1299

M.R.O. 1—20,002—12-8-65.

(1) Number of Pages 8.

(2) Date of repair 3-2-67

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1899.	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.

Dated 9-10-1874 ~~196~~ .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1/299

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 9th October 1874.

No. 104. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 22nd September 1874, No. 2,719:—

Read the following letter from J. HOPE, Esq., Acting Collector of Kurnool, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 31st August 1874, No. 335:—

I HAVE the honor to request the Board will inform me, if lands cultivated with wet crops in last year, and the year before, are entitled to the benefit of the progressive rates, under Clauses 1 and 2, Rule VI. of the Rules recently sanctioned in G. O., No. 830, dated 3rd July 1874. The clause commences with the words "*in future years*," and I am not sure that it applies to past cultivation. Mr. Latham thinks, that lands taken up for wet cultivation *last* year ought to be charged only 4 *Rupees this* year, and those taken up the year preceding, *Rupees* 5, which is the charge for the third year under the new rules. His Overseers have been acting upon this view, and if the Board think the rule cannot bear this interpretation, the only course left this year would be, for the Settling Officers to grant remission of the difference between the full charge and the progressive rate.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. The question is whether retrospective effect should be given to the note to Clause 2 of Rule VI of the Rules for the distribution of water from the canal of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, so that fields cultivated for the first time in 1872 may be charged Rupees 5 an acre this year, and fields cultivated for the first time in 1873 Rupees 4. The Company's Chief Engineer thinks that this retrospective effect should be allowed.

3. The note does not apply to fields cultivated before this year but there can be no objection to the Company's applying the principle of it in the way that Mr. Latham proposes.

No. 105. ORDER THEREON, 9th October 1874, No. 1,299.

Irrigation, No. 1.

THE Governor in Council accepts Mr. Latham's proposal.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.
„ the Public Works Department.

Exd. G. A. Turton.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 3413 2/1299

From Pro: Bd of Rev:

Dated 22nd September 1874

FOR ORDERS.

I have several times called attention

"to advise upon what steps
"should be taken by people, whose
"financial interests will be affected?"

Lord Oakeshott have it in their
power to step by step later in this
further. The new Rules would
do away with the Board in Ireland, after a suppliants
appeal is rejected. How are
the papers and what is the
statute to alter?

6/16

to the decision at which the Court
arrived, to act upon the recommend-
ation of the Board of Revenue (in para 3
of their Report) of 6 May 1874, that
the Draft Rules, that the rate
of 6 Rupees per acre assessed
should be reduced to 4 Rupees, be
rejected in toto. He should
say that the rates are fixed to
high, and express the strong opinion that they should

FOR ORDERS.

No. 2,719.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 22nd September 1874.

Read the following letter from J. HOPE, Esq., Acting Collector of Kurnool, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 31st August 1874, No. 335:—

I HAVE the honor to request the Board will inform me, if lands cultivated with wet crops in last year, and the year before, are entitled to the benefit of the progressive rates, under Clauses 1 and 2, Rule VI. of the Rules recently sanctioned in G. O., No. 830, dated 3rd July 1874. The clause commences with the words "*in future years*," and I am not sure that it applies to past cultivation. Mr. Latham thinks, that lands taken up for wet cultivation *last* year ought to be charged only 4 *Rupees this* year, and those taken up the year preceding, *Rupees* 5, which is the charge for the third year under the new rules. His Overseers have been acting upon this view, and if the Board think the rule cannot bear this interpretation, the only course left this year would be, for the Settling Officers to grant remission of the difference between the full charge and the progressive rate.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. The question is whether retrospective effect should be given to the note to Clause 1 of Rule VI. of the Rules for the distribution of water from the canal of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, so that fields cultivated for the first time in 1872 may be charged Rupees 5 an acre this year, and fields cultivated for the first time in 1873 Rupees 4. The Company's Chief Engineer thinks that this retrospective effect should be allowed.

3. The note does not apply to fields cultivated before this year but there can be no objection to the Company's applying the principle of it in the way that Mr. Latham proposes.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

J. Grose

Secretary.

To the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
" the Acting Collector of Kurnool.
Copy to the Collector of Cuddapah.

Exd. G. A. Turton.

No 3413.
No 1434
Rev. 1874. Dept.

G.O. 3rd July 1874 Nos 22-23
— 14th March 74 Nos 160-165
— 2nd July 73 No 7 Mlas

Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 22ND SEPTEMBER 1874, No. 2,719.

Dept. 28 Sept 74
Encl.

Received 29 9.

SEPTEMBER.

No. 2,719.

Rules for the distribution of water—from the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company's Canal, in Kurnool District, sanctioned in G. O., No. 830, dated 3rd July 1874.—Letter from Collector requesting information as to whether lands cultivated with wet crops in 1872 and 1873, are entitled to the benefit of the progressive rates under Clauses 1 and 2 of Rule VI. of — submitted for orders of Government, with remarks.

Mr Arden
for orders