Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 16th November 1871.

No. 141. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 31st October 1871, No. 4,553 : —

Read the following letters :—

From the Superintendent of Stamps, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Madras, 9th October 1871, No. 1,502.

In acknowledging the receipt of the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 28th ultimo, No. 4,163, I have the honour to inquire whether it is intended that I should take security from the Small Cause Court Vendor, and proceed to carry out the orders of Government. He was originally appointed by the Collector of Madras, and is, I believe, under his orders; and the Collector of Madras, as the Board know, is the Collector of Stamp Revenue for Madras, under the present Stamp Act.

Vide Proceedings Board of Revenue, 24th August 1869, No. 6,374.
Do. do., 12th November 1869, No. 8,406.

From the Officiating Collector of Madras, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 16th October 1871, No. 176.

In their Proceedings dated 28th September 1871, No. 4,163, the Board have directed the Superintendent of Stamps to take security from the Small Cause Court Stamp Vendor, and to proceed to carry out the orders of Government No. 1,470 of 28th August 1871. The Vendor was appointed by the Collector of Madras (*vide* Board's Proceedings No. 8,406 of 12th November 1869), and has hitherto been under his control; his accounts as regards the discharged Court Certificates being adjusted with the Deputy-Collector of Madras, in accordance with the rules published at pages 496 and 497 of the *Fort St. George Gazette* of 1870. I have therefore the honour to inquire whether it is intended that from the date of the introduction of the change ordered by Government, the Vendor is to indent for his supplies of Stamps directly from the Superintendent of Stamps, and to be altogether under his control.

2. With reference to the last paragraph of the Order of Government No. 1,470 of 28th August, in which they observe that they are prepared to sanction the establishment of the necessary permanent Advance Fund on security being furnished by the Vendor, I beg to state that the Stamp Vendor is now absent from Madras, and that he will be called upon for the necessary security on his return, which will be in two or three days. I may, however, mention that there [illegible] with the Deputy-Collector of Madras, a Government s[illegible] by him in favour of the Collector of Madras at the c[illegible] contract, and as the advance to be made to him on[illegible]945. is only Rs. 500, I think that the sanction of Gov[illegible] the sixteering taken from the Vendor, when the at once obtained as security for Rs. 500 being foregi[illegible] security for Rs. 1,000 is returned. advance is made to him, and his presen[illegible] and retur[illegible]ph 3 of the Proceedings under reference, I

3. With reference to paragra[illegible]er the special stamps are to continue in use till request also to be informed wheth[illegible] are sanctioned by Government. the rules applied for by the Board[illegible]

[illegible]curity for Rs. 1,000 endorsed [illegible]ommencement of his present [illegible] the introduction of the change [illegible]vernment for the advance may be

4. Orders are also necessary on paragraph 4 of my letter of No. 113 of 15th July 1871. No bond was taken from the Vendor when the present arrangement was introduced.

THE security should be taken by the *Collector* and not by the Superintendent as stated in paragraph 2 of the Proceedings referred to. The Stamp Vendor will still remain under the Collector's orders as before; and as it appears from paragraph 2 of the Collector's letter that the Vendor has left in the hands of the Deputy-Collector security for Rs. 1,000, Government will be requested to sanction the Advance Fund at once.

2. The Collector should prepare a modified set of Draft Rules for carrying out the new system, and should then take an engagement from the Vendor as suggested in paragraph 4 of his letter No. 113, dated 15th July 1871.

3. There does not appear to be any reason for the continuance of the special stamps.

No. 142. ORDER THEREON, 16th November 1871, No. 1,944.

Separate Revenue, No. 6.
Stamps.

THE Acting Collector of Madras is authorized to make the advance of Rs. 500 against the security deposited by the Stamp Vendor.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Acting Collector of Madras.
" the Board of Revenue.
" the Accountant-General.

4. O
July 1871.
was introd

THE s
as stated i
still rema
graph 2 o
Deputy-Co
the Advan
2. T
out the ne
suggested
3. T
stamps.

No. 142.

To the Acti
„ the Boar
„ the Acco

Rev. 1871. Despatch

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS. 8th 3575

PROCEEDINGS, 31ST OCTOBER 1871, No. 4,553.

Dept 6 Nov 1871

Received. 8th Encl.

OCTOBER.

No. 4,553.

Stamp vendor of Small Cause Court, Madras,—Security to be taken from, by Collector and not by Superintendent of Stamps.—Government requested to sanction Permanent Advance Fund of Rupees 500 to vendor, as he has already deposited security with Deputy Collector.—Collector to prepare a modified set of draft rules for carying out new system of stamp refunds in compromised suits, and then take an engagement from vendor.

No 1944. 16 November 1871

C-13th Nov 71- R-14th Nov 71

by the Collector. This should now be done.

3. The residence of the witness to the Collector's signature which has been omitted in Deeds Nos 15 & 20 and 22 & 25 should be entered thereon.

4. In one copy of Deed No. 24 the name of the purchaser is entered in the third line of the first page as Moonia instead of Moonia Pillay; and in the description of boundaries in the schedule of one copy of Deed No 25, the word waste has been incorrectly inserted for

for cash. These errors should be corrected under the Collr's initials.—

14 F. Rs Board of Revenue Sixteen Deeds
re-duplicated Dec 17 Nov 1871

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
16th November 1871.

No. 145. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 1st November 1871, No. 4,572:—

Read the following letter from the Collector of Nellore, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 27th September 1871, No. 1,884.

ADVERTING to the Board's remark in paragraph 2 of their Proceedings dated 14th instant, No. 3,964, that they "do not understand why a properly fenced platform should be the exception in Nellore," I have the honour to submit that repeated experiments have proved that (speaking generally) no secure fence but a prickly pear one can be raised in this district in the localities where our platforms are situated, and Government have peremptorily forbidden the planting of prickly pear for the purpose. The fence at Gogulapalli, to which I referred, is a prickly pear one grown long ago.

2. Prickly pear has no greater enemy in the country than myself; but I would nevertheless fence the platforms with it, in despair of securing them effectively by any other means.

3. To dig new and expensive trenches, such as were proposed at Kistnapatam, I regard as a waste of money. Unless combined with a fence impervious by itself, no trench will ensure security, and, if we have the impervious fence, the trench remains but an extravagant superfluity.

[illegible] to Government for consideration.

2. As observed by the Collector the protection of salt-works by a fence of prickly pear has been strictly forbidden* by Government; the Board are, however, convinced, from personal knowledge of the localities in which salt-platforms are placed on the East Coast, that in some places nothing but prickly pear will grow so as to form an efficient fence, and, as the Collector remarks, "unless combined with an impervious fence, no trench will ensure security."

*Government Order dated 24th February 1865, No. 412, Revenue Department.
Do. dated 12th May 1865, No. 1,001, Revenue Department, paragraph 23.
Do. dated 27th October 1870, No. 1,653, Revenue Department.

3. The Board are fully† aware of the desirability of eradicating and preventing the spread of prickly pear near villages, and in other places where it is a nuisance; but they submit that good cause exists for making an exception to the general rule (as was done in Government Order No. 611, dated 29th April 1870, Revenue Department) in the case of special localities, and for special purposes such as that referred to above—a measure which was‡ recommended by the Honourable Mr. Clarke in regard to certain salt-pans in the Kistna District, and to which§ Government apparently offered no objection.

†Proceedings recorded in Government Order dated 31st October 1860, No. 2,009, Revenue Department.
9th July 1861, No. 1,372, Revenue Department.

‡Report, dated 24th May 1864, paragraphs 21, 22, 64, 120, 122, 134.
§Government Order dated 29th May 1865, No. 1,128, Revenue Department.

4. The Board trust that Government will not deem it necessary to negative their proposal on the ground that, in their Proceedings dated 27th October 1870,