

(1) Number of pages 24

(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. <u>1831</u>	Press ☒
<u>540.541</u>	Mis.
Dated <u>29</u> - <u>11</u> - <u>1881</u> .	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

22.5.43

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

29th November 1881, No. 1831.

READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

No. 540. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 22nd August 1881,
No. 1835.

Read—the following letter from Colonel H. T. ROGERS, R.E., Superintendent of
Madras Survey, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, 16th July 1881,
No. 71 B:—

REFERRING to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 17th March 1877,
No. 1216, I have the honor to forward a map on a scale of one inch to one mile showing
the boundary between Coimbatore and Travancore, according to the Sheet Atlas, and
that proposed by Messrs. Douglas and Munro. The area at issue is 38.19 square
miles.

2. I further beg to enclose copy of a letter No. 419-S., dated 30th August 1880,
with a sketch from the Acting Deputy Superintendent, Coimbatore, requesting instruc-
tions regarding the boundary lines A to B and B to C shown in the sketch. The
former line was demarcated and surveyed in 1875 in the absence of the Cochin repre-
sentative, who subsequently objected to a part of it, and the remaining portion of the
line has not been inspected by him. In the latter case (B to C) the boundary line to
be followed has not yet been decided.

3. I request that early orders on the subject may be passed as it is of great
importance that the Coimbatore District boundary should be settled as soon as possible.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From Major W. FREETH, Acting Deputy Superintendent, No. I Party, Madras Survey, to
the Superintendent of Madras Survey, dated Coimbatore, 30th August 1880, No. 419-S.

As I shall shortly be taking up the work on the Anaimalais, I have the honor to bring to
notice that the district boundary still remains unsettled.

2. I enclose a précis of correspondence regarding the above boundary with an illustrative
map.

3. From A to B was demarcated and surveyed in 1875 (called on the map Russell's line).
The Cochin representative was absent, but when he inspected the line in 1876 he objected to a
part of it from Sheklakund to Vengoli. The remainder of the line was not inspected by him.
G.O., No. 410, of 30th January 1877, on this subject, asks Cochin to adopt the line notwith-
standing the objection. The Resident of Travancore, however, in a letter to Government, No. 28,
of 23rd March 1877, states that the Cochin Government decline to adopt the line, and the Board,
in their Proceedings, No. 2045, of 2nd May 1877, uphold the objection of the Cochin Govern-
ment and recommend that it should be admitted and the boundary altered provided Cochin
bears the cost.

4. Government concurs with the Board in G.O., No. 2033, of 19th June 1877, since which
no further orders have been received on the subject.

5. The next section of the line is from B to C. The orders of Government originally
were that the decision of 1854 as regards the Coimbatore-Cochin boundary should be followed
and the line of Ward and Connor's Survey be adhered to. This was done as far as the point B
(Kaliyanapandal), after which the old map was so incorrect that it was impossible to identify
the boundary any further.

6. This was reported to the Board, and they, in their Proceedings, No. 983, of 11th April
1876, recommend to Government that the tri-junction between Travancore, Cochin, and Coim-
batore (the point C in accompanying map) be first fixed by a Commission of officers from all these
States and that the same opportunity be taken to settle the boundary from Kaliyanapandal to
Pannimedukutta, i.e., B to C.

7. After some correspondence, three officers—Mr. Douglas for Coimbatore, Mr. Munro for Travancore, and Mr. Stephenson for Cochin—were nominated, and G.O., No. 922, of 7th July 1876, directed their meeting.

8. Mr. Douglas and Mr. Munro met in January 1877 and settled the tri-junction in the absence of the Cochin representative (*vide* Mr. Munro's report of the 5th February 1877 to the Diwan of Travancore).

9. Owing to the Cochin officer's absence the boundary from Kaliyanapandal to the tri-junction (B to C) was not decided, and nothing has been done about it since.

10. The Government of Cochin might be addressed again either to send an officer to settle this section of the boundary in conjunction with a Coimbatore officer or to agree to a compromise. A direct line from Kaliyanapandal to Pannimedukutta along the ridge as per map (No. II) enclosed would be a fair compromise.

11. The last section of the district boundary to be settled is that of Travancore lying between the two tri-junctions (C to D in map). After some correspondence (see the abstract) it was decided by the Board, in their Proceedings, Nos. 976, of 2nd March 1877, and 1216, of 17th March 1877, that a map must be prepared to illustrate the line before a settlement can be made. This line has been surveyed and the map, I hope, will be done this year.

12. In the meanwhile I request that orders may be obtained regarding the portion of boundary from Kaliyanapandal to Pannimedukutta (B to C). A gap in the survey line requires to be filled up.

13. To state the case in a few words, A to B was surveyed in the absence of the Cochin representative and subsequently on inspection was objected to by him; B to C not surveyed, instructions required as to the line to be followed; C to D settled by representatives of Coimbatore and Travancore, but not accepted by the Board, who want a correct map to illustrate the proposed line. This has been surveyed, but the map cannot be prepared till the plane table squares are finished.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Major Freeth's Sketch, dated 31st August 1880.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Map showing the boundary between Coimbatore District and Travancore Territory from Payarat Malai to Pannimedukutta.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Invoice.

Read—the following letter from A. W. PEET, Esq., Deputy Conservator of Forests, Coimbatore, to the Collector of Coimbatore, 19th July 1881, No. 1328; and Endorsement by W. WILSON, Esq., Collector, 28th July 1881, No. 181:—

I HAVE the honor to request that orders may be obtained on a point connected with the settlement of the Cochin-Coimbatore boundary.

This boundary runs from *Vengoli Peak* to *Pannimedukutta*.

1. As the Forest Officer for the time being, I am appointed to represent our Government in the settlement of a disputed portion of this boundary, and have arranged to meet Mr. Hudson, Chief Engineer to the Cochin Government, on the 15th of August (*vide* G.Os., No. 531, of the 12th December 1880, and No. 528, of the 1st March 1881).

2. It was only yesterday, on reading again those Government Orders and the letters printed therewith, that it struck me clearly that we were appointed to meet for the sake of settling merely the small portion of the boundary situated between Vengoli Peak and Sheklakund.

3. As it seems to me clearly a waste of opportunity not to get some sort of definite settlement of the rest of the boundary as far as Pannimedukutta, about three-fourths of which have already been provisionally marked out by Mr. Douglas and the Survey Department, I write to ask whether we may not be empowered to make a provisional settlement of the whole of the boundary.

4. The case stands shortly thus—

The line between Vengoli Peak and Sheklakund is in dispute and we have clear orders how to settle it.

5. Beyond Sheklakund, to the south, the line marked out by Mr. and by our Survey Department has been accepted by Cochin as correct (*vide* letter).

L. Shungoony Menon, Diwan of Cochin, to A. Macgregor, Esq., Resident, printed in Proceedings of Madras Government of the 7th October 1876).

6. But now comes the question on which I ask for orders. The line marked out and surveyed went only as far as a place called Kaliyanapandal and not to the end of the boundary, viz., Pannimedukutta. On this subject *vide* Colonel Hessey's letter, No. 420-14, dated 9th February 1876, in Board's Proceedings, No. 983, of 11th April 1876, paragraph 6.

7. It seems clear therefore that the assent of Cochin has never been obtained to that part of the boundary between Kaliyanapandal and Pannimedukutta.

8. This point (Pannimedukutta) is the tri-junction of Travancore, Cochin, and Coimbatore, and it will be remembered that the point was determined by Mr. Douglas and Mr. Munro on the parts of Coimbatore and Travancore in the absence of a representative from Cochin. It is therefore necessary to have the formal acquiescence of the Cochin representative in the correctness of this determination of Pannimedukutta.

SUBMITTED to Government, through the Board of Revenue, with the suggestion that the instructions of G.O., No. 1675, dated 9th December 1880, Revenue Department, be extended so as to embrace the final settlement of the second and third of the Board's proposals sanctioned in G.O., Revenue Department, No. 708, dated 30th May 1876.

Read—the following letter from A. W. PEET, Esq., Deputy Conservator of Forests, Coimbatore, to the Collector of Coimbatore, 16th July 1881, No. 1326; and Endorsement by W. WILSON, Esq., Collector, 28th July 1881, No. 184.

I HAVE the honor to address you on a subject connected with the boundary between Travancore and Coimbatore, and request that early orders may be obtained thereon.

Travancore-Coimbatore Boundary.—I wish to bring forward emergently an objection to the line settled provisionally by Mr. Munro on the part of Travancore and by Mr. Douglas on the part of Coimbatore, between the points on the Upper Anaimalais of Pannimedukutta and Payarat Malai (*vide* the annexed rough sketch and Trigonometrical Survey Map, Sheet No. 62).

2. The subject is treated of in Board's Proceedings, No. 976, dated the 2nd March 1877, and Board's Proceedings, No. 2397, dated the 22nd May 1877.

3. The facts shortly are that Mr. Munro was first on the ground at Payarat Malai and marked out a provisional line along a ridge to Pannimedukutta, to which Mr. Douglas assented on the idea that this line followed the water-shed and that in any case the tract of country between the line so marked and the line marked on the Trigonometrical Survey Sheet amounted to some five square miles only.

4. As a matter of fact I am informed by the Revenue Survey authorities that the tract amounts to at least thirty square miles and more, probably about thirty-eight square miles.

5. Mr. Douglas reports that the Trigonometrical Survey map is very much in error about this part of the country, and that I can well believe. However, I submit that there is a well-marked point, the Pembenmalé Cataract, on the boundary, and that unless good reason is shown this point should be adhered to.

6. To sum up shortly the contention which I wish to make on behalf of our hill tribes, a river in broken country is generally a far better boundary than a ridge, and our hillmen state that the Vaddamalé Aur, in which the Pembenmalé Cataract is found, was always, roughly speaking, their boundary.

7. I contend that unless the Trigonometrical Survey map is absolutely and fundamentally incorrect, the line followed by Mr. Munro is not the water-shed.

8. The *real water-shed* is formed by the marked ridge which runs north-west from Payarat Malai across the whole of the Upper Anaimalais, and if the tract in question is to be given over to Travancore because it follows the water-shed, the whole of the Upper Anaimalais to the south and west of this main ridge should be given up also.

9. The Board of Revenue have called for a detailed survey of the tract in question, and I understand that this detailed survey is already forwarded, so that I urge the emergency of the case, if an objection is to be lodged at all.

10. I beg respectfully to advert to the fact that in all our dealings with Native States, so far as my experience goes, our boundaries are always thrust back, and I submit that from an Imperial point of view the matter may often seem of small moment, yet to the hill tribes and forest tribes the matter is of the most vital importance.

11. I fail to see why rectifications of old boundary lines should always be at the expense of our Government.

FORWARDED to the Board of Revenue, before whom the matter is now pending, for consideration with reference to the detailed survey which it is understood has been recently submitted in pursuance of Board's Proceedings, No. 976, dated 2nd March 1877.* If Mr. Peet's sketch exactly represents the proposals, it seems clear that the ridge proposed as the Coimbatore-Travancore boundary between Pannimedukutta and Payarat Malai on the ground that it is the water-shed cannot possibly be the water-shed as it is a ridge more or less parallel to and between two parallel rivers, the Vaddamale Aur and the Sholeir, flowing in the same direction. There would be no ground therefore for superseding the old map boundary lines of the Vaddamale Aur by this new line on the ground of its being the water-shed and therefore the natural boundary.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Rough Sketch on the subject of Cochin and Travancore Boundaries.

Resolution—

THE papers read above will be submitted for the orders of Government.

2. G.O., dated 12th December 1880, No. 531, quoted in Mr. Peet's letter, No. 1328, has not reached the Board and they are therefore, to a certain extent, uninformed as to the instructions which have been issued lately regarding the settlement of the boundary between British territory and Cochin and Travancore.

3. Making reference to Major Freeth's sketch dated 31st August 1880, the actual state of negotiations appear to be as follows:—

Section A to B.—The line marked out from Vengoli to Sheklakund is objected to by Cochin and is now to be revised. From Sheklakund to Kaliyanapandal the line is accepted by both Governments.

Section B to C (Kaliyanapandal to Pannimedukutta).—The boundary has not been surveyed, and this has now to be done. Major Freeth suggests a straight line along the ridge between the two points.

Section C to D (Pannimed to Vellingiri East Hill).—From Pannimed to Payarat Malai a provisional line has been settled by Messrs. Douglas and Munro, with reference to which the sketch by Major Liardet, dated 29th June 1881, has been prepared as requested by the Board in their Proceedings, dated 17th March 1877, No. 1216. This sketch shows that the tract lying between the boundary proposed by Messrs. Douglas and Munro and that shown upon the Sheet Atlas is considerable, and the Superintendent of Survey states that the area is equal to 38.19 square miles.

4. The Board are decidedly of opinion that, with the exception of that portion of Section A—B regarding which no difference of opinion exists, the whole boundary

between A and D should now be settled by representatives of the three Governments interested, and they recommend that the necessary instructions be issued without delay. Attention is specially invited to the remarks of the Collector of Coimbatore in his note upon Mr. Peet's letter of the 16th July 1881, No. 1326. The opinion that the line taken by Messrs. Douglas and Munro is the water-shed between the two territories is clearly untenable; the line followed is evidently the ridge of a spur running down between two parallel rivers.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) E. GIBSON,
Acting Secretary.

No. 541. ORDER THEREON, 29th November 1881, No. 1831.

Miscellaneous.

THE Right Honorable the Governor in Council sees no reason to assume that the tri-junction (Pannimedukutta) between Cochin, Travancore and Coimbatore has not been correctly identified.

From this point north, the Cochin boundary should now be settled by Messrs. Peet and Hudson, excepting that part* of the line which has already been mutually accepted.

2. The Resident, Travancore and Cochin, will be instructed in the Political Department to arrange for this being done. The boundary which they are to recut under the marginally noted order† is but a part‡ of the line above specified, the extension of the operation now required being from Kaliyanapandal to Pannimedukutta.

3. The Government are unable to accept the boundary laid down by Messrs. Douglas and Munro between Travancore and Coimbatore. On this side the water-shed was never known as the boundary. If it had been, the *real watershed*, as pointed out by Mr. Peet, does not seem what they assumed it to be, but is well away to the north-west of their line; and if that is to separate British territory from Travancore, an enormous tract of valuable forest, to which Travancore has never asserted any claim, would have to be given up. The Government cannot consent to such sacrifice of territory and would therefore maintain the Ordnance Survey line from Payarat Malai to Pamban Malai Cataract and further on along the course of Vadamalair. So far as this latter part of the line is concerned, the Government understand that the river was always considered the boundary.

4. It will be necessary therefore that the representatives of the two Governments should meet and go over the line to be finally adopted.

5. Adverting to paragraph 2 of the Board's Proceedings, it is observed that G.O., No. 531, was issued in the Political Department and merely communicated to the Resident G.O., No. 1675, dated 9th December 1880, Revenue Department—(vide Mis. G.O., No. 528, dated 1st March 1881, Revenue Department).

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue, with two enclosures.
„ the Conservator of Forests.
„ the Superintendent of Revenue Survey.
„ the Political Department.

Exd. W. H. French.

80 Copies.

Govt. of (1881) Madras.

REVENUE.

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Recd. Coimbatore 20th

Printed Coimbatore 18th

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 20th November 1881, No. 1831

NOVEMBER
Nos. 340-341

Summary.
Boundary—between Coimbatore, Cochin and
Travancore.—Passing orders on Board's Pro-
ceedings regarding

[22nd August 1881, No. 1,835.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 22nd August 1881.
No. 1,835.

Read—the following letter from Colonel H. T. ROGERS, R.E., Superintendent of
Madras Survey, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From Major W. FREETH, Acting Deputy Superintendent, No. I Party, Madras Survey, to
the Superintendent of Madras Survey, dated Coimbatore, 30th August 1880, No. 419 S.

As I shall shortly be taking up the work on the Anaimalais, I have the honor to bring to
notice that the district boundary still remains unsettled.

2. I enclose a précis of correspondence regarding the above boundary with an illustrative
map.

3. From A to B was demarcated and surveyed in 1875 (called on the map Russell's line).
The Cochin representative was absent, but when he inspected the line in 1876 he objected to a
part of it from Sheklakund to Vengoli. The remainder of the line was not inspected by him.
G.O., No. 410, of 30th January 1877, on this subject, asks Cochin to adopt the line notwith-
standing the objection. The Resident of Travancore, however, in a letter to Government, No. 28,
of 23rd March 1877, states that the Cochin Government decline to adopt the line, and the Board,
in their Proceedings, No. 2,045, of 2nd May 1877, uphold the objection of the Cochin Govern-
ment and recommend that it should be admitted and the boundary altered provided Cochin
bears the cost.

4. Government concurs with the Board in G.O., No. 2,033, of 19th June 1877, since which
no further orders have been received on the subject.

5. The next section of the line is from B to C. The orders of Government originally
were that the decision of 1854 as regards the Coimbatore-Cochin boundary should be followed
and the line of Ward and Connor's Survey be adhered to. This was done as far as the point B
(Kaliyanapandal), after which the old map was so incorrect that it was impossible to identify
the boundary any further.

6. This was reported to the Board, and they, in their Proceedings, No. 983, of 11th April
1876, recommend to Government that the tri-junction between Travancore, Cochin, and Coim-
batore (the point C in accompanying map) be first fixed by a Commission of officers from all these
States and that the same opportunity be taken to settle the boundary from Kaliyanapandal to
Pannimedukutta, i.e., B to C.

7. After some correspondence, three officers—Mr. Douglas for Coimbatore, Mr. Munro for
Travancore, and Mr. Stephenson for Cochin—were nominated, and G.O., No. 922, of 7th July
1876, directed their meeting.

8. Mr. Douglas and Mr. Munro met in January 1877 and settled the tri-junction in the
absence of the Cochin representative (vide Mr. Munro's report of the 5th February 1877 to the
Diwan of Travancore).

9. Owing to the Cochin officer's absence the boundary from Kaliyanapandal to the
tri-junction (B to C) was not decided, and nothing has been done about it since.

10. The Government of Cochin might be addressed again either to send an officer to
settle this section of the boundary in conjunction with a Coimbatore officer or to agree to a
compromise. A direct line from Kaliyanapandal to Pannimedukutta along the ridge as per map
(No. II) enclosed would be a fair compromise.

11. The last section of the district boundary to be settled is that of Travancore lying
between the two tri-junctions (C to D in map). After some correspondence (see the abstract) it
was decided by the Board, in their Proceedings, Nos. 976, of 2nd March 1877, and 1,216, of 17th
March 1877, that a map must be prepared to illustrate the line before a settlement can be made.
This line has been surveyed and the map, I hope, will be done this year.

12. In the meanwhile I request that orders may be obtained regarding the portion of boundary from Kaliyanapandal to Pannimedukutta (B to C). A gap in the survey line requires to be filled up.

13. To state the case in a few words, A to B was surveyed in the absence of the Cochin representative and subsequently on inspection was objected to by him; B to C not surveyed, instructions required as to the line to be followed; C to D settled by representatives of Coimbatore and Travancore, but not accepted by the Board, who want a correct map to illustrate the proposed line. This has been surveyed, but the map cannot be prepared till the plane table squares are finished.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Major Freeth's Sketch dated 31st August 1880.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Map showing the boundary between Coimbatore District and Travancore Territory from Payarat Malai to Pannimedukutta.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Invoice.

Letter—16th July 1881, No. 71 B.

REFERRING to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 17th March 1877, No. 1,216, I have the honor to forward a map on a scale of one inch to one mile showing the boundary between Coimbatore and Travancore, according to the Sheet Atlas, and that proposed by Messrs. Douglas and Munro. The area at issue is 38.19 square miles.

2. I further beg to enclose copy of a letter, No. 419 S., dated 30th August 1880, with a sketch from the Acting Deputy Superintendent, Coimbatore, requesting instructions regarding the boundary lines A to B and B to C shown in the sketch. The former line was demarcated and surveyed in 1875 in the absence of the Cochin representative, who subsequently objected to a part of it, and the remaining portion of the line has not been inspected by him. In the latter case (B to C) the boundary line to be followed has not yet been decided.

3. I request that early orders on the subject may be passed as it is of great importance that the Coimbatore District boundary should be settled as soon as possible.

Read—the following letter from A. W. PEET, Esq., Deputy Conservator of Forests, Coimbatore, to the Collector of Coimbatore; and Endorsement by W. WILSON, Esq., Collector.

Letter—19th July 1881, No. 1,328.

I HAVE the honor to request that orders may be obtained on a point connected with the settlement of the Cochin-Coimbatore boundary.

This boundary runs from Vengoli Peak to Pannimedukutta.

1. As the Forest Officer for the time being, I am appointed to represent our Government in the settlement of a disputed portion of this boundary, and have arranged to meet Mr. Hudson, Chief Engineer to the Cochin Government, on the 15th of August (vide G.Os., No. 531, of the 12th December 1880, and No. 528, of the 1st March 1881).

2. It was only yesterday, on reading again those Government Orders and the letters printed therewith, that it struck me clearly that we were appointed to meet for the sake of settling merely the small portion of the boundary situated between Vengoli Peak and Sheklakund.

3. As it seems to me clearly a waste of opportunity not to get some sort of definite settlement of the rest of the boundary as far as Pannimedukutta, about three-fourths of which have already been provisionally marked out by Mr. Douglas and the Survey Department, I write to ask whether we may not be empowered to make a provisional settlement of the whole of the boundary.

4. The case stands shortly thus—

The line between Vengoli Peak and Sheklakund is in dispute and we have clear orders how to settle it.

5. Beyond Sheklakund, to the south, the line marked out by Mr. Douglas * Dated 14th September 1876, No. 886. and by our Survey Department has been accepted by Cochin as correct (vide letter* of L. Shungoony Menon, Diwan of Cochin, to A. Macgregor, Esq., Resident, printed in Proceedings of Madras Government of the 7th October 1876).

6. But now comes the question on which I ask for orders. The line marked out and surveyed went only as far as a place called Kaliyanapandal and not to the end of the boundary, viz., Pannimedukutta. On this subject vide Colonel Hesse's letter, No. 420-14, dated 9th February 1876, in Board's Proceedings, No. 983, of 11th April 1876, paragraph 6.

7. It seems clear therefore that the assent of Cochin has never been obtained to that part of the boundary between Kaliyanapandal and Pannimedukutta.

8. This point (Pannimedukutta) is the tri-junction of Travancore, Cochin, and Coimbatore, and it will be remembered that the point was determined by Mr. Douglas and Mr. Munro on the parts of Coimbatore and Travancore in the absence of a representative from Cochin. It is therefore necessary to have the formal acquiescence of the Cochin representative in the correctness of this determination of Pannimedukutta.

Endorsement—28th July 1881, No. 181.

SUBMITTED to Government, through the Board of Revenue, with the suggestion that the instructions of G.O., No. 1,675, dated 9th December 1880, Revenue Department, be extended so as to embrace the final settlement of the second and third of the Board's proposals sanctioned in G.O., Revenue Department, No. 708, dated 30th May 1876.

Read—the following letter from A. W. PEET, Esq., Deputy Conservator of Forests, Coimbatore, to the Collector of Coimbatore; and Endorsement by W. WILSON, Esq., Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Rough Sketch on the subject of Cochin and Travancore Boundaries.

Letter—16th July 1881, No. 1,326.

I HAVE the honor to address you on a subject connected with the boundary between Travancore and Coimbatore and request that early orders may be obtained thereon.

Travancore-Coimbatore Boundary.—I wish to bring forward emergently an objection to the line settled provisionally by Mr. Munro on the part of Travancore and by Mr. Douglas on the part of Coimbatore, between the points on the Upper Anaimalais of Pannimedukutta and Payarat Malai (vide the annexed rough sketch and Trigonometrical Survey Map, Sheet No. 62).

2. The subject is treated of in Board's Proceedings, No. 976, dated the 2nd March 1877, and Board's Proceedings, No. 2,397, dated the 22nd May 1877.

3. The facts shortly are that Mr. Munro was first on the ground at Payarat Malai and marked out a provisional line along a ridge to Pannimedukutta, to which Mr. Douglas assented on the idea that this line followed the water-shed and that in any case the tract of country between the line so marked and the line marked on the Trigonometrical Survey Sheet amounted to some five square miles only.

4. As a matter of fact I am informed by the Revenue Survey authorities that the tract amounts to at least thirty square miles and more, probably about thirty-eight square miles.

5. Mr. Douglas reports that the Trigonometrical Survey map is very much in error about this part of the country, and that I can well believe. However, I submit that there is a well-marked point, the Pembenmalé Cataract, on the boundary, and that unless good reason is shown this point should be adhered to.

6. To sum up shortly the contention which I wish to make on behalf of our hill tribes, a river in broken country is generally a far better boundary than a ridge, and our hillmen state that the Vaddamalé Aur, in which the Pembenmalé Cataract is found, was always, roughly speaking, their boundary.

7. I contend that unless the Trigonometrical Survey map is absolutely and fundamentally incorrect, the line followed by Mr. Munro is not the water-shed.

8. The real water-shed is formed by the marked ridge which runs north-west from Payarat Malai across the whole of the Upper Anaimalais, and if the tract in question is to be given over to Travancore because it follows the water-shed, the whole of the Upper Anaimalais to the south and west of this main ridge should be given up also.

9. The Board of Revenue have called for a detailed survey of the tract in question, and I understand that this detailed survey is already forwarded, so that I urge the emergency of the case, if an objection is to be lodged at all.

10. I beg respectfully to advert to the fact that in all our dealings with Native States, so far as my experience goes, our boundaries are always thrust back, and I submit that from an Imperial point of view the matter may often seem of small moment, yet to the hill tribes and forest tribes the matter is of the most vital importance.

11. I fail to see why rectifications of old boundary lines should always be at the expense of our Government.

Endorsement—28th July 1881, No. 184.

FORWARDED to the Board of Revenue, before whom the matter is now pending, for consideration with reference to the detailed survey which it is understood has been recently submitted in pursuance of Board's Proceedings, No. 976, dated 2nd March 1877.* If Mr. Peet's sketch exactly represents the proposals, it seems clear that the ridge proposed as the Coimbatore-Travancore boundary between Pannimedukutta and Payarat Malai on the ground that it is the water-shed cannot possibly be the water-shed as it is a ridge more or less parallel to and between two parallel rivers, the Vaddamalé Aur and the Sholeir, flowing in the same direction. There would be no ground therefore for superseding the old map boundary lines of the Vaddamalé Aur by this new line on the ground of its being the water-shed and therefore the natural boundary.

Resolution—

The papers read above will be submitted for the orders of Government.

2. G.O., dated 12th December 1880, No. 531, quoted in Mr. Peet's letter No. 1,328 has not reached the Board and they are therefore, to a certain extent, uninformed as to the instructions which have been issued lately regarding the settlement of the boundary between British territory and Cochin and Travancore.

3. Making reference to Major Freeth's sketch dated 31st August 1880, the actual state of negotiations appear to be as follows:—

Section A to B.—The line marked out from Vengoli to Sheklakund is objected to by Cochin and is now to be revised. From Sheklakund to Kaliyanapandal the line is accepted by both Governments.

[22nd August 1881, No. 1,835.

Section B to C (Kaliyanapandal to Pannimedukutta).—The boundary has not been surveyed, and this has now to be done. Major Freeth suggests a straight line along the ridge between the two points.

Section C to D (Pannimed to Vellingiri East Hill).—From Pannimed to Payarat Malai a provisional line has been settled by Messrs. Douglas and Munro, with reference to which the sketch by Major Liardet dated 29th June 1881 has been prepared as requested by the Board in their Proceedings, dated 17th March 1877, No. 1,216. This sketch shows that the tract lying between the boundary proposed by Messrs. Douglas and Munro and that shown upon the Sheet Atlas is considerable, and the Superintendent of Survey states that the area is equal to 38.19 square miles.

4. The Board are decidedly of opinion that, with the exception of that portion of Section A—B regarding which no difference of opinion exists, the whole boundary between A and D should now be settled by representatives of the three Governments interested, and they recommend that the necessary instructions be issued without delay. Attention is specially invited to the remarks of the Collector of Coimbatore in his note upon Mr. Peet's letter of the 16th July 1881, No. 1,326. The opinion that the line taken by Messrs. Douglas and Munro is the water-shed between the two territories is clearly untenable; the line followed is evidently the ridge of a spur running down between two parallel rivers.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with a map and sketch (in G. R. No. 5,718 of 1881) to be returned.

Copy to the Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

" " Collector of Coimbatore.

" " Conservator of Forests.

Exd. A. S. Rodgers.

Revenue 1881 Depar^t
No 4882

1881.
Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Print

Printed September th.

Received 11/10/81

PROCEEDINGS, 22ND AUGUST 1881, No. 1,835.

Deposited 11/10/81

SUBMITTING for the orders of Government
papers relating to the Boundary between the
British Territory and Travancore and Cochin.

C. 23-11-81 R. 19-11-81

R. 14-11-81

C. 23-11-81 R. 19-11-81

R.D.

Memo
C No 4882 of 1881

Three Surveys & traces
I assume that the Disjunctive
Boundary between (Cochin &
Travancore) is correct
can easily be traced.

I think from this point
forth the Cochin boundary
will be settled by the
fact that the line has already been
tacitly accepted.

As regards the draft
boundary from the Travancore
to the Cochin (Cochin &
Travancore) boundary, I
think that by the
line settled by the
Douglas & Munro. Report
the same is authorized
to be the settled as
to the case

Mr. Roberts says that if
the line is not

It is no doubt
most desirable to decide
the entire boundary,
except that portion of
the Cochin - Travancore
line (between Shakk-
lakund and Kalijer-
napandal) which has
already been accep-
ted by both Govern-
ments.

2. But the prin-
ciple on which the
Cochin boundary
has been decided,
differs from that which
Mr. Douglas thought
he had adapted in
the portion from

C to D which represents the Traucanone frontier.

3. In the former Ward and Connor's map & Memoir were to be followed.

4. In the latter Mr Douglas has attempted to define the water shed between the Traucanone State and Coimbatore, as has been done further South, and has paid no attention to Ward & Connor's line because it did not follow the supposed watershed.

5. But as pointed out

absolutely incorrect the latter line does not represent the main watershed but then cannot be so. Enson & I assuming that the T.S. Map is any thing & assuming in these tracts then again I doubt that Mr Douglas & Enson proposed to follow the main watershed. But they aimed at a line & we have been & follow the watershed. I must have been considerably with the line on the T.S. Map & this was I think a very reasonable course if as I believe the T.S. Map line cannot be followed this out. Mr Douglas (Ev. App.) points out the difficulties &

only suggests one point. The Emburkalai Cataract as a possible identification. altho I say that our hills were chosen as our boundary the river is it is situated. I am sure that in a British country a river is a better boundary than a ridge. Be this as it may. The watershed is I believe universally accepted in our hills & tracts as the boundary between villages. But the course of the stream altho I perceive the general line of the ridge between river valleys will come: find more or less nearly to the line of the valleys themselves. My belief is that in all these tracts the watershed was the

15
out by the fall of Coimbatore in his endorsement of 28th July 1887 to 1884, Mr Douglas and Enson's watershed is not really the watershed but simply a ridge running between two parallel rivers which flow in the same direction.

6. Mr. Peet points out (para 8 of his No. 1326) what the real watershed is viz, a line which runs northwest from Payarat Malai across the whole of the Upper Anamalais so that if the watershed

is to be the boundary
the whole of the Upper
Anamalais to the
South and West of
this main ridge must
be given to Travancore.

7. In these circum-
stances perhaps the
Govt. will agree with
the fact that there
is "no ground for
superseding the old
map boundary
lines of the Mad-
rasale Govt."

Q. U.

(Loring) principal
boundary that when
it comes to clearly
showing it is a boundary
roughly & inaccurately
indicated by a map &
a Memoir. It clearly
cannot be absolutely
fixed on. We shall
probably more nearly
come in following the
boundary than in all other
to follow the map. It is

It is the fact that
the line on the map does not
appear to be identical with
the line claimed by the
British as to boundary
& that it can only be
approximately indicated
by the map.

the selected line must
be more dependent on
the fact that this
approximation chooses
to place it.

Should have nothing to say
to the principal boundary
line shown by Douglas &
Memoir. It is not the water
shed and was never meant
for being the boundary line.
They started the idea. The
real water shed as pointed
out by Mr. Fort is halfway
between the N. W. of their line and
of this is separate British
territory from Travancore
to. must give up an. Govt.
to make that of valuable
forest & timber. Travancore
has never put in for them
any claim. I deprecate
any such sacrifice of terri-
tory and advocate the re-
tention of the boundary line
from Sural Malai &
Dumbur Malai Calanet
& along the course of the
Vadimalai river. As far
as the part of the line is con-
sidered that river was always
considered the boundary
when I was in the

Mr. Sullivan knows
the boundary & Travancore
also. I will not have

R. 10/11

The District

MA

News

Boundary between
Mangalore & Cochin
territory

Order No. 8497 November 1881

The Honble the Governor
The Hon. H. R. Vallabha
The Hon. B. S. Connelley

Copy

Viz: between Shiklakhund
and Kaliyanapandal.

Revenue Department.

No 1831

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT,

under date the 29 November 1881

C. N. 4882

Read Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue, dated 22nd
August 1881, 11th 1835.

The Right Honourable
the Governor in Council sees
no reason to assume that
the tri-junction (Pannimadu-
Kutta) between Cochin, Tra-
vancore and Coimbatore, has
not been correctly identified.

From this point north,
the Cochin boundary should
now be settled by Messrs Peet
and Hudson, excepting that
part of the line which has
already been mutually ac-
cepted.

2. The Resident, Travancore
and

Res. 11-11-81
C. 26-10-81 11-11-81

and Cochin, will be instructed
in the Political Department to
arrange for this being done.
The boundary which they are
to report under the marginally
noted ^{*}orders, is but a part of
the line above specified, the
extension of the operation now
required being from Kaligama
-pandal to Pannimmedukutta.

* G.O. 19th June 1877, No. 2063.
" 9th December 1880, No. 1645.
" 1st March 1881, No. 528 Miss.
on Political G.O. 28th February
1881, No. 96.
* Viz: from Tengoli to Shokilakundu.

3. The Government are
unable to accept the boundary
laid down by Messrs Douglas
and Munro between Travancore
and Coimbatore. On this
side the watershed was never
known as the boundary. If it
had been, the real watershed,
as pointed out by Mr. Pitt, does
not seem what they assumed
it to be, but is well away
to

to the North West of their line; and
if that is to separate British
Territory from Travancore, an
enormous tract of valuable
Forest, to which Travancore has
never asserted any claim would
have to be given up. The Govern-
-ment cannot consent to such
sacrifice of territory and would
therefore maintain the Ordnance
survey line from Payarat Malai
to Pambou Malai Cataract and
further on along the course of
Tadamalain. So far as this latter
part of the line is concerned, the
Government understand that
the river was always considered
the boundary.

4. It will be necessary
therefore that the representatives
of the two Governments should
meet and go over the line to
be finally adopted.

5. Adverting to para. 2 of
the

the Board's Proceedings, it is observed
 that G.O. No. 531, was issued in the
 Political Department and merely
 communicated to the Resident,
 G.O. No. 1675, dated 9th December 1880,
 R.D. / vide his G.O. No. 528, dated 1st
 March 1881 (R.D.)

Y. M.

- To
 14 The Board of Revenue with 2 encls.
 20 " Conservator of Forests ^{201/1/100}
 7 " Supt. of Prov. Survey S
 5 " Political Departt. S

$\frac{80}{6}$

56

Boundary between
two Territory and Laramie
and Cochrane.

Print-
29/11

540 541

C-23-11-81. R-29-11-81