THE

COUNCIL OF STATE DEBATES

VOLUME I, 1927

(8th February 1927 to 29th March 1927)

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

SECOND COUNCIL OF STATE, 1927

CALCUTTA : GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
CENTRAL PUBLICATION BRANCH
1927

CONTENTS.

Pages.

COUNCIL OF STATE.

Tuesday, 22nd February, 1927.

The Council met in the Council Chamber of the Council House at Twelve of the Clock, the Honourable the President in the Chair.

MEMBER SWORN:

The Honourable Major-General Thomas Henry Symons, C.S.I., O.B.E., K.H.S., I.M.S. (Director-General, Indian Medical Service).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

PROVISION OF AN OVERBRIDGE AND WAITING-SHED FOR INTERMEDIATE AND THIRD CLASS PASSENGERS AT JAMMOOEE STATION ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

92. THE HONOURABLE SHAH MUHAMMAD ZUBAIR: Will the Government be pleased to state whether the railway authorities are taking steps to provide an overbridge and also to construct a suitable waiting-shed for intermediate and third class passengers at the Jammooee station on the East Indian Railway?

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. L. CORBETT: The policy of the Government is to leave to the discretion of the Railway Administrations such matters as the provision of overbridges and waiting-shed accommodation where the traffic offering justifies their provision. The question therefore is one which should be referred to the Agent of the Railway concerned through the Local Advisory Committee.

PROVISION OF A RAISED PLATFORM AT PURAB SARAI STATION ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

93. THE HONOURABLE SHAH MUHAMMAD ZUBAIR: (*a*) Will the Government be pleased to state the number of daily passengers travelling to and from the Purabsarai (East Indian Railway) station?

(*b*) Is it a fact that the said Purabsarai railway station has not yet been provided with a raised platform?

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. L. CORBETT: (*a*) and (*b*). Government have no information on the subject.

Questions of this nature are more suitable for discussion at Railway Local Advisory Committee meetings, but a copy of the question and answer will be sent to the Agent, East Indian Railway.

EXPENDITURE ON THE PUBLICATION OF NOTICES AND ADVERTISEMENTS RELATING TO STATE RAILWAYS.

94. THE HONOURABLE SHAH MUHAMMAD ZUBAIR: (*a*) Will the Government be pleased to state the actual amount spent during the year 1926-27 on publication of notices and advertisements of all State Railways in India?

(*b*) Will the Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that all such notices and advertisements, relating to State Railways, are published only in English newspapers and not in any of the provincial vernacular newspapers?

(*c*) If the answer to question (*b*) be in the negative, will the Government be pleased to state the names of such provincial vernacular newspapers?

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. L. CORBETT: (*a*) to (*c*). The information is not available. This is a matter usually left to Agents who are in a better position than Government to decide which papers to use so as to reach the widest public and thus obtain the best results from the money spent on advertising.

DIFFERENT RATES ON STATE RAILWAYS FOR *KHADAR* AND FOREIGN CLOTH.

95. THE HONOURABLE SHAH MUHAMMAD ZUBAIR: (*a*) Will the Government be pleased to state if the Indian State Railways have different rates of freights for *Khadar* or country-made cloth and foreign-made cloth?

(*b*) If the answer to the above question be in the affirmative, will the Government be pleased to state the reason or reasons for such distinction?

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. L. CORBETT: (*a*) The answer is in the negative.

(*b*) Does not arise.

DIFFERENCES IN DESIGNATIONS, PAY AND PROSPECTS OF CHARGEHANDS AND CHARGEMEN IN THE JAMALPUR WORKSHOPS.

96. THE HONOURABLE SHAH MUHAMMAD ZUBAIR: (*a*) Will the Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that a first grade Indian apprentice of the mechanical department when employed in the Jamalpur State Railway workshops, after completing his full 5 years' term of apprenticeship, is designated as a "Chargehand", and that a European or Anglo-Indian, having undergone the same course of theoretical and practical training, is designated as a "Chargeman"?

(*b*) Will the Government be pleased to state if there is any difference in the pay and prospects of a " Chargehand " and a " Chargeman "?

(*c*) If the answer to (*b*) be in the affirmative, will the Government be pleased to state the reason or reasons, if any, for such differences in their designations, pay and prospects?

TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT OF INDIAN, EUROPEAN AND ANGLO-INDIAN APPRENTICES OF THE RAILWAY WORKSHOPS AT JAMALPUR ON COMPLETION OF THEIR APPRENTICESHIP.

97. THE HONOURABLE SHAH MUHAMMAD ZUBAIR: Will the Government be pleased to state the number and names of those Indian

and European or Anglo-Indian apprentices, who have completed their terms of apprenticeship from the said Jamalpur workshops in the year 1926 and have since been employed in the said workshops, with designation and initial pay of each of them?

LEAVE ON FULL PAY OF CHARGEHANDS AND CHARGEMEN ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

98. THE HONOURABLE SHAH MUHAMMAD ZUBAIR: (*a*) Will the Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the Indian "Chargehands" are entitled to full pay for only 13 days out of about 42 days gazetted holidays in a year, whereas their European or Anglo-Indian colleagues designated as "Chargemen" are entitled to draw full pay for the entire gazetted holidays?

(*b*) If the answer to (*a*) be in the affirmative, will the Government be pleased to state the reason or reasons for such differential treatment?

TRAINING IN THE WORK OF DRAFTSMEN OF INDIAN APPRENTICES IN THE JAMALPUR WORKSHOPS.

99. THE HONOURABLE SHAH MUHAMMAD ZUBAIR: (*a*) Will the Government be pleased to state if the Indian apprentices in the said Jamalpur workshops are allowed to learn the work of a draftsman?

(*b*) If the answer to (*a*) be in the negative, will the Government be pleased to state the reason or reasons for such exclusion of Indians?

SICK LEAVE OF CHARGEHANDS AND CHARGEMEN.

100. THE HONOURABLE SHAH MUHAMMAD ZUBAIR: (*a*) Will the Government be pleased to state if Indian "Chargehands" like European or Anglo-Indian "Chargemen" are also entitled to short sick leave for 60 days in a year with full pay?

(*b*) If the answer to (*a*) be in the negative, will the Government be pleased to state the reason or reasons for such differential treatment?

DIFFERENCES IN PAY AND PROSPECTS OF INDIAN AS COMPARED WITH EUROPEAN OR ANGLO-INDIAN APPRENTICES EMPLOYED IN THE ELECTRICAL BRANCH OF THE JAMALPUR WORKSHOPS.

101. THE HONOURABLE SHAH MUHAMMAD ZUBAIR: Will the Government be pleased to state the difference, if any, in the designation, pay and prospects of an Indian as compared with a European or Anglo-Indian time-expired apprentice employed in the electrical branch of the said Jamalpur workshops?

INCLUSION IN THE ANNUAL CLASSIFIED LIST OF INDIAN FIRST GRADE APPRENTICES EMPLOYED IN THE JAMALPUR WORKSHOPS.

102. THE HONOURABLE SHAH MUHAMMAD ZUBAIR: (*a*) Will the Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the names of Indian first grade apprentices employed in the said Jamalpur workshops are not included in the classified list published annually, whereas the names of their European or Anglo-Indian colleagues of the same qualifications are so included?

(*b*) If the answer to (*a*) be in the affirmative, do the Government propose to remove this distinction?

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. L. CORBETT: Sir, with your permission, I propose to reply to questions Nos. 96-102 together.

The answer is that the Government are making inquiries and will communicate with the Honourable Member in due course.

SAFE DELIVERY IN TOWNS AND THE MOFUSSIL OF BIHAR AND ORISSA OF LETTERS, MONEY ORDERS, ETC., BEARING ADDRESSES IN URDU.

103. THE HONOURABLE SHAH MUHAMMAD ZUBAIR: Will the Government be pleased to state what steps have been taken by the postal authorities of Bihar and Orissa to ensure a safe, proper and prompt delivery, in towns and mofussil, of all letters, money-orders, etc., bearing addresses in Urdu script?

THE HONOURABLE MR. A. C. MCWATTERS: No general complaints have been received by the Postmaster-General, Bihar and Orissa, regarding delay to letters, and money orders, etc., addressed in Urdu script. As a matter of fact, new entrants, both clerks and post-men, are required to have a working knowledge of Urdu script.

GRANT OF GUN LICENCES TO NON-CO-OPERATORS AND THEIR RELATIONS.

104. THE HONOURABLE SHAH MUHAMMAD ZUBAIR: Will Government be pleased to state if it has caused any instruction to be given to the district authorities not to grant licences for guns to the non-co-operators or to their relations?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. G. HAIG: The reply is in the negative.

EXPENDITURE ON THE PRESERVATION OF ANCIENT MONUMENTS.

105. THE HONOURABLE MAHARAJADHIRAJA SIR BIJAY CHAND MAHTAB: Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a complete list of ancient monuments in India protected under the Act relating to the preservation of ancient monuments, giving against each monument the amounts spent on its preservation and conservation since the year of the inauguration of the Reforms, and another statement giving the figures for five years from the date of the inauguration of the Morley-Minto Reforms, *i.e.*, from 1909 to 1913?

THE HONOURABLE KHAN BAHADUR SIR MUHAMMAD HABIBULLAH, SAHIB BAHADUR: The Director-General of Archæology will be glad to show to the Honourable Member statements giving the names, Province by Province, of the protected monuments accepted by the Government of India.

Particulars in respect of the expenditure incurred on the conservation of such protected monuments as required repairs in 1921-22 and thereafter are given in Appendix A to the Annual Reports of the Archæological Survey of India. Copies of the reports already issued will be found in the Members' Library. For similar information in respect of the years 1909 to 1913 the attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the statements of monuments repaired which will be found in the Provincial Archæological Reports for those years.

DIVORCE LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH INDIGENOUS MARRIAGES.

106. THE HONOURABLE MAHARAJADHIRAJA SIR BIJAY CHAND MAHTAB: Is there any legislation, private or otherwise, under contemplation in the Legislative Assembly for the introduction of some law of divorce in the indigenous marriage laws in the country?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. G. HAIG: The answer is in the negative.

LOCATION OF THE INQUIRY OFFICE AT THE DELHI RAILWAY STATION.

107. THE HONOURABLE LALA SUKHBIR SINHA: Why has the inquiry office at the Delhi station been removed to a distant place from the main entrance hall?

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. L. CORBETT: The information is not available, but a copy of the question has been sent to the Agent, North-Western Railway, who will no doubt look into the matter.

RETURN TICKETS ON STATE RAILWAYS.

108. THE HONOURABLE LALA SUKHBIR SINHA: Will Government be pleased to state whether it is under contemplation to have one uniform system of return tickets, at reduced rates, introduced from and to all stations on all Government Railways? If so, from what date will this be done?

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. L. CORBETT: Government are not contemplating the introduction of a uniform system of return tickets at reduced rates throughout the State Railways.

FORMATION OF A SEPARATE KANNADA PROVINCE, ETC.

109. THE HONOURABLE RAO SAHIB DR. U. RAMA RAU: Will the Government be pleased to state:

(*a*) if any representation has been received from the Canarese-speaking districts in the Madras and Bombay Presidencies urging the formation of a separate Kannada Province and the establishment of a separate Kannada University; and

(*b*) if so, what steps have been taken by the Government thereon?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. G. HAIG: (*a*) and (*b*). Resolutions were received in May and June, 1926, from the Presidents of the Uppinangady, Udipi and Kasaragod Taluk Boards urging the establishment of a separate Karnataka University and province, which were duly acknowledged

THE HONOURABLE RAO SAHIB DR. U. RAMA RAU: Part (*b*), Sir.

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. G. HAIG: I gave the answer to (*b*), (*a*) and (*b*) together.

BILL PASSED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY LAID ON THE TABLE.

SECRETARY OF THE COUNCIL: Sir, in accordance with Rule 25 of the Indian Legislative Rules, I lay on the table a copy of the Bill to

[Secretary of the Council.]

provide for the continuance of the protection of the steel industry in British India, which was passed by the Legislative Assembly at its meeting held on the 21st February, 1927.

RESOLUTION *RE* AMENDMENT OF THE COURT-FEES ACT.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. C. DESIKA CHARI (Burma: General): Sir, I beg to move the Resolution which stands in my name and which runs as follows:

"This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council to appoint an expert committee, with a non-official majority, to revise the Court-fees Act and the Schedule thereto in such manner as to pitch the scale of court-fees as low as possible consistently with the production of revenue just sufficient to cover all the costs of the administration of Civil Justice."

Sir, I do not propose to detain this House long over this Resolution and I resist the temptation of going into various matters which the scope of the Resolution affords. Sir, there are three sets of views on the propriety of levying court-fees. On the one hand, we have got the extreme view that the court-fees are taxation on justice, that justice ought not to be sold and there ought to be no element of taxation at all in fixing court-fees. We have got the support of the school of thought of Bentham and Mill who are inclined to the view that court-fees being in the nature of taxes on redress ought not to be levied at all, and that the court should be absolutely free to all persons who seek redress therein. There is the other extreme view that the State has got a monopoly in levying taxation in the shape of court-fees and it will be just and proper for the Government to levy as much as possible, because indulgence in litigation, and especially in vexatious litigation, is a sign of taxable capacity. There is the mean course, the middle course, that litigation is promoted or facilitated by the establishment of courts and the litigants or other persons who avail themselves of the special services maintained for a special purpose ought to pay for those services and nothing more. Sir, in my opinion the proper view to take of these things is to take note of the fact that the courts exist not only for the purpose of litigants, but also serve another purpose, and that is, that they are a sort of safeguard for the purpose of deterring wrongdoers for fear that they will be punished by the courts. There is also the security or immunity from seeking redress from courts in the case of those individuals whose rights are not invaded. It is therefore necessary that the general tax-payer should bear a certain portion of the burden, and I would submit that the proper view to take is that the general tax-payer being interested in the establishment of costs, the capital expenditure should come out of the general tax-payer, and the cost of maintenance should be shared by the litigants who seek the special service afforded by the courts. Sir, it is very necessary that this aspect of the question should not be unduly stressed, and honest litigation should not be checked. With this object in view, I think that the purpose would be best served by introducing a system of initial payment in the shape of court-fees at the time of institution or immediately after it, before the issue of process to the other side, in all cases, and there must be an element of penalty after adjudication of cases and consideration of all the facts and circumstances, and this portion of the fee, which is the larger portion, should be collected after

the judgment has been delivered. That would be the proper thing, and with the view to allocate the fees, and with this principle in view, I have brought forward this Resolution.

Sir, it may be an interesting study to go into the history of court-fees in India and other countries, but no useful purpose would be served by going into this subject. At the same time I think I need not weary this House over the technical or intricate portions of the Act which lays down various principles for valuing suits and other proceedings. It is enough for my purpose if I mention that no definite principles are adhered to in the various provisions of the Court-fees Act, and that the principle of valuation is more or less arbitrary. There is no scientific adjustment in the rates mentioned in the various Schedules, and it is necessary that we adopt a more scientific and more rational basis of levying fees, having regard to the principle that has been enunciated by Dr. Paranjpye, one of the members of the Taxation Enquiry Committee. The law courts ought to be practically free to the law-abiding citizen, and the element of penalty should come in only at the end after the decision is given, having regard to the conduct of the parties, and there ought to be no element of taxation on the litigant who was found not to interfere with the free exercise of the right of property.

Sir, I am in favour of introducing a small initial fee, varying according to the grade of the courts. I would suggest a fee of Rs. 5 in all cases in Munsiffs' courts and a fee ranging from Rs. 25 to Rs. 50 in courts of first appeal, or less in small cases, and in courts of second appeal there ought to be an initial fee of Rs. 25 to Rs. 50. In all courts of original jurisdiction the fee should be put at Rs. 25. This is only an initial fee. The major portion should be collected at the end by way of penalty.

There is a general complaint that enhancement of fees in various provinces have had the effect of checking honest litigation, and the statistics will go to prove that this complaint is not unfounded. But there is also a good deal of complaint that justice is made a source of income to be used in other departments of Government, and I believe a note ought to be made of this complaint. This question of fees and this complaint has been repeatedly raised in the various provincial Legislatures, and it is unnecessary for me to dilate on the subject. A perusal of the notes in the Taxation Enquiry Committee's Report will convince all concerned that there has been a lot of complaint on this score, and it is generally admitted that there is need for fresh codification in view of the fact that the valuation is not only arbitrary, but there is no clearness in the principles embodied, and the various High Courts have deferred in regard to the views to be taken in regard to assessment. My Resolution finds considerable support in the recommendation of the Taxation Enquiry Committee, who say that the fixing of court-fees as low as possible, with a view to provide income just sufficient to provide the cost of maintenance, is the ideal to be aimed at. There is also a great deal of support for the realization of fees by various stages, just as in the case of county courts in England, the fees should be collected in two instalments. I submit that there is a good deal to be said in favour of the view that in all cases where a case is decided by admission of claim, no more than the initial fee ought to be levied, and in all cases decided *ex parte*, or cases where there has been a settlement out of court, the proper course is to take only half the required fee. In cases where a portion only of the claims is admitted, the only fit and

[Mr. P. C. Desika Chari.]

proper course is that fees should only be levied on the balance of the disputed claim. I find that the Taxation Enquiry Committee recommend uniformity in the matter of court-fees in all provinces. They give two reasons for this. If there is a higher fee in one province there is a feeling of injustice. Then there is the other aspect that litigation will be driven from one province to another.

There is a good deal to be said in favour of the reduction of court-fees, because if you reduce court-fees there will be a greater income in the shape of court-fees. I have to take note of the fact that court-fees are a source of provincial revenue, but this is no insurmountable obstacle in the way of the Central Legislature undertaking legislation for an all-India Court-fees Act. The desirability of having uniformity in all provinces is the first consideration, and the second consideration is that which is an accepted principle, that there ought to be no element of taxation in collecting court-fees, and the Local Governments that make some revenue out of court-fees ought to have no reason to grumble because it was not intended that these court-fees ought to give any revenue for other purposes than the maintenance of the courts. After all, if there is a loss from this source of revenue, it can very well be compensated for by giving Provincial Governments a greater share in income-tax or other sources which are directly connected with the provinces—I mean the working of those departments directly connected with the provincial administration.

Sir, it is unnecessary for me to go further into details, and I have given a broad outline of what I want by this Resolution. I would like to add one word about the Chartered High Courts and the original civil jurisdiction, which is the direct outcome of the High Courts being the successors in office of the Supreme Courts in Madras, Calcutta and Bombay. It is well that these courts ought not to be regulated by the Court-fees Act, and those provisions which apply now might very well be left to apply to these particular courts. I have stated in my Resolution that I want an expert committee with a non-official majority. It is for this reason. There are numerous experts in this branch of legislation among the non-officials, but there is a general feeling among the Members of the Council that we need not put in a clause requiring that there ought to be a majority of non-officials. I am not very keen about it. I am anxious that there ought to be a committee which would go into these different rates and the various provisions of the Act and their interrelation with each other with a view to find out a more equitable and rational system of levying court-fees. With these words I commend my Resolution for acceptance.

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. G. HAIG (Home Secretary): Sir, after the soaring experiences of my friend the Honourable the Mover and myself and other Honourable Members this morning, this seems to be rather a pedestrian topic to be discussed. It is certainly one of considerable complexity and I hope the House will bear with me if I explain the existing position. The scheme of the existing Court-fees Act is that the circumstances in which court-fees are leviable and the principles and methods of assessment are contained in the Act itself, while the rates at which fees are levied are contained in Schedules. So much for the Act. Now as to who can amend it. It has been provided in the Devolution Rules that judicial stamps, which means court-fees, is a provincial subject, subject to legislation by the Indian Legislature in one matter only, namely, fees in

relation to suits and proceedings in the High Courts under their original jurisdiction. The position therefore is that legislation to amend the Court-fees Act is primarily a matter for the Local Governments. The Government of India are conscious that there are numerous defects in the Act as it now stands, and, in spite of the constitutional position which I have just explained, they did take up, a few years ago, the question of amending the Act itself, while leaving the Schedules laying down the rates of fees to be amended by the provinces. Even such a limited measure as that needed the concurrence of the Local Governments. A Bill was introduced in the Assembly dealing with the procedure, principle and methods of realising fees. It was introduced in March 1924, was circulated for opinion and referred to a Select Committee. The Select Committee put a great deal of work into this very complicated subject and presented its report to the Assembly on the 14th September 1925. The matter was not further pursued at the moment because it was known that the Taxation Enquiry Committee would have the subject under consideration, and with the dissolution of the Assembly, the Bill has lapsed. That is, Sir, the existing position. My Honourable friend's Resolution in which he proposes a committee to recast the schedules of fees implies central legislation for this purpose. That, Sir, is an entire reversal of the existing position which has been in force since the introduction of the Reforms. Local Governments have been consulted on this proposal, which was contained in the report of the Taxation Enquiry Committee, that there should be a uniform scale of fees imposed throughout India, and their replies, or most of them, are still awaited, but I hope the House will understand that there are grave difficulties in the way of accepting such a proposal. The Government of India obviously can come to no conclusion until the replies of Local Governments have been received and considered, but I think it is only right to put before the House at the moment certain obvious objections which must occur to anybody. The first consideration, and one that always appeals very strongly to Provincial Governments, is the argument of finance. The existing financial settlement, known as the Meston Settlement, which distributed the sources of taxation between the Government of India and the various Local Governments, assigned this item of court-fees to Local Governments. If now the Government of India are to step in and impose a uniform scale of court-fees throughout India, they may in some cases be reducing the scale in force in certain provinces; in other words taking away from the provinces certain existing sources of revenue. Again, it is contemplated under the existing financial settlement that Local Governments, if they choose, can enhance the rates for court-fees, and certain Local Governments have done so already. If the Government of India are to impose a uniform scale throughout India, it takes away from Local Governments this slight measure of elasticity in their finances, and I think it is quite clear that there would be the gravest objection on the part of Local Governments to any proposal of this nature, unless it was accompanied simultaneously by a revision of the financial settlement, and that is hardly a matter that can be taken up at the moment. I need hardly lay stress on the point that local opinion in some places may resent the removal of their existing authority to deal with court-fees as they please. But there is possibly a more practical point. It is by no means certain that uniformity in court-fees throughout India is really suitable to the conditions of India, a country where in the different provinces conditions—economic and otherwise—differ very largely. I do not want to express any opinion on that point at the moment, but at any rate it

[Mr. H. G. Haig.]

is a matter which will obviously have to be considered when the proposals of the Taxation Enquiry Committee, to which I have referred, come up for final decision.

Well, Sir, so much for the proposal that the Government of India should introduce legislation for the purpose of laying down uniform rates of court-fees. The other point which was touched upon by my Honourable friend was, if I may say so, a somewhat theoretical one which has been discussed by theorists many times, namely, that court-fees should not exceed in the aggregate the cost of the administration of civil justice. Well, Sir, the Taxation Enquiry Committee referred to this point, and it seems to me that they made some wise reflections. They drew attention to the fact that there are other considerations than an actual balancing of cost against receipts to be taken into account. They pointed out very clearly that there are dangers in court-fees being fixed too low just as there are dangers in court-fees being fixed too high. In this country it hardly needs any argument to point out the special dangers in having court-fees too low. Litigation is a popular practice in India and frivolous or excessive litigation like other things in excess is vicious, and I think it is the experience of most Honourable Members that already in India there is a good deal of frivolous and unnecessary litigation which really does harm to the community. I do not say for a moment that on that account we should deny justice to those who require it, but at any rate we have to balance the considerations, the disadvantages of too low court-fees against the disadvantages of too high court-fees, and it appears to me that the conclusion of the Committee is a reasonable one. They say:

"Having regard to all these considerations the Committee are of opinion that while the pitching of the scale of fees so as to produce a revenue just sufficient to cover all the cost of the administration of civil justice is an ideal to be aimed at,"

—and in this life we very seldom realise our ideals:

"financial considerations may justify the State in charging something more provided that the fees charged are not such as to cause substantial hardship to any class and particularly to the poorer litigants."

But, Sir, in practice this ideal which my Honourable friend commends to our attention is one that it is exceedingly difficult to attain. We cannot really ascertain with any degree of exactitude the cost of the administration of civil justice. There are items mixed up with other items exceedingly difficult to disentangle, and this is not any theoretical expression of opinion. We have had in the past painful experience of the difficulties of trying to ascertain the cost of the administration of civil justice. In 1886, the Government of India undertook an elaborate inquiry extending over a period of more than 4 years with a view to ascertaining the extent to which the cost of the administration of civil justice in India was met by the revenues derived from court-fees and other receipts of civil courts. I think possibly at that time the idea underlying the inquiry was not the one that commends itself to my Honourable friend. The Government of India may have been afraid that civil justice was costing something more than the receipts. In the Resolution issued by them in 1890 the Government of India pointed out that the calculations were extremely intricate and that, notwithstanding the labours that had been bestowed, the result could only be considered to be approximately correct.

In 1914, when the question was raised again, Sir William Meyer pointed out that it was impossible to prepare such a statement without a careful and detailed inquiry and after the experience of the inquiries of the years 1886-1890 the Government of India did not consider it desirable to embark on the expenditure of time and labour which such an inquiry necessitated. Sir, the position of the Government of India is still the same. They consider that the preparation of these figures with any degree of accuracy would involve an immense amount of labour, and the entertainment of additional staff—no one I suppose wishes for such a thing; and even then there will always be some dispute as to the accuracy and completeness of the figures. Moreover, the point is not really a very practical one. All authorities seem to agree that there is no very marked divergence between the real cost of civil justice and the receipts. There is an interesting note on this subject which is printed in Volume II of the Taxation Enquiry Committee's Report—a note by the Legal Adviser to the Committee,—and this is his conclusion on the whole subject:

" There may be some difference of opinion."

He is quoting a pronouncement by a Committee appointed in the Central Provinces in 1922:

" ' There may be some difference of opinion whether the receipts from court-fees should be expected to produce a net revenue or only to cover the cost of litigation. There can be no doubt that at present they do not do the latter'. Since their report was written court-fees have been enhanced in the Central Provinces with the result that the deficit appears to have been wiped off. In Burma, Assam and the Punjab it appears probable that a statement prepared on the lines described above would show that the administration of civil justice is resulting in a loss, while in one or two provinces, and especially in Bengal, it may perhaps be shown to be resulting in a profit."

Well, Sir, I do not know whether my Honourable friend would recommend in provinces where the administration of civil justice is shown to be resulting at present in a loss that the fees should be enhanced. I should be surprised to hear him supporting such a proposal. In any case these attempts to equate the cost and the receipts seem to me to be very theoretical, and I would venture to urge that it is better to proceed on the existing lines, amending obvious defects in the procedure of the present Act and leaving, at any rate under present conditions, the rates of fees to be fixed by the provinces. I trust, Sir, that the House will not support the Resolution.

THE HONOURABLE MR. V. RAMADAS PANTULU (Madras: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, this morning I find myself in the somewhat curious position of being able to agree with both the Mover of the Resolution and the Honourable Member who opposed it. I agree with my Honourable friend Mr. Chari in thinking that the Court-fees Act does require considerable emendation and overhauling; many of the provisions are anomalous and some of them are inequitable and they are fully set out in the Taxation Enquiry Committee's Report. Therefore I do not propose to travel over that ground. I am therefore in entire sympathy with the object of his Resolution. At the same time I agree with the Honourable Mr. Haig that the small measure of fiscal autonomy, which the provinces enjoy with regard to this subject—this head Provincial Revenue—ought not to be interfered with by the Government of India. As a matter of

[Mr. V. Ramadas Pantulu.]

principle I agree. Therefore I am in agreement with most of what he said with regard to the provinces being left to deal with this matter. But there is one matter to which he alluded and on which I wish to offer a few remarks. He said that the question of court-fees of High Courts is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Central Government. I wish he had told the House what the Government of India proposed to do in that matter. At present the position of the High Courts is a very anomalous one. Probably my non-lawyer friends here do not know that the Chartered High Courts levy taxation by way of court-fee, without any legislative control by executive powers. The Indian Court-fees Act does not apply to Chartered High Courts. In the Bombay High Court on every suit instituted in the Original Side a fixed fee of Rs. 15 is levied at the outset. In the Calcutta High Court a fee of Rs. 20 is levied, and in the High Court in my province, Madras, an initial fee of Rs. 150 is levied on suits whose value is less than Rs. 10,000 and an additional fee at so much for every Rs. 5,000 over the Rs. 10,000 of initial value; and in addition to these fees they charge what are called sitting fees for the Judges and various other fees, which ultimately amount to something considerable. This is a very anomalous state of affairs; and High Courts, other than Bombay, Madras and Calcutta, follow a different procedure. The three Chartered High Courts have got different scales. These three Chartered High Courts are entirely proceeding upon executive powers to levy the source of revenue and they are not controlled by the Legislature—certainly an anomalous position. We find that while the fees in some small cases in High Courts run up to very large amounts, the High Court administers justice in very heavy cases where the entire court-fee levied is considerably less than what is paid on a trumpery suit in the mofussil court. The High Court consists of a body of Judges whose time is very valuable and they are very highly paid Judges, and they should work on the principle of at least a *quid pro quo* for the services rendered. Where Government is legitimately entitled to a large revenue, very small revenue is got, and *vice versa*. These are things which I think ought to receive the attention of the Government of India very immediately, and I hope that at least so far as that portion of the Resolution of Mr. Chari, which relates to court-fees leviable in High Courts is concerned, the Honourable Member for Government may find it easy to accept it in that restricted sense, or even if he does not accept it, to do what he can to induce the Government of India to take up that matter. Those who go into the question of court-fees will see that this is a matter which requires very urgent attention. There is one other portion of the Taxation Enquiry Committee's Report to which I wish to draw the attention of the Honourable the Home Secretary. The Committee has pointed out that in 1886 and on other occasions when Committees wanted to find out the proper and equitable mode of levying court-fees, they found that data were not available and the figures given in the Administration Reports of Civil Justice were inadequate for the purpose and therefore they made two recommendations. One recommendation is that in the Reports on Administration of Civil Justice there should be introduced a classification of receipts from court-fees and charges on account of courts and they set out certain heads under which this account is to be maintained; and secondly, they recommended that inquiries by officers trained both in the law of stamps

and court-fees and in procedure in accounts be undertaken. Without these two things being done and without Committees being afforded ample material to proceed, they said it would not be possible for any Committee to fix the scale of court-fees equitably and uniformly. I hope the Government of India will pay some attention to that part of the Taxation Enquiry Committee's Report and inaugurate that inquiry and also introduce the classification in the accounts. With these words, Sir, I would neither say that I support the Resolution nor oppose it. I merely wanted to say that in one matter at least the Government of India ought to move and in other matters the provinces ought to move.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The question is:

"That the following Resolution be adopted:

'This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council to appoint an expert Committee, with a non-official majority, to revise the Court-fees Act and the Schedule thereto in such manner as to pitch the scale of court-fees as low as possible consistently with the production of revenue just sufficient to cover all the costs of the administration of Civil Justice.'"

The motion was negatived.

MOTION *RE* APPRECIATION OF THE RESULTS ACHIEVED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA DELEGATION TO SOUTH AFRICA.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Before we proceed to the next Resolution, I think I should tell the House that in connection with the decision arrived at yesterday that time should be given to discuss the statement made by the Honourable the Leader of the House on the Indian question in South Africa, I have received notice of a motion from the Honourable Sir Dinshaw Wacha, which runs as follows:

"This Council begs to convey to His Excellency the Governor General in Council its appreciation of the results achieved by the Government of India delegation to the recent Round Table Conference on the Indian question in South Africa, and expresses the hope that the direct relations that have now been established may eventuate in lasting amity between India and South Africa by the satisfactory settlement of any questions that might still require adjustment."

The Council will notice that this is not couched in the form of a Resolution. It is not a recommendation to the Governor General in Council. I should have preferred myself that the discussion should have come up on a Resolution, but I quite understand the difficulties of the Honourable Sir Dinshaw Wacha and his friends. Indeed I do not know that I myself could frame a Resolution recommending the Governor General in Council to do anything that the Government have not already done. The motion is one which is contemplated by Rule 24-A. of the Indian Legislative Rules, that is to say, it can only be moved with the previous consent of the Member of the Government concerned and of the Chair. I have ascertained that the Honourable Sir Muhammad Habibullah does not object to the motion, and I therefore give my consent to its being moved to-morrow morning.

RESOLUTION *RE* REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS IMPOSED ON MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS IN REGARD TO THE DISPENSING OF OPIUM.

THE HONOURABLE RAO SAHIB DR. U. RAMA RAU (Madras: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution which stands in my name:

"This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that the restrictions now imposed on registered medical practitioners who do their own dispensing in respect of such matters as the maintenance of detailed accounts for opium or opium preparations prescribed or dispensed by them, as medicines for their patients, be relaxed."

Sir, with your permission, I propose to make a small verbal alteration of which I have given notice, *i.e.*, for the word "or" between the words "prescribed" and "dispensed" to substitute the word "and". If I have your permission, Sir, I shall make the change.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The Honourable Member may make the change.

THE HONOURABLE RAO SAHIB DR. U. RAMA RAU: Sir, the question of preventing the growing opium habit among the people of India has been engaging the serious attention of the Government and the public during the past half a century. Alongside of it, there was also the graver question of producing opium in India for purposes of export to China and other foreign countries. But how far the Government of India have attempted to check this drug evil among the people, without external pressure, history has yet to record. True, there was a Royal Commission appointed in 1893 to inquire into, and devise ways and means to break, the opium habit among the inhabitants of India and China, but like many other Royal Commissions it proved to be an eye-washing one, unproductive of any tangible good to the people. One important finding of that Commission however which has a direct bearing on the subject of this Resolution is worthy of mention here. The Commission found that opium almost everywhere in India was the common domestic medicine of the people; that it was extensively used for non-medical and quasi-medical purposes and that the non-medical uses were so interwoven with the medical uses that it would not be practicable to draw a distinction between them in the distribution and sale of the drug. They found further that as regards the use of opium as a stimulant, the practice of taking the drug in pills or infusions was of old-standing and was generally followed in moderation and without injurious consequences; and that as to this quasi-medical habit, the evidence of the medical witnesses led to the conclusion that in the circumstances of India in respect to climate, diet, modes of living and medical aid, this use is probably on the whole beneficial. This was just the kind of finding which the Government of India had wanted. It exonerated the Government from all blame and gave them a free hand to carry on their nefarious trade in opium with unabated vigour and unrestricted rigour. According to Sir Richard Dane, who was one of those who had served in the Royal Commission alluded to above, and who was formerly Inspector-General of Salt and Excise in India:

"the use of opium is a serious evil and even when used in moderation, it has an enervating tendency and is therefore a dangerous thing for the nation. There must either be complete prohibition or complete licence. The evils arising from the abuse of opium are so serious that prohibition is probably preferable."

The Government of India chose the latter alternative, namely, complete licence instead of complete prohibition for the sake of revenue, ignoring altogether the human aspect of the problem involved in this transaction, with the result that abuse of opium has become rampant in spite of their vigilance.

The licensed opium vendor, as the trusted agent of the Government for the sale of opium, is, in the opinion of the Government, not likely to be a party to bring about this abuse of opium among the people, by any indiscreet or indiscriminate sale of opium. The Government of India looked therefore for this abuse of opium from other and unexpected quarters and they cast their suspicious eyes on the poor medical practitioners. The restrictions imposed on the medical practitioners who do their own dispensing are really annoying and harassing. The previous sanction of the Revenue Board is necessary for the importation of opium or opium preparations. The medical practitioners are required to give the composition of patent drugs, which it is impossible for them to do. Every application is to bear a stamp duty of Rs. 1-8, if the medicine has to be imported from foreign countries or from outside the province. If a particular medicine is out of stock and is not available within the Presidency and the value of it too is comparatively small, then its importation from outside the province will cost Rs. 1-8 extra. This is a hardship on the patient besides being a worry to the practitioner not to mention the delay entailed in getting the required permit. Considering all these, the doctor may have to drop prescribing this particular medicine, while the patient may be deprived of an opportunity of a ready cure. The bureaucratic wheel often moves slowly and the application is seldom received in time to be duly sanctioned. The sale of opium from one shop to another and from one shop to a doctor, who owns no dispensary, has to be effected only after a permit has been obtained from the Collector. Emergent requests for opium preparations often have to remain uncomplied with, owing to this restriction. Then comes the accounting process which is simply tedious and exacting. There can be no objection to maintaining accounts for the quantities of opium purchased and prescribed by the doctor. But, then, there are certain cases in which very small quantities of opium are prescribed with other drugs in combination and in such proportion that they cannot be used as intoxicants or cannot produce the drug habit in the patients unless taken in large quantities when the proportion of other drugs will have to be correspondingly increased, resulting in dire consequences to the patients. The Excise rules require that even these fractions of doses have to be accounted for so that the totals might tally. For instance, Palvis Creta Aromatic Cum-opii is one such preparation which is largely prescribed daily in every dispensary. The opium content of this preparation is 1 in 40. About 4 grains to 90 grains of the preparation are prescribed in a day and the opium content for these small quantities varies from 0·100 to 2·25 grains. All these have to be accounted for in detail with their drug contents and opium contents and the patient's addresses and the doctor's signature are required to be taken and the file of prescriptions preserved for some years. Similarly there are preparations like Tinc. Camphor Co., Pulvis Kino Co., etc., which must undergo the same tedious process of accounting. This is the sort of restriction placed on the doctor and indirectly on the patient, to prevent the latter from acquiring the drug habit. But let us examine the position of the man in the street who must be safeguarded with greater care and vigilance. Every individual can obtain from the licensed vendor not less

[Dr. U. Rama Rau.]

than one tola of opium at a time for his daily use. But there is nothing to prevent that individual from concealing it or distributing it to his friends and obtaining another tola the same day and going on in this way for any length of time. So long as that individual takes care not to possess more than one tola of opium daily, he is free. Who is the greater danger to society, the medical man or the licensed vendor, it is for you to picture. In a large dispensary, where there are a good number of prescriptions of this kind daily, to work out the opium contents in each of those preparations and enter them in a register, noting down at the same time the names and addresses of the parties and other particulars is really beyond the patience and endurance of a busy practitioner. While in the midst of his professional work, the Excise Officer comes in to check the accounts and pesters him with a thousand and one questions and many a dying patient has to wait till this gentleman, dressed in a brief little authority, is satisfactorily answered and disposed of. Countless are the account books the medical practitioner has to maintain, one for opium, one for morphia, one for cocaine and one each for a host of these intoxicating drugs which the doctor has perforce to use to save an individual from suffering and death. The medical practitioner is trusted to keep poisons, to handle poisons, to prescribe poisons, and yet he has not got to account for them except by an entry in the prescription book. But with regard to opium and opium contents, he is treated as a suspect. Is it because the Government think that the medical practitioner might set up illicit trade in opium and other intoxicants among his constituents that such rigid rules are enforced? Suspicion seems to lurk in every line of those rules. On behalf of the independent medical profession who do their own dispensing, I can assure the Government that the medical practitioners are a band of honest workers engaged in the noble task of curing the sick and suffering and not in that demoralising traffic of selling opium and other intoxicants.

1 P.M. The Honourable Colonel Symons, than whom no more ardent supporter and bold advocate of the cause of the medical profession can be found in India at the present day, is not unaware of the oppression of the Excise Department and the hardships the medical practitioners undergo on account of the extreme stringency of the Excise rules. As President of the All-India Sub-Assistant Surgeons' Conference, held in Madras last year, he was appraised of the difficulties of the profession and, while sympathising with the unfortunate lot of the profession, he said he would do his level best to have their disabilities removed. It is a happy augury that he has since been transformed into a higher sphere of activity and is now the Head of the Medical Administration in India. I hope he will lend the full weight of his position and authority and espouse the cause and redress the wrongs of the much-neglected medical profession throughout this country. Thanks to the recent awakening in China and India and the pressure exerted by the League of Nations, the Government of India have since resolved to pursue a policy of total prohibition of opium in India and the abolition of the trade with China. The memorable speech of His Excellency Lord Reading on the 9th February, 1926, to surrender the revenue from opium to achieve this noble end is an indication of their earnestness. The Government can therefore have no manner of objection to relax the opium rules and give the independent registered medical practitioners less worry and more freedom in attending to their professional

duties. I fervently appeal to the Government to be more generous with the medical practitioners and to wholly exempt them from the operation of the Excise rules, so far as drugs in use for treatment are concerned, which go only to fetter the hands of the medical profession and thereby frustrate the object of the Government to make medical aid more cheap and less irksome. I appeal also to the Honourable non-official Members in this Council to stand by the medical profession in their hour of distress—a profession that is ever ready to help them in their sufferings—and record their united votes in favour of this Resolution. With these words, Sir, I move this Resolution for favour of acceptance by this House.

THE HONOURABLE MR. A. F. L. BRAYNE (Finance Secretary): This Resolution also, Sir, raises a very definite constitutional issue, and I will confine my remarks to trying to make those issues clear and also the position of the Government of India in regard to this Resolution. As regards poisons and other dangerous drugs such as cocaine, the rules and regulations which govern the distribution and sale of these preparations are solely matters for the concern of the Provincial Governments. Equally so as regards opium. Under section 6 of the Opium Act, the rules for the local distribution and sale of opium and opium preparations are framed by the Local Governments subject to the control of the Government of India. That control is exercised in accordance with the present Reformed constitution. The Government of India's concern in the matter of opium is primarily as regards regulation of the cultivation, manufacture and export of opium and opium preparations. But apart from this, the Government of India have undertaken very definite international obligations. Under article 6 of the Protocol of the Second Opium Conference, signed at Geneva on February 19th, 1925, the following requirements were laid down:

"Contracting parties shall require that all persons engaged in the manufacture, import, sale, distribution or export of the said substances, (that is to say opium and opium preparations), shall obtain a licence or permit to engage in these operations.

Further, contracting parties shall require that such persons shall enter in their books a notice of the manufacture, imports, exports, sales and all other distribution of the said substances.

This requirement shall not necessarily apply either to supplies dispensed by medical practitioners or to sales by duly authorised chemists on medical precriptions, provided in each case the medical prescriptions are filed and preserved by the medical practitioner or chemist."

It will be clear to the House that the Government of India cannot accept any proposal which would infringe this solemn undertaking. At the same time medical practitioners must either keep accounts or they must file their prescriptions dealing with opium and opium preparations. But nevertheless, if Local Governments, having regard to local conditions, find it necessary to enforce still more stringent regulations on medical practitioners in this matter, it is a question entirely within their discretion and a discretion with which the Government of India cannot constitutionally interfere. In these circumstances, Sir, and having regard to the obligations of the Government of India, I would ask the Honourable Member to withdraw his Resolution.

THE HONOURABLE RAO SAHIB DR. U. RAMA RAU: If the Honourable Member promises that he will send my speech and also his speech to the Local Governments for their consideration, I have no objection to withdraw.

THE HONOURABLE MR. A. F. L. BRAYNE: I am prepared to agree that these discussions should be forwarded to Local Governments for their consideration.

THE HONOURABLE RAO SAHIB DR. U. RAMA RAU: Then I will withdraw.

The Resolution was, by leave of the Council, withdrawn.

SOCIETIES REGISTRATION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. KHAPARDE (Berar Representative): Sir, I beg to move that the Bill further to amend the Societies Registration Act, 1860, for certain purposes, as passed by the Legislative Assembly, be taken into consideration.

The amending Bill which has been brought in and which I ask the Honourable Members to consider, is a very simple and easy measure. It consists of only two clauses and these two clauses really introduce only one little addition to the existing law. As early as 1860, nearly 70 years ago, this Act which I seek to amend was enacted, and it really says a great deal for the drafting of those days that for 70 years it has endured without requiring any amendment. The circumstances have changed now and these altered circumstances do require a little modification. The Preamble of this Act mentions only literature, science and charities in the title itself. Then it adds further, the fine arts and diffusion of useful knowledge. Then there is a section 20 which introduces a number of other things into it, and it goes on further and further, so that to get at the scope of this Act it means that we must read its Title, Preamble and section 20. Apparently this has caused some confusion. The late Mr. Gokhale is, I think, very well known to all Members here; his statue used to be in the vestibule of the old Council. I do not know whether it is in this building; it may be somewhere among the veiled figures, but I did not see it. Mr. Gokhale in 1905 established his Society called the "Servants of India Society," and he thought it would come under the heading of the "Diffusion of Useful Knowledge." That Society does educational work and social work, and has also founded a school of political thought which was known as "Moderate" at one time. Since then it has been called "Liberal" and now I suppose it functions under the title of "National." That school is there and its principles are there; they have not changed and everything is going on in the same way. Two attempts were made to get this Society registered and on both occasions the Registrar of Societies thought that this Society did not come within the scope of this Act and the registration was refused. So there arose a difficulty and I suppose the only remedy would have been for Mr. Gokhale to go to a court and ask for a direction to the Registrar that he should register the Society. But he did not take that course. The only other Act that can govern this case is the Act of 1913, the Companies Act. It is possible, I believe, to get this Society registered under that Act, but there is a certain bad odour about it. The Society would have to call itself a Company under that Act, and these people who want to establish schools of political politics would not wish to call themselves a company because a company has a commercial connotation. Anything registered under the Companies' Act has to have a tail added to its name of being "limited". It may be any company, but if you get it registered it will have to be So-and-So Company, Limited. Now people who want to

establish schools for spreading learning would not like to have this tail to the name of their schools of being called "limited". Therefore there is a real sentimental objection, and I believe a real objection too, to going under the Companies Act. So the only remedy left is to have this Act amended; and this amendment when it was discussed in the other place fortunately was not objected to too much and the amendment that has been printed here is merely a drafting amendment as we call it, and I am disposed to accept it. It is not therefore necessary for me to go into the whole matter at great length at any rate at this stage unless some objections are raised, in which case I shall answer them; but in their absence I content myself with moving that this Bill be taken into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The question is:

"That clause 2 do stand part of the Bill."

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. G. HAIG (Home Secretary): Sir, I beg to move the amendment which stands in my name:

"That in clause 2—

(1) before the words 'In section 20' the words 'In the Preamble to and' be inserted;

(2) the letter and brackets '(*a*)', the word 'and', and the whole of sub-clause (*b*), be omitted."

These, Sir, are very small amendments and I am glad that my Honourable friend has expressed his willingness to accept them. I need only say that the first amendment is purely a drafting one. The relevant words which it is sought to amend occur both in the Preamble and in section 20, and the object of this first amendment is merely that the same words should be inserted in the Preamble as are being inserted in section 20.

The second point seeks to confine the amendment of this Act to the particular object which the Mover of the Bill had in mind. I understand, Sir, that in regard to this particular class of society there is a sentimental feeling that they would prefer to be called "society" rather than "company", and in deference to that sentiment the Government of India have decided for their part to accept the amendment which will enable these societies to register themselves under the Societies Registration Act. The Government of India see no necessity to extend the provisions of the Societies Registration Act any further to overlap the provisions of the Companies Act. The words contained in sub-clause (*b*) of clause 2 of this Bill are already contained substantially in section 26 of the Companies Act, and the Government of India therefore think it unnecessary that they should be repeated. Sir, I move the amendment.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

The Title and Preamble were added to the Bill.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. KHAPARDE: I move, Sir, that the Bill, as passed by the Legislative Assembly, and as amended further by the Council of State, be passed.

The motion was adopted.

ELECTION OF A PANEL FOR THE CENTRAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR RAILWAYS.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Honourable Members will now proceed to elect a panel of 8 members from which 6 members shall be selected to serve on the Central Advisory Council for Railways.

(The ballot was then taken.)

ELECTION OF A PANEL FOR THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. L. CORBETT (Commerce Secretary): Sir, I move that this Council do proceed to elect in the manner described in the rules published in the Home Department Notification No. F.-49, dated the 22nd August, 1922, as amended by the Home Department Notification No. D.-794-C., dated the 30th January, 1924, a panel consisting of 6 members from which 2 will be nominated to serve on the Standing Committee to advise on subjects in the Department of Commerce.

The motion was adopted.

The Council then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock, on Wednesday, the 23rd February, 1927.

CORRIGENDUM.

On page 167 of Vol. IX, No. 6, of the C. of S. Debates, *for* "The Honourable Dr. U. Rama Rau (Madras: Non-Muhammadan):" before Mr. President, *read* "The Honourable Raja Sri Ravu Swetachalapati Ramakrishna Bahadur Ranga Rao, of Bobbili (Madras: Nominated Non-Official):" and *for* "The Honourable Raja Sri Ravu Swetachâlapati Ramakrishna Bahadur Ranga Rao, of Bobbili (Madras: Nominated Non-Official):" before Sir, *read* "The Honourable Dr. U. Rama Rau (Madras: Non-Muhammadan):"