

(1) Number of pages 12(2) Date of repair 18-5-43

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. <u>509</u>	Press <u>Mis.</u>
Dated <u>15. 5.</u>	<u>1882</u> .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

15TH MAY 1882, No. 509, REVENUE.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 22nd April 1882, No. 1099 :—

Read—the following letter from A. J. STUART, Esq., Acting Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department (through the Board of Revenue), dated 17th March 1882, No. 23 :—

With reference to G.O., dated 29th November 1881, No. 1831, Revenue Department, paragraph 1, I have the honor to report that the Cochin Sircar does not accept the boundary between Sheklakund and Kaliyanapandal nor that between Pannimedukutta and Sheklakund, but desire to have this also settled by Messrs. Peet and Hudson in the season of this year.

I enclose a letter* from the Dewan to the President stating the reasons upon which their objection is founded.

* Copy enclosure to Deputy Conservator's letter. 2. I also beg to submit a letter from Mr. Peet which shows that from our side the boundary line to which the Cochin Government objects is not considered to be satisfactory, and under these circumstances I feel so sure that the Government will include this portion also in what has to be settled this year that I do not think it necessary to make any comment upon the reasons assigned by the Dewan for the objection on the part of Cochin.

3. I request the authority of Government for Mr. Peet to re-open and settle this portion of the line.

4. I beg also to enclose a letter from the Conservator of Forests which shows that in his opinion the services of a Survey officer are very necessary, and suggesting Mr. Baber as a suitable officer. I agree in the desirability of making the work done permanent by means of a survey, and hope that the Government will be pleased to depute an officer from the Survey Department for this purpose. The work will commence by the 1st August.

5. The following matter also referred to in paragraph 1 of the letter from the Conservator of Forests appears to need the orders of Government. Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, No. 1442, dated 7th October 1876, contain a letter from Mr. MacGregor, the late Resident of Travancore, describing claims made by the Kolangód Nambiddy, a proprietor in Malabar District, to lands which, if his, would be bounded by the boundary now to be settled. The Conservator recommends that these claims be considered and settled at the same time, but I cannot agree for the following reasons.

6. Cochin is in possession of the area claimed, and the Nambiddy has nothing for it but to sue for the land in the Cochin Courts unless indeed the Government sees fit to take his place and part and to contest the matter with Cochin as a boundary dispute between Malabar and Cochin. In that case an officer from Malabar ought, I think, to be present, advised, if necessary, by the Nambiddy and his people, but having the entire control on behalf of Malabar of the settlement of the boundary as between Malabar, Cochin, and Coimbatore, leaving it to the Nambiddy hereafter to sue for

whatever land he claims in the Courts of Cochin, Malabar or Coimbatore, according to whichever of these districts the lands he claims may fall at the close of the present settlement.

7. The recognition of the Nambiddy on his own account as an actor in the settlement of the boundary would in any case, I believe, lead to complications which would probably bring the whole year's work to nothing, for it is difficult enough to bring the Government officers and the Cochin officers to an agreement; and, if this agreement is liable to be challenged by a third party in no way under the control of either Government, I think the chances are great that nothing will be settled and the season and work of the officers employed lost.

8. Either on the Coimbatore side or the Malabar side the Nambiddy's claims can, after the boundary is settled with Cochin, be considered by the Government or referred to the Civil Courts, and as above said Cochin being in possession of what else he claims, we cannot help him as regards what eventually falls within the Cochin boundary, with regard to which he will, I think, have to apply to the Cochin Sircar or their Courts.

9. With reference to paragraph 5 of the Conservator's letter, I beg that the Government will be pleased to order the despatch from their own office of Ward and Connor's Memoirs and of the original Atlas sheet, large scale, of the portion of the range which is to be examined. These are not on my records, and Mr. Peet tells me that they are of the greatest importance, being in fact the basis of the proposed settlement.

ENCLOSURES.

Letter from A. W. PEET, Esq., Deputy Conservator of Forests, Coimbatore, to the Acting Collector (through the Conservator of Forests), dated Coimbatore, 18th February 1882, No. 264.

I have the honor to ask for further orders on the subject of the Cochin-Coimbatore boundary.

2. G.O., No. 599, of the 28th December 1881, assumes that the Cochin Government had agreed to the surveyed line between Sheklakund and Kaliyanapandal.

3. From a letter, No. 55, dated the 13th January 1882, from the Dewan of Cochin to the Resident, a copy of which was enclosed to me in a letter from the Chief Engineer, it appears that the Cochin Government asserts that only the portion of the boundary between Sheklakund and the Palacadavu river was agreed to by them.

4. Under these circumstances I beg that further orders be asked for, so as to empower me to settle with Mr. Hudson the whole line *south of Sheklakund*.

5. It is with intention that I have used the above words; for Mr. Hudson and I are agreed up to the summit of the Sheklakund ridge, but I am of opinion that the line thence to Palacadavu river is wrong; and, if we are to go over again all the boundary between the Palacadavu river and Pannimedukutta, we might as well commence so short a distance back as Sheklakund.

Letter from T. GOVINDA MENON, Dewan, to the Acting British Resident in Travancore and Cochin, dated Ernacollam, 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 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 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 Sheklakund 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 1878, 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 Sheklakund His Highness's Government accepts the boundary as now demarcated," he cannot have meant so far south as Kaliyanapandal, 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 (9th August) we took up the line from Coomalar Aur southward up Pulivipara mudi down to the 'Amenankul,' and thence on the Palacadavu on the bank of a river of the same name. Up to this point the line is marked on rocks thus $\llcorner$. As this part of the line may be considered to be as nearly correct as possible, we beg to suggest that the Cochin Sircar'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 Kaliyanapandal.

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

Letter from the Conservator of Forests, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated Madras, 11th March 1882, No. 1370-C.

In forwarding a letter, with its enclosures, from Mr. Peet and copy of a letter received by me from Mr. Hudson, I have the honor to suggest that it be arranged that Messrs. Peet and Hudson meet on or about 1st August next and settle the whole Coimbatore-Cochin-Malabar boundary line *south of Sheklakund* as proposed by Mr. Peet. I include Malabar as I understand that there are claims on the part of the Nambiddy of Kolangod in that district remaining unsettled, and I think it highly desirable that all should be settled or none.

2. It will be observed that the Cochin Sircar demur to the accuracy of the statement in the opening paragraph of G.O., No. 1831, dated 29th November 1881, as to the line between Sheklakund and Kaliyanapandal having been "mutually accepted," and contend that when the Dewan in his letter, No. 886, dated 14th September 1876, made use of the words "to the south" he meant only as far as the Palacadavu river and not up to Kaliyanapandal; we propose to accept this reading and to re-open the question from Sheklakund a little further north, from which point to the Palacadavu, Mr. Peet considers the line is wrong.

3. It is unnecessary at present to consider Mr. Hudson's remarks as to "Major Freeth's compromise." The matter can only be settled on the ground.

4. It is, I may say, imperative that the officers be accompanied by a competent officer of the Survey Department; and if Mr. Baber could be spared he is pre-eminently the best man, as he is already well acquainted with the localities.

5. Mr. Peet should be furnished with Ward and Connor's Memoir and copies of the original Atlas sheets (large scale), and I shall endeavour to relieve him as much as possible of his routine forest work so that he may devote his time and attention to this boundary settlement, in connection with which I would solicit your attention to my letter, No. 990, recorded with G.O., No. 86, dated 23rd January 1882. Since writing which I have been informed by the Sub-Assistant Conservator that our Kaders say they will certainly leave if further tracts are alienated from the British Government.

Letter from H. W. HUDSON, Esq., M.I.C.E., Chief Engineer, Cochin Government, to the Conservator of Forests, Madras, dated Trichoor, 13th February 1882, No. 57.

As requested by Mr. Peet I have the honor to address you on the subject of the Cochin and Coimbatore boundary settlement.

2. According to G.O., No. 1831, dated the 29th November 1881, my instructions are to go over and examine the whole line from Palacadavu to Pannimedukutta, as you will see from the Dewan's letter to the Resident of Travancore and Cochin, No. 55, of the 13th January 1882 (copy

of which is herein enclosed for your information), that the boundary line between Palacadavu and Kaliyanapandal has not yet been accepted by this Government.

3. I do not know that any objection will be raised to the line now surveyed and demarcated between the above stations, but it will be necessary for me, as before pointed out, to examine the line before it is formally accepted by the Sircar.

4. With regard to "Major Freeth's compromise" between Kaliyanapandal and Pannimedukutta, it is stated, in paragraph 10 of Major Freeth's letter to the Superintendent of Madras Survey, dated Coimbatore, 30th August 1880, No. 419, S, that "a direct line from Kaliyanapandal to Pannimedukutta along the ridge as per map (No. 11) enclosed would be a fair compromise."

5. On the copy of the map forwarded to me by Mr. Peet, the proposed boundary or compromise is shown running along a stream; the watershed ridge east of this stream and running parallel to it would, as pointed out by Major Freeth, probably be found to be a better boundary.

Sketch.

Resolution—dated 22nd April 1882, No. 1099.

Submitted for the orders of Government.

2. The Order of Government, dated 10th February 1882, No. 184, had apparently not reached the Collector when his letter was written. He will observe that the necessary orders have already been issued in regard to the line from Sheklakund southwards. It seems desirable that a Survey officer should be deputed to accompany the representatives of the two Governments. The Superintendent, Revenue Survey, will be requested to state whether Mr. Baber's services can be spared; if not, Colonel Rogers will doubtless be able to make some other arrangement which would ensure the demarcation of the line which may be decided upon.

3. The Board agree with the Collector that it is not desirable to attempt, upon this occasion, the settlement of any claims which may be advanced by the Nambiddy of Kolangód. For the reasons given by Mr. Stuart they would confine the proceedings to the determination of the boundary between Coimbatore and Cochin. Any inquiry regarding the Kolangód claim should be postponed, and conducted independently, as seems to have been contemplated—G.O., 12th August 1881, No. 1180.

4. Referring to the Collector's request for a map, it is observed that two copies of the Boundary Map prepared by the Survey Department were sent to him and five to the Conservator of Forests with the Board's Proceedings, dated 22nd August 1881, No. 1843.

5. Ward and Connor's Memoirs and Atlas are not on record in the Board's Office, but were transferred with the records of the Tank Department, and should now be in the office of the Examiner, Public Works Accounts,—E.M.C., 2nd June 1854, No. 630, being an enclosure to G.O., 17th June 1875, No. 920.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) E. GIBSON,
Acting Secretary.

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

To the Superintendent, Revenue Survey, with copy of G.O., dated 12th August 1881, No. 1180.

To the Collector of Coimbatore, with original enclosures returned.

Copy to the Conservator of Forests, with copy of G.O., dated 12th August 1881, No. 1180.

ORDER—dated 15th May 1882, No. 509, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

The Board's orders are approved.

2. The application for Ward and Connor's Memoirs and Atlas will be disposed of in the Public Works Department.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) E. F. WEBSTER,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue, with sketch returned.

" Superintendent, Revenue Survey.

" Conservator of Forests.

" Political Department (for communication to the Resident in Travancore and Cochin).

" Public Works Department.

Exd. W. H. French.

120 Copies.

20/7/27 II

Original

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

Order, dated 15th May 1902, No. 502.

No. 1099.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 22nd April 1882.

Read the following letter from A. J. STUART, Esq., Acting Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department (through the Board of Revenue), dated 17th March 1882, No. 23:—

With reference to G.O., dated 29th November 1881, No. 1831, Revenue Department, paragraph 1, I have the honor to

report that the Cochin Sircar does not accept the boundary between Sheklakund and Kaliyanapandal nor that between Pannimedukutta and Sheklakund, but desire to have this also settled by Messrs. Peet and Hudson in the season of this year.

I enclose a letter* from the Dewan to the President stating the reasons upon which their objection is founded.

* Copy enclosure to Deputy Conservator's letter. 2. I also beg to submit a letter from Mr. Peet which shows that from our side the boundary line to which the Cochin Government objects is not considered to be satisfactory, and under these circumstances I feel so sure that the Government will include this portion also in what has to be settled this year that I do not think it necessary to make any comment upon the reasons assigned by the Dewan for the objection on the part of Cochin.

3. I request the authority of Government for Mr. Peet to re-open and settle this portion of the line.

4. I beg also to enclose a letter from the Conservator of Forests which shows that in his opinion the services of a Survey officer are very necessary, and suggesting Mr. Baber as a suitable officer. I agree in the desirability of making the work done permanent by means of a survey, and hope that the Government will be pleased to depute an officer from the Survey Department for this purpose. The work will commence by the 1st August.

5. The following matter also referred to in paragraph 1 of the letter from the Conservator of Forests appears to need the orders of Government. Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, No. 1442, dated 7th October 1876, contain a letter from Mr. MacGregor, the late Resident of Travancore, describing claims made by the Kolangód Nambiddy, a proprietor in Malabar District, to lands which, if his, would be bounded by the boundary now to be settled. The Conservator recommends that these claims be considered and settled at the same time, but I cannot agree for the following reasons.

6. Cochin is in possession of the area claimed, and the Nambiddy has nothing for it but to sue for the land in the Cochin Courts unless indeed the Government sees fit to take his place and part and to contest the matter with Cochin as a boundary dispute between Malabar and Cochin. In that case an officer from Malabar ought, I think, to be present, advised, if necessary, by the Nambiddy and his people, but having the entire control on behalf of Malabar of the settlement of the boundary as between Malabar, Cochin, and Coimbatore, leaving it to the Nambiddy hereafter to sue for whatever land he claims in the Courts of Cochin, Malabar or Coimbatore, according to whichever of these districts the lands he claims may fall at the close of the present settlement.

7. The recognition of the Nambiddy on his own account as an actor in the settlement of the boundary would in any case, I believe, lead to complications which would probably bring the whole year's work to nothing, for it is difficult enough to bring the Government officers and the Cochin officers to an agreement; and, if this agreement is liable to be challenged by a third party in no way under the control of either Government, I think the chances are great that nothing will be settled and the season and work of the officers employed lost.

8. Either on the Coimbatore side or the Malabar side the Nambiddy's claims can, after the boundary is settled with Cochin, be considered by the Government or referred to the Civil Courts, and as above said Cochin being in possession of what else he claims, we cannot help him as regards what eventually falls within the Cochin boundary, with regard to which he will, I think, have to apply to the Cochin Sircar or their Courts.

9. With reference to paragraph 5 of the Conservator's letter, I beg that the Government will be pleased to order the despatch from their own office of Ward and Connor's Memoirs and of the original Atlas sheet, large scale, of the portion of the range which is to be examined. These are not on my records, and Mr. Peet tells me that they are of the greatest importance, being in fact the basis of the proposed settlement.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From A. W. PEET, Esq., Deputy Conservator of Forests, Coimbatore, to the Acting Collector (through the Conservator of Forests), dated Coimbatore, 18th February 1882, No. 264.

I HAVE the honor to ask for further orders on the subject of the Cochin-Coimbatore boundary.

2. G.O., No. 599, of the 28th December 1881, assumes that the Cochin Government had agreed to the surveyed line between Sheklakund and Kaliyanapandal.

3. From a letter, No. 55, dated the 13th January 1882, from the Dewan of Cochin to the Resident, a copy of which was enclosed to me in a letter from the Chief Engineer, it appears

* Copy attached.

that the Cochin Government asserts that only the portion of the boundary between Sheklakund and the Palacadavu river was agreed to by them.

4. Under these circumstances I beg that further orders be asked for, so as to empower me to settle with Mr. Hudson the whole line south of Sheklakund.

5. It is with intention that I have used the above words; for Mr. Hudson and I are agreed up to the summit of the Sheklakund ridge, but I am of opinion that the line thence to Palacadavu river is wrong; and, if we are to go over again all the boundary between the Palacadavu river and Pannimedukutta, we might as well commence so short a distance back as Sheklakund.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From T. GOVINDA MENON, Dewan, to the Acting British Resident in Travancore and Cochin, dated Ernacollam, 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 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 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 Sheklakund 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 1878, 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 Sheklakund His Highness's Government accepts the boundary as now demarcated," he cannot have meant so far south as Kaliyanapandal, 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 (9th August) we took up the line from Coomalar Aur southward up Pulivipara mudi down to the 'Amenankul,' and thence on the Palacadavu on the bank of a river of the same name. Up to this point the line is marked on rocks thus $\llcorner$. As this part of the line may be considered to be as nearly correct as possible, we beg to suggest that the Cochin Sircar'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 Kaliyanapandal.

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

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

From the Conservator of Forests, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated Madras, 11th March 1882, No. 1370-C.

IN forwarding a letter, with its enclosures, from Mr. Peet and copy of a letter received by me from Mr. Hudson, I have the honor to suggest that it be arranged that Messrs. Peet and Hudson meet on or about 1st August next and settle the whole Coimbatore-Cochin-Malabar boundary line south of Sheklakund as proposed by Mr. Peet. I include Malabar as I understand that there are claims on the part of the Nambiddy of Kolangod in that district remaining unsettled, and I think it highly desirable that all should be settled or none.

2. It will be observed that the Cochin Sircar demur to the accuracy of the statement in the opening paragraph of G.O., No. 1831, dated 29th November 1881, as to the line between Sheklakund and Kaliyanapandal having been "mutually accepted," and contend that when the Dewan in his letter, No. 886, dated 14th September 1876, made use of the words "to the south" he meant only as far as the Palacadavu river and not up to Kaliyanapandal; we propose to accept this reading and to re-open the question from Sheklakund a little further north, from which point to the Palacadavu, Mr. Peet considers the line is wrong.

3. It is unnecessary at present to consider Mr. Hudson's remarks as to "Major Freeth's compromise." The matter can only be settled on the ground.

4. It is, I may say, imperative that the officers be accompanied by a competent officer of the Survey Department; and if Mr. Baber could be spared he is pre-eminently the best man, as he is already well acquainted with the localities.

5. Mr. Peet should be furnished with Ward and Connor's Memoir and copies of the original Atlas sheets (large scale), and I shall endeavour to relieve him as much as possible of his routine forest work so that he may devote his time and attention to this boundary settlement, in connection with which I would solicit your attention to my letter, No. 990, recorded with G.O., No. 86, dated 23rd January 1882. Since writing which I have been informed by the Sub-Assistant Conservator that our Kaders say they will certainly leave if further tracts are alienated from the British Government.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.

From H. W. HUDSON, Esq., M.L.C.E., Chief Engineer, Cochin Government, to the Conservator of Forests, Madras, dated Trichoor, 13th February 1882, No. 57.

As requested by Mr. Peet I have the honor to address you on the subject of the Cochin and Coimbatore boundary settlement.

2. According to G.O., No. 1831, dated the 29th November 1881, my instructions are to go over and examine the whole line from Palacadavu to Pannimedukutta, as you will see from the Dewan's letter to the Resident of Travancore and Cochin, No. 55, of the 13th January 1882 (copy of which is herein enclosed for your information), that the boundary line between Palacadavu and Kaliyanapandal has not yet been accepted by this Government.

3. I do not know that any objection will be raised to the line now surveyed and demarcated between the above stations, but it will be necessary for me, as before pointed out, to examine the line before it is formally accepted by the Sircar.

4. With regard to "Major Freeth's compromise" between Kaliyanapandal and Pannimedukutta, it is stated, in paragraph 10 of Major Freeth's letter to the Superintendent of Madras Survey, dated Coimbatore, 30th August 1880, No. 419 S, that "a direct line from Kaliyanapandal to Pannimedukutta along the ridge as per map (No. II) enclosed would be a fair compromise."

5. On the copy of the map forwarded to me by Mr. Peet, the proposed boundary or compromise is shown running along a stream; the watershed ridge east of this stream and running parallel to it would, as pointed out by Major Freeth, probably be found to be a better boundary.

ENCLOSURE No. 5.—Sketch.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. The Order of Government, dated 10th February 1882, No. 184, had apparently not reached the Collector when his letter was written. He will observe that the necessary orders have already been issued in regard to the line from Sheklakund southwards. It seems desirable that a Survey officer should be deputed to accompany the representatives of the two Governments. The Superintendent, Revenue Survey, will be requested to state whether Mr. Baber's services can be spared; if not, Colonel Rogers will doubtless be able to make some other arrangement which would ensure the demarcation of the line which may be decided upon.

3. The Board agree with the Collector that it is not desirable to attempt, upon this occasion, the settlement of any claims which may be advanced by the Nambiddy of Kolangódi. For the reasons given by Mr. Stuart they would confine the proceedings to the determination of the boundary between Coimbatore and Cochin. Any inquiry regarding the Kolangódi claim should be postponed, and conducted independently, as seems to have been contemplated—G.O., 12th August 1881, No. 1180.

4. Referring to the Collector's request for a map, it is observed that two copies of the Boundary Map prepared by the Survey Department were sent to him and five to the Conservator of Forests with the Board's Proceedings, dated 22nd August 1881, No. 1343.

5. Ward and Connor's Memoirs and Atlas are not on record in the Board's Office, but were transferred with the records of the Tank Department, and should now be in the office of the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, E.M.C., 2nd June 1854, No. 630, being an enclosure to G.O., 17th June 1875, No. 920.

(True Copies and Extract.)

W. H. H. H.
Acting Secretary.

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

„ Superintendent, Revenue Survey, with copy of
G.O., dated 12th August 1881, No. 1180.

„ Collector of Coimbatore, with original enclosures returned.

Copy to the Conservator of Forests, with copy of
G.O., dated 12th August 1881, No. 1180.

100 24/5

MADRAS.

THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,

&c., &c, &c.

Received

Depd 2-5-32 and

SUBMITTING for the orders of Government, with remarks, letter from the Collector of Coimbatore reporting further regarding the *boundary* between Coimbatore and Cochin.

2nd Ed.