PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF INDIA,

FROM

January to December 1857.

VOL. III.

Published by the Authority of the Council.

CALCUTTA:
PRINTED BY J. THOMAS, BAPTIST MISSION PRESS.
1857.

at Bombay concerning a proposed Bill relating to the Municipal Assessment of Bombay be laid upon the table and printed.

Agreed to.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS.

MR. PEACOCK gave notice that he would, on Saturday next, move the second reading of the Civil Procedure Bills which were read a first time this day.

Also the first reading of Bills for simplifying Criminal Procedure in Bengal, Madras, Bombay, and the North Western Provinces.

The Council adjourned.

Saturday, January 24, 1857.

PRESENT:

The Honorable J. A. Dorin, *Vice-President*, in the Chair.

Hon. the Chief Justice,	D. Eliott, Esq.,
Hon. Major General J. Low,	C. Allen, Esq.,
	P. W. LeGeyt, Esq.,
Hon. J. P. Grant,	E. Currie, Esq., and
Hon. B. Peacock,	Hon. Sir A. W. Buller.

CIVIL REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS.

THE CLERK presented to the Council a Petition of Inhabitants of Bangalore stating that, by reason of their creed, they are precluded from recording the births of their children in the Ecclesiastical Registers in this country, and praying for the passing of an Act for the Civil registry of births.

HINDOO POLYGAMY.

Also the following Petitions praying for the abolition of Hindoo Polygamy:—

A Petition of Hindoo Inhabitants of Bengal.

Three Petitions of Hindoo Inhabitants of Hooghly.

MR. GRANT moved that the above Petitions be printed.

Agreed to.

POLICE AND CONSERVANCY (SUBURBS OF CALCUTTA AND HOWRAH.)

MR. CURRIE presented the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill "to make better provision for the order and good government of the Suburbs of Calcutta and of the Station of Howrah."

IMPRESSMENT OF CARTS (BENGAL.)

MR. GRANT postponed the motion (of which he had given notice for this day) for the first reading of a Bill to amend the law for the impressment of Carts for the use of Troops marching.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (BENGAL.)

MR. PEACOCK moved the first reading of a Bill "for extending the jurisdiction of the Courts of Criminal Judicature of the East India Company in Bengal, for simplifying the Procedure thereof, and for investing other Courts with Criminal jurisdiction." In doing so, he said that he had prepared the Bill on the same principle as the Bill for simplifying the Civil Procedure of India—namely, by reserving, for the present, the question of the amalgamation of the Supreme and Sudder Courts, and leaving the Sudder Courts to exercise the same Criminal jurisdiction as they did at present. Accordingly, he had proceeded with this Code as it had been prepared by the Commissioners.

The Code provided four classes of Courts—Courts of Session; Courts of the Magistrates; Subordinate Criminal Courts of the 1st Class; and Subordinate Criminal Courts of the 2nd Class. First Assistants to Magistrates and Principal Sudder Ameens were to form the Subordinate Criminal Courts of the 1st Class; and Second Assistants to Magistrates, and Moonsiffs, were to form the Subordinate Criminal Courts of the 2nd Class. The Courts of Session were to exercise original jurisdiction in respect of all offences punishable under the Penal Code, provided that, in any case in which the accused was convicted of an offence which was punishable with death, they should not pass sentence of death, but should refer the case to the Sudder Court. The Courts of Session were also to exercise exclusive jurisdiction in certain specified cases.

Magistrates would be empowered to try all offences not assigned to the ex-

clusive jurisdiction of the Session Courts, and to pass sentence of imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, or of fine not exceeding Rs. 1,000, or, subject to that limitation, of fine together with imprisonment where both punishments were authorized by the Penal Code. The Subordinate Courts of the 1st and 2nd classes would have jurisdiction over the offences specified in a Schedule of the Code as triable by them respectively. Those of the 1st class would be empowered to pass sentence of imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year, or of fine not exceeding Rs. 200, or of both where both punishments could be imposed under the Penal Code; and those of the 2nd class would be empowered to pass sentence of imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, or of fine not exceeding Rs. 50, or of both.

There was an Article in the Code which involved a question of considerable importance, and would, no doubt, give rise to much conflict of opinion and become the subject of future discussion. He alluded to Article 8 of Chapter I, which provided as follows:—

"No person whatever shall, by reason of place of birth, or by reason of descent, be in any criminal proceeding whatever excepted from the jurisdiction of any of the Criminal Courts."

This Article would invest the Courts of the country with jurisdiction over European British subjects. To him, it appeared to be correct in principle; for he could not understand upon what ground it could be contended that any one class of persons should be exempt from the jurisdiction of those Courts. No Frenchman, or German, or American, or Armenian, or East Indian, was exempt from their jurisdiction. European British subjects alone enjoyed that privilege; and the Council was aware that there were many cases in which, on account of the extreme inconvenience, expense, and delay which must necessarily be caused by committing defendants for trial to the Supreme Courts for offences committed in distant parts of the country, offenders were frequently allowed to go unpunished. The inconvenience was not confined to prosecutors. It extended also to witnesses, who were, frequently, in no way interested in the proceedings. The Article to which he referred would bring an offender, whatever his place of birth or whatever his descent, under the jurisdiction of the Court within the local limits of which his offence might be committed.

There was an Article in the Code which exempted proceedings in any Criminal Court from Stamp Duties. When moving the first reading of the Bill for simplifying Civil Procedure, he had stated that the Government of India had, after mature deliberation, come to the conclusion that financial considerations rendered it impossible to give up the large amount of revenue derived from Stamp or Judicial proceedings; and he had struck out from the present Bill the Article relating to the same subject.

Chapter II provided for obtaining a summons or warrant.

Chapter III provided the form of a warrant, and the mode of its execution.

Chapter IV provided for arrests without warrant. It was not necessary to enter into the details of the provisions upon this head. It would be sufficient to say that, by Article 58, a Police officer or other person who saw any offence committed for which a warrant might issue upon complaint, might, without warrant, arrest the offender.

Chapter V dealt with cases of escape and retaking.

Chapter VI related to the issue of Search Warrants.

Chapter VII provided for preliminary enquiries by the Police. It was unnecessary to enter into the details contained in this Chapter, except to refer to Article 90. That article involved a question which would, no doubt, form a subject for future discussion. He thought that no Member of the Council, by supporting the Motion for the first and second reading of the Bill, would be bound to support each Article in the Code. The Code had been prepared with great care, and, in his judgment, would very much simplify the procedure of the Courts of Criminal Judicature. But there were certain Articles which might give rise to difference of opinion. He had thought it right to insert them as framed by Her Majesty's Commissioners, and to leave every Honorable Member to adopt any amend-

ments which it might appear expedient to make after considering the communications which the publication of the Code might elicit, and the Report of the Select Committee to whom the Code would be referred.

Article 91 provided that—

"It shall not be competent to a Darogah or other Police Officer to examine a person accused of a criminal offence, or to reduce into writing any admission or confession of guilt which he may propose to make."

This provision had no doubt been introduced to prevent the practice of torture.

Article 57, which dealt with the same subject, said—

"No officer or other person, after the arrest of any suspected person, is to offer to him any inducement, by threat or promise or otherwise, to make any disclosure, but shall, when necessary, apprize him of the cause of arrest, and leave him free to speak or keep silence: and no such officer or other person shall, after such arrest, prevent the person arrested, by any caution or otherwise, from making any disclosure which he may be disposed to make of his own free will."

So that, although a Police Officer was to hold out no inducement to a prisoner to make a disclosure, he was to leave him free to speak or keep silence, and not to prevent him from making a voluntary disclosure. In reading this Article, he had asked himself what its object was?—with what object a prisoner was to be permitted to make a voluntary disclosure? Was it that the disclosure might operate as a clue to further discovery? Or was it that it might be used as evidence against the prisoner? If it was to be used as evidence against the prisoner, it appeared to him that it would be much better to allow it to be reduced into writing than to be left to the memory of the Police Officer. When he came to a subsequent part of the Code, he found that a voluntary confession by a prisoner might be used as evidence against himself. That being the case, he could not see the necessity of preventing Police Officers from writing down disclosures made by prisoners of their own free will. On the contrary, he thought it would be far more satisfactory that Police Officers should be required to take down such disclosures in writing, because the writing would be some check against perjury, and would at least prevent Police Officers from adapting their evidence as to statements alleged to be made by prisoners to circumstances which might afterwards transpire. In Article 130, he found it provided that—

"It shall not be competent to the Magistrate to receive in evidence against the Defendant any written admission or confession of guilt, or any statement made by him to the Darogah, or other Officer of Police, and by him reduced into writing."

So that an admission or confession of guilt, or any other statement made by a prisoner, if reduced into writing by a Police Officer, could not be received. Then, Article 131 provided that—

"Nothing contained in the last preceding Article shall prevent the Magistrate from receiving the evidence of a Police Officer as to any unrecorded admission or confession of guilt, or other statement made to him by the Defendant."

With such a provision, it appeared to him that the Code would not be at all calculated to prevent torture or perjury. If evidence given by Police Officers as to unrecorded admissions or confessions were to be received, the fact of not allowing them to write down admissions or confessions would not in any degree restrain them from inflicting torture for the purpose of obtaining a confession, or from committing perjury for the purpose of proving one. Therefore, although he had not altered the provisions on this subject, but had left them to be considered and dealt with by the Council hereafter, he thought it right to state that his own opinion was that disclosures made by prisoners ought either to be taken down in writing, or not to be used as evidence against the Defendant at all. His impression was, that the statement ought not to be used as evidence against the prisoner, until greater reliance could be placed upon the Police of the country. He was well aware that such a provision would cause the rejection of a class of evidence most valuable when reliance could be placed upon the witnesses.

Another Article upon which he had no doubt some difference of opinion would

arise, was that which provided that no oath, affirmation, or warning should be administered to witnesses. That Article also involved a very important question; and he had retained it in the Code, as he had retained a similar Article in regard to Civil cases in the Code of Civil Procedure, for future consideration and discussion by the Council.

Chapter VIII provided for Contempts and disobedience of orders.

Chapter IX enabled the Advocate General to file criminal informations in Courts in the Mofussil in the same way as he was now authorized to do in the Supreme Court.

Chapter X provided for Prosecutions in certain cases, which it was unnecessary to detail.

Chapter XI provided the mode in which Magistrates should conduct preliminary enquiries in cases triable by the Sudder Court or the Courts of Session, and empowered them to tender conditional pardon to criminals; to admit Defendants to bail in certain cases; and to liberate Defendants where there should appear no sufficient grounds for putting them on their trial on a formal charge, or of remanding them.

Chapter XII provided the forms in which Magistrates should frame charges in cases which they sent up to the Sudder Court or the Courts of Session for trial. It might probably be considered hereafter that these forms were rather too general and indefinite. They did not state either the time or place at which the offence was charged to have been committed. It was possible that the Law Commissioners had thought that copies of the depositions which were to be made before the Magistrates would be furnished to the Defendant, and that these would be sufficient to supply him with all the information required; but it appeared to him (Mr. Peacock) that it would be far better to specify in the charge that the offence was committed on or about such a day and at or near to such a place, especially when he found in a subsequent part of the Code that the Court would be allowed to make any amendment in the charge which might serve the ends of Justice, and either postpone the trial of the case, or proceed with it at once.

Chapter XIII provided for the trial by Magistrates of offences within their jurisdiction which were punishable, under the Penal Code, with imprisonment for a period exceeding six months.

Chapter XIV provided the procedure in those classes of cases in which Magistrates had jurisdiction to commit summarily.

Chapter XV provided for inquiries and trials before the Subordinate Courts of Criminal Judicature.

Chapter XVI consisted of a single, but a very important Article. It provided that the Courts in which preliminary investigations and trials were held by Magistrates or Judges of the Subordinate Courts should be open Courts, to which the Public generally might have access; but that the Magistrates or Judges of Subordinate Courts might refuse admission to persons during a preliminary investigation of any particular case to be subsequently tried by the Sudder Court or the Courts of Session if it should appear to them that the ends of justice would be best answered by so doing. This discretion it was very proper to allow, in order that information might not get abroad which might enable persons to avoid apprehension or otherwise defeat the ends of justice.

Chapter XVII was a very important one. It got rid of the necessity of passing what was called the Mochulka Act. It enabled the Courts to require

> "a person charged with rioting, assault, or other violent breach of the peace, or with abetting the same, or with assembling armed men, or taking other unlawful measures with the evident intention of committing the same,"

to enter into personal recognizance to keep the peace, and also, if necessary, to find sureties. This might be done either after conviction of the offence, or even before conviction where such a course might appear to be necessary for the maintenance of peace. In cases where it might appear necessary to require sureties in addition to the personal recognizance, Judges of the Session Courts might, for default, direct the Defendants to be kept in custody for any term not exceeding three years, and Magistrates for any term not exceeding one year. If it should appear to a Magistrate that the period for which the party should be bound to keep the peace ought to exceed one year, he must

record his opinion to that effect, and refer the case to the Court of Session.

Chapter XVIII provided for taking security for good behaviour. Magistrates would be authorized to require security for good behaviour whenever it should appear to them, from evidence as to general character, that a person was, by repute, a robber, house-breaker, or thief, or a receiver of stolen property knowing it to have been stolen. If it should appear to the Magistrate that a Defendant was of a character so desperate and dangerous that his release, without security, at the expiration of the limited period of one year, would be hazardous to the community, the Magistrate must record his opinion to that effect, with an order specifying the amount of security to be given, the number of sureties, and the period, not exceeding three years, during which the sureties should be responsible. If the Defendant should fail to furnish the security required, the proceedings were to be laid before the Court of Session.

The Chapter then provided the means of compelling Defendants to give security, namely, imprisonment for a period not exceeding that for which the security might be required; and it further provided for the discharge of sureties after they should have surrendered the persons for whom they had become responsible.

Chapter XIX provided for Trials by Juries and Assessors. That was a Chapter which would probably require some amendment. He had omitted from it two Articles inserted by the Commissioners—Article 257, which provided that Grand Juries should be abolished; and Article 258, which provided that the trial of all offences within the limits of the Town of Calcutta, except offences punishable upon summary conviction, should be by Jury. The necessity for these Sections depended on the reserved question of amalgamation.

Article 259 provided that—

"The provisions of the preceding Article may be extended by the Governor General in Council to such places beyond the limits of the town of Calcutta as he may see fit."

He had altered that Article so as to give it the same sense which it bore when the preceding Article stood in the Code.

Article 260 provided as follows:—

"Criminal trials before the Session Judge, in which a British subject, or a European, or an American, or an East Indian, or an Armenian, or a person of any other class to which the Governor-General in Council may see fit to extend this rule, registered according to such rules as the Governor-General in Council shall prescribe, is the Defendant, or one of the Defendants, shall be by Jury, of which at least one-half shall consist, if such Defendant desire it, of persons so registered."

He thought that this was an Article which might require some alteration. It appeared to him that much difficulty would arise if it were retained. If one-half of a Jury were to consist of registered persons, how was the Government to obtain the names of persons for registration; where was the Registry to be kept; and how was the system to be worked? It appeared to be that the Code did not sufficiently provide for these objects, and he thought that an attempt to carry out the proposed plan in this country would be attended with some difficulty. He had deemed it advisable, however, to leave the Article as it stood, in order that it might undergo consideration by the Council in Committee.

Article 265 enacted as follows:—

"For all classes of the community not included in the number of those to whom the mode of trial by Jury has, by the above provisions, been extended, trials before the Session Judge shall be conducted with the aid of two or more assessors as members of the Court, with a view to the advantages derivable from their observations, particularly in the examination of witnesses."

He thought that this was hardly right. It made too great a distinction between trials by Jurors and trials by Assessors. It appeared to him that if one class of the community was to be entitled to trial by Jury, it should at least be left optional with all other classes of the community to claim trial by a similar tribunal.

Chapters XX and XXI he had omitted, because they would not be adapted to the state of things unless the Supreme and Sudder Courts were amalgamated.

Chapter XXII provided for trials before the Courts of Session.

Chapter XXIII provided the procedure of the Sudder Court as a Court of

Reference; and Chapter XXIV for Finding, Judgment, and Sentence.

Chapter XXV related to the procedure of the Sudder Court as a Court of Revision.

Chapter XXVI provided for appeals.

By Article 331, there would be no appeal from a Judgment of acquittal passed by any Criminal Court.

By Article 332, an appeal would lie

"in all cases of conviction by the Magistrates in the Mofussil, and by the Judges of the subordinate Criminal Courts, to the Session Judge; and in all cases of conviction by the Session Judges in the exercise of original jurisdiction, to the Sudder Court."

By Article 336, an appeal would also lie

"from all orders in proceedings other than Criminal trials, passed by the Magistrates in the Mofussil and by the Judges of the subordinate Criminal Courts, to the Session Court."

By Article 337,

"The petition of appeal from a sentence of the Session Judge must be presented within ninety days immediately following, and exclusive of the day on which sentence was passed; and from the sentence or order of any other Court, within thirty days, calculated in the same manner."

It appeared to him that the right given by these Articles might have the effect of overwhelming the Courts of Session with appeals. As he understood the Articles, appeals would lie from every decision of a Magistrate or a Judge of a Subordinate Court. But it appeared to him that it was doubtful whether an appeal should be allowed in every case. The amount of fine might be so small, or the period of imprisonment so short that it might expire before the appeal could possibly be granted. Article 340, however, provided—

"It shall be at all times lawful for a Session Judge, and for a Magistrate, or other officer exercising the powers of a Magistrate, to call for and examine the records of any Court immediately subordinate to their respective Courts for the purpose of satisfying themselves as to the regularity of the proceedings of such subordinate Courts; but it shall not be lawful for any other Court than the Sudder Court to alter any sentence of any subordinate Court except upon appeal by parties concerned duly made according to the foregoing provisions."

That was a very important provision; and probably it might be found that, with some alterations, it might obviate the necessity of giving an appeal in every case.

The Code concluded with a Schedule relating to the offences made punishable under the Penal Code, stating whether particular offences were bailable or not, by what Court they were triable, what amount of punishment might be inflicted in each case, and when the punishment should be cumulative. This would be of great assistance to those who would have to administer the Penal Code and the proposed system of Criminal Procedure.

Upon the whole, it appeared to him that this Code, with some modifications, would be of great benefit to the country, and would very much simplify the procedure of the Criminal Courts.

With these observations he moved the first reading of the Bill which applied to the Lower Provinces of the East India Company in Bengal.

The Bill was read a first time.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (NORTH WESTERN PROVINCES.)

MR. PEACOCK moved the first reading of a Bill "for extending the jurisdiction of the Courts of Criminal Judicature of the East India Company in the North Western Provinces, for simplifying the Procedure thereof, and for investing other Courts with Criminal jurisdiction." He said, it was unnecessary for him to make any observations in regard to this Bill. It was the same in substance as the Bill relating to the Lower Provinces. He might mention that the reason which had induced him to frame four separate Bills with regard to Civil Procedure had induced him to adopt the same course with regard to Criminal Procedure. The four Bills might hereafter, by an amendment in any one of them, be consolidated if that arrangement should be considered desirable. If, on the other hand, it should appear that the circumstances of any particular Presidency required alterations to be introduced in the Bill applicable to that Presidency, the four Bills might stand with the necessary alterations.

The Bill was read a first time.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (MADRAS.)

MR. PEACOCK moved the first reading of a Bill "for extending the jurisdiction of the Courts of Criminal Judicature of the East India Company in Madras, for simplifying the Procedure thereof, and for investing other Courts with Criminal jurisdiction."

The Bill was read a first time.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (BOMBAY.)

MR. PEACOCK moved the first reading of a Bill "for extending the jurisdiction of the Courts of Criminal Judicature of the East India Company in Bombay, for simplifying the Procedure thereof, and for investing other Courts with Criminal jurisdiction."

The Bill was read a first time.

CIVIL PROCEDURE.

MR. PEACOCK postponed the Motion (which stood in the Orders of the Day) for the second reading of the Bill "for simplifying the Procedure of the Courts of Civil Judicature of the East India Company in Bengal," and also in respect of the Bills for the North-Western Provinces, Madras, and Bombay. He said, at the last Meeting of the Council he had given notice that he would move for the second reading of these Bills on this occasion, because he was anxious that no unnecessary delay should take place between the first and second readings; but he was afraid he had fixed too early a day, since it had been found impossible to print and circulate the Code during the week. Although the Standing Orders did not actually require that a Bill should be printed and circulated amongst the Members of the Council before the Motion for the second reading, he certainly did think that it was intended that that should be done as a general rule, in order that Members might have an opportunity of considering the measure before they gave their assent to its principle. Had the present been an ordinary case, he should not have thought it necessary to give notice of motion for the 2nd reading on so early a date; but he had been under the impression that the Blue Books containing the Codes of Procedure had been in the hands of every Member, and he thought that the alterations which he had made in the Code, none of which was of a substantial nature, might be in writing. He found, however, that every Member had not a copy of all the Codes, and, if any Member of the Council desired it, he would postpone his Motion for the second reading of all the Bills relating to Civil Procedure. A delay of one or two weeks would not be of very great consequence. If the Bills should be printed and circulated sufficiently early next week, he should give notice at the ensuing Meeting for the second reading that day week: if not, he should defer his Motion until that day fortnight.

CATTLE TRESPASS.

MR. CURRIE moved that the Bill "relating to Trespasses by Cattle" be read a third time and passed.

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

BOMBAY TOBACCO DUTIES.

MR. LEGEYT moved that the Council resolve itself into a Committee on the Bill "to amend the Law relating to the duties payable on Tobacco, and the retail sale and warehousing thereof in the Town of Bombay;" and that the Committee be instructed to consider it in the amended form in which the Select Committee had recommended it to be passed.

Agreed to.

Sections I to III were passed as they stood.

Section IV was passed after an amendment.

Sections V and VI were passed as they stood.

Sections VII, VIII, and IX were passed after amendments.

Section X was passed as it stood.

Sections XI and XII were passed after amendments.

Section XIII was passed as it stood.

Section XIV provided that every retail dealer in Tobacco should on or before the 10th of every month make to the Revenue Commissioner or other licensing officer a separate return, for each shop, of the quantity of Tobacco which he had on hand at the beginning of the preceding month; the quantity received during such month, and the persons from

whom, and the dates on which he received it; and the stock remaining at the close of such month.

After some verbal amendments, introduced on the motion of Mr. LeGeyt—

Mr. ALLEN said, it appeared to him that this would be a very vexatious provision. Section XV required that retail-dealers should make entries of the same particulars in their books, and that these books should be open to the inspection of the Revenue officers. That ought to be quite sufficient for the protection of the revenue, without further providing that retail-dealers should make monthly returns, which, after all, could never be looked at. He should, therefore, move that Section XIV be left out.

The question being put, the Council divided :—

AYES—5.	NOES—4.
Sir Arthur Buller,	Mr. Currie,
Mr. LeGeyt,	Mr. Allen,
Mr. Peacock,	Mr. Eliott,
The Chief Justice,	General Low.
The Chairman.	

Section XV was passed as it stood.

The remaining Sections of the Bill were passed after amendments.

The Schedule, Preamble, and Title were passed as they stood.

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

MESSENGER.

MR. CURRIE moved that Mr. Peacock be requested to take the Bill "relating to trespasses by Cattle" to the Governor General for his assent.

Agreed to.

CIVIL REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS.

MR. ELIOTT moved that the Petition of Inhabitants of Bangalore (presented to the Council this day) be printed.

Agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

MR. LEGEYT gave notice that he would, on Saturday the 31st Instant, move the third reading of the Bill "to amend the law relating to the duties payable on Tobacco, and the retail sale and warehousing thereof in the Town of Bombay."

The Council adjourned.

Saturday, January 31, 1857.

PRESENT :

The Honorable J. A. Dorin, *Vice-President*, in the Chair.

Hon. Major General J. Low,	C. Allen, Esq.,
Hon. J. P. Grant,	P. W. LeGeyt, Esq.,
Hon. B. Peacock,	E. Currie, Esq.,
D. Eliott, Esq.,	and Hon. Sir A.W. Buller.

The following Message from the Governor General was brought by Mr. Peacock and read.

MESSAGE No. 94.

The Governor General informs the Legislative Council that he has given his assent to the Bill which was passed by them on the 10th January, 1857, entitled "A Bill to prevent the overcrowding of Vessels carrying Native Passengers in the Bay of Bengal."

By Order of the Right Honorable the Governor General.

R. B. CHAPMAN,
Offg. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

FORT WILLIAM,
The 17*th Jan.* 1857.

The following Message from the Governor General was brought by Mr. Grant and read.

MESSAGE No. 95.

The Governor General informs the Legislative Council that he has given his assent to the Bill which was passed by them on the 17th January, 1857, entitled "A Bill to establish and incorporate an University at Calcutta."

By Order of the Right Honorable the Governor General.

CECIL BEADON,
Secy. to the Government of India.

FORT WILLIAM,
The 24*th Jan.* 1857.

POLICE AND CONSERVANCY (SUBURBS OF CALCUTTA AND HOWRAH).

THE CLERK presented a Petition from the British Indian Association containing certain suggestions and remarks relating to the Bill "to make better provision for the order and good government of the Suburbs of Calcutta and of the Station of Howrah."