

	former	present	reductions
1 The Duke of Devonshire	163. 6. 6	134. 6. 1	29. 0. 5
2 Sir Augustus Warren	99. 7. 0	81. 14. 0	17. 13. 0
3 Co Rowland	139. 18. 0	115. 0. 10	24. 17. 2
4 Tho Ware Esq	66	54. 5. 6	11. 14. 6
5 Francis Scamish	51. 3. 4	42. 1. 9	9. 1. 7
6 Messrs Rec ^d John Scamish	16. 11. 10	13. 12. 10	2. 19. 0
7 J ^o Rec ^d John Webb	51. 2. 0	42. 0. 5	9. 1. 7
8 J ^o Henry Radwin	15. 4. 2	12. 10. 1	2. 14. 1
9 Francis J. Gillman	11. 9. 10	9. 9. 0	2. 0. 10
10 John Ballard Esq	8. 7. 2	6. 17. 6	1. 9. 8
11 Mrs Stonebrook	6. 12. 4	5. 8. 10	1. 3. 6
12 Edward Foot Esq	6. 6. 0	5. 3. 7	1. 2. 5
	635. 8. 2	522. 10. 5	112. 17. 9

Proof of the correctness of the foregoing Calculations.

If 1. 12. 10. be reduced to 1. 7. 0 what will 635. 8. 2 be reduced to.

$\frac{32}{394}$

$\frac{12708}{152498}$
 $\frac{106748}{304996}$
 $\frac{394}{4117446}$ (10450)
 $\frac{1774}{19547}$ 522. 10. 5.
 $\frac{1752}{1752}$ 5.

In the Parish of Moragh

Calculation shewing the yearly tithe rent charge which J. Ware Esq was subject previous to Nov 1854, and the yearly rent charge to which ~~the~~ since became subject pursuant to the order of the Justices assembled at Clonakilty Sessions in July 1854

No.	Schedule	former yearly rent charge at 1. 7. 0 per Bag	present yearly rent charge at 1. 7. 0 per Bag	yearly Reduction
4	Thomas Ware	66	54. 5. 6	11. 14. 6

Proof of above statement

If 1. 12. 10. produce 66 what will 1. 7. 0 produce

$\frac{32}{394}$

$\frac{1944}{21384}$ (54. 5. 6 less about 1/4)
 $\frac{1684}{2160}$ 5
 $\frac{192}{2280}$ 5
 $\frac{310}{394}$ 3 about