

(1) Number of pages 26

(2) Date of repair 20-5-43

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue

DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 32/

Press ✓
~~Mis~~

277-279

Dated 19-2-1881.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

20-5-43

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

19th February 1881, No. 321.

READ THE FOLLOWING PAPERS :—

No. 277. From A. MACGREGOR, Esq., British Resident in Travancore and Cochin, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Madras, dated 30th September 1880, No. B-5.

I HAVE the honor to forward copy of a telegram received from the Diwan of Travancore with reference to paragraph 14 of G.O., 18th August 1880, No. 975.

2. The provisos in regard to Mr. Cocq's land, to the Muthukuli Vayil, and Alwarkurchi tracts, and to the Zemindari claims to land west of the watershed bordering on the Periyár, are all conceded in the terms of the Government Order, all being thrown into Travancore by the watershed line.

3. In regard to the Angusteer Peak, &c., which forms part of Athurmalais, the small area sought is valueless for any purpose, being rocky and precipitous and clothed only here and there with dwarf vegetation such as alone can stand the continuous hurricane which blows on this exposed locality during the greater part of the year. Government have already signified their willingness to make this concession.

4. The only other proviso is as to certain villages known as Shasthanellore, the claim to which it is proposed to reserve for future adjudication. I have not received any statement as to the nature of the claim, which must be that referred to in the latter part of paragraph 13, G.O., 18th August 1880. It seems to refer to an isolated tract in the inhabited plains of Tinnevely similar to some portions of the Shenkotah taluk. It does not seem to form any essential part of the boundary now under discussion and may be left to be decided hereafter.

5. The Travancore Government are, I imagine, right in stating finally that the settlement now made does not refer to the boundary of the Shenkotah taluk, which is understood to depend on the decision passed and carried out in General Cullen's time. This is for the most part defined by masonry pillars, and the position of a lost mark may here and there have to be decided, but it would needlessly complicate matters to go into this question in connection with the settlement of the section now in hand. The stipulations about irrigation works seem unobjectionable.

ENCLOSURE.

Telegram from Diwan of Travancore, to British Resident, dated 30th September 1880.

His Highness the Maharajah gladly agrees to the proposal of His Grace in Council and accepts the watershed boundary as marked by the Commissioners, it being understood that the British Government abandons all claim to Cocq's land, Muthukuli Vayil tract, Alwarkurchi tract, and the Zemindari claims bordering on the Periyár on the one hand, and on the Sétúr and Shivagiri Zemindaris on the other.

2. In regard to parts of Atharmalai which falls to the other side, I am commanded to request that, in consideration of our having maintained there an institution for the benefit of science for many years and kept an undisputed possession of the tract, the boundary line at that point of the ridge be so run as to include in Travancore territory the bungalow site

and all such part of the Augusteer Mountain itself as is above the level of the bungalow site.

3. This Government claims certain villages known as Shasthanellore Gramum belonging to Shavaroy Mulla Devasom in Travancore, which villages lie to the east of the watershed line, and are held by the Shivagiri Zemindar. When we establish our claim by evidence we shall ask restoration of the villages.

4. It is to be understood that while the water of flowing channels in the line marked will be allowed to British ryots in the same volume as now, no new channel or irrigation works will be allowed to be constructed or disused and ruined ones repaired without permission from Travancore.

5. It is understood also that the present arrangement does not affect the boundaries of the Shenkotah Taluk which stand as demarcated in General Cullen's time.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) A. MACGREGOR,
British Resident.

No. 278. From A. MACGREGOR, Esq., British Resident in Travancore and Cochin, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Madras, dated 29th October 1880, No. B-2.

WITH reference to the subject of my letter of the 30th September, No. B-5, regarding the Travancore and Tinnevely boundary, I have the honor to inform you that the Travancore Government relinquishes the claim to the Shasthanellore Gramum, belonging to the Shavaroy Mulla Devasom.

2. Copy of a telegram from the Diwan of Travancore is annexed.

3. This was the only point when the line, as offered by the British Government, was not finally and unreservedly accepted.

TELEGRAM.

Travancore relinquishes claims to Shasthanellore Gramum held by Shivagiri Zemindar.

Requests final demarcation and survey.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) A. MACGREGOR.

No. 279. ORDER THEREON, 19th February 1881, No. 321.

Miscellaneous.

In regard to the matters noticed in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Diwan's earlier telegram, it is observed that Mr. Cocq's claim was abandoned by G.O., 5th December 1877, No. 3,358; that the Muthukuli Vayil tract was reported* by the Boundary Commissioner to be undeniably in Travancore territory; that the Alwarkurchi tract and Zemindari claims have been relinquished by G.O., 18th August 1880, No. 975, paragraph 14; and that Mr. Hayne has stated† that the "few acres of land occupied by the Travancore Government on the Athurmala * * * fall under the watershed division to Travancore."

2. The claim referred to in paragraph 3 of the same telegram has now been abandoned.

3. The stipulations of the Sirkar in regard to works of irrigation are accepted.

4. The boundary of the Shenkotah taluk, as already settled, is in no way involved in the present settlement.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
,, the Board of Revenue.

Exd. W. H. French.

50 Copies.

Original
 Govt. of (1881) Madras.
 REVENUE.

To
 THE RESIDENT IN TRAVANCORE
 AND COCHIN,
 &c., &c., &c.

Dated February 19th.

Printed March 1st.

Local. Dist.

G.O., 19th February 1881, No. 821.

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
 AND INDIAN STATES.

FEBRUARY,
 Nos. 277-279.

SUMMARY.

Boundary between Travancore and Cochin,
 north of Mahendragiri.—Passing orders on letter
 from the Resident in Travancore and Cochin
 relating to the—

Sept. 30th 1880.

From

Arthur Macgregor, Esq.,

British Resident in Travancore and

Cochin.

To C. G. Master Esq.

Secy to Govt. Res. Dept.

Sir,

I have the honour to forward copy of
 a Telegram received from the Dewan
 of Travancore with reference to para
 14 of G.O. 18th Aug. 1880. No. 975.

The provisions in regard, to Mr. Coe's
 land, to the Muthukuli Pagh, to
 Alwarconby tract & to the Jemindery
 claims to land west of the watershed
 bordering on the Periyar are all
 conceded in the terms of the Govt. order,
 all being thrown into Travancore &
 the watershed line—

In regard to the Angusteen Pagh
 in which forms part of Athermully

the small area in English is valuable
for any purpose being rocky, precipitous
& clothed and here & there with dwarf
vegetation such as alums can stand
the continuous hurricanes which blow
in this island locality during the
greater part of the year - but have
already signified their willingness
to make this concession.

The only other proviso is as to certain
villages known as Thasthewellan the
claim which it is proposed to reserve
for future adjudication. I have not
received any statement as to the nature
of the claim, which must be that
referred to in the latter part of para
13. of O. 18th Aug. 80. It seems to
refer to an isolated tract in the
inhabited plains of Immervally similar
to some portions of the Thewesthale Valley.

It does not seem to form any important
part of the boundary now under
discussion & may be left to be decided
hereafter -

The Durawan Plan I imagine right
in stating finally that the settlement now
made does not refer to the boundary
of the Thewesthale Valley which is
understood to depend on the decision
passed several out in General
Gallen's time - This is for the
most part defined by masonry
pillars, & the position (a look
mark may here show how the decision
but it would needlessly complicate
matters to bring this question in
connection with the settlement of the
section now in hand -

The stipulations about I have the honor to be, Sir.
irrigation works seem
unobjectionable.

Your most obedient servant,

A. Macpherson.

British Resident in Travancore and Cochin.

Telegram from Dewan of Travancore

To British Resident.

Dated Sept 30th

His Highness the Maharajah gladly agrees to the proposal of his grace in (mail) & accepts the watershed boundary as marked by the commissioners it being understood that the British Govt abandons all claims to Coey's land, Moothukul, vyzal tract, Alwarvorchy tract & the Terimunday claims bordering on the Perregur on the one hand, & the Setur & Shingherry Terimundaries on the other.

In regard to part of Athermully which falls on the other side I am commanded to report that in consideration of our having maintained there an institution for the benefit of science for many years, & kept an undisputed possession of the tract the boundary line at that point of the ridge

Received 1/33

Sept 30/44.

British Resident.

To His Highness the Maharajah.

Sept 30/44

Transmitted with original copy of a telegram from the Dewan to the British Resident, dated 30th Sept 1844.

to run as to include in Travancore territory the Bangalore site & all such part of the Angusteen mountain itself as is above the level of the Bangalore site.

This Govt claims certain villages known as Shasthanchlor param, belonging to Chavang mully devasom, in Travancore, which villages lie to the East of the watershed line, & are held by the Shivagiri Jemindar.

When we establish our claim by evidence we shall ask restoration of the villages -

It is to be understood that while the water of flowing channels in the line marked will be allowed to British ryots in the same volume as now no new channel, or irrigation works will be allowed to be constructed or disused or ruined nor repaired without permission from Travancore.

It is understood also that the present arrangement does not

affect the boundaries of the Shevattah Taluk which stand as demarcated in General Fullen's time.

(True copy)

A. Macgregor.

Brit Res.

8

Dated Sept 30/80

Res. Secy. to Govt.
to Secy & Govt.
Res. Secy.
from Brit. Resident
Trav. Secy.

No.

RESIDENT'S OFFICE,

Oct 29th

1880

From

Atholl Macgregor Esq

RESIDENT in Travancore and Cochin,

To

C. G. Master Esq

Rev. ~~Genl~~ SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

FORT ST. GEORGE.

SIR,

With reference to the subject of my letter of the 30 September regarding the Travancore & Cochin Boundary I have the honor to inform you that the Travancore Govt. relinquishes the claim to the Shasthamelloor gramma, belonging to the Thavany Mulla Devassom. Copy of a Telegram from the Govt. of Travancore is annexed.

This was the only point where the line, as offered by the British Govt. was not finally & unreservedly accepted.

I have the honor to

Sir, your most obedient servant.

A. Macfarlane
Resident

Telegram.

Gravamen relinquishes claims
to Shashanatho paucum held
by Shisagiri Jecundus.
Request final demarcation
and survey.

(Yours truly)

A. Macfarlane

C. Nos 59144 and 113214.

From Resident Travancore Cochin of 30th Sept/80.
 Rev. Secy. of Govt. Dated 3 October 1880. No 11477.

FOR ORDERS.

Taking the points raised in the Revenue telegram in order, Mr. George's claim was abandoned by G.O. 5th December 1877, No 3358; the Muttukudi Teyit tract was reported by Mr. Hayne to be "undeniably" in Travancore territory; the Althumalai tract and Linnidari claims have been relinquished by G.O. 18 August 1880, No 775, paras 14 and 15. Mr. Hayne has stated the former of land occupied by the Travancore Government on the Althumalai &c &c fall under the watershed division to Travancore.

Thus the understanding of the Serwar is correct.

* Para 16 of report in G.O. 21st December 1875, No 1928.

* Para 14 of report in G.O. 4th September 1877, No 2638.

Revenue 1879. 1880.
 Political Department.

From

The Resident in Travancore and Cochin.

To

The Secy. to Govt.

For St. George.

Dated

Oct 29th 1880.

Received

No.

Enclosure.

Answering copy of P.L.

from Secy. of Travancore

relating to claim

of village in the

matter of boundary

between Travancore

and Cochin

C. M. 2. 81 R. 18-2-81
 27/10/80 27/10/80

But Mr. Pennington
 proposed that the Alwarahati
 tract should only be given
 up in exchange for a
 tract South of Mahendra-
 giri Mountain which Mr.
 Puckle formerly suggested
 should be traced from Tra-
 vancore. At present the tract
 in question was allowed to
 remain with Travancore on
 the old established principle
 accepted as the basis of the
 settlement of the whole line
 south of Mahendragiri in
 Lt. 29 June 1857 No 1123.

The Maunohat taluk
 boundary settlement it has
 been somewhat troublesome
 to trace but apparently it
 was decided by Lt. M. C. 1858
 14th January 1857.

The Residents suggestion

* See para 8 of letter in Lt. 7th
 May 1869, No 1287.
 Rs. 1000 was paid them by the
 then residents para 5 of Mr. Puckle's
 letter, page 14, Lt. 11 July 1870, No 1488.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.		Reed.	Retd.
Right Hon. the			
2 - THE MOST NOBLE THE GOVERNOR			
H. E. THE COMR-IN-CHIEF.			2
THE HON. SIR W. ROBINSON, K.C.S.I.			
1 - THE HON. W. HUDLESTON.			
<i>Boundary between Travancore and Travancore. North of Mahendragiri. Travancore - Travancore boundary.</i>			
<i>16th February 1861</i>			

By order of the Government

as to the matter, Travancore,
purposed to reserve for future
adjudication seems correct
but at the same time it
was, it is believed, the in-
tention of Government that
Travancore should finally
abandon that claim in
consideration of all that is
ceded to them.

[illegible]

FOR ORDERS.

Boundary between
Tinnevely and
Travancore, North
of Mahendragiri

321

Honble W. R. D. S. S.

2. is not correct

copy of 1875

c. 18/12/50 R 20/12/50

Revenue Department.

No 321

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT,

under date the 19 July/51

C. No 3744 + 6544/50.

Read letters from the Presi-
dent in Travancore and Cochin,
dated 30th September and 29th Octo-
ber 1880, regarding boundary
between Tinnevely and Tra-
vancore, North of Mahendragiri.

In regard to the matter
noticed in paras 1 and 2 of the
Governor's earlier telegram it is
observed that Mr. Coogo's claim
was abandoned by G.O. 5th
December 1877 No 3358, that the
Muthukuli Vayal tract was
reported by the boundary Com-
missioner to be undeniably in
Travancore territory, that the
Alwarthiruchi tract and Zamin-
dari claims have been relin-
quished by G.O. 18 August 1880.

* Para 16 of Mr. Haynes' report in
G.O. 21st December 1875 No 1828.

W.

10
No 9/5, para 14, and ^{14th} Mr. Wayne
has stated that the few
acres of land occupied by
the Larancore Government
on the Athornmalais xxx
fall under the watered di-
vision to Larancore.

2. The claim referred to
in para 3 has now been
abandoned.

3. The stipulations of
the Sirhar in regard to water
& irrigation are accepted.

4. The boundary of the Shan-
Kotah taluk, as already settled,
is in no way involved in the
present settlement.

② Parast of report in Lt. 4th
September 1877, No 2638.

20. The President in
Tarnool & John
20. Board of Revenue

Sept 5/77

1878
Boundary between
Lincoln and
Innocent - both
of the same district

Crack

Do

277-279