

(1) Number of pages 42
(2) Date of repair 17. 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>184</u>	Press ~~Mis.~~
<u>151-153.</u>	
Dated <u>10. 2.</u>	<u>1882.</u>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

10th February 1882, No. 184.

READ THE FOLLOWING PAPERS:—

No. 151. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 23rd November 1881, No. 2921.

Read the following letters:—

From A. W. PEET, Esq., Deputy Conservator of Forests, Coimbatore, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated Coimbatore, 15th September 1881, No. 1627.

I HAVE the honor to report on the arrangement agreed to by Mr. Hudson, Chief Engineer to the Cochin Government, and myself on behalf of the Madras Government with regard to the Cochin-Coimbatore boundary from Vengoli Peak to Sheklacund on the Anaimalais.

2. It was unnecessary to enter into the merits of the rival claims of Coimbatore and Cochin hillmen, as our orders were restricted and clear as contained in G.O., No. 2033, of the 19th June 1877, and G.O., No. 1675, of the 9th December 1880, viz., to re-cut the boundary between the points mentioned above in the direction of the water-shed ridge.

3. In order therefore to prevent needless complications, I refused to re-open any question of rights addressed me by the Kaders; but tried to ascertain the fact whether there was a natural ridge connecting the points.

4. As the country was entirely new to me, I left Coimbatore before the date settled for meeting the Cochin representative, and reached Tunacadavu on the 6th August. I spent a week studying the country about there and went down again to Anaimalai village on the 13th.

5. Mr. Hudson came to Anaimalai on the 15th, the day agreed upon beforehand, and Mr. Baber, of the Madras Revenue Survey, met us also on that day and kindly accompanied us all the way.

6. We reached Tunacadavu on the 17th, and went up the Vengoli slopes on the 18th. Unfortunately we were disappointed of a view, as I had been disappointed previously, owing to the mist and rain on Vengoli Peak.

7. At this stage I would refer to the eye-sketch, marked No. I, that accompanies this letter, which was prepared by Mr. Baber, to illustrate our settlement. I have marked a point A on the slopes of Vengoli, where there was clearly a fault in the old boundary, inasmuch as it crossed the water-shed at once; for there is a considerable stream running eastwards from Vengoli below this point. I brought this to notice, and after a careful examination, on Mr. Baber's suggestion, of the course of the stream, Mr. Hudson frankly admitted the error.

8. We therefore agreed to run the line from Vengoli to the top of Cheratombai, leaving this stream to the northwards.

9. As regards Cheratombai, a conspicuous peak, we agreed that no approximately natural boundary could be drawn where but directly over the top. The former boundary had run along the slopes to some extent.

10. We halted on the 19th, as I had to carry on my current official work, and moved on to a camp on the Palacadavu river on the 20th, marked B on the map. On our way we passed over the top of Sheklacund, another conspicuous hill, which formed the last point on the disputed portion now under consideration.

11. On the 21st we went back to Sheklacund and worked backwards along the ridge towards Cheratombai, returning again to the camp on Palacadavu, and going thence late in the evening to a further camp at Naygund.

12. We found that there were fair grounds for the contention formerly made by the Cochin representatives that a more natural boundary than that actually cut was

incorrect, and that this incorrect determination of the Palacadavu Amman affects the whole boundary thence to Kalianapandal.

9. I would first strengthen this opinion by a reference to Colonel Cloete's own words: "After Vengoli Peak the first two points identified were 'Sheklacund' and 'Palacadavu Amman,' an upright stone about four feet high near the bank of the river of that name, and close to 'Anaimalai Cheri.' The two places are named by Ward and Connor, and the points shown by the hillmen as bearing those names agree with Ward and Connor's description. Further, the measured distance between the points is about the same as that given in the old survey, *although the bearing between them somewhat differs.*

10. Having identified what they held to be the "Amman" stone, they made use of this as a *fixed point*, and proceeded to settle the rest of the boundary eastwards along the stream and then southwards.

11. Now my contention is that the "Anaimalai Cheri" to which the Boundary officers were taken was not Ward and Connor's "Anaimalai Cheri" and this "Amman," a religious mark common to many Kader's padis, was not Ward and Connor's "Amman." In short, their Anaimalai Cheri is the new hamlet of that name, the old hamlet lying also on the Palacadavu river, but about a mile to the west. This old village was spoken of at once by the Kaders without any questions on our part.

12. To prove my contention I would refer first of all to the fact that the direction of the line taken in 1876 is an unnatural one. After reaching the summit of Sheklacund, the ridge gradually slopes down in the line of its general direction (South-west or South-west by South) nearly to the Palacadavu river.

13. It is evidently natural to follow this ridge down, *and this is what was done by Ward and Connor, but was not done by the Boundary Commission in 1876.*

14. A reference to Ward and Connor's large map on a scale of one mile to an inch will show this at once. I append a tracing from this map to which I will presently refer—*vide* Map III appended.

Ward and Connor's line continues in a south-westerly direction from the summit of Sheklacund, following the natural slope down from the ridge and going near the *old hamlet of Anaimalai Cheri.*

15. On the contrary the line taken in 1876 (known as Russell's line) strikes straight down the side of the hill from the summit of Sheklacund, and goes in a south-easterly direction *to the new hamlet of Anaimalai Cheri.*

16. The result of this is that as the Boundary Commission of 1876 took the Amman stone near the new Anaimalai Cheri as a fixed point of departure for the determination of the rest of the line, the whole of their settlement from this point is thrown about a mile too much to the east to the loss of the Madras Government.

17. What are the facts as stated in Colonel Cloete's letter? Take paragraph 13. I do not understand about the statement of the position of the Palacadavu river; but I wish to consider the last clause: "The Palaginar stream, which flows into the Palacadavu, is shown nearly a mile to the west of its proper position." My idea is that their point of departure was a mile too far to the east.

18. In further proof see paragraphs 16 and 17 of the same letter, which run thus:—

"Eastwards from the Amman there was for some distance no doubt, as the map clearly shows, that the Palacadavu river forms the boundary, *but the point where the line should leave the river and turn southwards was difficult to determine.*" "Sitakal, a point named by Ward and Connor, was shown by the hillmen, *but some way further down the river than the position assigned to it by Ward and Connor.*"

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

19. Now I question whether on a reconsideration of the ground it would not be found that Sitakal is nearly in its correct position, if the point of departure is taken

a mile to the west, and one of the streams near Sitakal was the stream that flowed into the Palacadavu at the end of Ward and Connor's river line.

20. About the next point, Chirikal, I can say nothing, as I have never been there; but I should feel inclined to think that the point might possibly be wrongly determined by the hillmen, unless it is a point clearly marked by any peculiar characteristic.

21. I am led to think this because of my belief that Ward and Connor's fixed points are more accurate than they have been given credit for; my idea being that their main points were accurately determined by triangulation and the country between roughly sketched in.

This would account for the inaccuracies in the course of streams (of which a noteworthy example occurs in the present map in the course of the Sholay Aur), though the fixed points thereon may be accurately determined.

22. A reference to the Map No. II herewith forwarded may seem to refute at once this idea of the general accuracy of Ward and Connor's main points. On this map is shown a dotted line which marks out Kalianapandal according to Ward and Connor's distances and bearings to be about two miles to the E.N.E. of its true position.

23. At first sight this would seem conclusive proof of the general inaccuracy of Ward and Connor's map and specifications; but I beg to submit a theory whether this enormous discrepancy is not due to a *change of meridian*, that is to say that the true North as shown in Ward and Connor's map differs from the true North as shown on the Revenue Survey map. That the meridian does alter is well known; but whether it has so altered in fact I know not. I merely propound the theory, as it seems to me to account for what otherwise is a hopeless discrepancy.

24. To show the effect of carrying out this theory, I have appended to this letter a Map No. III in which I have copied in blue the outline of the boundary according to the Revenue Survey Map No. II, and in red the outline copied from Ward and Connor's map, large scale; shifting the meridian of the latter.

25. In short, starting from Vengoli as a fixed point and taking Kalianapandal as a fixed point at the other end of the line, I have (to use a term of Euclid) applied Ward and Connor's lines to the Revenue Survey lines.

I found that after applying the points "Vengoli" in each and shifting round Ward and Connor's lines by changing the meridian that the points "Kalianapandal" absolutely coincided without the slightest need of alteration.

26. This outline map shows at a glance some of the points for which I have been contending, viz., the difference between the old and new Anaimalai Cheri and the effect produced by taking as a fresh point of departure a stone near the latter too much to the east.

27. I have colored in blue the gain to Cochin and in red the gain to Madras on a comparison of the two maps.

28. After much hesitation I have felt bound to ask you to bring these facts and theories to the notice of the Board in order that the question may be decided whether Government thinks it necessary to re-open the whole line south of Sheklacund, or whether the settlement of 1876 as far as Kalianapandal is to be adhered to.

29. In any case the line is still unsettled from Kalianapandal to Pannimedkuttu, but I think if necessary what is known as "Major Freeth's compromise" could be agreed to by both parties without a further formal meeting being left to the Revenue Survey Department to carry out on the ground.

No. 252.

SUBMITTED to Government with the accompanying sketches, through the Board of Revenue in continuation of this Office No. 251, dated 24th October 1881.

2. The Deputy Conservator of Forests, Mr. Peet, points out certain inaccuracies in the line between Sheklacund and Kalianapandal on the Coimbatore-Cochin boundary,

and suggests the re-opening of the same. But it was settled in 1876 and accepted by both Governments in 1877, and it is most desirable that whether right or wrong and whether it is a gain to one Government and loss to another or not that the matter be not again opened.

3. The suggestion of Mr. Peet in paragraph 29 of his letter as regards the settlement of the remaining line between Kalianapandal and Pannimedkuttu by drawing a direct line from Kalianapandal to Pannimedkuttu along the ridge as proposed in paragraph 10 of Major Freeth's letter, No. 4195, dated 30th August 1880, to the Superintendent of Madras Survey, recorded in Board's Proceedings, No. 1835, dated 22nd August 1881, may be accepted if the Cochin Government has no objection.

COIMBATORE,
25th October 1881.

(Signed) G. D. LEMAN,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 to 3.—Maps.

The foregoing papers relating to the settlement of the boundary between British Territory and Cochin will be submitted for the orders of Government.

2. In their Order, dated 19th June 1877, No. 2033, the Government, on the representations of the Collector, directed that the portion of the boundary line between Vengoli Peak and Sheklacund should be re-cut. The representatives of the two Governments—Mr. Peet, Deputy Conservator of Forests, for this Government, and Mr. Hudson, Chief Engineer under the Cochin Government—have met and agreed upon the line to be adopted in lieu of that originally fixed, as shown in Sketch Map No. I. The grounds for this revision are explained in the Board's Proceedings printed with the Government Order above quoted, and the Board recommend that the decision arrived at by the representatives be accepted. The tract of country involved in the settlement is inconsiderable.

3. In his second letter Mr. Peet re-opens the question of the correctness of the boundary demarcated in 1876 from Sheklacund to Kalianapandal, and advances arguments in support of Ward and Connor's line, which was set aside in favor of the recent survey. This portion of the boundary has been definitely accepted by Cochin—*vide* the Dewan's letter embodied in G.O., dated 7th October 1876, No. 1442, and the Board are decidedly of opinion that the settlement should not be disturbed.

4. The portion of the boundary between Kalianapandal and Pannimedkuttu, the trijunction, alone remains to be settled so far as Cochin is concerned. The distance is short, and this section appears to present no difficulty. If Major Freeth's proposal to take a direct line along the ridge between these two points is accepted by Cochin, the line can be demarcated and the boundary completed without further delay.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary.

No. 152. Endorsement of the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 30th January 1882, No. 95.

Read the following letter from J. C. HANNYNGTON, Esq., Acting Resident in Travancore and Cochin, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Cochin, 24th January 1882, No. 11.

WITH reference to G.O., No. 1831, of 29th November 1881, Political Department No. 599, dated 28th December, I have the honor to forward copy of a letter*

* No. 55, dated 13th instant.

† By separate post (banghy).

and its enclosure from the Dewan of Cochin as well as the plans† or sketches alluded to in paragraph 2 of the Dewan's letter.

2. The Dewan urges that the line south from Sheklacund has been accepted by the Circar only as far as Palacadavu, and, although in the sketch B I find the whole line from Sheklacund to Kalianapandal entered as surveyed and accepted, I am not aware of its being so entered in the sketches signed by the representatives of both sides.

3. A tracing from Ward and Connor's map is also forwarded, which is useful, as, by laying it over the sketch C, the difference between that map and the present survey is seen at a glance.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Letter from T. GOVINDA MENON, Dewan of Cochin, to the Acting British Resident in Travancore and Cochin, dated Ernacolum, 13th January 1882, No. 55.

WITH reference to G.O., No. 599, dated 28th December 1881, copy of which accompanied your letter, No. 27, of the 6th instant, I have the honor to state that I shall desire Mr. Hudson to arrange with Mr. Peet and meet him at the proper season to mark out the remaining portion of the Cochin-Coimbatore boundary.

2. I beg to state that, as proposed in the correspondence noted in the margin, Mr. Hudson met Mr. Peet and Mr. Baber of the Madras Revenue Survey on the boundary in August last, and they decided that the boundary line should run over the top of Cheratom-

bai, which forms a portion of the continuous ridge or water-shed between Sheklacund and Vengoli Peak, which is similar to the line laid down in the trigonometrical map prepared by Messrs. Ward and Connor. I beg to forward herewith extract from Mr. Hudson's report on the subject, dated 1st November 1881, No. 439, and the sketches mentioned in paragraphs 8, 12, and 13.

3. With reference to the misunderstanding alluded to in paragraph 11 of Mr. Hudson's report, I beg to state that, in paragraph 5 of Mr. Peet's letter printed with the Government Order received with your letter under acknowledgment, Mr. Peet says: "Beyond Sheklacund to the south the line marked out by Mr. Douglas and by our Survey Department has been accepted by Cochin as correct," and he gives the date of the Cochin Dewan's letter (14th September 1876, No. 886,) to the Resident printed in Proceedings of the Madras Government of the 7th October 1876. On referring to the papers printed with the said Government Proceedings I find that, although the Dewan said that "to the south of Sheklacund His Highness' Government accepts the boundary as now demarcated," he cannot have meant so far south as Kalianapandal, because his letter was evidently based on the report of Messrs. Stevenson and Hudson, dated 22nd August 1876, No. 1, printed with the same Government Proceedings, the 8th paragraph of which runs as follows:—

"The following day (August 9th) we took up the line from Coomulur Aur southward up Pulivipara Mudi down to the Amenaukul and thence on to Palacadavu on the bank of a river

of the same name. Up to this point the line is marked on the rocks thus  As this part

of the line may be considered to be as nearly correct as possible, we beg to suggest that the Cochin Circar's mark may also be cut on these rocks."

4. I, therefore, conclude that the Dewan, when he said "to the south," meant only so far south as Palacadavu, and not up to Kalianapandal.

5. I would, therefore, suggest that the whole line from Palacadavu to Pannimedkuttu be demarcated by the Cochin and British Officers.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

Extract from a letter from H. W. HUDSON, Esq., Chief Engineer, to the Dewan of Cochin, dated Trichore, 1st November 1881, No. 439.

I HAVE the honor to report that, in accordance with the instructions contained in your letter, No. 125, of the 28th January 1881, I proceeded to Pollachi and Anaimalai on the 15th August last, where I met Mr. Peet, the Deputy Conservator of Forests, Coimbatore, and Mr. Baber of the Madras Revenue Survey, who had been deputed to accompany Mr. Peet and myself over the disputed boundary between Vengoli Peak and Sheklacund.

2. On the 16th of August we left Anaimalai and camped at Settimadi; on the 17th we proceeded to Tunacadavu (the head-quarters of the Coimbatore Forest Officer on the Anaimalais). On the 18th we examined the boundary on Vengoli and decided that the boundary line should

run over the top of Cheratombai, which forms a portion of the continuous ridge or water-shed between Sheklacund and Vengoli Peak and is similar to the line laid down on the trigonometrical map prepared by Messrs. Ward and Connor.

3. On the 20th we removed to our next camp at Palacadavu and examined the boundary on the way between Kallipara and Sheklacund.

4. On the 21st we returned to Sheklacund accompanied by the Surveyors, followed the ridge, and marked the trees defining the boundary between Kallipara and Sheklacund; we then returned to camp, and afterwards proceeded to Naygund. 22nd and 23rd Naygund.

5. After waiting at this camp for two days (Mr. Peet having been daily expecting orders from the Revenue Board to proceed to the trijunction at Pannimedkuttu, and none having arrived), we decided to return. Work would, however, have been impracticable beyond this camp during the south-west monsoon owing to the severity of the weather. Mr. Douglas, the former Deputy Conservator of Forests, Coimbatore, represents this in his letters relating to this part of the Anaimalais.

6. On the 24th we left Naygund for Palacadavu.

7. On the 26th we again examined and fixed the boundary along the water-shed ridge between Sheklacund and Vengoli.

8. The sketch map (A) herewith forwarded, signed by Mr. Baber and certified to by me, shows the line as now recut, which is according to the trigonometrical map and the G.O., No. 1675, dated 9th December 1880.

9. On the 28th of August we left Tunacadavu and returned to the low country.

10. The G.O., No. 1675, dated 9th December 1880, only directs the settlement of that portion of the Cochin-Coimbatore boundary which is to be recut between Sheklacund and Vengoli.

11. The British officials are under the impression that the Sirkar has accepted the boundary between Sheklacund and Kalianapandal, as it is stated in the last paragraph of the Dewan's letter to the Resident, No. 886, of the 14th September 1876—"To the south of Sheklacund His Highness' Government accepts the boundary as now demarcated."

12. I enclose a map (B) showing this portion of the boundary signed by the Acting Deputy Superintendent, Madras Survey. At the same time I would beg to point out the great difference existing between this map and the trigonometrical map prepared by Messrs. Ward and Connor.

13. On the enclosed sketch (C) I have laid down the boundaries as near as possible, first showing the line as now demarcated, and secondly the line as given on the trigonometrical map.

14. Lieutenant-Colonel Cloete, Deputy Superintendent, Revenue Survey, explains these differences in his letter, No. 79-34, dated 28th January 1876, to Lieutenant-Colonel Hessey, Acting Superintendent, Revenue Survey, and states that the trigonometrical map between Sheklacund, Kalianapandal, and the Trijunction at Pannimedkuttu is altogether wrong.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) T. GOVINDA MENON,
Dewan.

TRANSFERRED to the Revenue Department, with reference to their Order of the 29th November last, No. 1831.

(Signed) R. DAVIDSON,
Chief Secretary.

No. 153.

ORDER THEREON, 10th February 1882, No. 184.

Miscellaneous.

THE boundary line between Vengoli Peak and Sheklacund, as now run, is approved and accepted. If not already recut, it should be so.

2. It now appears from the Resident's letter read above and received since the date of the Board's Proceedings, that as regards the line already fixed between Sheklacund and Kalianapandal, which it was supposed had been agreed to by the Cochin Circar, there has been a misunderstanding, and that the line accepted by that Government extended no further south than Palacadavu. In accordance with

the Dewan's suggestion, the representatives of the two Governments will meet and go over the ground again, when the observations of Mr. Peet, as contained in his letter, No. 1629-A, dated 15th September 1881, should be carefully considered. If they prove correct, it will be necessary to re-open the whole line from Sheklacund southwards.

3. As a further formal meeting of the representatives is to take place, they will also deal with the proposed line between Kalianapandal and Pannimedkuttu—the trijunction.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue, with three original maps returned.

„ the Conservator of Forests.

„ the Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

„ the Political Department, for communication to the
Resident in Travancore and Cochin.

Exd. J. W. Fischer.

85 Copies.

Original

GOVT. OF (1881) BOMBAY

REVENUE

THE BOARD OF REVENUE

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

Order of the Board

Order of the Board

Order of the Board

G.O. No. 1184 of 1881

FEBRUARY

No. 151-152

Boundary—Cochin and Coimbatore—
of the boundary between the two papers already
of the



No. 2921.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 23rd November 1881.

Read the following letters:—

From A. W. PEET, Esq., Deputy Conservator of Forests, Coimbatore, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated Coimbatore, 15th September 1881, No. 1627.

I HAVE the honor to report on the arrangement agreed to by Mr. Hudson, Chief Engineer to the Cochin Government, and myself on behalf of the Madras Government with regard to the Cochin-Coimbatore boundary from Vengoli Peak to Sheklacund on the Anaimalais.

2. It was unnecessary to enter into the merits of the rival claims of Coimbatore and Cochin hillmen, as our orders were restricted and clear as contained in G.O., No. 2033, of the 19th June 1877, and G.O., No. 1675, of the 9th December 1880, viz., to re-cut the boundary between the points mentioned above in the direction of the water-shed ridge.

3. In order therefore to prevent needless complications, I refused to re-open any question of rights addressed me by the Kaders; but tried to ascertain the fact whether there was a natural ridge connecting the points.

4. As the country was entirely new to me, I left Coimbatore before the date settled for meeting the Cochin representative, and reached Tunacadavu on the 6th August. I spent a week studying the country about there and went down again to Anaimalai village on the 13th.

5. Mr. Hudson came to Anaimalai on the 15th, the day agreed upon beforehand, and Mr. Baber, of the Madras Revenue Survey, met us also on that day and kindly accompanied us all the way.

6. We reached Tunacadavu on the 17th, and went up the Vengoli slopes on the 18th. Unfortunately we were disappointed of a view, as I had been disappointed previously, owing to the mist and rain on Vengoli Peak.

7. At this stage I would refer to the eye-sketch, marked No. I, that accompanies this letter, which was prepared by Mr. Baber, to illustrate our settlement. I have marked a point A on the slopes of Vengoli, where there was clearly a fault in the old boundary, inasmuch as it crossed the water-shed at once; for there is a considerable stream running eastwards from Vengoli below this point. I brought this to notice, and after a careful examination, on Mr. Baber's suggestion, of the course of the stream, Mr. Hudson frankly admitted the error.

8. We therefore agreed to run the line from Vengoli to the top of Cheratombai, leaving this stream to the northwards.

9. As regards Cheratombai, which is a conspicuous peak, we agreed that no approximately natural boundary could be taken anywhere but directly over the top. The former boundary had run along the slopes to some extent.

10. We halted on the 19th, as I had to carry on my current official work, and moved on to a camp on the Palacadavu river on the 20th, marked B on the map. On our way we passed over the top of Sheklacund, another conspicuous hill, which formed the last point on the disputed portion now under consideration.

11. On the 21st we went back to Sheklacund and worked backwards along the ridge towards Cheratombai, returning again to the camp on Palacadavu, and going thence late in the evening to a further camp at Naygund.

12. We found that there were fair grounds for the contention formerly made by the Cochin representatives that a more natural boundary than that actually cut was ready to hand; though it was not absolutely correct to say that there was a single water-shed ridge all the way between Sheklacund and Vengoli.

13. What we actually found was that the natural ridge running north-east from Sheklacund had been suddenly abandoned in cutting the old boundary. We therefore continued along the ridge to the summit, marked C (Kallipara). There are great differences of elevation in the ridge, but it is clearly traceable.

14. After reaching point C, however, we found that there was a descent to a small stream where there was an ascent again to a ridge, which we traced as far as the slopes of Cheratombai.

15. This stream runs west, but it seemed clearly an abandonment of Ward and Connor's line to have tried to trace this stream up to its source. We therefore adopted the line I have indicated in paragraph 14, viz., we found after some little difficulty a spur running gradually down to a point on this stream near a Kader's padi, whence a spur ascended to a ridge clearly traceable as far as the slopes of Cheratombai.

16. The point where the stream is crossed is clearly marked by some conspicuous flat rocks in which survey marks can be imprinted with advantage.

17. To give a resumé of the whole line. It starts for a short distance southwards from Vengoli Peak to a saddle, whence it runs South-east to the top of Cheratombai; thence South-east by South down the slopes, and along a ridge which gradually falls to a point D on a small stream near a Kader's hamlet; whence it runs up a spur to the point C, the highest point in this vicinity on the main ridge to Sheklacund. From C to Sheklacund the direction is about South-west.

18. The loss or gain to either Government is trifling; but the present line has, we believe, the advantage of being as nearly a natural boundary as the nature of the ground admits, and is very closely approximate to the lines on Ward and Connor's map.

19. In the present letter I have, for the sake of clearness, adhered to the single subject of the line from Vengoli to Sheklacund, as this was the line to which our orders referred; and I express a hope that the settlement proposed will meet the favorable consideration of Government.

20. As regards the rest of the boundary, I address a separate letter (No. 1629).

No. 251.

SUBMITTED to Government, through the Board of Revenue, with reference to G.O., No. 1675, dated 9th December 1880, communicated in Board's Miscellaneous Proceedings, No. 14,102, dated 21st December 1880, with the suggestion that the line now settled between Vengoli Peak and Sheklacund as the Coimbatore-Cochin boundary may be accepted.

COIMBATORE,
24th October 1881.

(Signed) G. D. LEMAN,
Acting Collector.

From A. W. PEET, Esq., Deputy Conservator of Forests, Coimbatore, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated Coimbatore, 15th September 1881, No. 1629-A.

In continuation of my letter, No. 1627, of the 15th instant, I have the honor to refer to the rest of the boundary between Cochin and Coimbatore, viz., southwards from Sheklacund to Pannimedkuttu.

I divide this letter for the sake of clearness into—

A.—Record of Proceedings.

B.—Remarks on the line demarcated in 1876 between Sheklacund and Kalianapandal.

A.—Record of our Proceedings.

1. At the same time that the boundary from Vengoli to Sheklacund was marked out and cut by the Anaimalai Forest Officer and the Survey Department in 1876, the line southwards was also marked out from Sheklacund to Kalianapandal on the Sholay Aur.

2. Beyond this point, Kalianapandal, it is important to remember that no line whatever was demarcated towards Pannimedkuttu, the trijunction of Cochin, Travancore and Coimbatore.

3. The line southwards from Sheklacund was accepted by Cochin so far as it was demarcated, that is, as far as Kalianapandal.

4. No settlement has been made beyond, and therefore our settlement of the line from Vengoli to Sheklacund, as detailed in my former letter, does not set at rest the whole question.

5. So soon as I was clearly aware that our orders extended merely to the first part of the line, viz., from Vengoli to Sheklacund, I addressed to your office a letter, No. 1328, dated the 19th July 1881, in which I asked that these facts might be brought before the Board of Revenue for orders.

6. When Mr. Hudson, Mr. Baber, and I met at Pollachi, I explained these facts; and Mr. Hudson said that not only did his orders not refer to the line beyond Kalianapandal, but that there was a claim made by Travancore to some land about there, and that this claim was still pending.

7. However, as I hoped, we might receive further orders while out in camp. Mr. Hudson agreed to come on with us to Pannimedkuttu, if necessary, to look at the ground.

8. It was for this purpose that we went on to a camp at Naygund on the 21st August as mentioned in my former letter. Here we stayed three nights on the possibility of getting orders to settle the rest of the boundary; but as none reached us, we returned, especially as it was pouring with rain, and our Kaders and Mulcers were making outcries against attempting the journey at this season; while some of the latter actually deserted.

B.—Remarks on the line demarcated in 1876 from Sheklacund southwards to Kalianapandal.

1. The record of the determination of this line by Colonel Cloete, Major Freeth, and Mr. Douglas (in the absence of a Cochin representative) is detailed in Proceedings of the Madras Government of the 30th May 1876.

2. The line was accepted by Cochin—vide Proceedings of the Madras Government of the 7th October 1876. If this acceptance terminates the contract on both sides, there is no more to be said.

3. However, as I explained in my letter of the 19th July 1881, No. 1328 above mentioned, there has been no settlement whatever of the line from Kalianapandal to Pannimedkuttu.

4. In case, therefore, it should be held advisable or admissible to reconsider the whole line southwards from Sheklacund, I venture with deference to criticize some part of the conclusions arrived at by the boundary officers in 1876.

5. At this point I would deprecate the idea of any assumption of superior penetration, if my conclusions be held to be correct; for these conclusions have been founded in great part on information gained from the labors of the former Boundary Commission; and it is often easy to detect errors after a series of maps have been published, into which as a pioneer one might have readily fallen.

6. I feel bound, however, to note what I consider to be errors in order to place the facts before the Board as fully as possible, and to dispute the point whether Ward and Connor's map is so inaccurate as has been suggested.

7. Taking Colonel Cloete's very lucid description of the course taken by the Boundary officers (vide his letter of the 28th January 1876), I would first of all refer to paragraphs 8 and 9 of his letter.

8. In these he mentions having identified two points mentioned by Ward and Connor, viz., "Sheklacund" and "Palacadavu Amman," near "Anaimalai Cheri." Now I venture to submit my opinion that the identification of this latter place was

incorrect, and that this incorrect determination of the Palacadavu Amman affects the whole boundary thence to Kalianapandal.

9. I would first strengthen this opinion by a reference to Colonel Cloete's own words: "After Vengoli Peak the first two points indentified were "Sheklacund" and "Palacadavu Amman," an upright stone about four feet high near the bank of the river of that name, and close to "Anaimalai Cheri." The two places are named by Ward and Connor, and the points shown by the hillmen as bearing those names agree with Ward and Connor's description. Further, the measured distance between the points is about the same as that given in the old survey, *although the bearing between them somewhat differs.*

10. Having identified what they held to be the "Amman" stone, they made use of this as a *fixed point*, and proceeded to settle the rest of the boundary eastwards along the stream and then southwards.

11. Now my contention is that the "Anaimalai Cheri" to which the Boundary officers were taken was not Ward and Connor's "Anaimalai Cheri" and this "Amman," a religious mark common to many Kader's padis, was not Ward and Connor's "Amman." In short, their Anaimalai Cheri is the new hamlet of that name, the old hamlet lying also on the Palacadavu river, but about a mile to the west. This old village was spoken of at once by the Kaders without any questions on our part.

12. To prove my contention I would refer first of all to the fact that the direction of the line taken in 1876 is an unnatural one. After reaching the summit of Sheklacund, the ridge gradually slopes down in the line of its general direction (South-west or South-west by South) nearly to the Palacadavu river.

13. It is evidently natural to follow this ridge down, and this is what was done by Ward and Connor, but was not done by the Boundary Commission in 1876.

14. A reference to Ward and Connor's large map on a scale of one mile to an inch will show this at once. I append a tracing from this map to which I will presently refer—*vide* Map III appended.

Ward and Connor's line continues in a south-westerly direction from the summit of Sheklacund, following the natural slope down from the ridge and going near the old hamlet of Anaimalai Cheri.

15. On the contrary the line taken in 1876 (known as Russell's line) strikes straight down the side of the hill from the summit of Sheklacund, and goes in a southeasterly direction to the new hamlet of Anaimalai Cheri.

16. The result of this is that as the Boundary Commission of 1876 took the Amman stone near the new Anaimalai Cheri as a fixed point of departure for the determination of the rest of the line, the whole of their settlement from this point is thrown about a mile too much to the east to the loss of the Madras Government.

17. What are the facts as stated in Colonel Cloete's letter? Take paragraph 13. I do not understand about the statement of the position of the Palacadavu river; but I wish to consider the last clause: "The Palaginar stream, which flows into the Palacadavu, is shown nearly a mile to the west of its proper position." My idea is that their point of departure was a mile too far to the east.

18. In further proof see paragraphs 16 and 17 of the same letter, which run thus:—

"Eastwards from the Amman there was for some distance no doubt, as the map clearly shows, that the Palacadavu river forms the boundary, but the point where the line should leave the river and turn southwards was difficult to determine." "Sitakal, a point named by Ward and Connor, was shown by the hillmen, but some way further down the river than the position assigned to it by Ward and Connor."

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

19. Now I question whether on a reconsideration of the ground it would not be found that Sitakal is nearly in its correct position, if the point of departure is taken

a mile to the west, and one of the streams near Sitakal was the stream that flowed into the Palacadavu at the end of Ward and Connor's river line.

20. About the next point, Chirikal, I can say nothing, as I have never been there; but I should feel inclined to think that the point might possibly be wrongly determined by the hillmen, unless it is a point clearly marked by any peculiar characteristic.

21. I am led to think this because of my belief that Ward and Connor's fixed points are more accurate than they have been given credit for; my idea being that their main points were accurately determined by triangulation and the country between roughly sketched in.

This would account for the inaccuracies in the course of streams (of which a noteworthy example occurs in the present map in the course of the Sholay Aur), though the fixed points thereon may be accurately determined.

22. A reference to the Map No. II herewith forwarded may seem to refute at once this idea of the general accuracy of Ward and Connor's main points. On this map is shown a dotted line which marks out Kalianapandal according to Ward and Connor's distances and bearings to be about two miles to the E.N.E. of its true position.

23. At first sight this would seem conclusive proof of the general inaccuracy of Ward and Connor's map and specifications; but I beg to submit a theory whether this enormous discrepancy is not due to a *change of meridian*, that is to say that the true North as shown in Ward and Connor's map differs from the true North as shown on the Revenue Survey map. That the meridian does alter is well known; but whether it has so altered in fact I know not. I merely propound the theory, as it seems to me to account for what otherwise is a hopeless discrepancy.

24. To show the effect of carrying out this theory, I have appended to this letter a Map No. III in which I have copied in blue the outline of the boundary according to the Revenue Survey Map No. II, and in red the outline copied from Ward and Connor's map, large scale; shifting the meridian of the latter.

25. In short, starting from Vengoli as a fixed point and taking Kalianapandal as a fixed point at the other end of the line, I have (to use a term of Euclid) applied Ward and Connor's lines to the Revenue Survey lines.

I found that after applying the points "Vengoli" in each and shifting round Ward and Connor's lines by changing the meridian that the points "Kalianapandal" absolutely coincided without the slightest need of alteration.

26. This outline map shows at a glance some of the points for which I have been contending, viz., the difference between the old and new Anaimalai Cheri and the effect produced by taking as a fresh point of departure a stone near the latter too much to the east.

27. I have colored in blue the gain to Cochin and in red the gain to Madras on a comparison of the two maps.

28. After much hesitation I have felt bound to ask you to bring these facts and theories to the notice of the Board in order that the question may be decided whether Government thinks it necessary to re-open the whole line south of Sheklacund, or whether the settlement of 1876 as far as Kalianapandal is to be adhered to.

29. In any case the line is still unsettled from Kalianapandal to Pannimedkuttu, but I think if necessary what is known as "Major Freeth's compromise" could be agreed to by both parties without a further formal meeting, being left to the Revenue Survey Department to carry out on the ground.

No. 252.

SUBMITTED to Government with the accompanying sketches, through the Board of Revenue in continuation of this Office No. 251, dated 24th October 1881.

2. The Deputy Conservator of Forests, Mr. Peet, points out certain inaccuracies in the line between Sheklacund and Kalianapandal on the Coimbatore-Cochin boundary, and suggests the re-opening of the same. But it was settled in 1876 and accepted by both Governments in 1877, and it is most desirable that whether right or wrong and whether it is a gain to one Government and loss to another or not that the matter be not again opened.

3. The suggestion of Mr. Peet in paragraph 29 of his letter as regards the settlement of the remaining line between Kalianapandal and Pannimedkuttu by drawing a direct line from Kaliana pandal to Pannimedkuttu along the ridge as proposed in paragraph 10 of Major Freeth's letter, No. 4195, dated 30th August 1880, to the Superintendent of Madras Survey, recorded in Board's Proceedings, No. 1835, dated 22nd August 1881, may be accepted if the Cochin Government has no objection.

COIMBATORE,
25th October 1881.

(Signed) G. D. LEMAN,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 to 3.—Maps.

The foregoing papers relating to the settlement of the boundary between British Territory and Cochin will be submitted for the orders of Government.

2. In their Order, dated 19th June 1877, No. 2033, the Government, on the representations of the Collector, directed that the portion of the boundary line between Vengoli Peak and Sheklacund should be re-cut. The representatives of the two Governments—Mr. Peet, Deputy Conservator of Forests, for this Government, and Mr. Hudson, Chief Engineer under the Cochin Government—have met and agreed upon the line to be adopted in lieu of that originally fixed, as shown in Sketch Map No. I. The grounds for this revision are explained in the Board's Proceedings printed with the Government Order above quoted, and the Board recommend that the decision arrived at by the representatives be accepted. The tract of country involved in the settlement is inconsiderable.

3. In his second letter Mr. Peet re-opens the question of the correctness of the boundary demarcated in 1876 from Sheklacund to Kalianapandal, and advances arguments in support of Ward and Connor's line, which was set aside in favor of the recent survey. This portion of the boundary has been definitely accepted by Cochin—*vide* the Dewan's letter embodied in G.O., dated 7th October 1876, No. 1442, and the Board are decidedly of opinion that the settlement should not be disturbed.

4. The portion of the boundary between Kalianapandal and Pannimedkuttu, the trijunction, alone remains to be settled so far as Cochin is concerned. The distance is short, and this section appears to present no difficulty. If Major Freeth's proposal to take a direct line along the ridge between these two points is accepted by Cochin, the line can be demarcated and the boundary completed without further delay.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with 3 maps (in G.R. No. 7834 of 1881) to be returned.
" Collector of Coimbatore.
" Conservator of Forests.
" Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

Exd. W. J. Lewis.

29-11-81 20540-541.
 - 1-3-81 - 52841
 - 9-12-80 - 154-155.
 - 19-6-77 - 275-76.
 - 7-10-76 - 25-96.
 - 30-5-76 - 315-316.

Revenue Department

No 7041

1881.

Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Print

Printed November th.

Received

16th Dec^r

PROCEEDINGS, 23RD NOV. 1881, No. 2921.

Copy 15/12/81 encs

SUBMITTING, for the orders of Government,
papers relating to the boundary between the
British Territory and Cochin.

15/12/81
15/12/81

14-1-82 R.16-1-82 R.21-1-82 R.23-1-82

Azoor Butcherry.

Ernaaculum in Cochin

13th January 1882.

No 55.

4
To

J. C. Hannington Esq.
Ag. British Resident in
Travancore and Cochin.

Sir,

With reference to G. O No 599 dated
28th December 1881, copy of which accompanied
your letter No 27 of the 6th Instant, I have
the honor to state that I shall desire Mr
Hudson to arrange with Mr Peet and meet
him at the proper season to mark out the
remaining portion of the Cochin - Coim-
bator boundary.

2. I beg to state that, as proposed
in the correspondence noted in the margin
Mr Hudson met Mr Peet and Mr Baber
of the Madras Revenue Survey on the
boundary in August last and they de-
cided that the Boundary line should
run over the top of Cheratombai which
forms a portion of the Continuous Ridge
or watershed between Sheklakund and
Vengoli Peak which is similar to the
line laid down in the Trigonometrical
Map prepared by Messrs Ward and Bonnor.
I beg to forward herewith Extract from
Mr Hudson's report on the subject dated

From Resident No 8 dated 12th January 1881
with G.O. No 1675 dated 3rd December 1880
Dewan's reply No 167 dated 8th February 1881

1st November 1881, N^o 439 and the Sketches mentioned in Paras. 8, 12 and 13.

3. With reference to the misunderstanding alluded to in Para 11 of Mr Hudson's report, I beg to state that in Para 5 of Mr Peet's letter printed with the G. O. received with your letter under acknowledgment Mr Peet says: "Beyond Shetklamund, to the South, the line marked out by Mr Douglas and by our Survey Department has been accepted by Cochin as correct" and he gives the date of the Cochin Dewan's letter (14th September 1876 N^o 886) to the Resident, printed in Proceedings of the Madras Government of the 7th October 1876. On referring to the papers printed with the said Government Proceedings I find that although the Dewan said that "to the South of Shetklamund" "His Highness Government accepts the boundary as now demarcated" he cannot have meant so far South as Kalianpandal because his letter was evidently based on the report of Messrs Stevenson and Hudson dated 22nd August 1876, N^o 1, printed with the same Government Proceedings, the 8th Para of which runs as follows:—
"The following day (August 9th)

we took up the line from Coomulur Kur southward up Pulivipara Mudi down to the Amenankul and thence on to Palakadavu, on the bank of a river of the same name. Up to this point the line is marked on the rocks thus: 
"As this part of the line may be considered to be as nearly correct as possible, we beg to suggest that the Cochin Sirkar's mark may also be cut on these rocks".

4. I therefore conclude that the Dewan when he said "to the South" meant only so far South as Palacadavu, and not up to Kalianpandal.

5. I would therefore suggest that the whole line from Palacadavu to Punnimadekuthu be demarcated by the Cochin and British Officers.

I have &c.

(Sgd) T. Govinda Menon
Dewan

Extract from a letter from Mr H. W.
Henderson, Chief Engineer to the Dewan
of Cochin, dated Trichur 1 November 1885 No 439.

Para 1 I have the honor to report that in
accordance with the instructions con-
tained in your letter No 125 of the 28th January
1881, I proceeded to Polachy and Annamali
on the 15th August last, where I met Mr Peet
the Deputy Conservator of Forests, Coim-
batore and Mr. Baker of the Madras
Revenue Survey, who had been deputed to
accompany Mr. Peet and myself over
the disputed boundary between Vengoli
Peak and Shakalacund.

2. On the 16th of August we left Annas-
mal and camped at Sittimadi, on the
17th we proceeded to Turacadavoo (the
head quarters of the Coimbatore Forest
Officer on the Annamalis) On the 18th
we examined the boundary on Vengoli
and decided that the boundary line
should run over the top of Cheratombai
which forms a portion of the continuous
ridge or watershed between Shakalacund
and Vengoli Peak, and is similar to the
line laid down on the Trigonometrical
map prepared by Messrs. Ward & Connor.

3 On the 20th we removed to our
next

In Pol. No 439

2
Rev 50/11

next camp at Palakadavu and examined the Boundary on the way between Kallipara and Shakalacund.

4. On the 21st we returned to Shakalacund accompanied by the Surveyors, followed the ridge and marked the trees defining the Boundary between Kallipara and Shakalacund, we then returned to Camp and afterwards proceeded to Naygund 22nd and 23rd Naygund.

5. After waiting at this camp for two days (Mr. Peet having been daily expecting orders from the Revenue Board to proceed to the Trigon. station at Panniad Kutta, and none having arrived) we decided to return. Work would, however have been impracticable beyond this camp during the South West monsoon, owing to the severity of the weather. Mr. Douglas the former Deputy Conservator of Forests, Coimbatore, represents ^{this} in his letters relating to this part of the Annamalais.

6. On the 24th we left Naygund for Palakadavu.

7. On the 26th we again examined and

and fixed the Boundary along the watershed Ridge between Shakalacund and Tengoli.

A

8. The sketch map herewith forwarded, signed by Mr. Kaber and certified to by me shows the line as now recut, which is according to the Trigonometrical map, and the Government order No 1675 dated 9th December 1880.

9. On the 28th of August we left Eumacadavoor and returned to the low country.

10. The Government Order No 1676 dated 9th December 1880, only directs the settlement of that portion of the Kochui Corin. above Boundary which is to be recut between Shakalacund and Tengoli.

11. The British Officials are under the impression that the Sirkar has accepted the boundary between Shakalacund & Kallipandal, as it is stated in the last para. of the Dewan's letter to the Resident No 586 of the 14th September 1876. "To the South of Shakalacund He is His Highness Government accepts the Boundary as now demarcated."

12. I enclose a map showing the portion of the boundary signed by the Asst. Deputy Superintendent, Madras Survey. At the same time I would beg to point out the great difference existing between this map and the Trigonometrical map prepared by Messrs. Ward and Connor.

13. On the enclosed sketch I have laid down the boundaries as near as possible, first showing the line as now demarcated, and secondly the line as given on the Trigonometrical map.

14. Lieutenant Colonel Blake, Deputy Superintendent Revenue Survey explains these differences in his letter No 7734 dated 28th January 1876. ^{Printed 9.2.8} A Lieutenant Colonel Keary, Acting Superintendent Revenue Survey, and states that the Trigonometrical map between Shakalacund, Kaliaipandal and the junction at Panniaru Kutta is altogether wrong.

(True Extract)

Signed J. Hornida Munro
Deewan

(True Copies)

Respectfully
of Resident

S.D.L.

N^o 11. Residents' Office
Cochin, 24th January 1882
From CURRENT No.

J. C. Harrington Esq
Asst. Resident in Travancore
and Cochin

To
The Honorable J. Davidson C.S.I.
Chief Secretary to Government
Fort Saint George

Sir,

* No 53 dated
13th Instant

by separate post.
(Banghy)

With reference to Government Order No 1831 of 29th November 1881, Political Department No 599 dated 28th December, I have the honor to forward copy of a letter and its enclosure from the Dewan of Cochin as well as the plans or sketches alluded to in para 2 of the Dewan's letter. 2. The Dewan urges that the line south from Shaklakund has been accepted by the Sikhs only as far as Palacadam and although in the sketch B. I find the whole line from Shaklakund to Kaliaipandal entered as surveyed and accepted, I am not aware

of its being entered in the sketches signed
by the representatives of both sides.

3. A Tracing from Ward & Combs
Map is also forwarded which is useful
as by laying it over the sketch & the
difference between that map and the
present survey is seen at a glance.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant.

Wm. H. H. H.

Adj. Resident.

Enc.

Agf
 transferred to
 the Sec. Dept.
 with reference to
 their order of the
 29th November last,
 No. 1831.

30/1/82
 27/1/82

N. D. D. D.
 Chief Secy.

30/1

Revenue Department
 1st (1882) Department
 From (Boundaries)
 No 533

The Dy. Resident in
 Immen Kochin
 To the Dy. Resident
 1st 1882

The Chief Secretary
 to Government
 Fort Saint George

No 11. 2. 2. 2.
 24th January 1882
 Received 16
 30
 No

CURRENT No. 34.

Forwarding Kochin Dewan's
 letter as well as the plans &
 sketches in connection
 with the Kochin and
 Coimbatore Boundary
 Settlements.

Endeavour

85/1

90 10-2-82-184.

C. No. 7041

Draft G.O.

Settlement of the Coimbatore
Cochin boundary line

17/1

267. 268

C. 14-1-82 R. 16-1-82 R. 23-1-82

184 9 10-2-82

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

23rd January 1882, No. 81.

READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

No. 267. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 23rd November 1881, No. 2921.

Read the following letters:—

From A. W. PEET, Esq., Deputy Conservator of Forests, Coimbatore, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated Coimbatore, 15th September 1881, No. 1627.

I HAVE the honor to report on the arrangement agreed to by Mr. Hudson, Chief Engineer to the Cochin Government, and myself on behalf of the Madras Government with regard to the Cochin-Coimbatore boundary from Vengoli Peak to Sheklacund on the Anaimalais.

2. It was unnecessary to enter into the merits of the rival claims of Coimbatore and Cochin hillmen, as our orders were restricted and clear as contained in G.O., No. 2033, of the 19th June 1877, and G.O., No. 1675, of the 9th December 1880, viz., to re-cut the boundary between the points mentioned above in the direction of the water-shed ridge.

3. In order therefore to prevent needless complications, I refused to re-open any question of rights addressed me by the Kaders; but tried to ascertain the fact whether there was a natural ridge connecting the points.

4. As the country was entirely new to me, I left Coimbatore before the date settled for meeting the Cochin representative, and reached Tunacadavu on the 6th August. I spent a week studying the country about there and went down again to Anaimalai village on the 13th.

5. Mr. Hudson came to Anaimalai on the 15th, the day agreed upon beforehand, and Mr. Baber, of the Madras Revenue Survey, met us also on that day and kindly accompanied us all the way.

6. We reached Tunacadavu on the 17th, and went up the Vengoli slopes on the 18th. Unfortunately we were disappointed of a view, as I had been disappointed previously, owing to the mist and rain on Vengoli Peak.

7. At this stage I would refer to the eye-sketch, marked No. I, that accompanies this letter, which was prepared by Mr. Baber, to illustrate our settlement. I have marked a point A on the slopes of Vengoli, where there was clearly a fault in the old boundary, inasmuch as it crossed the water-shed at once; for there is a considerable stream running eastwards from Vengoli below this point. I brought this to notice, and after a careful examination, on Mr. Baber's suggestion, of the course of the stream, Mr. Hudson frankly admitted the error.

8. We therefore agreed to run the line from Vengoli to the top of Cheratombai, leaving this stream to the northwards.

9. As regards Cheratombai, which is a conspicuous peak, we agreed that no approximately natural boundary could be taken anywhere but directly over the top. The former boundary had run along the slopes to some extent.

10. We halted on the 19th, as I had to carry on my current official work, and moved on to a camp on the Palacadavu river on the 20th, marked B on the map. On our way we passed over the top of Sheklacund, another conspicuous hill, which formed the last point on the disputed portion now under consideration.

11. On the 21st we went back to Sheklacund and worked backwards along the ridge towards Cheratombai, returning again to the camp on Palacadavu, and going thence late in the evening to a further camp at Naygund.

12. We found that there were fair grounds for the contention formerly made by the Cochin representatives that a more natural boundary than that actually cut was

ready to hand; though it was not absolutely correct to say that there was a single water-shed ridge all the way between Sheklacund and Vengoli.

13. What we actually found was that the natural ridge running north-east from Sheklacund had been suddenly abandoned in cutting the old boundary. We therefore continued along the ridge to the summit, marked C (Kallipara). There are great differences of elevation in the ridge, but it is clearly traceable.

14. After reaching point C, however, we found that there was a descent to a small stream where there was an ascent again to a ridge, which we traced as far as the slopes of Cheratombai.

15. This stream runs west, but it seemed clearly an abandonment of Ward and Connor's line to have tried to trace this stream up to its source. We therefore adopted the line I have indicated in paragraph 14, viz., we found after some little difficulty a spur running gradually down to a point on this stream near a Kader's padi, whence a spur ascended to a ridge clearly traceable as far as the slopes of Cheratombai.

16. The point where the stream is crossed is clearly marked by some conspicuous flat rocks in which survey marks can be imprinted with advantage.

17. To give a résumé of the whole line. It starts for a short distance southwards from Vengoli Peak to a saddle, whence it runs South-east to the top of Cheratombai; thence South-east by South down the slopes, and along a ridge which gradually falls to a point D on a small stream near a Kader's hamlet; whence it runs up a spur to the point C, the highest point in this vicinity on the main ridge to Sheklacund. From C to Sheklacund the direction is about South-west.

18. The loss or gain to either Government is trifling; but the present line has, we believe, the advantage of being as nearly a natural boundary as the nature of the ground admits, and is very closely approximate to the lines on Ward and Connor's map.

19. In the present letter I have, for the sake of clearness, adhered to the single subject of the line from Vengoli to Sheklacund, as this was the line to which our orders referred; and I express a hope that the settlement proposed will meet the favorable consideration of Government.

20. As regards the rest of the boundary, I address a separate letter (No. 1629).

No. 251.

SUBMITTED to Government, through the Board of Revenue, with reference to G.O., No. 1675, dated 9th December 1880, communicated in Board's Miscellaneous Proceedings, No. 14102, dated 21st December 1880, with the suggestion that the line now settled between Vengoli Peak and Sheklacund as the Coimbatore-Cochin boundary may be accepted.

COIMBATORE,
24th October 1881.

(Signed) G. D. LEMAN,
Acting Collector.

From A. W. PEET, Esq., Deputy Conservator of Forests, Coimbatore, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated Coimbatore, 15th September 1881, No. 1629-A.

In continuation of my letter, No. 1627, of the 15th instant, I have the honor to refer to the rest of the boundary between Cochin and Coimbatore, viz., southwards from Sheklacund to Pannimedkuttu.

I divide this letter for the sake of clearness into—

A.—Record of Proceedings.

B.—Remarks on the line demarcated in 1876 between Sheklacund and Kalianapandal.

A.—Record of our Proceedings.

1. At the same time that the boundary from Vengoli to Sheklacund was marked out and cut by the Anaimalai Forest Officer and the Survey Department in 1876, the line southwards was also marked out from Sheklacund to Kalianapandal on the Sholay Aur.

2. Beyond this point, Kalianapandal, it is important to remember that no line whatever was demarcated towards Pannimedkuttu, the trijunction of Cochin, Travancore and Coimbatore.

3. The line southwards from Sheklacund was accepted by Cochin so far as it was demarcated, that is, as far as Kalianapandal.

4. No settlement has been made beyond, and therefore our settlement of the line from Vengoli to Sheklacund, as detailed in my former letter, does not set at rest the whole question.

5. So soon as I was clearly aware that our orders extended merely to the first part of the line, viz., from Vengoli to Sheklacund, I addressed to your office a letter, No. 1328, dated the 19th July 1881, in which I asked that these facts might be brought before the Board of Revenue for orders.

6. When Mr. Hudson, Mr. Baber, and I met at Pollachi, I explained these facts; and Mr. Hudson said that not only did his orders not refer to the line beyond Kalianapandal, but that there was a claim made by Travancore to some land about there, and that this claim was still pending.

7. However, as I hoped, we might receive further orders while out in camp. Mr. Hudson agreed to come on with us to Pannimedkuttu, if necessary, to look at the ground.

8. It was for this purpose that we went on to a camp at Naygund on the 21st August as mentioned in my former letter. Here we stayed three nights on the possibility of getting orders to settle the rest of the boundary; but as none reached us, we returned, especially as it was pouring with rain, and our Kaders and Mulcers were making outcries against attempting the journey at this season; while some of the latter actually deserted.

B.—Remarks on the line demarcated in 1876 from Sheklacund southwards to Kalianapandal.

1. The record of the determination of this line by Colonel Cloete, Major Freeth, and Mr. Douglas (in the absence of a Cochin representative) is detailed in Proceedings of the Madras Government of the 30th May 1876.

2. The line was accepted by Cochin—vide Proceedings of the Madras Government of the 7th October 1876. If this acceptance terminates the contract on both sides, there is no more to be said.

3. However, as I explained in my letter of the 19th July 1881, No. 1328, above mentioned, there has been no settlement whatever of the line from Kalianapandal to Pannimedkuttu.

4. In case, therefore, it should be held advisable or admissible to reconsider the whole line southwards from Sheklacund, I venture with deference to criticize some part of the conclusions arrived at by the boundary officers in 1876.

5. At this point I would deprecate the idea of any assumption of superior penetration, if my conclusions be held to be correct; for these conclusions have been founded in great part on information gained from the labors of the former Boundary Commission; and it is often easy to detect errors after a series of maps have been published, into which as a pioneer one might have readily fallen.

6. I feel bound, however, to note what I consider to be errors in order to place the facts before the Board as fully as possible, and to dispute the point whether Ward and Connor's map is so inaccurate as has been suggested.

7. Taking Colonel Cloete's very lucid description of the course taken by the Boundary officers (vide his letter of the 28th January 1876), I would first of all refer to paragraphs 8 and 9 of his letter.

8. In these he mentions having identified two points mentioned by Ward and Connor, viz., "Sheklacund" and "Palacadavu Amman," near "Anaimalai Cheri." Now I venture to submit my opinion that the identification of this latter place was

incorrect, and that this incorrect determination of the Palacadavu Amman affects the whole boundary thence to Kalianapandal.

9. I would first strengthen this opinion by a reference to Colonel Cloete's own words: "After Vengoli Peak the first two points identified were "Sheklacund" and "Palacadavu Amman," an upright stone about four feet high near the bank of the river of that name, and close to "Anaimalai Cheri." The two places are named by Ward and Connor, and the points shown by the hillmen as bearing those names agree with Ward and Connor's description. Further, the measured distance between the points is about the same as that given in the old survey, although the bearing between them somewhat differs.

10. Having identified what they held to be the "Amman" stone, they made use of this as a fixed point, and proceeded to settle the rest of the boundary eastwards along the stream and then southwards.

11. Now my contention is that the "Anaimalai Cheri" to which the Boundary officers were taken was not Ward and Connor's "Anaimalai Cheri" and this "Amman," a religious mark common to many Kader's padis, was not Ward and Connor's "Amman." In short, their Anaimalai Cheri is the new hamlet of that name, the old hamlet lying also on the Palacadavu river, but about a mile to the west. This old village was spoken of at once by the Kaders without any questions on our part.

12. To prove my contention I would refer first of all to the fact that the direction of the line taken in 1876 is an unnatural one. After reaching the summit of Sheklacund, the ridge gradually slopes down in the line of its general direction (South-west or South-west by South) nearly to the Palacadavu river.

13. It is evidently natural to follow this ridge down, and this is what was done by Ward and Connor, but was not done by the Boundary Commission in 1876.

14. A reference to Ward and Connor's large map on a scale of one mile to an inch will show this at once. I append a tracing from this map to which I will presently refer—vide Map III appended.

Ward and Connor's line continues in a south-westerly direction from the summit of Sheklacund, following the natural slope down from the ridge and going near the old hamlet of Anaimalai Cheri.

15. On the contrary the line taken in 1876 (known as Russell's line) strikes straight down the side of the hill from the summit of Sheklacund, and goes in a south-easterly direction to the new hamlet of Anaimalai Cheri.

16. The result of this is that as the Boundary Commission of 1876 took the Amman stone near the new Anaimalai Cheri as a fixed point of departure for the determination of the rest of the line, the whole of their settlement from this point is thrown about a mile too much to the east to the loss of the Madras Government.

17. What are the facts as stated in Colonel Cloete's letter? Take paragraph 13. I do not understand about the statement of the position of the Palacadavu river; but I wish to consider the last clause: "The Palaginar stream, which flows into the Palacadavu, is shown nearly a mile to the west of its proper position." My idea is that their point of departure was a mile too far to the east.

18. In further proof see paragraphs 16 and 17 of the same letter, which run thus:—

"Eastwards from the Amman there was for some distance no doubt, as the map clearly shows, that the Palacadavu river forms the boundary, but the point where the line should leave the river and turn southwards was difficult to determine." "Sitakal, a point named by Ward and Connor, was shown by the hillmen, but some way further down the river than the position assigned to it by Ward and Connor."

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

19. Now I question whether on a reconsideration of the ground it would not be found that Sitakal is nearly in its correct position, if the point of departure is taken

Revenue Department

C No. 7041

Draft S.O. No. 81 23 January 1882

Read by the Board of Revenue

23rd Nov. 1881 No. 2921

The boundary line between
Vengoli Peak and Sheklacund
as now ~~settled~~ is approved
and accepted. If not already
settled, it is so.

2. The Government agree
with the Board in considering
that the line already fixed
between Sheklacund and
Kalyanapandal and approved
by both Governments should
not again be disturbed.

3. The Resident in Travancore
and Cochin will ascertain
if the Cochin Government is willing
to accept the proposed line

between Kalianapandal

and Pannimedakutta - the
trijunction. The demarcation

of this bit will complete

the Settlement of the long-

-pending Cochin-Chochin
boundary.

Gill

To

The Board of Rev.

" Conservator of Forests

" Supt. of Rev. Survey

" Political Dept. for

Communication to the

President in Travancore

Chochin.

a mile to the west, and one of the streams near Sitakal was the stream that flowed into the Palacadavu at the end of Ward and Connor's river line.

20. About the next point, Chirikal, I can say nothing, as I have never been there; but I should feel inclined to think that the point might possibly be wrongly determined by the hillmen, unless it is a point clearly marked by any peculiar characteristic.

21. I am led to think this because of my belief that Ward and Connor's fixed points are more accurate than they have been given credit for; my idea being that their main points were accurately determined by triangulation and the country between roughly sketched in.

This would account for the inaccuracies in the course of streams (of which a noteworthy example occurs in the present map in the course of the Sholay Aur), though the fixed points thereon may be accurately determined.

22. A reference to the Map No. II herewith forwarded may seem to refute at once this idea of the general accuracy of Ward and Connor's main points. On this map is shown a dotted line which marks out Kalianapandal according to Ward and Connor's distances and bearings to be about two miles to the E.N.E. of its true position.

23. At first sight this would seem conclusive proof of the general inaccuracy of Ward and Connor's map and specifications; but I beg to submit a theory whether this enormous discrepancy is not due to a *change of meridian*, that is to say that the true North as shown in Ward and Connor's map differs from the true North as shown on the Revenue Survey map. That the meridian does alter is well known; but whether it has so altered in fact I know not. I merely propound the theory, as it seems to me to account for what otherwise is a hopeless discrepancy.

24. To show the effect of carrying out this theory, I have appended to this letter a Map No. III in which I have copied in blue the outline of the boundary according to the Revenue Survey Map No. II, and in red the outline copied from Ward and Connor's map, large scale; shifting the meridian of the latter.

25. In short, starting from Vengoli as a fixed point and taking Kalianapandal as a fixed point at the other end of the line, I have (to use a term of Euclid) applied Ward and Connor's lines to the Revenue Survey lines.

I found that after applying the points "Vengoli" in each and shifting round Ward and Connor's lines by changing the meridian that the points "Kalianapandal" absolutely coincided without the slightest need of alteration.

26. This outline map shows at a glance some of the points for which I have been contending, viz., the difference between the old and new Anaimalai Cheris and the effect produced by taking as a fresh point of departure a stone near the latter too much to the east.

27. I have colored in blue the gain to Cochin and in red the gain to Madras on a comparison of the two maps.

28. After much hesitation I have felt bound to ask you to bring these facts and theories to the notice of the Board in order that the question may be decided whether Government thinks it necessary to re-open the whole line south of Sheklacund, or whether the settlement of 1876 as far as Kalianapandal is to be adhered to.

29. In any case the line is still unsettled from Kalianapandal to Pannimedakutta, but I think if necessary what is known as "Major Freeth's compromise" could be agreed to by both parties without a further formal meeting being left to the Revenue Survey Department to carry out on the ground.

No. 252.

SUBMITTED to Government with the accompanying sketches, through the Board of Revenue in continuation of this Office No. 251, dated 24th October 1881.

2. The Deputy Conservator of Forests, Mr. Peet, points out certain inaccuracies in the line between Sheklacund and Kalianapandal on the Coimbatore-Cochin boundary, and suggests the re-opening of the same. But it was settled in 1876 and accepted by both Governments in 1877, and it is most desirable that whether right or wrong and whether it is a gain to one Government and loss to another or not that the matter be not again opened.

3. The suggestion of Mr. Peet in paragraph 29 of his letter as regards the settlement of the remaining line between Kalianapandal and Pannimedkuttu by drawing a direct line from Kalianapandal to Pannimedkuttu along the ridge as proposed in paragraph 10 of Major Freeth's letter, No. 4195, dated 30th August 1880, to the Superintendent of Madras Survey, recorded in Board's Proceedings, No. 1835, dated 22nd August 1881, may be accepted if the Cochin Government has no objection.

COIMBATORE,
25th October 1881.

(Signed) G. D. LEMAN,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 to 3.—Maps.

THE foregoing papers relating to the settlement of the boundary between British Territory and Cochin will be submitted for the orders of Government.

2. In their Order, dated 19th June 1877, No. 2033, the Government, on the representations of the Collector, directed that the portion of the boundary line between Vengoli Peak and Sheklacund should be re-cut. The representatives of the two Governments—Mr. Peet, Deputy Conservator of Forests, for this Government, and Mr. Hudson, Chief Engineer under the Cochin Government—have met and agreed upon the line to be adopted in lieu of that originally fixed, as shown in Sketch Map No. I. The grounds for this revision are explained in the Board's Proceedings printed with the Government Order above quoted, and the Board recommend that the decision arrived at by the representatives be accepted. The tract of country involved in the settlement is inconsiderable.

3. In his second letter Mr. Peet re-opens the question of the correctness of the boundary demarcated in 1876 from Sheklacund to Kalianapandal, and advances arguments in support of Ward and Connor's line, which was set aside in favor of the recent survey. This portion of the boundary has been definitely accepted by Cochin—vide the Dewan's letter embodied in G.O., dated 7th October 1876, No. 1442, and the Board are decidedly of opinion that the settlement should not be disturbed.

4. The portion of the boundary between Kalianapandal and Pannimedkuttu, the trijunction, alone remains to be settled so far as Cochin is concerned. The distance is short, and this section appears to present no difficulty. If Major Freeth's proposal to take a direct line along the ridge between these two points is accepted by Cochin, the line can be demarcated and the boundary completed without further delay.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary.

[Here print Current No. 533]

No. 263.

ORDER THEREON, 23rd January 1882, No. 81.

Miscellaneous.

THE boundary line between Vengoli Peak and Sheklacund, as now run, is approved and accepted. If not already re-cut, it should be so.

2. ~~The Government agree with the Board in considering that the line already fixed between Sheklacund and Kalianapandal, and approved by both Governments, should not be disturbed, which it was supposed had been agreed to by the Cochin Ricer, then has been a misunderstanding, and that the line accepted by that Government extended no further south than Polacadar. In accordance with the Dewan's proposal, the representatives of the two Governments should will meet & go over the ground again, when the demarcation of the~~

Peet, as contained in his letter No. 1629 A dated 15th Sept 1881. should be carefully considered. If they prove correct, it will be necessary to re-open the whole line from Sheklacund southwards.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT, 23RD JANUARY 1882, No. 81.

As a further formal meeting of the representatives of the two Governments to take place, the Resident in Travancore and Cochin will ascertain if the Cochin Government is willing to accept the proposed line between Kalianapandal and Pannimedkuttu—the trijunction. The demarcation of this bit will complete the settlement of the long pending Coimbatore-Cochin boundary.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue. with 3 original maps returned. Dec 10/82
To the Conservator of Forests.
To the Superintendent of Revenue Survey.
To the Political Department, for communication to the Resident in Travancore and Cochin.

85

6.

85 Copies.

Original

Gobt. of (1882) Madras.
REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated January 23rd.

Printed February 6th.

Recd.

Renewed

Encl.

G.O.

JANUARY.
Nos. 267-268.

SUBJECT.

Boundary — between Coimbatore and Cochin.
— Settlement of —. Passing orders on papers
relating to the —.

Original

Gobt. of (1882) Madras.
REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated January 23rd.

Printed February 6th.

Recd.

Renewed

Encl.

G.O.

JANUARY.
Nos. 267-268.

SUBJECT.

Boundary — between Coimbatore and Cochin.
— Settlement of —. Passing orders on papers
relating to the —.