# Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
4 FEB 97
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

*From*

*The Board of Revenue*

*(Rev. Sett., L. R. & Agri.).*

Madras

*No.* 802 Rev

*Dated* 3rd February 1897

*Received* 4th

*Registered* 5th

*Enclosures*

*Spare copies*

SUBJECT.

Recording with remark
letter from Rezavi Sultan
and Co informing that
they cannot accept any
arrangement that is not
and may prove disadvan

22/2/97

Copy the Hon: mr Grose C. 22. Order misc No. 1041 dt 22nd Feb: 97

Recorded. 19/2/97

LD 15-2-97 11/2/97.

The inventors of the Sultan list seem to have but little confidence in it. It is for consideration whether the Board should not be asked to examine the list to see what they do possess & what the merits claim for it

LD 15-2-97

11/11/96

I do not think the M.s adduced by us justify examining the list docket!!! & the wishes of the proprietors in this matter are.

Wilson.

No 1245 of 97 since read is inserted. Orders are solicited as to whether it may be referred for

M.s 6.2.97. C 15/2/97.

Unnecessary
Board's remarks before the papers
circulated to the Hon. The Govt having
ided not to offer prizes (vide Go. 2150
16th June 1896) it is not clear
what action should be taken on
messrs Sultan & Co's petn —
12.11.97 If submitted for Govt orders.
by one of these lifts, Really Govt
to in order to see whether or not
it is expedient to recommend to
General use thereof. — Two disputes have
some jealousy between Sultan & Co &
Subba Rao (M. Benson's Assistant)
a rival inventor is at some root of the
cause of Sultan's disinclination to
submit to a public trial at the
hands of the Board of Revenue.
D
15-2-97

I think it may possibly that the
Bd may overrule itself in order
trouble if its criticism the lift
adversely of the interests of the
Inspection when other machines
are not thus subscribed for it —
criticism. I submit that other
wise opinion of the Govt be taken on the
attempt to criticize be dropped.
If Govt decide not to interfere I submit that the
is the best course. They may state that they

BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |

FURTHER PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |

Unless Messrs Sultan & Co
agree to have their Lifts
tried by the Bd & criticised
by it, the Bd will have
nothing to do with the Lifts
JC
19/2/97

(Estt. 24—2,000—29-10-96.)

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE
MADRAS.

# Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture.)

*Dated* 3rd February 1897.

No. 502 Miscellaneous.

READ again Board's Proceedings No. 6443 Mis dated 11th December 1896, informing Messrs Sultan & Co that before their water-lifts are exhibited at Coimbatore by this Department it is necessary that one of their lifts should be subjected to full trial as laid down in para 3 of B.P. No. 201 of 96 and requesting have him to inform the Board when and where by the such trials of one of their water-lifts can be that conducted.

Read also Boards Proceedings No. 365 Mis dated 18th January 1897, informing Messrs Sultan and Co that if their water-lift is submitted to public trial on behalf of this Department, full discretion will be reserved

reserved to make such use of the report of the trial as may seem desirable.

Read also the following letter from Messrs Sultan and Co, dated 25th January 1897:—

With reference to Board's resolution dated 18th January 1897, we beg to say that we cannot accept any arrangement that is risky and may prove disadvantageous to ourselves and the public. We do not think the Board either intends or will do anything that will prove disadvantageous to us, but we have the example of two other lifts though they were reported favourably by the Committee, yet they have failed to receive public patronage on account of the criticisms passed on them. Besides the Committee already went to the length of alluding to the superiority of value benefits while ours are the only buckets in trial have such an

an arrangement. There was no necessity for making such an allusion before examining them. Under the above circumstances we are afraid to do any risky business. Our lift is before the public and has been so for a considerably long time and there is no secret about it. It has been considered to be, all in all, superior and certified so by all who have seen and examined it. Now no prize is offered nor any advantage is held out to us by the trial and consequently we cannot possibly do anything unless we are distinctly told what gain we will have by the trial. As we said before, we have no objection to the lift being examined by the Committee for its own information. We have no guarantee that the lift approved of by the Committee will be approved by the reports or that what will suit the reports will be approved by the Committee.

Resolution

Recorded with the remark that

that the Board understands that Messrs Sultan & Co decline to submit their water-lift to a public trial. It will be pointed out to them that by doing this, they lose the advantage of having one of their lifts tested under conditions the most favourable to successful working.

(True Copy and Extract)

R. V. Shirreff
Secretary

To
Messrs Sultan and Co
Copy to the Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

Encl
7/07