did not reach the scene of their former labors. Of the distance some NW upwards of 5 miles was in dispute, and two lines were cut

(1) Along the boundary claimed by Tinnivelly and (2) Along the watershed to which the Travancore Agent adhered "under protest."

The block proposed as the Alwarthirunagari block and called by the Conservator (Mr. Miller) comprised an area "to be not less than 20 square miles, and containing some of the finest forest land in the Tinnivelly division."

This block had formed the subject of correspondence between the Board and Government in previous years, and had undoubtedly been attached to the village of Alwarthirunagari for more than 60 years.

10. In the meantime it had transpired that another piece of land near Courtallum, but on the West of the watershed which had been gained away by the Tinnivelly Collector to a Mr. Cocq, had subsequently been sold by Travancore to a Mr. Miller. Correspondence ensued, but eventually Govt. gave

Para 9 of Report in G.O. 17 January 1877 No 179 of 8.

G.O. 17 Jany/77, No 179, Revd Dett

G.O. 5 Dec. 77 No. 3358.

may be East of the general line the forward operations should not affect them in any way. If there is undisputed Timiravelly land immediately on the Western side of the watershed x x x, it should be marked to Tinnivelly. If extensive tracts are involved, or the officers cannot agree, the matter must be referred for orders."

The Government approved these views.

9. In the 2nd season the party began at Courtallum four North of the place they left off at in the previous season and worked South. They completed upwards of 24 miles but did not reach the scene of their former labors. Of the distance some NW upwards of 5 miles was in dispute, and two lines were cut

(1) Along the boundary claimed by Tinnivelly and (2) Along the watershed to which the Travancore Agent adhered "under protest."

The block proposed as the Alwarthirunagari block and called by the Conservator (Mr. Miller) comprised an area "to be not less than 20 square miles, and containing some of the finest forest land in the Tinnivelly division."

This block had formed the subject of correspondence between the Board and Government in previous years, and had undoubtedly been attached to the village of Alwarthirunagari for more than 60 years.

10. In the meantime it had transpired that another piece of land near Courtallum, but on the West of the watershed which had been gained away by the Tinnivelly Collector to a Mr. Cocq, had subsequently been sold by Travancore to a Mr. Miller. Correspondence ensued, but eventually Govt. gave

Para 9 of Report in G.O. 17 January 1877 No 179 of 8.

G.O. 17 Jany/77, No 179, Revd Dett

G.O. 5 Dec. 77 No. 3358.

saw upon the land and left
Mr. Gregg to settle with the
Tasmanian authorities.

II. As regards the Aboriginal
tribes and other instances
in which, in their fastness-
ness North of Launceston or
Hobart Town, the determination
party might find the water-
shed line departed from, the
Board thought that "cases should
be investigated, and at the
conclusion of the work the
outstanding claims ××× may
perhaps admit of adjustment
by mutual concession of
boundary."

The Contractor that the
best course to pursue will
be to run the boundary line
from and to end continuously
each being taking whenever a
dispute arises which cannot be
at once settled locally, to mark
both lines ×××. Such disputes,
if not in the meanwhile
adjusted, can be disposed of ×××

when

G.B. 4 Sept 1877 / No 2638 P.D.

when the whole boundary line has been completed. 22.

12: In the 3rd Season 16 miles were accomplished and the line South of Shankota (Countries unfinished), which had been left (attn) which had been left unfinished, was completed, but no fresh dispute was reported.

13. In the 4th season, as now reported on, some 43 miles from Shankota Northwards and the Madura Tajunction were gone over and numerous claims by British (including Zamindars) villagers to land West of the water-shed line were found in this portion of the boundary.

(14) These claims and the Alwarkurichi boundary dispute have now to be disposed of. Two decided by Govt in G.O. 17th January 1879 / No 179. The latter has been characterised and the Board would leave all claims called.

15. Ward and Connor's Survey

of

See para 11 of this Letter.

of 117-20 has been referred to, and their descriptive Memoir has now been obtained and sent up.

North of Manitoba (or on the tract denounced last season) it is of no value. As to the South of Manitoba the Board have asked the Deputy Receiver to have a Map prepared showing Land and Coal areas and that recently denounced by the boundary party. The map has been called for but has not yet reached Government.

In B.C. Letter No. 1559 d. 27th April the Depr. was told to expedite it.

I understand that Inspection to be checked. Subject Land occupied by B. Subjects. Land of by good evidence. Certificate of Map & Entry to be a Map & Entry to be surrendered County to be undefined boundary between B.C. & T.C. by Bill

except the Watershed which may, upon agreement, be taken to be the Watershed as the Watershed is.

Rivers entering Lake. Where such Rivers or Streams as the Lake of St. Joseph claim lands on both sides of the line shall be the property of St. Joseph claim lands on one side.

Islands. Islands in the Lake to belong to the Province in which they are situate.

Jurisdiction. Jurisdiction

C20.5
R3.0.5
Fol 12
1824

Surely no reason for granting a claim to this Island. Kuriehi states that he did formerly possess it, but asserts that another Chief is at present authorized to grant it. Such a grant would be void, as private possessions of the natives are unnecessarily confirmed by Government. Such a grant would be void, as private possessions of the natives are unnecessarily confirmed by Government. Such a grant would be void, as private possessions of the natives are unnecessarily confirmed by Government.

Note.

The Secretary thinks it would be very desirable if there were only those of those who formerly held from the British Govt. would be held, in part or entirely from the Travancore Circar. But it is complicated by the Govt. desire to retain as a field for forest operations in connection with the Water supply — the large tract known as the Aliyakurchi block. (See para. 9 of the foregoing note.)

In order that full information regarding this Tract may be before Government

f.o. 8th March/86
No: 594 was sent-
for has now been
put up.
It contains Mr
Ingrey's report
on the forest & the
nature of the claims
put forward to it-
by our own Headmen
- Claims - that is -
against - Government -
and - against - Traders etc.
Attention is
invited to the
extent involved.
"as a rule" - while
Mr. Ingrey -
the Travancore
frontier advances
eastwards to the crest
of the ghats in some
places extending
down the slopes
& even into the
plains on the
Eastward side but-

Mr. the "Sudawadi
depending on the species
in it. is indefinite. I
can't find the G. Rock
in the map. but it
flows into Tinnevelly
then the Alwar R. &
drains into it appears
cannot be on the crest
side of the watershed.
If it flows into both
it does not respect
mountains carefully -
The only claims on the
crest of the watershed that
do not be disposed of which
Mr. and Mrs. the
concern are the Land
Limit forging Avenue

Mr. Sanders -
J.B.

here on the contrary
British territory extends
down the Western
slope to the Kunnimalay
River, a distance of
probably 15 miles
from the crest."
The Collector considered
the
"just-Northern &
Southern limit ... not
not more than 20
miles distant as the
crow flies."
At that time appa-
-rently the tract was
admittedly British
It is also noted that
coffee planting had
been stopped in it - and
that Mr. Ingrey
the Solicitor
to the Govt. as the Poddavadi
River which the water
is all utilized depends on
the streams in there
forests for its supply of
Water."

Sd
16/6.

Rev: Dept.

No 975

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under Date the 18th August 1880

26.

Read Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 10th January, 24th February and 27th April 1880, Nos 209, 275 and 455 Miscellaneous, respectively, regarding the Settlement of the Boundary line between Travancore and Timevelly.

(2)

The Timevelly - Travancore boundary may conveniently be divided into two portions.

(1) Cape Comorin to Makendagiri mountain

2) Makendagiri to the Madura, Timevelly and Travancore frontier

2. The (1) was finally settled in 1871 and the settlement

G.O. 8 August 1871 No 240 Pol. Dept
& 19 Feby. 1872 No 315 R.D.

Forwarded

January

Recirculated with a "note" as to the Alwarkurichi forest which will be made over to Travancore if the Watershed boundary is strictly followed.

Jan/81
10/6.

C.P.C.
R.L.S.
R.C.M.C.
R.T.C.

~~Tuck to pp 192, 193~~

settlement approved by the Secretary of State. The line was divided into two tracts and the settlement was made on the "uti possidetis" principle. In one the British claim was abandoned; in the other that of Savanore — in favour of actual possession.

3. In first discussing the question as to the method of settlement this Govt suggested that the watershed on the Bhut range should be accepted as the boundary line wherever Savanore marches with Sirsi city, the question of compensation for actual loss of Revenue on being received for distinct settlement by equivalent cession elsewhere.

4. This principle was as shown above not rigidly

rigidly observed in settling the line south of Bellahonda-giri, but when the question of the boundary north of that mountain towards the Madura trijunction was raised in 1872, the Govt pointed out that the Resident had stated that the Savanore Government were willing to accept the watershed on the Giant range as the boundary between the two States," and he was directed back the Savanore Govt to notify that this natural boundary defines the line of separation between the States by the mutual agreement of the Governments."

5. It does not appear

appear that the Travancore Government even assisted in any such notification, but in 1874 the President (Mr Ballard) suggested that the whole boundary between Travancore, Cochin and British territory be finally settled and demarcated.

Memo on GO. 10 June 1874 No 912 R.D.

It was agreed to, and eventually officers were appointed by the two States to work with the British officers.

GO. 22 Sept. 74 Legislative

Briefly the principle to be followed in the settlement was stated by the President to be "that the exact spot be marked generally should be the boundary, but that the officers appointed should work together on the give and take principle to fix and

GO. Case 12 of Memo in GO. 10 June 1874 No 912 R.D.

mark the best and most convenient line in detail as near the exact line as might be, without disputing about trifles".

28

6. Operations on the Travancore-Travancore Cochin frontier, commenced from Mankendragiri in October 1874, were continued in 1875 and 1876 and completed in 1879, up the Madura Injunction as stated in the paper now under consideration.

GO. 21 December 1875 No 1020 R.D.

7. In the 1st season 38½ miles of boundary were settled without dispute, but the Collector pointed out that in the following season on "tracts of forest of considerable value which have always been and are still admittedly in actual British

British possession and enjoyment but which lie on the western or Savanne side of the water-shed" would come under denunciation and that the Savanne Govt manifested no inclination beyond any lands on the Eastern side "which are in their possession".

8. The acting Colonial Secretary thought that the terms laid down by Government in May 1871 should be adhered to and that the water-shed should be taken "as the boundary in such a manner as to reserve for future settlement by exchange of lands elsewhere, all questions

of prior occupation and actual possession by either State, of lands on which will, after the new boundary is agreed, be made over to the other."

The Board entirely remarked that these proposals were not agreed to by Savanne-ese in their entirety—and indeed would be very difficult to give practical effect to — as involving extensive exchanges of lands.

The Board therefore think where the boundaries are undisputed and marked xxx, although Savanne lands may lie east of the general line, the present operations should not

not affect them in any way. If there is undisputed Tinnevelly land unmarked on the western side of the watershed ×××, it should be marked by Tinnevelly. If the two Govts are unable to agree, the matter must be referred for orders."

The Government of Travancore approved these views.

In the 2d Season the party began at the Courtallum, far north of the place they left off at in the previous season and worked South. They completed upwards of 24 miles but did not reach the scene of their former labors. Of the distance gone over upwards of 5 miles was in dispute, and two lines were cut

Ref. G.O. 17th Jany/77 No 179 R.D.

Para 9 of report and G.O. 17 January 1877 No 179 R.D.

(1) along the boundary claimed by Tinnevelly and (2) along the watershed to which the Travancore Agent adhered "under protest". The tract was known as the Alwar Kurichi block, and the British representative (Mr Wayne) computed its area "to be not less than 20 square miles, and containing some of the finest forest land in the Tinnevelly Division".

This block had formed the subject of correspondence between the Board and Govt in previous years, and had undoubtedly been attacked by

to the village of Alwar-
-kurichi formore than
60 years."

10. In the meantime
had transpired that
another piece of land
near Courtallum, but
on the west of the water-
-shed which had been
given away by the ex
Travancore authorities
to a Mr Cocq, had sub-
-sequently been sold by
Travancore to a Mr Miller.
Correspondence ensued,
but eventually Govt gave
up the land and left
Mr Cocq to settle with
the Travancore Authorities.

11. As regards the Alwar-
-kurichi track and other
instances in which, in
their future course —

North

North of Courtallum or
Shenkota, the demarca-
-tion party might find
the watershed line 3 | de-
-parted from, the Board
thought the "cases should
be investigated, and at
the conclusion of the work
the conflicting claims ×××
may perhaps admit of
adjustment by mutual
concessions of territory".

The Govt ruled that the
best course to pursue will
be to run the boundary line
from end to end continu-
-ously, care being taken,
wherever a dispute which
cannot be at once settled
exists, to mark both lines ×
××. such disputes, if
not in the meanwhile

adjusted

× GO 5 Dec: 77 No 3300

to the village of Alwar-
-kurichi formore than
60 years."

10. In the meantime
had transpired that
another piece of land
near Courtallum, but
on the west of the water-
-shed which had been
given away by the ex
Travancore authorities
to a Mr Cocq, had sub-
-sequently been sold by
Travancore to a Mr Miller.
Correspondence ensued,
but eventually Govt gave
up the land and left
Mr Cocq to settle with
the Travancore Authorities.

11. As regards the Alwar-
-kurichi track and other
instances in which, in
their future course —

North

North of Courtallum or
Shenkota, the demarca-
-tion party might find
the watershed line 3 | de-
-parted from, the Board
thought the "cases should
be investigated, and at
the conclusion of the work
the conflicting claims ×××
may perhaps admit of
adjustment by mutual
concessions of territory".

The Govt ruled that the
best course to pursue will
be to run the boundary line
from end to end continu-
-ously, care being taken,
wherever a dispute which
cannot be at once settled
exists, to mark both lines ×
××. such disputes, if
not in the meanwhile

adjusted

× GO 5 Dec: 77 No 3300

can be disposed
adjudged of xxx when the
whole boundary line has
been completed.

12. In the 3rd season 16
miles were accomplished
and the line south of
Shenkota (Courtallum),
which had been left
unfinished, was completed,
but no fresh dispute
was reported.

13. In the 4th season, as
now reported on, some 43
miles from Shenkota
Northwards to the Madura
boundary were gone
over and several claims
by British (including Za-
mindari) villages to
land West of the Water-
shed have come in this
in this portion of the
boundary, as well as one
claim

G.O. 11 Sept.r: 1877. No 2658 RR.

claim by Travancore to
land East of the Ghats.

14. After full consi-
deration the Governor
in Council resolves to
direct the Resident to
inform the Travancore
Sirkar of the willingness
of this Govt to accept
throughout the water-
shed boundary as
followed and defined
by the Commissioners and
to invite an expression
of the Sirkar's views.

This settlement will
involve the cession of the
Alwarkurichi tract, but
will in no way prejudice
the rights and claims of
British Zemindars, or
villages, over, to, lands
on the west side of the
watershed.

watershed. Private proprietary rights are not necessarily, compromised by recognition of Travancore — State authority rather than British.

15. The Govt do not understand that there are anywhere on the west of the watershed boundary north of Mahendragiri any cultivated lands hitherto paying revenue to Govt; but, if so, the question of their disposal will be reserved until their extent and assessment are reported.

20 Feb. Odoardo Vercruys will.
4. the Woodcutters Travancore V
7. Bishop of Madras V a.d Madras

60/6

Chapt 1 Origl Corr: Nos 2 Dis 2/9

PETT
25. 8. 80

197 DAS.
C16.8
8217-8