

Friday, February 24, 1865

**COUNCIL OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL
OF INDIA**

VOL. 4

JAN. - DEC.

1865

P. L.

*Abstract of the Proceedings of the Council of the Governor-General of India,
assembled for the purpose of making Laws and Regulations under the
provisions of the Act of Parliament 24 and 25 Vic., cap. 67.*

The Council met at Government House on Friday, the 24th February 1865.

P R E S E N T :

His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India, *presiding*.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal.

Major General the Hon'ble Sir R. Napier, K. C. B.

The Hon'ble H. B. Harington.

The Hon'ble H. Sumner Maine.

The Hon'ble Sir C. E. Trevelyan, K. C. B.

The Hon'ble W. Grey.

The Hon'ble H. L. Anderson.

The Hon'ble J. N. Bullen.

The Hon'ble Mahārājā Vijayarāma Gajapati Rāj Bahādur of Vizianagram.

The Hon'ble Rājā Sāhib Dyāl Bahādur.

The Hon'ble G. Noble Taylor.

The Hon'ble W. Muir.

The Hon'ble R. N. Cust.

The Hon'ble Mahārājā Dhīraj Mahtab Chand Bahādur, Mahārājā of
Burdwan.

The Hon'ble D. Cowie.

SUCCESSION AND INHERITANCE (PARSEES') BILL.

The Hon'ble MR. ANDERSON introduced the Bill to define and amend the law relating to Succession and Inheritance among the Parsees, and moved that it be referred to a Select Committee.

He said—"I have the honour, Sir, to introduce the Bill to define and amend the law relative to intestate succession among the Parsees, and to move that it be referred for consideration to a Select Committee.

As the Bill is a very short Bill, and as I recently explained its provisions at some length, I do not propose to detain the Council with any detailed statement on the present occasion. I would only repeat that the principal and almost only provision of the Bill is the reduction of the share which females shall take in succession to intestate property. The distinction to be drawn between the provisions relative to such property in the Indian Civil Code, and the provi-

sions of the measure now submitted, is, that the former contemplates that men possessed of considerable property will, as a rule, make Wills. The distribution, therefore, proposed has chiefly had in view small properties, and with reference to such properties, it is a just and fair one. But the Parsees, on the other hand, are extremely averse from making Wills. Their measure then presumes, that large properties will be left intestate, and the distribution which they propose is that which a reasonable and provident man would make, were he framing a Will. For example—to take the instance which I suggested on a former occasion—a man dies leaving a widow, two sons, and two daughters. His property, we will assume, is worth £12,000; each son would then receive £4,000, the widow £2,000, and each daughter £1,000. Now, putting aside the obligations imposed on sons, among Parsees, by their religious and social usages, I think if a Will to this effect were made by an Englishman, it would not be thought an unreasonable one. I make these remarks because I have just read in a public print of high character and ability of which I wish to speak with all respect, that the Bill I am introducing is a “semi-barbarous” measure. I confess that I am unable to understand in what the barbarous component consists. Gavelkind and Borough-English, which still exist in parts of England, may be called semi-barbarous, but there is no provision in the present Bill which deserves such an epithet. A French Jurist would not be justified in designating the English Law of Primogeniture semi-barbarous, because it differed from the law of his own country, and an English Jurist for the same reason would not be justified in applying the same censure to the French Law which prescribes an equal division of landed property. A divergence from English Law does not constitute semi-barbarism; if it did, Scotland would be far removed from civilization. But as I am unwilling to remain under such censure without a successful attempt to justify myself, I beg to be permitted to read the substance of some observations in which I heartily concur.

The Parsees and their Legislation.

“The Parsee meeting of the 20th August was an event in the history of India. For the first time a Native race has endeavoured by a national effort to remove a national grievance. The Parsees, the wealthiest and the most able of the smaller races of India, labour under one special disadvantage. The British Government, though not bound by the pledge so often quoted and denied, has always conceded perfect religious liberty to Mussulmans and Hindús, or rather, we should say, it has always conceded those social rights, which, in the East, are unfortunately mingled with religious belief. To employ the official phrase, the Natives settle “questions of divorce, marriage, and inheritance,”—the family bond, and the division of property—for themselves. When these principles came into operation, however, the Parsees were an obscure race of cultivators existing on sufferance in Guzerat and Cutch. Even if any one had known any thing of them or their creed, it would have seemed no special hardship to leave them undistinguished amid the millions of Hindús. They have since become what we know

them, the most successful traders, the most active reformers, and the truest friends of the British Government in India. Still they have not been relieved of their disabilities. In the Mofussil, they have been subject to Muhammadan, and in Bombay, to the English Law. The Koran and Blackstone have been the Codes of men who recognize only the Zend Avesta. Up to 1837, they were under the English Law, even in matters of inheritance. In that year, however, a great scandal brought the anomalies of their position into strong relief. A Parsee lad, to the disgust of all around him, claimed the whole of his father's landed property, under the English Law. The idea of primogeniture seems to be opposed in the Native mind to some fundamental principle of justice. The Parsees petitioned the Legislature, and the Legislature passed an Act by which the landed property of the Parsees was declared to be in the nature of chattels real. Intestate estates are still, however, administered according to English Law, while all other difficulties remain unremoved as before. The English Law of marriage is made applicable to a people who have scarcely the idea of illegitimacy, and the law of divorce is applied to a race to whom the indissolubility of marriage, and the pecuniary penalty for dishonour, are equally abhorrent. Moreover, the Parsees have not even the advantage of a Code recognized among themselves. The force of public opinion might otherwise have supplied the place of legal enactment, and arguments derived from "immemorial custom" must have been attended to by the tribunals. They have no ancient book of laws, no Koran, and no authoritative account even of their *lex non scripta*. No man, therefore, knows the extent of his family rights, or the obligation of his family duties. Every family lawsuit is a lottery, and each man, of course, appeals to the system which best suits his own interest and convenience.

To remedy all these evils, the Parsees called the meeting of the 20th August. It was most numerously attended, and the report is well worthy of attentive perusal. For the first time, a great body of Natives have met to remove a practical grievance by measures calculated to have a practical effect. The Parsees act under no European instigation, for no European has any personal interest in the question. They have benefitted by no European guidance, for no European knew anything of the matter in hand. They did their own work by themselves. They used their own language to express their own thoughts. They appointed a Committee entirely of their own race, and their speeches were, for the most part, the free expression of Parsee ideas. In short, they originated instead of merely imitating. Nor was this perfect independence the only remarkable feature of the meeting. The tone adopted by the speakers in alluding to the British Government was equally observable. Not one speaker but started from the assumption that he lived under a good Government, and that because it was a good Government, he felt assured of ultimate success.

The plan adopted by such men is sure to be practical. The Parsee does not content himself with declaiming against injustice. The meeting listened to a quiet and indeed under-stated account of their grievance, and then resolved that a Managing Committee should be appointed to draw up a Code, embodying their ideas upon marriage, inheritance, and divorce. That this Code so prepared should be entrusted to Mr. LeGeyt, and that the Legislative Council should be earnestly entreated to pass it into law. There is little chance that the request will be refused. The Council has no prejudices in favour of any special system upon these points, and least of all any prejudice in favour of the English regulation of them. It will scarcely object to sanction, directly, rules which, in the case of Hindús and Muhammadans, it already sanctions tacitly. The Parsee request must, we conceive, be granted, and the leaders of the movement will have the credit of having, by one temperate effort, removed a long-standing grievance."

When reading sentiments like these, I can only recall the Bristol Election of 1774, and play the part of Creevey to the Burke of this able writer. They contain, I submit, my complete absolution from the charge of having submitted a semi-barbarous measure to the Council, and I therefore in all good humour appeal from the *Friend of India* of 1865, to the *Friend of India* of 1855.

There is another observation which I would wish to submit. The Indian Law Commissioners, not having the report of Sir Joseph Arnould's Commission before them, were of opinion that the Parsees were not entitled to separate legislation. They have recently been again addressed on the subject by Her Majesty's Secretary of State, who had taken a different view. Since the last meeting of the Council, I have received a letter from England, stating that the Indian Law Commissioners have informed the Secretary of State that they have now no objection to separate legislation for the Parsees in relation to intestate property, but that in their opinion the Parsees should be subject to that part of the Civil Code which relates to testamentary succession. I would submit that this is the exact course which it is proposed in the present Bill to follow.

I should mention that, as this Bill depends upon the Indian Civil Code, which has not yet become law, I have not mentioned the date from which it should have effect. In Committee, I shall propose that the date be the 1st January 1866, the date on which the Indian Civil Code will probably come in force. I have for the same reason abstained from mentioning a particular period within which the Select Committee should be instructed to report."

The Hon'ble RÁJÁ SÁHIB DYÁL BAHÁDUR said that he wished to ask two questions.—

First.—When the intestate, having been twice married, shall die leaving children by both marriages, are all such children to share alike, or is the collective issue of each marriage to receive an equal share ?

Second.—Should the second wife of an intestate herself die intestate, will her property descend only to her own children, or to the whole of her husband's children, whether born of herself or his first wife ? The Rájá thought these points should be clearly defined in the Bill.

The Hon'ble the MAHÁRÁJÁ OF VIZIANAGRAM said that the Bill having in substance been prepared by the Parsees themselves, the Council, he thought, could have little or no objection to pass it. But he confessed he was at a loss to know why in certain cases the females should obtain only a fourth of what the males

succeeded to, and in others to one-half, and in others again to an equal share. Sections 1 and 3 for instance provided that the share of each son should be four times the share of each daughter. According to Sections 2 and 4, the shares of the children, whether male or female, were to be equal. On reference to Sections 6 and 7, the general principle followed in the division of the property would seem to be that the males would obtain double of what the females standing in the same degree of propinquity would. He (the Mahārājā) would therefore suggest to the Council that some of the details be taken into their consideration, also the points referred to, before the Bill passed into law.

The Hon'ble MR. HARRINGTON said it was right he should point out with reference to what had fallen from the Hon'ble Mr. Anderson at the conclusion of his remarks, to the effect that he had specified no period in his motion for the Select Committee to make their report, that if the Hon'ble Member's motion was adopted as it now stood, it would not be competent to the Select Committee, under the Rules of the Council, to report upon the Bill until after the expiration of twelve weeks from the date of the publication of the Bill in the Official Gazette. It was generally understood that when a Bill was ordered to be referred to a Select Committee without any instruction as to the time within which the Committee was to make their report, the public would have the full period mentioned in the Rule to which he had referred for considering the Bill and offering any remarks or suggestions in respect to it. It often happened that objections to a Bill were not received by the Select Committee until the time for reporting upon the Bill had arrived. It would not be fair to the public if, without any previous notice, the report of the Select Committee upon the present Bill was made before it was due with a view to the early passing of the Bill. Looking to the important character of the Bill, which proposed to amend the law of a large section of the community on the delicate subject of Inheritance and Succession to property, he did not think that twelve weeks could be considered too long a period for the publication of the Bill. This period was not required for the convenience of the Select Committee, who, if they had only the Bill to consider, would have no difficulty in settling its provisions in a much shorter time. The object in publishing a Bill for twelve weeks was that the public at large, and particularly that portion of it which was chiefly interested in the Bill, might know what was proposed, and have ample time to state any objections that they might have to any part of the Bill. The Bill was not intended for the Parsees in Bombay alone. It was intended also for the Parsees residing in Calcutta, Madras, and in other parts of the country. It might be true that the Bill had been prepared by the Parsees themselves, but it was prepared by only a small body of that community, and they knew that considerable

difference of opinion prevailed amongst the Parsees in respect to the provisions of the Bill, which rendered it the more necessary that the Bill should be published for the full time prescribed by the Rules of the Council. Nor was there any reason for hurrying the Bill through the Council. It was not intended that the Indian Civil Code, from some of the provisions of which it was deemed right to exempt the Parsee community, should take effect until the 1st January 1866, and there would be ample time to pass the Bill before that date, even though it should not become law during the present sittings of the Council. If the Bill proposed only to exempt the Parsees from certain provisions of the Indian Civil Code, he should have no objection to the Bill being passed at once, but the Bill went further, and proposed to alter the existing laws of the Parsees in respect to Inheritance and Succession, which was a very different thing.

The Hon'ble Mr. MAINE said that the question was, whether a Committee could not report at any time it thought proper. He rather thought that, if a Committee considered that longer time was not necessary, there would be no objection to their reporting sooner. He should be very sorry if they had to wait for twelve weeks in every case. Perhaps his Hon'ble friend (Mr. Anderson) would be so good as to inform the Council to what extent the so-called Law Committee of Bombay had authority to speak on behalf of their co-religionists. It would be undesirable to pass a measure like this without the consent of the whole Parsee community.

The Hon'ble Mr. ANDERSON said, with reference to what had fallen from the Hon'ble Mr. Harington and the Hon'ble Mr. Maine, that he wished to offer only a few observations. The question before the Council was whether the Parsees should be exempted from the operation of the first Chapter of the Indian Civil Code, or as it was now to be called "The Indian Succession Act, 1865." The difference between the Parsees in the Mofussil and the Parsees of Bombay was not considerable, and the course taken by the Bombay Parsees was a mean between that Act and the propositions of the Parsees in the Mofussil.

With regard to what fell from his Hon'ble friend Mr. Harington, he (Mr. Anderson) would first remark that this Bill had really been before the Parsees of India for the last ten years. He could not bring it forward at an earlier period of the Session, because it depended on the fate of the Indian Civil Code. But with regard to Mr. Harington's remark that they were asked to legislate for only a small portion of the Parsees, he (Mr. Anderson) begged to offer the following observations. First of all, the Parsees of Bombay were numerically the large majority. But besides that, the Council had had the

opinions of the Parsees from all parts of the Mofussil, and, except as to a very few points, they in all material respects concurred with the Parsees of Bombay. Mr. Harington had said that there were Parsees in Calcutta. But he (Mr. Anderson) was in a position to state that the Parsees of Calcutta entirely approved of the Bill, and that such was the view conveyed to him by a deputation of Parsee residents in Calcutta whom he had the pleasure of meeting last year. He feared that the Council would consider that on the subject of the Parsees, he was lapsing into a state of boredom, and indeed yesterday his Hon'ble friend Mr. Cust, with that wit and scholarship for which he was remarkable, had observed to him "*Persicos odi, puer, apparatus.*" He hoped the Council would understand that this Bill had come before the Council in another form about five years ago. It had been referred to a Select Committee who said that this measure had not received any expression of opinion from the Bombay Judges, or the Bombay Government and the local Officers. A Commission had accordingly been appointed, and in order to secure an expression of opinion from the Judges of the High Court, two of them had been appointed Members of the Commission. The Commission examined a great variety of witnesses, and received communications from Parsees in all parts of the Bombay Presidency, from those of Poona, Tannah, Surat, Broach, Ahmedabad, and other places.

He (Mr. Anderson) himself, on behalf of the Government, had sent copies of the Code all over the country. The Report of the Commission convinced the Bombay Government and Her Majesty's Secretary of State. The Bombay Government at that time was composed of men who were not likely to have recommended the measure without due consideration. At the head of the Government was a gentleman who was once a Member of the Government of India. He referred to Sir Bartle Frere. There was also Sir William Mansfield, who was little likely to vote in favour of the measure without a conviction of its propriety. He would also refer to the Hon'ble Mr. Frere who for years had been Judge at Surat, and who for about twelve years had been in Bombay either as the Chief Judge of the Sudder Court or as Member of Council. He (Mr. Anderson) thought that the Council had every guarantee that this Bill had been fully considered, and that every possible opportunity had been afforded to the Parsees for expressing their opinions with regard to it. They had stated objections—a great number of objections—but they were not of a very material character. The scale of distribution of intestate property proposed in the Bill presented a less divergence from the standard of the Indian Civil Code than the Parsees of the Mofussil themselves wished for. He did not see what objection there could be to the Bill, considering that the Parsees had for years past been beseeching the Council and the

Government of India for this simple act of justice, *viz.*, that they should not be squared down to the English law of intestate succession, but that with regard to intestate property, all should share equally. He thought that the Select Committee were fully competent, if they felt themselves in a position to do so, to report in three or five weeks, instead of in twelve weeks. If the rule regarding twelve weeks were strictly followed, the Council would hardly be able to pass any Bills in each Session, unless they were Bills ready cut and dry. Surely that was not what a wise Legislature should insist upon. He therefore trusted that the Council would permit this Bill to pass after consideration by a Select Committee.

With regard to the suggestions which had been made by Rájá Sáhib Dyál and the Mahárájá of Vizianagram, they would be better considered in Committee; and if both those gentlemen would do him the honour to be Members of the Committee, he hoped he should be able to satisfy them with regard to their objections to the Bill.

The Hon'ble Mr. Muir said that he would wish to ask the Hon'ble Mr. Anderson if the Bill was substantially the same as that which had been before the Parsees for so many years?

The Hon'ble Mr. Anderson said that the Bill was in substance precisely the same. The Parsees had not had the benefit of a legal education, and the wording of the Bill, as drawn by them, was somewhat untechnical and inaccurate. The Parsees' draft provided (Section 3) that, "if the intestate be a male, his property shall be divided into such number of shares as shall admit of its distribution in the following proportions:—To the widow half a share. To the sons one share each. To the daughters one quarter share each," and (Section 4) "if the intestate be a female, in the following proportions:—To her husband, one share. To her sons and daughters, one share each." For these provisions, at the suggestion of the Secretary to the Council, the following Sections had been substituted:—

"Where the intestate has left a widow, if he has also left any children, the property shall be divided among the widow and children, so that the share of each son shall be double the share of the widow, and that her share shall be double the share of each daughter."

"Where the intestate has left a widower, if she has also left any children, the property shall be divided among the widower and children, so that his share shall be double the share of each of the children."

The tables of kindred had also been removed from the body of the Bill to the Schedules. But as he (Mr. Anderson) said before, in substance there had not been the slightest alteration.

His Excellency the President said that it appeared to him that, under the Rules, if no shorter period were fixed by the Council, the Committee could not report in less than three months. Rule 20 provided as follows :—

“When three months have elapsed from the publication of a Bill in the *Calcutta Gazette* or in any shorter period that the Council may order, the Select Committee to which the Bill may have been referred shall make a report thereon.”

The Hon'ble MR. GREY begged to suggest to the Hon'ble Member for Bombay to amend his motion by stating that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee with instructions to report in five weeks.

The Hon'ble MR. ANDERSON then moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, with instructions to report in five weeks.

The Hon'ble MR. HARRINGTON said he would offer no opposition to the motion, but he reserved to himself the right of opposing hereafter the passing of the Bill until it had been published for the usual period.

The Motion was put and agreed to.

GOVERNMENT FORESTS' BILL.

The Hon'ble MR. MAINE moved that the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to give effect to Rules for the management and preservation of Government Forests, be taken into consideration. He said that, the alterations which had been recommended by the Select Committee in this Bill were not very material. Section 5 had been slightly altered. As it had stood, it merely provided for fine or imprisonment, or both. The Select Committee, however, thought that the maximum of the amount of the fine should be expressed in the Bill, and that the fine, if not paid, should be enforced by imprisonment, as provided in the Penal Code. There was no doubt that this was an improvement on the Section as originally drawn.

The last Section was new. The Bill originally applied to the whole of India. But when it was last before the Council, he had stated that the Government had no information to show whether it would be favourably received by the Governments of Madras and Bombay. The Council were still without any information on this matter. On the whole, it appeared to him that the Forest system of those Presidencies exhibited some material differences from that of the Government of India. The Bill would not, in the first instance, apply to those Presidencies, but the Governments of Madras and Bombay would have the power to extend its operation to the territories under them respectively. He did not see what objection they could have to a Bill

which only gave them power to make rules. This power, of course it was to be understood, would not stand in their way to make any other local enactment which they might think desirable.

The Motion was put and agreed to.

The Hon'ble MR. MAINE also moved that the Bill, as amended, be passed.

The Motion was put and agreed to.

INDIAN CIVIL CODE, CHAPTER I.

The Hon'ble MR. MAINE also presented the Report of the Select Committee on the Indian Civil Code, Chapter I.

SHERIFF'S INDEMNITY (BENGAL) BILL.

The Hon'ble MR. HARRINGTON in moving for leave to introduce a Bill to make valid the imprisonment of certain persons arrested under the process of the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal in the exercise of its ordinary original Civil jurisdiction, said that the necessity for this Bill had arisen from some recent proceedings in the High Court. Certain persons having been arrested in execution of decrees passed against them by the Court, had been committed to custody in default of paying the amounts for which they had severally been declared liable. After those persons had been in confinement for some time, a question arose whether Act VII of 1855, entitled an Act to amend the law of arrest on mesne process in Civil actions in Her Majesty's Courts of Judicature, and to provide for the subsistence of prisoners confined under Civil process of any of the said Courts, was still in force, or whether the Act had not been repealed or superseded by the Code of Civil Procedure, which was extended to the High Courts of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay by Her Majesty's Letters Patent on the establishment of those Courts. It did not appear to have been denied that, up to the time to which he was referring, the law of 1855 had continued to be acted upon in the High Court at Calcutta in all matters to which it related.

- This was of course done in the belief that Act VII of 1855 was still in force, anything in the Code of Civil Procedure notwithstanding. Had this belief been well founded, there would have been no necessity for the present Bill; but the High Court, after hearing the point fully argued, ruled—and he (Mr. Harrington) ventured to think rightly—that from the date of the establishment of the Court, Act VII of 1855 ceased to have effect, and that its place had been taken by the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure relating to arrests whether on mesne process or in execution of decrees, which thenceforth became the only rule for regulating the proceedings of the Court in such

matters. The Court followed up this ruling by declaring that, certain provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure not having been observed in the cases of the persons referred to by him before they were sent to jail, their imprisonment and subsequent detention in custody by the Sheriff were illegal, and the Court accordingly ordered their discharge. It was not the intention of the Bill which he had asked for leave to introduce, to call in question the correctness of this order, much less to exercise any interference with it; but the effect of the order had been to place the Sheriff and Deputy Sheriff of Calcutta, and probably also the judgment-creditors, at whose instance the persons alluded to had been arrested, in jeopardy, in other words, to render them liable to actions for damages by the persons whose imprisonment had been pronounced by the Court to have been illegal. As there could be no doubt that the Sheriff and his Officers, in arresting the persons in question and detaining them in custody, and the detaining creditors, had acted in good faith, and had only done what they were justified in considering the orders and practice of the Court authorized and required them to do, he thought the Council would agree with him that they ought not to be exposed to the danger which he had mentioned, and that they were entitled to be indemnified by an Act of the Legislature. The second Section of the Bill proposed therefore to enact that—"No suit or proceeding should be maintained in any Court on the ground that any such arrest, detention or imprisonment, as referred to in the preceding Section, and thereby made valid and effectual, was illegal or invalid by reason of its not having been in accordance with the Code of Civil Procedure, or of the omission of the Sheriff or Deputy Sheriff of the said High Court to conform to any of the provisions of the said Code." There were still some persons in confinement in execution of judgments of the High Court under the circumstances which he had described, who, taking advantage of the recent orders of the Court, might apply for their discharge, and in some of the cases, it might be difficult for the Court to refuse their applications unless the Legislature interposed and made their imprisonment valid. There was no reason to believe that these persons had suffered any greater hardship in consequence of their having been imprisoned under Act VII of 1855, than they would have suffered had their imprisonment and detention taken place under the Code of Civil Procedure, and he did not think that it would be for the interests of justice that they should be set at liberty on what was really a technical ground. The first Section of the Bill accordingly provided that "All arrests made subsequently to the establishment of the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, and before the passing of this Act, in execution of any process issued by the said Court in the exercise of its ordinary original Civil jurisdiction, and the detention and imprisonment of all persons so arrested shall for all purposes be deemed to be and always to have been as valid and effectual as if such arrests, detentions and imprison-

ments had been in accordance with the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure." These were the principal provisions of the Bill. He had ascertained from Madras and Bombay that the Code of Civil Procedure had been considered in force in the High Courts of those Presidencies from the time of their establishment, in supersession of Act VII of 1855, but as a precautionary measure he had added a Section to the Bill giving power to the Governors in Council of Madras and Bombay, by an order to be published in the Official Gazette, to extend the Act so as to apply to arrests, imprisonments and detentions under process issued by the High Court of Judicature at Madras, and the High Court of Judicature at Bombay, respectively, on or before the first day of March 1865.

The Motion was put and agreed to.

The Hon'ble MR. HARRINGTON also applied to His Excellency the President to suspend the rules for the Conduct of Business.

The President declared the Rules suspended.

The Hon'ble MR. HARRINGTON then introduced the Bill and moved that it be taken into consideration.

The Motion was put and agreed to.

The Hon'ble MR. HARRINGTON also moved that the Bill be passed.

The Motion was put and agreed to.

The following Select Committee was named :—

On the Bill to define and amend the law relating to Succession and Inheritance among the Parsees—The Hon'ble Messrs. Harrington, Maine and Anderson, the Hon'ble the Mahārājā of Vizianagram, the Hon'ble Rājā Sāhib Dyāl Bahādur, and the Hon'ble Messrs. Taylor and Muir.

The Council then adjourned.

WHITLEY STOKES,

*Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India,
Home Dept. (Legislative).*

CALCUTTA,
The 24th February 1865. }