

Saturday, 24th November, 1855

**PROCEEDINGS**

**OF THE**

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

**OF INDIA**

**Vol. I**

**(1854-1855)**

mittee of the whole Council on the Bill "to prohibit the exportation of Saltpetre except in British Vessels bound to the Ports of London or Liverpool."

The Council adjourned.

Saturday, November 24, 1855.

PRESENT :

The Honorable J. A. Dorin, Senior Member of the Council of India, *Presiding*.

Hon. J. P. Grant,	P. W. LeGoyt, Esq.
Hon. B. Peacock,	C. Allen, Esq.
Hon. Sir James Colville,	and
D. Elliott, Esq.,	E. Currie, Esq.

MARRIAGE OF HINDU WIDOWS.

THE CLERK presented a Petition from certain Brahmins resident at Poonah, expressing their cordial approval of the principle upon which the proposed Bill to remove all legal obstacles to the Marriage of Hindu Widows, is based.

MR. LE GEYT moved that the Petition be printed.

Agreed to.

PROTECTION OF UNDER-TENANTS.

THE CLERK presented a Petition from Captain Henry William Craufurd, of Mulnauth, zillah Nuddea, in Lower Bengal, praying for the relief of under-tenants from the consequences of the sale of estates for arrears of revenue.

SIR JAMES COLVILLE moved that the Petition be read.

Agreed to.

The Petition, which was as follows, was then read :—

" TO THE HONORABLE THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF INDIA.

*The Humble Petition of Henry William Craufurd, of Mulnauth, in the Zillah of Nuddea, in the Province of Lower Bengal, sheweth ;—*

1. That your Petitioner is the manager of, and the largest proprietor in, a joint-stock company holding under-tenures of land to the value of some lakhs of rupees.

2. That your Petitioner, finding portions of this valuable property frequently exposed to the risk of forfeiture under the action of the law for the sale of estates for arrears of revenue, which permits the purchase of the estate free from all encumbrances created since the perpetual settlement, though the holders of such encumbrances may have punctually liquidated all the claims of the superior Talookhdar against them—and further that this risk was frequently made use of as an engine against him

by the superior Talookhdar to extract loans from him under the threat of a default as to the revenue for the due payment of which he was in no way responsible, was struck by the gross injustice of such a state of things, and by the grave injury done to all landed property by its continuance, and began to exert himself by both public and private representations to procure relief.

3. That your Petitioner was met on the threshold of his exertions now more than two years ago, by assurances that the Government, aware of the injustice inflicted on under-tenants by the sale law, was prepared *proprio motu* to grant the relief required, and had actually drafted a law for that purpose, which had, at that date, and after long continued communications with the most experienced and enlightened of the East India Company's servants, received the approval of the Most Noble the Governor General.

4. That your Petitioner too glad, instead of meeting obstacles in his path, to find matters so advanced, and that the reform of the sale law generally and the condemnation of its abuses was concurred in by His Honor the present Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, by the Honorable J. P. Grant, now Member of the Executive and Legislative Councils, and by the Honorable E. Currie, now Member of the Legislative Council, readily withdrew from the task which he had undertaken, in full confidence that Government having satisfied itself after long years of inquiry of the evils of the present law, and that the relief from them could be granted without endangering the punctual payment of the revenue, would hasten to free itself from the imputation of allowing the continuance of an acknowledged injury to those living under its rule.

5. That your Petitioner only yesterday perceived, by the report in the public prints of the proceedings of your Honorable Council, that you were about to legislate regarding under-tenures without granting the long promised relief to under-tenants, which forms the subject of this humble petition ; and that being aware that one of your most distinguished Members has been engaged, ever since the constitution of your Honorable Council, in the arduous task of preparing such a thorough reform of the present law for the sale of estates for arrears of revenue, as shall remove all the unjust responsibilities that affect owners of landed property, depreciate its value, and obstruct its transfer and improvement, and trusting speedily to obtain the result of those labors, has confined himself strictly to the part of that great reform which is embodied in his humble prayer that your Honorable Council, now legislating on the subject of under-tenures, will enact—

1. That Section XXVI of Act No. I of 1845, and so much of Section XXVIII of the same Act as relates to the permanently settled districts of Bengal, Behar, Orissa, and Benares, be repealed.

2. That the purchaser of an estate sold under Act I of 1845, for the recovery of arrears of revenue due on account of the same in the permanently settled districts of Bengal, Behar, Orissa, and Benares, shall acquire the estate subject to all encumbrances which may have been imposed upon it either before or after the

time of settlement by any former proprietor, and shall succeed to all the rights and interests of the former proprietor in the estate as they existed at the time of sale, and to no more.

Provided that no lease or engagement granted by any former proprietor shall have any validity whatever as against the purchaser, unless the same shall have been duly executed and registered, and possession given to the lessee at least three months previous to the date of sale.

Provided also that the purchaser shall have no greater power to enhance the rents of under-tenants and ryots, whose liabilities have not been limited by express engagements, than that possessed by the former proprietor before the sale.

3. That when an estate be put up for sale under the said Act for the recovery of arrears of land revenue due thereon, if there be no bid, or if the highest bid offered be insufficient to cover the said arrears and those subsequently accruing up to the date of sale, the Collector shall postpone the sale to any subsequent day, not being a holiday, and not being less than one week or more than one month from the day first fixed. And on the day to which the sale has been so postponed, the Collector shall put the estate up for sale free from all encumbrances, the holders of which had not, previous to the Government day, liquidated all claims against them on account of the said estate, and if there be no bid, or if the highest bid be insufficient to cover the said arrears and those subsequently accruing up to that day, the Government shall acquire the estate free from all encumbrances which may have been imposed upon it after the time of settlement, except lands held for the erection of and occupied by dwelling-houses and manufactories, or for mines, gardens, tanks, canals, places of worship, or burying grounds.

SIR JAMES COLVILLE moved that the Petition be printed.

Agreed to.

#### EXPORT OF SALTPETRE.

THE CLERK reported that he had received from certain gentlemen describing themselves as citizens of the United States engaged in the trade between this country and America, a communication relative to the Bill "to prohibit the exportation of saltpetre, except in British vessels, bound to the ports of London or Liverpool."

MR. PEACOCK moved that the communication be read.

Agreed to.

THE CLERK then read the communication, which was as follows:—

"SIR,—As citizens of the United States engaged in the trade between this country and America, we feel called upon respectfully to protest against the proposed Act which prohibits the exportation of saltpetre to any ports excepting London and Liverpool, as, in its present form an unwarrantable and excessive interference with the trade of the United States.

"The Act allows no time and makes no provision for the completion of existing contracts.

"We have purchased largely, and have engaged freight for saltpetre for America. It is proposed, not only to stop all this saltpetre without notice, but to subject us to damages for the non-fulfilment of our contracts for tonnage without compensation of any kind.

"Contrast this with the conduct of the belligerents in Europe.

"On the declaration of war, the British and Russian Governments allowed a certain reasonable period for the departure of the enemy's vessels from the ports of each country; by which means existing engagements were respected, and they were enabled to leave without injury.

"Are we, as citizens of a Government in amity with Great Britain, to be treated more harshly than avowed enemies?

"Even when a blockade was declared in the Baltic last season, ample time was given for neutral vessels to finish loading, and to leave the ports to be blockaded.

"Is the present a case which demands greater stringency than the operations of a blockading force—than actual war itself?

"And are we, in Calcutta, to be treated more summarily than our fellow-citizens in Cronstadt and St. Petersburg?

"The Act moreover has all the offensive characteristics of a penal *ex-post-facto* Law. Its prohibition is retrospective, and it proposes to indemnify the Officers of Government who may now act under illegal orders, and stop our merchandize in course of shipment. Would such a proceeding be tolerated by the British Government if resorted to in Naples, Turkey, or Morocco? and can it be seriously contemplated in a dependency in which a respect for law is supposed to be maintained?

"We will not dwell upon the prohibition to export saltpetre to British ports in any but British vessels, though it is strangely at variance with the notices published, placing foreign vessels on an equality with those of Great Britain in the trade between India and the United Kingdom, and on the strength of which equality concessions have been called for, and we believe obtained, from foreign Governments.

"We submit simply that we are entitled to full compensation for interference with our business, as far as that interference shall prove to be illegal and without force of law, and that some reasonable time shall also be given, as usual in such cases, for vessels that have come to this port for merchandise, relying upon the good faith and fair dealing of the British Government, to load and depart.

"We request, at the same time, that you will lay before the Legislative Council our respectful request to be heard in support of our claims by Counsel before the pending Bill becomes law.

"We have the honor to be, Sir, your most obedient servants.

(Signed) J. E. BARTOW.  
 " RICHARD LEWIS.  
 " JAM. H. ADAMS.  
 " WHITNEY AND CO.  
 " FOSTER, ROGERS, AND CO.  
 " AUGUSTIN WILLS AND CO.

(Signed) WHITNEY AND YOUNG.  
 " JNO. W. LIVKZEE.  
 " J. T. COOLKDG, JR.  
 " ATKINSON, TILTON, AND CO.  
 " A. H. RHOADES, JR.  
 " CHARLES FORRESTER."

MR. PEACOCK said, this communication was not strictly in conformity with the Standing Orders of the Council. It was a letter addressed to the Clerk of the Council, whereas it should have been a Petition addressed to the Council. Looking at the nature of the case, however, he thought it would be expedient to treat it as a Petition. He desired that every Member of the Council should have an opportunity of fully considering the objections which were urged in it; and it was not his intention, therefore, to press on the Bill at the present Meeting. There was one point, however, upon which he might make a remark. He alluded to the request of the gentlemen who had signed the letter to be heard by Counsel. The measure to which they objected was a proposed *public* Act; and it therefore appeared to him that, under the Standing Orders, this was not a case in which they ought to be heard by Counsel. Honorable Members were not called upon to discuss this question now; but he merely threw out this remark as his own opinion upon it.

MR. GRANT said, he was very anxious to receive the communication as a Petition; but the form in which it was framed was directly in contradiction to the rule laid down in one of the Standing Orders of the Council. Standing Order No. XXII said, "Every Petition shall be superscribed 'To the Honorable the Legislative Council.'" This was a communication addressed to the Clerk of the Council. If the rule were broken through, the Council might become a corresponding Council. The object was, that it should not be a corresponding Council—that it should not write letters, or receive any.

MR. PEACOCK said, he should not like to deal with a communication like this in a summary manner. He had rather that every Honorable Member should have an opportunity of attentively weighing the objections which were advanced in it. He was aware that the form of the communication was not in accordance with the Standing Orders; but he had no doubt that the gentlemen who had signed the communication, thought they were addressing a Petition to the Council. If its reception were postponed, in order that it might be altered into a Petition to the Council, there would be a delay of one week in the progress of a measure that was important.

SIR JAMES COLVILE said, he certainly concurred with his Honorable and learned Friend opposite (Mr. Peacock) in thinking that, under all the circumstances of the case, it would be very inexpedient to stand too strictly on the Standing Orders, and prevent the remonstrance sent up from being received at once by the Council. It was desirable that it should be received and considered as soon as possible, because delay would only postpone the consideration of the Bill. If it really was necessary, as a matter of regularity, to place upon record that the admission of this document was not to be a precedent for the admission of documents in the same form, that might be done by moving the suspension of the Standing Orders.

MR. PEACOCK observed that the Standing Orders had been already suspended in regard to the Bill to which the communication related.

After some conversation, the question was put that the Letter be treated as a Petition, and be printed for the consideration of the Council.

Agreed to.

MR. DORIN said he should take the liberty of mentioning that, by Standing Order No. LXVII,

"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 apprehended that the paper which had just been ordered to be printed was a communication of the nature contemplated by the first portion of this Standing Order. It was true that the Order directed that such communications should be laid by the Clerk before the Select Committee on the Bill; but in this case no Select Committee had been appointed; and therefore, he thought that the communication was receivable by the Council in the same manner as if a Select Committee had been appointed.

#### SMALL CAUSE COURTS.

THE CLERK reported that he had received from the Secretary to the Government of Bengal certain papers containing opinions on the Bill "for the more easy recovery of small debts and demands."

MR. CURRIE moved that the papers be printed.

Agreed to.

## REPORTS OF SELECT COMMITTEES.

MR. ALLEN presented the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill "to abolish the levy of Customs Duty on the Import of Cotton into the North-Western Provinces of the Presidency of Bengal."

Also the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill "to empower officers of the Customs and Revenue Departments to search manufactories and houses for Contraband Salt in the North-Western Provinces."

MR. PEACOCK presented the Report of the Select Committee on the Despatch received from the Honorable the Court of Directors on the Act relating to the office and duties of Administrator General.

## ARTICLES OF WAR FOR THE NATIVE ARMY.

MR. LEGEYT moved the first reading of a Bill "to amend the 122nd Article of War for the Native Army." He said, the object of this Bill was to remedy the defective state of the existing law as contained in Article 122 of Act XIX of 1847, which was commonly known as the Articles of War for the Native Army in India. The defect had been noticed in the Bombay Presidency by the Judge Advocate General of the Bombay Army, in the case of a camp-follower whose death had been attempted by strangulation. The parties accused were convicted of the crime; but it was found that the punishment which could be inflicted upon them was not that which Act XIX of 1847 provided for attempts at murder, but that the offence could be punished only as an assault. The matter was submitted by the Government of Bombay to the Government of India. The opinion of the Judge Advocate General of the Bengal Army coincided with that of the Judge Advocate General of the Bombay Army as to the propriety of remedying the defect in the law, and the papers were forwarded to this Council for consideration. He had now the honor to propose the first reading of a Bill which he thought would remedy the defect in the law. It was a very short one. It provided that Article 122 of Act XIX of 1847 should, in future, comprise all acts which caused any corporal injury to any person with the intent to commit murder; and it made every such offence liable to the same punishment that was assigned for attempts at murder by that Article as it now stood.

The Bill was read a first time.

## DESERTION OF EUROPEAN SOLDIERS.

MR. LEGEYT next moved the first reading of a Bill "for the better prevention of Desertion by European Soldiers from the land forces of Her Majesty and of the East India Company in India." In doing so, he said simultaneous representations had been made to the Government of India from the Government of Bombay and from the General Officer commanding at Pegu on the subject of providing more stringent measures than the existing law contained for the prevention of this offence; and these representations had been forwarded to the Legislative Council. Both the Government of Bombay and the General Officer commanding at Pegu, attributed the prevalence of the crime of desertion in those places to the facilities which were afforded by ships lying in ports adjacent to the local military stations. The Government of Bombay was of opinion that the provisions of Act III of 1855, which was passed for the prevention of desertion of seamen from the Indian Navy, if extended to desertion from the Army, would be a sufficient remedy. He had prepared a Bill which did so extend them. He had incorporated in it, with a few alterations, Sections III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX of Act III of 1855. The Council would recollect that Section III of that Act provided a penalty on Masters, in certain cases, if a deserter was found concealed on board his ship. The present law providing punishment for aiding in the desertion of soldiers from the Indian Army did not go nearly so far as that. It made it penal for any person to aid generally in the desertion of soldiers; but Section III of Act III of 1855 provided as follows:—

"If it shall appear that a deserter has been concealed on board any merchant vessel, and that the Master or person in charge of such vessel for the time being, though ignorant of the fact of such concealment, might have known of the same but for some neglect of his duty as such Master or person, or for the want of proper discipline on board his vessel, such Master or person shall be liable to a fine not exceeding five hundred rupees."

Section IV of the Act provided that any person who should be guilty of an offence under the Act, should be punishable by any Justice of the Peace, Magistrate, or Joint Magistrate, or person lawfully exercising the powers of a Magistrate, in any port within the territories of the East India Company, within whose jurisdiction the offence might have been committed, or the offender might have been apprehended, whether the offence

should have been committed within the local limits of the jurisdiction of such Officer or not; and it further provided that any person made punishable by the Act by a Justice of the Peace, should be punishable on summary conviction.

Section VII gave the Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Navy, or other person who should be in the performance of the duties of Superintendent of the Indian Navy, or his Deputy, or, in their absence, the senior Officer of the Indian Navy at any port or place within the territories of the East India Company, power to issue warrants for the apprehension of deserters from the Indian Navy, upon information given on oath or solemn affirmation. Following out that principle, Section V of the Bill which he moved gave the Commanding Officer of any Fort, garrison, station, regiment, or detachment at any port or place within the territories of the East India Company, power to issue warrants for the apprehension of European deserters from the Indian Army; and the following Section provided that such warrants might be addressed either to any European Officer or Soldier of the Queen's or Company's land forces or to Police Officers.

The Bill also provided that any deserter who might be taken under the 5th Section, should be brought forthwith before a Justice of the Peace, who should cause him to be delivered over to the Commanding Officer of his regiment, or to the nearest military authority.

With these observations, he begged to move the first reading of the Bill.

The Bill was read a first time.

#### BILLS OF LADING.

SIR JAMES COLVILLE moved the first reading of a Bill to amend the Law relating to Bills of Lading. In doing so, he said the Bill had merely for its object the introduction into this country of the provisions of a Statute which was passed by Parliament during the last Session. The objects of that Statute were two-fold. The Council was probably aware that, by the Law Merchant, although the delivery and endorsement of a Bill of Lading might operate to transfer the property in the goods, they could not operate to transfer the contract evidenced by the Bill of Lading, so as to give the transferee the rights of action which arise on a breach of that contract. It therefore frequently happened that the person who had

acquired the ownership of the goods, and consequently was solely interested in asserting the rights of action arising from any breach of the contract for the carriage of them, was unable to assert those rights in his own name, because he was not a party to the original contract; and could not assert them in the name of the original contractor, for want of a power of attorney. The Courts of Law had struggled a good deal against this inconvenience by endeavoring, whenever there was a color for doing so, to treat the consignee of the goods as having been a party to the original contract through the consignor, as his agent; but that had led to very nice considerations as to the time when the property in the goods passed to the consignee. This inconvenience was of frequent occurrence, and had been seriously felt in this country, from the distance at which the consignee found himself from the consignor, and from the fact that Masters of vessels continually move from port to port. The Bill provided that, in future, whenever the property in the goods passed by delivery and indorsement of the Bill of Lading, the rights of action should pass also—just as they would on the negotiation of a Bill of Exchange.

The second object of the Bill was, to define somewhat more clearly the effect of a Bill of Lading granted by a Master in respect of goods not actually laden on board his vessel, and the liability to which such an act subjected him.

His Bill followed the Act of Parliament nearly word for word. He had so framed it because it was desirable that the Commercial Law of India should be made as uniform as possible with the Commercial Law of England.

The Bill was read a first time.

#### BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES.

SIR JAMES COLVILLE postponed the motion (of which he had given notice for this day) for the first reading of a Bill to facilitate the remedies on Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes by the prevention of fictitious or frivolous defences to actions thereon.

#### EMBANKMENTS (BENGAL).

Mr. CURRIE moved the third reading of the Bill "relating to Embankments." Motion carried, and Bill read a third time accordingly.

## EXPORT OF SALTPETRE.

On the Order of the Day being read for the Council to go into Committee on the Bill "to prohibit the exportation of saltpetre, except in British vessels bound to the ports of London or Liverpool"—

MR. PEACOCK said, he would postpone the consideration of the Bill, in order that all the Members of the Council might have an opportunity of fully considering the letter which had been read.

## ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENTS.

MR. LEGEYNT moved that the Council should resolve itself into a Committee upon the Bill "to amend Act No. XXXIII of 1852."

The Bill passed through Committee without amendment.

The Council having resumed its sitting, the Bill was reported.

## PORTS AND PORT-DUES ACT.

MR. ELIOTT asked, according to notice, whether any communication had been made by the Supreme to the local Governments on the subject of Act XXII of 1855 "for the regulation of Ports and Port-dues."

MR. GRANT said, he had ascertained from the Home Office that a letter relative to the Bill had been written to the several local Governments, and to the Commissioners of the Eastern Provinces. He had been furnished with a copy of the letter, which was the only one that had been written on the subject; and he found that it did not call attention to the particular point to which the honorable Member's question referred. The letter written was as follows:—

"4th October, 1855.

"SIR,—I am directed by the Honorable the President in Council to call the attention of the Madras Government to the provisions of Act XXII of 1855 for the 'regulation of ports and port-dues;' and, with reference to Sections III, IV, and VII, to request that, under the orders of the (Madras) Government, you will report the places to which the law is proposed to be made applicable, and forward a copy of the port rules which the Government of (Madras) would recommend for adoption."

MR. ELIOTT said, it appeared to him to be necessary to obtain as early as possible the information required for the framing of the supplemental Act contemplated by Section XLI of Act XXII of 1855; and he should therefore move that the Clerk of the Council

be directed to address a letter to the Secretary to the Government of India in the Home Department, requesting that the several local Governments may be called upon to furnish the information requisite to enable the Legislative Council to pass an Act for the regulation of port-dues and fees after the expiration of the period of one year, during which the collection of the present dues and fees is authorized by Section XLI Act XXII of 1855.

MR. PEACOCK said, he would suggest to the Honorable Member whether the wording of his Motion would be sufficient to show the precise nature of the information which the Council desired the local Governments to submit—whether the Council itself ought not to specify the data which it required; such, for instance, as the average annual expenses of each port for the last three years, its average collections, and the average amount of tonnage that resorted to it. Without some such specification, the local Governments might not know exactly what the information was that the Council wished for. He thought that the Motion should be so worded as to enable each Member of the Council to specify the particular points upon which he required information, so that he might be in a position to form his own judgment as to whether the scale of dues recommended for each port was a proper one or not, and to determine what the rate ought to be. He now heard the Honorable Member's Motion for the first time; otherwise he would have suggested this amendment to him before. But if the Honorable Member would postpone his Motion until next Saturday, they could probably determine in the mean time what information would be required, and the Honorable Member might frame his Motion accordingly.

Upon the suggestion of Mr. Peacock, Mr. Elliott asked leave to withdraw his Motion, in order that he might prepare another specifying the information required, which he would submit at the next Meeting of Council.

## LIMITATION OF SUITS.

MR. LEGEYNT moved that a communication received by him from the Secretary to the Government of Bombay, relative to the Bill "to provide for the acquirement and extinction of rights by prescription, and for the limitation of suits," be laid upon the table and referred to the Select Committee on the Bill.

Agreed to.

## EMBANKMENTS.

Mr. CURRIE moved that Mr. Grant be requested to carry the Bill "relating to Embankments" to the President in Council, in order that it may be submitted to the Most Noble the Governor General for his assent. Agreed to.

## NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr. LEGEYT gave notice that he would, on Saturday the 1st of December, move that the Bill "to explain and amend Act No. XXXIII of 1852" be read a third time and passed.

Mr. CURRIE gave notice that he would on the same day move the second reading of the Bill "to amend the law relating to the sale of under-tenures."

Sir JAMES COLVILLE gave notice that he would on the same day move the second reading of the Bill "to amend the law relating to Bills of Lading."

The Council adjourned.

Saturday, December 1, 1855.

## PRESENT :

The Most Noble the Governor General, *President*.

Hon. J. A. Dorin,	D. Elliott, Esq.,
Hon. Major-Genl. J. Low,	C. Allen, Esq.,
Hon. J. P. Grant,	P. W. LeGeyt, Esq.,
Hon. B. Peacock,	and
Hon. Sir J. W. Colville,	E. Currie, Esq.

The following Messages from the Most Noble the Governor General were brought by Mr. PEACOCK, and read :—

## MESSAGE No. 57.

The Governor General informs the Legislative Council that he has given his assent to the Bill passed by them on the 13th of October 1855, entitled "A Bill relating to the Emigration of Native Laborers to the British Colonies of Saint Lucia and Grenada."

By Order of the Most Noble the Governor General.

G. F. EDMONSTONE,  
*Secy. to the Govt. of India,*  
*with the Governor General.*

MADRAS,  
The 14th November, 1855. }

## MESSAGE No. 58.

The Governor General informs the Legislative Council that he has given his assent to the Bill passed by them on the 24th of November 1855, entitled "A Bill relating to Embankments."

By Order of the Most Noble the Governor General.

J. W. DALRYMPLE,

*Offg. Secy. to the Govt. of India.*

FORT WILLIAM,  
The 30th November, 1855. }

## LIGHTING OF THE TOWN OF CALCUTTA.

THE CLERK presented a Petition signed by the Secretary of the Mahomedan Association against the Bill "to provide for the better Lighting of the Town of Calcutta."

Mr. CURRIE moved that the Petition be printed, and referred to the Select Committee on the Bill.

Agreed to.

## OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS.

Mr. ALLEN presented the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill "to prevent the public sale or exposure of obscene books and pictures."

## SALE OF UNDER-TENURES (BENGAL.)

Mr. CURRIE moved the second reading of the Bill "to amend the law relating to the Sale of Under-Tenures."

The motion was carried, and the Bill read a second time accordingly.

## BILLS OF LADING.

Sir JAMES COLVILLE moved the second reading of the Bill "to amend the law relating to Bills of Lading."

The motion was carried, and the Bill read a second time accordingly.

Sir JAMES COLVILLE moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Mr. Dorin, Mr. Allen, and the Mover.

Agreed to.

## ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENTS.

Mr. LEGEYT moved the third reading of the Bill "to explain and amend Act No. XXXIII of 1852."