

Tuesday, 3rd July, 1860

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF
INDIA**

Vol. VI

(1860)

a mistake. Frequent complaints had been made against the Government for not placing the North-Western Provinces under the Non-Regulation system. His name had been mixed up with those complaints. Very recently a complaint of this nature had appeared in a paper enjoying a very large circulation. Now what did the Council suppose was the origin of the complaint? Why, the dearth of grain in a particular district, and the inability of the ruling power under the Regulations to make it cheaper; whereas it was contended by those who made the complaint that, had the district been Non-Regulation, instead of subject to the Regulations, the local authorities could have interfered and compelled the grain merchants to sell at what might be deemed a reasonable price. He (Mr. Harington) very much doubted whether the Right Honorable Gentleman opposite would concur in these views.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the Bill brought in by the Honorable Member for the North-Western Provinces, who was at that time a Member of Government, was not read a third time, nor did it receive the Governor-General's assent and become law. He thought it proper to make this observation, because he thought it ought to be understood that no local Government had a right to make any law or to act upon a law introduced into this Council, whether it was read a second time or not, before it was read a third time and passed and had received the Governor-General's assent. Under the explanation given by the Member of the Executive Government that in reality no oppression had taken place, he would not object to the proposition of the Right Honorable Gentleman; something must also be done to indemnify the Officers of Government who had, he had no doubt, acted in good faith, although in an erroneous assumption of power. With this view he would suggest that the Clerk of the Council be requested to draw up an indemnity Clause to be inserted in this Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN'S Motion was then put and carried, and the Section as amended passed.

Sections CXXLIX and CCL were passed as they stood.

Section COLI was passed after a verbal amendment in Clause 7.

Section CCLII was passed after amendments.

The further consideration of the Bill was postponed, and the Council resumed its sitting.

The Council adjourned at 10 o'clock, on the Motion of Sir Bartle Frere, till to-morrow, at 7 o'clock in the morning.

Tuesday Morning, July 3, 1860.

PRESENT :

The Hon'ble the Chief Justice, *Vice-President*,
in the Chair.

Hon'ble Sir H. B. E. Frere,	H. Forbes, Esq.,
Right Hon'ble J. Wilson,	A. Sconce, Esq.,
son,	and
H. B. Harington, Esq.,	Hon'ble Sir M. L. Wolls.

LICENSING OF TRADES AND PROFESSIONS.

MR. WILSON moved that the Council resolve itself into a Committee on the Bill "for the Licensing of Arts, Trades, and Professions," and that the Committee be instructed to consider the Bill in the amended form in which it had been recommended by the Select Committee to be passed.

Agreed to.

Section I was passed after verbal amendments.

Section II provided as follows:—

"From and after the said day of every person who shall carry on any lawful Art, Trade, or Profession as hereinafter described shall be required to take out such License as is in Schedule A to this Act annexed directed, namely:—

"Every person who shall carry on any Art or Trade, having for its object the procurement of gain to such person:

"Every Company or Association or body of persons who shall carry on any Art or Trade as aforesaid, whether constituted a Company by Act of Parliament, Royal Charter, Letters Patent, or Act of the Legislative Council of

India ; or constituted or regulated by deed of settlement or other instrument :

“Every partnership of persons who shall carry on any Art or Trade for the procurement of gain to such partnership :

“Every practising Barrister, Attorney, Vakeel, and Mookhtear; every Member of any College of Physicians or College of Surgeons; and every Medical Graduate of any University or College, not being in Her Majesty's Army or in Her Majesty's Indian Army; every Architect; every Civil Engineer.”

MR. SCONCE said, he had strong doubts as to this Bill, both as regarded the time and manner in which it was proposed to the Council to adopt it. He had no objection to accept a system of specific licenses, such as licenses for dealing in tobacco and other employments that might be mentioned; but as the Bill now stood, it was far from being so. Looking to the classes of persons proposed to be licensed by this Bill, and the scale of rates chargeable, and connecting the Bill with the terms of the other Bill which had not yet been passed, he desired to take the sense of the Council on the system advocated by the majority of the Select Committee. His first objection to the Bill was that it was useless. We had just been considering and had almost passed the Income Tax Bill, which presented the amplest and most satisfactory data for levying a tax on every man according to his means. If you were satisfied that the machinery of that Bill was quite adequate for the purpose, it seemed to him that the adoption of any arbitrary, indeterminate, and unnecessary scheme of this kind was altogether unworthy of the Council. It would amount, in fact, to a double Income Tax. By the Bill that they had been lately considering, they would tax incomes down to 200 rupees a year. They had spared no pains to perfect their machinery for that purpose, and he for one believed that a tax of 2 per cent. on smaller incomes and 3 per cent. on higher was the utmost they should exact. But at any rate, having perfected their measure, were they to abandon the means of taxation which it afforded, and devise another scheme to bring in more money ?

We ought in the present state of things to have the utmost assurance that we were not going to tax the people more than they could bear, and no adequate justification, he thought, had been offered for adopting this additional project of taxation. He had said that this Bill would be imposing a double Income Tax. His meaning was that, if they levied four or ten Rupees a year from parties whose income amounted to two, four, or five hundred rupees a year, such license duties would be equivalent to an additional tax upon income of two or even five per cent. There appeared to be no distinction made between a Bank in this city and a Native mahajun. The latter perhaps earned two hundred Rupees a year, and to take ten Rupees from that man was most unreasonable, while the former might earn many thousand Rupees a year, and would be charged the same amount. So was it the case with many others. The measure seemed to him impracticable in itself and was drawn without any adequate check to secure the fair administration of it. He must certainly deprecate and repudiate such a system, which would be a source of very great hardship to the poorer classes. It presented the most unsatisfactory data for levying such a tax, while in the Income Tax Bill we had, it must be presumed, the most legitimate standard of assessment. If by the Income Tax Bill we did not raise sufficient revenue, the alternative was manifest; we might raise the rates, we might take 2½ or 2¾, 3¼ or 3½ per cent., and he thought no one could hesitate between that modification of the Income Tax Bill and the arbitrary and injurious assessments of the Bill now under discussion. He would not harass the people with two Bills, if one could be made to suffice. He would ask the Council to consider what the title of the Bill was. It was a Bill for the Licensing of Arts, Trades, and Professions. The object seemed to be to bring within its scope artisans, small dealers or traders of every class and whole-sale traders, and small and large manufacturers. There were various descriptions of people of very various

circumstances. Then as to the members of a profession, the names of the first four were Barristers, Attorneys, Vakeels, and Mookhtears, who were required to pay ten Rupees a year. Now a Barrister had to pay ten Rupees, and a Vakeel had also to pay ten Rupees. No difference was made between a Vakeel in a Sudder Court and a Vakeel in a Moonsiff's Court. But he should say, if there was no difference in the title, there was a material difference in their incomes; for instance, a Vakeel in the Sudder Court made some thousands a year, while the Pleader in a Moonsiff's Court earned, it might be, not more than five Rupees a month. It was the purpose of this Bill to take the same tax from Her Majesty's Law Officers in the Supreme Court as from the humblest Pleader in a Moonsiff's Court. He was merely pointing out the imperfections of the Bill. Then there was a distinction between a Vakeel and a Mookhtear—a Vakeel was a professional man, whose legal status was laid down by local law; whereas a Mookhtear was an agent, and there were not only such men habitually attached to the Courts, but the personal agents of zemindars were Mookhtears, and they also, men merely distinguished by holding a power of attorney, would also have to pay ten Rupees a year. The mere possession of a power of Attorney would render a man liable to be classed as a member of a profession. It was impossible to expect such people to pay. Then, as to an Architect, he was a Member of a profession. There were few Architects, according to the real acceptation of the term, in Calcutta, where there would be no difficulty about them. But if we went beyond the Presidency, it would be hard to say whom they should call an Architect, unless it was a *rajmistry* or house builder. As he had already said, he had no doubt that they would be able to put it in force in the Presidency Towns, but in the Mofussil some difficulty would be experienced as to the classification as to who was a Mason and who an Architect; besides which, it would be very hard to make

such men pay ten Rupees a year. Then as to the Banks and Mahajuns, the inconsistency was as great. The Bank of Bengal, as he said before, would be required to pay ten Rupees and a native Mahajun the same. A Bill which attempted to assimilate both must be most unjust. Could we honestly, justly, or conscientiously take from a person ten Rupees who earned only one hundred Rupees, and the same sum from a person or a Company that earned thousands? it was impossible. He was not quite prepared to go through the whole Bill, as he was not aware that the Bill would be proceeded with this morning. The objections he had made practically applied to other classes as well. He was ready to admit that means might be properly devised for reaching incomes below two hundred Rupees; but he must say that, for the reasons he had explained, he was averse to the present measure being proceeded with in the form in which it was now presented to the Council.

SIR MORDAUNT WELLS said, he confessed that he entertained much the same objections as those taken by the Honorable Member for Bengal in reference to incomes of Rupees two hundred. He saw no reason why a man earning two hundred Rupees a year was to pay seven per cent. on his income, while many who had the means of paying more would pay the same tax. He would instance the Medical profession. A Surgeon in the Presidency with a large practice, perhaps earnings some four thousand Rupees a month, would be called upon to pay ten Rupees, while a man who had just come out and hardly making two hundred Rupees a year, would have to pay the same amount; the inequality was so very great, that he could hardly believe it was the intention of his Right Honorable friend to pass the Bill in its present shape. A tax of this kind would fall ten-fold on a man striving hard to make two ends meet, as it would be five per cent on his income, while it would be scarcely anything on the other getting four thousand Rupees a month. He thought this was essentially an injustice, and he would suggest

to his Right Honorable friend to make a distinction. He saw no reason why Members of professions, whether Barristers, Architects, or Engineers, should be liable to the same tax. He was not prepared to say that he was opposed to this Bill as a whole. On the contrary, he was convinced that it would reach many incomes which should be taxed, but which would not come under the Income Tax. He remembered that Sir Robert Peel wished to carry out the Income Tax so as to touch the artisan. He thought that the small manufacturer and artisan was better able to pay than a man on £200 a year who had to keep up an establishment. The only class of professional men who were taxed were a very small body, who were called Special Pleaders. If they numbered so large a body as the Barristers, he was certain they would not be taxed for a day. He believed the Special Pleaders numbered about fifty or sixty gentlemen. It was always considered a most unjust thing to tax those men when a Barrister was not subject to the tax. He did not remember that any others of the legal profession were taxed.

THE CHAIRMAN.—The Attorneys were also taxed?

SIR MORDAUNT WELLS.—Yes, but under very peculiar circumstances, and on quite a different principle.

The reason why Attorneys were taxed was, because they derived certain exclusive privileges as officers of the Court of Queen's Bench. No such privileges were enjoyed by the Medical profession. He would ask why they should not introduce some principle which would secure uniformity, and that was every thing in legislation. Why should they take from a man ten Rupees when he could not afford it, and if compelled, he must give up some necessary of life, or, in other words, he must necessarily deprive himself and his family of many little comforts they might stand in need of. Following up the argument, if they were to take two per cent. from a man's income who lived up to the last farthing, and who had no margin left, what would be the consequence, but positive

ruin? He could not be let off as a man who had to pay rates at home and who was discharged therefrom because he was absolutely poor. Was it worth while, for the sake of a few Rupees, to drive a man to such a state? He could not, as a Legislator, sanction such a principle. Before he gave his support to the Bill, he would wish to see its imperfections corrected. He would ask the Council to consider the very great hardship they would entail on poor people. We must remember that there existed here and elsewhere considerable opposition to this Bill, and the representations which had been made by the people here, he must say, had put them forth very moderately indeed. What he wished to suggest to the Right Honorable gentleman was that he should not tax people whose incomes were only two hundred Rupees a year. It would be worth while to make this sacrifice in consideration of the relief which it would afford to poor people. Ten Rupees was a pound, and a pound was a significant sum. It would enable a man to buy a pair of boots or a hat, or it would pay for a fort-night's bazar. In conclusion, he said that he would sooner see the Bill thrown out, than allow it to pass in its present form.

MR. WILSON said, it was rather unfortunate that the two Bills had happened to be discussed at the same time. If the License Bill had been the law of the land a year ago, the anomalies which had been pointed out, would not, he thought, have been apparent. But it was purely by an accident that the two Bills happened to come before the Council at the same time. When he introduced the Bills, he explained how one measure would bear against the other. The principle adopted by him was nearly similar to that now in force in England. All measures of taxation were distasteful to the people, and he was aware of the great excitement which such taxation had created in England. This was what must be expected in every country. The Honorable and learned Judge had stated as a precedent that the Special Pleaders in England were exempted from

the tax, in which he was corrected by the Honorable and learned Chairman. Surely the Honorable and learned Judge could not have forgotten that, when the Income Tax Bills were brought before Parliament by which the Attorneys were made to pay £15 per annum as revenue to the State, how strenuously they endeavored to oppose it. Motions were annually made in Parliament by Lord Robert Grosvenor for the purpose of repealing that provision. He (Mr. Wilson) certainly never remembered more extraneous pressure than that which had been brought to bear on that question, and with every one of the representatives in Parliament, whether Tories, Radicals, or Whigs, the Attorneys exercised a most important influence, but with their united strength they failed to carry their opposition. In 1854, however, the tax was reduced by the Stamp Bill, which he (Mr. Wilson) brought in that year, and since then the matter had been set at rest.

SIR MORDAUNT WELLS — That was just before the dissolution of Parliament.

Mr. WILSON said, no, it was just after a general election, and at the beginning of a new Parliament and a new ministry. Then again the learned Judge had entered at great length into the question of the in-quality of the tax, and had pictured very vividly the hardship of making a man pay tax who was on the receipt of two hundred Rupees a year. He did not entirely agree with all that his Honorable and learned friend had said, for he must know that in England the lawyer who could hardly pay the rent of his chamber was obliged to pay his £15 per year. The Honorable Member for Bengal had mentioned about the Bank of Bengal having to pay the same as a Mahajan or Native money-lender. Why, the London Banker paid the same as the country Bankers. Then as to exempting from this Bill those whose incomes were two hundred Rupees a year, all he would say was that it was not inflicting any very great hardship on any person, for this reason. He would only have to pay two rupees for his license annually. A person

who carried on trade and paid taxes, had the immediate advantage of those taxes. But this Bill would not apply to several persons. It would only apply to those carrying on a trade or profession, who had the benefits arising from the success of improved fiscal measures and the general prosperity of the country. It would not apply to any Clerk or to any person deriving his income otherwise than from a trade or profession. The Honorable and learned Judge then said that the Bill made no provision for the relief of persons who were reduced to a state of poverty. But if his Honorable and learned friend would refer to Section IX, he would find that the Collector was authorized "to exempt from payment of the License Duty hereby imposed, any person of whose inability to pay for the same he may be satisfied," and the person so exempted was declared not liable to take out a license under the Act.

SIR MORDAUNT WELLS here explained that he did not put the case of a pauper, but he alluded to men who earned two hundred Rupees a year.

Mr. WILSON said, it was only in the case of paupers that relief was granted in England; whereas in the case of a man getting two hundred Rupees a year, there seemed no necessity of affording relief to him. If a man, whatever might be his income or position, had an income, he must pay his tax. There was no difficulty in picturing hardships. There was no tax which did not expose some persons to very great hardships, and did not give rise to some dissatisfaction. We must look to the effect of the measure as a whole. The object of this Bill was to impose a general license fee on Trades and Professions, which should be permanent in its character. Seeing that the operation of two taxes might inflict hardship, it was proposed to fix a small uniform rate. Had we attempted to place it on the income, then he agreed with the Honorable Member for Bengal that it would have been better to include it in the Income Tax. We thought it proper however to make it a general

tax, and one so moderate, that it would not press hardly on any class. As those who receive below two hundred Rupees could not be included in the Income Tax, he thought by this means to reach the whole of the large body of small traders whose incomes might be below two hundred Rupees. Those who heard him knew that that class in England paid a great deal more by indirect taxation, by which means no less a sum than forty-two millions a year were realised—and Customs Duties and Excise upon the common necessaries of life, such as Beer, Sugar, Rum, &c., were very high, so that in the aggregate a very large sum was realised. Without some such tax, there was no means of including in a general taxation the great bulk of the population who were deriving the benefit of British Rule, but who would be exempt from the Income Tax. He thought that the Council had already agreed to the principle of this Bill. As to the rates proposed to be charged, it appeared to him that to a professional man rising in practice, ten Rupees a year was a very trifling sum, and would be a matter of very little importance. He would therefore ask the Council to consider this Bill as a whole system, and unless a strong case of practical oppression or practical inconvenience to particular classes were made out, he would ask them to consider carefully before the principle of the Bill was infringed. No doubt ten Rupees would deprive a man of great many luxuries, but good Government was also a valuable thing. He (Mr. Wilson) did not think that it would really be any hardship to a Banker or a Medical or other professional man to pay a license fee of ten Rupees a year.

SIR MORDAUNT WELLS would simply remark that in many of the Calcutta dispensaries and hospitals there were medical men whose incomes were very small, and ten Rupees would be a large sum for them to pay.

Mr. WILSON resumed. All he had to say was that with regard to the whole of the financial measures of Government, after forming the most sanguine expectations of their result, and after making the most extensive

calculations of reduction of expenditure, it would be with the greatest possible difficulty that the Government would be able to bring about a financial equilibrium. He did not say that that was any reason why they should inflict hardships or injustice on any class. If the Bill was susceptible of improvement, any modifications which might be suggested with that view would be gladly attended to and carefully considered by him. He hoped however that the Council would regard the Bill, not as a matter of choice, but one of necessity, and he would only remark that the necessity which existed in February was still greater now. Flattering as had been the prospects held out by persons who had no means of knowing the real necessities of the Government, he could only assure the Honorable Members that the necessity was still greater now than he (Mr. Wilson) believed it to be in February last.

THE CHAIRMAN said, he quite agreed in the observations which had fallen from the Honorable and learned Judge. He would, in the first place, ask, what was the object of this Bill? Was it to prevent persons from carrying on a trade or profession who did not take out a license, or was it merely a fiscal measure to raise revenue? He apprehended it was not the intention of the Bill to grant licenses or to place any restriction on the granting of them. To tell a Barrister or Physician that he could not exercise his profession without getting a license from the Collector, was simply absurd. It appeared to him (the Chairman) that the real object was to get money, but that he thought might be done in a much less offensive mode, than by putting a first class Merchant on the same footing with a pawn-broker or a pedlar. He would suggest that every person should have a certificate, as was done in England with regard to Attornies. As a matter of precedent, however, it appeared to him that the Attorney's Certificate Duty was a most unjust tax. Now if he (the Chairman) were in Parliament, he should certainly vote against their being subject to the

tax, for he considered it very unjust to tax them when Barristers were exempted. The Right Honorable gentleman had instanced the case of a legal gentleman struggling hard, and scarcely able to pay for his chamber, being made to pay the tax. Now he (the Chairman) did not see why they should follow the example and compel a person placed under such circumstances to pay. On what principle were they to force a person to pay with starvation staring him in the face and to tell him—"It is true you are striving hard by your industry to get up in the world, but we cannot help it; you must pay the tax?" The reason why Barristers were exempted in England was, because they had greater influence in Parliament. They had the Attorney General, Solicitor General, and the Lord Chancellor.

SIR MORDAUNT WELLS.—And the Press, too.

THE CHAIRMAN continued. He did not see any difference in principle between taxing a Barrister and an Attorney. If the Attorney enjoyed any peculiar privileges, so did the Barrister, or if it were said that the Barrister had to struggle very much at his first outset in practice, it was equally so the case with the Attorney. A Barrister was exempted; on what principle was an Attorney taxed? Was it because an Attorney was offensive or injurious to society? If so, he would say, don't allow him a license, or rather don't give him any certificate at all. He did not see however why he should be singled out from among the others. The Right Honorable gentleman referred the other day to the Queen's Proclamation. He (the Chairman) would ask him, why were Barristers and merchants to be placed on a different footing from Civilians and officers. If the License Fee were intended to be taken from persons who would have to pay the Income Tax, why should it not be taken from all alike?

It appeared to him that this Bill would give a bonus to property over industry. It would give this privilege to a fund-holder or a landlord, not because he had done anything for the benefit of society, but because he happened to be the son of a particular

father, from whom he inherited his property; while the professional man, who lived by his own industry, would be obliged to pay. This, it appeared to him (the Chairman), was taxing the bees and allowing the drones to escape. Again, he did not see why this Bill should omit to tax a Civil Servant, or a Judge, or a Member of Council. These were men who could afford to pay better than the poor artisan. Were they exempted, because they were paid by Government?

As he said before, there was no occasion to grant licenses. It was not for a Collector to say to a Barrister or a Physician applying for a license—"In my opinion you are not qualified for the profession in which you are or wish to be engaged." In England licenses were granted to pawn-brokers and others during the Sessions. He thought it was necessary that a pawn-broker should have a license. If it turned out he was a receiver of stolen goods, the license might be taken away from him. He knew not why hawkers and pedlars were taxed; probably because they were not properly represented in the House of Commons.

Then, again, the definition of a profession as given in the Bill included "every Member of any College of Physicians or College of Surgeons, and every Medical Graduate of any University or College, not being in Her Majesty's Army or in Her Majesty's Indian Army; every Architect; every Civil Engineer." He did not see why Physicians, Surgeons, Medical Graduates of Universities and Colleges in Her Majesty's service should have the privilege of being excluded from the tax. Nor did he see any reason why an Army Surgeon, who might be engaged in a very extensive private practice in Calcutta, should be exempt, while the unfortunate Medical man in charge of a Dispensary or a Chemist's shop, who was striving hard with starvation staring him in the face, would be taxed.

Mr. WILSON said that, though it was not provided in the Bill, it was intended to tax Army Surgeons if they carried on a private practice.

THE CHAIRMAN continued. Then every Civil Engineer was to be taxed, because he was an uncov-

nanted officer, while the Civil Servant who came out under a covenant was to be exempted. Why, again, should not a Colonel or Major in the Army pay? Why should Officers or Commanders in Her Majesty's Navy be excluded, while the carpenters on board their vessels or artisans in the Government Dockyards were to be subject to the tax? He did not make these observations with the view of throwing any difficulty in the way of the Right Honorable gentleman; but he would suggest to him the propriety of so altering this Section as to make it applicable to any person exercising any business or calling whatever.

Mr. WILSON said, the lateness of the hour prevented his making a reply, but he would only remark that the Honorable and learned Chairman's suggestions were worthy of consideration, and were so far different in character from those of the Honorable and learned Judge (Sir Mordaunt Wells) and the Honorable Member for Bengal, that, whereas the former were calculated to increase the revenue, the effect of the latter would be to decrease the revenue. With regard to the Honorable and learned Chairman's allusion to the exemption of landholders from the operation of this Bill, he (Mr. Wilson) thought it proper to mention that it was not considered advisable to tax them any further at present.

The consideration of the Bill was then postponed, and the Council resumed its sitting.

The Council adjourned at 10 o'clock, on the Motion of Sir Bartle Frere, till to-morrow morning at 7 o'clock.

Wednesday Morning, July 4, 1860.

PRESENT :

The Hon'ble the Chief Justice, *Vice-President*,
in the Chair.

Hon'ble Sir H. B. E. Frere,	H. Forbes, Esq.,
Right Hon'ble J. Wilson,	A. Sounce, Esq.,
H. B. Harington, Esq.,	Hon'ble Sir M. L. Wells.

ARMS AND AMMUNITION.

The Order of the Day being read for the adjourned Committee of the whole.

The Chairman

Council on the Bill "to make perpetual Act XXVIII of 1857 (relating to the importation, manufacture, and sale of arms and ammunition, and for regulating the right to keep or use the same)," the Council resolved itself into a Committee for the further consideration of the Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN said, when this Bill was last before the Council, he endeavored to draw up a Section to enable the Government to disarm certain districts. That Section had been printed and circulated, but since then he had made some slight alterations, and it was his intention to move the Section in its altered form. Since last Saturday some papers had been brought to his notice which had escaped his recollection. He alluded to certain communications received from the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces on the subject of this Bill, and reports from certain Officers of Government upon the working of Act XXVIII of 1857. To his great surprise, he read some extracts from these papers in the *Hurkaru* newspaper on Monday last. He did not wish to impute blame to any one, but what he wished to call the attention of the Council to was this. It was usual to notice in the margins of Reports from Select Committees the communications which were received on the subject of the Bill referred to them. Standing Order 67 provided as follows:—

"All written communications on the subject of Bills published for general information shall be addressed to the Clerk of the Council, who shall cause the same, and also all such petitions as shall be ordered by the Council to be referred to the Select Committee on the Bill, to be printed, and a copy thereof to be forthwith laid before such Select Committee, and to be sent to each Member of the Council."

He believed that these papers were sent to him some months ago, but at different times, and he remembered having read the first page, but he had laid them aside until the present Bill should come on for consideration, and as he had not seen them noticed in the Report of the Select Committee, his attention was not drawn to them.