M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2503 Press
Mis.

435-436

Dated 24 — 12 — 1860.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 24th December 1860.

No. 435. Read the following letter from G. N. TAYLOR, Esq., Inám Commissioner, to J. D. SIM, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated Palmanér, 12th December 1860, No. 485:—

SIR,

1. I have the honor to request the reconsideration of the Government of their Order, No. 2,261, dated 28th November 1860.

2. There can be no objection to accepting as security for any purpose Inám lands, the title to which has been confirmed by this Commission, and which have been converted into permanent freeholds. But as many Ináms are confirmed to the holders on their present tenures, and not enfranchised, it seems desirable, in order to prevent future embarrassment, that the order of Government should be more precise: and I beg, therefore, to recommend the addition to paragraph 1 of the words "and the Inám enfranchised under the rules of the 6th July 1859."

No. 436. ORDER THEREON, 24th December 1860, No. 2,503.

Ordered that the addition proposed by the Commissioner be made to paragraph 1 of the Proceedings of Government, dated 28th November 1860, No. 2,261.

(Signed) J. D. SIM,
Acting Secretary to Government.

Rec'd 2nd November/Encl 486-487

Revenue 1860 &c &c
Rec'd from Govt for Lieut
Tim
No 2946

The Manx Commissioners

To The Acting Secretary
of Government
Cape Coast

Dated 12th Decr 1860.
Ans 14th Do

No 485

No 2503. 24 December
Suggests a modification
in the order of Govt No 2261
dated 28 Nov 1860 permitting
Crown Lands to be held
as security under certain
conditions.
Withdraw Order

No 2503

Ordered that the pro-
-ditions proposed by the Govt
be made to form part of the
Proceedings of Govt of 28th
Nov No 110, No 2261.

Sent 2 Certified
Board of Rev Off 26
to Treasurer

J. D. S.

Note. The original order ex-
-cluded all Service Grants
because they could not be held
liable as security without affecting
the Service - but upon Consi-
deration, it was thought that Ser-
vices held they were pro tanto good
security.

No 435 & 436.

Ans 18th Dec R 20th