

The Waterford Chronicle.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1830.

Price 6d.

No. 557.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 10.
Lord Wynford, in the absence of the Lord Chancellor, sat from ten until past four this day, for the purpose of hearing appeals, but no other public business was transacted.—Adjourned to tomorrow.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 10.
Mr. Parkhouse from the India House presented the 6th report of the Tanjore commissioners.

Mr. DENMAN, Lord BELGRAVE, and several other Hon. Members presented a great many petitions praying for the abolition of slavery in the colonies. Laid on the table.

Alderman WAITHMAN gave notice, that he should, on as early a day as possible, submit a motion to the House for a repeal of the assessed taxes. He also gave notice, that he should, unless some more influential Member took it upon himself, after the Christmas recess, move for an inquiry into the distressed state of the country.

The Hon. Alderman moved for returns of the names and names, &c., of ships employed by the revenue department, from the 25th of July to the 10th of August, 1830. His object was to show that ministers had made use of undue influence at the late general election, in permitting the voters for government candidates at certain places to be conveyed in transport vessels.

Colonel TRENCH thought it the better and the more course for the Hon. Alderman to give notice of his motion—rather, as none of his Majesty's Ministers were then in their places.

Alderman WAITHMAN was very willing to let the motion stand for a notice.

Mr. BROUGHAM could not help complaining that no Member of the Government was present, to attend to the important petitions of the people, on questions of great public interest. It was the understanding that ministers should be in their places at half-past three o'clock, and it was then past that hour.

Mr. G. DAWSON said that the understanding was, that ministers should be in their places at four o'clock. It then wanted a quarter to that hour: so that the complaint of the Hon. Member was not warranted.

Sir R. PEEL, who entered the House as Mr. Dawson was speaking, was surprised that any Hon. Member should make a complaint in his absence. He was no party to any arrangement that ministers should be in their places at half-past three o'clock; for was the hour which he had understood to be fixed upon. It was impossible for the Secretary of State for the Home Department to be always in his place to the minute—(hear)—all he could do was to endeavour that his official duties should interfere as little as possible with his duties in that House. (Hear, hear.) How, for instance, could he be thought that the Home Secretary might not have been officially engaged in the investigation of matters arising out of the disturbed state of the metropolis last night? (Hear.) Besides, as a minister of the Crown, he was bound to be present at his Majesty's levee held that day; from which he had obtained the King's gracious permission to retire before the usual time, in order to be in that House as soon as possible. (Hear.)

Mr. BROUGHAM had made no complaint of the absence of the Right Hon. Home Secretary, but of the Secretary to the Ordnance. (Oh, oh, and hear.) As to the charge of complaining in the absence of the Right Hon. Baronet, he should like to know how, without incurring the imputation of the most absurdity, he could with any face complain of a man's absence in his presence? (Hear, and a laugh.) The complaint was of the absence of the servants of the crown, and therefore in its very expression precluded the physical possibility of making it in their presence. Besides, his charge was general—the Right Hon. Baronet was not the only minister in that House—in fact, the only minister of the crown sat in another place—(hear, and a laugh)—and was not directed against him individually. The Right Hon. Baronet had referred to the disturbed state of the metropolis last night, as a reason for his not appearing sooner than he did then. Now, all that he (Mr. Brougham) could say on that point was, that he had walked in the Strand and Charing-cross at a late hour last night, and met with nothing to warrant the inference from the Right Hon. Baronet's declaration. He certainly had met a crowd, but never one more peaceable and less disposed to riot. He saw four troops of police drawn up in two lines along the street, and waving to and fro, from their want of practice in military discipline; but as to tumult, or any thing like tumult, he saw none. He denied the fact on the part of the good people of Westminster. There were a number of men and women and children assembled—all in good humour—but they appeared as if they were waiting in expectation of the illumination, or of learning whether it might not be a hoax that the Right Honourable Secretary had written the letter which bore his name, or that his Majesty had been induced by him to postpone his visit to the city.—(Cries of "Order.") He was decidedly in order—he was replying to the Right Honourable Secretary's observation, who had asked "Could any one who saw the disturbed state of the town last night doubt that there would be that morning sufficient business in the Home Office to detain the Chief Secretary till four o'clock?" Now, he had seen the state of Westminster yesterday evening, and he had seen nothing in it like disturbance.

Sir R. PEEL said that the Hon. and Learned Gentleman might not have seen the collision which had taken place between the people and the police at Temple-bar, and in various parts of the Strand, but others had seen it, though he had not, and there could be no doubt as to the fact.

Mr. BEAUMONT said that he could say, from his own personal knowledge that there had been a riot between the people and the police at Temple-bar. He was afraid that ministers would be occupied with similar business every morning to that which had this morning occupied the Right Honourable Secretary, so long as they retained their present unpopularity; and he was afraid that they would retain their unpopularity so long as they retained their places.

Sir J. GRAHAM gave notice, that he would on Thursday submit a motion on the subject-matter of a petition which had been presented to his Majesty from the inhabitants of Stanhope, in the county of Durham, regarding the intended elevation of Dr. Phillpotts, the rector of that parish, to the vacant see of Exeter.

Mr. BEAUMONT said that he was desirous to ask the Right Hon. Secretary a question upon that very subject. There was at present great discontent prevailing in the extensive parish of Stanhope, which contained 12,000 inhabitants, in consequence of its being generally believed, that Dr. Phillpotts, the present rector of it, was to retain that very valuable living, of which the tithes alone amounted to £4,000 a-year, along with the bishopric of Exeter. What he suggested to know from the Right Hon. Secretary was, whether the valuable living of Stanhope was to be held by the same person who held the bishopric of Exeter.—(Hear.)

Sir R. PEEL observed that the living of Stanhope would be held in connection with the bishopric of Exeter, and that the present would not be the first time in which a bishop had held the living of Stanhope.

Sir J. GRAHAM said, that in consequence of the answer which had just been given to his Hon. Friend the Member for Northumberland, by the Right Hon. Secretary, he should vary the form of the motion, of which he had just given notice—instead of making a motion, he should take the direct course of moving an address to his Majesty, praying that he would not allow the rectory of Stanhope to be held along with any bishopric.—(Cries of "Hear.")

Mr. HUME presented a petition from the parish of Marylebone, praying for a reduction of taxation and a reform of Parliament.

Mr. BROUGHAM presented 355 petitions from various parts of the country—of which 283 were from places in Yorkshire—praying for the abolition of negro slavery. He was convinced that these petitions would be far outnumbered, in value and in weight, by petitions for reform in Parliament.

Mr. BROUGHAM said, he rose to move for leave to bring in a bill for the establishment of local judicatures. The House would recollect that the bill had, in the last session, been brought in, read a first and second time, and committed, on the understanding that it was not to be pressed further during that session, but stand over for consideration during the vacation. He had only to ask that the bill might now be brought to the same stage as speedily as the forms of the House would permit, in order that, if it should pass this House, there might be given to the other House a sufficient time to form a judgment respecting it during the present session.

Sir R. PEEL said he had no objection to the Bill being brought in, read a first and second time, and committed *pro forma*.

Mr. CAMPBELL said he would not discuss the merits of the Bill now; but he must say that, after all the consideration which he had been able to give it, it appeared to him to be liable to the most serious objections.

Mr. TENNANT declared his intention of opposing the Bill.

After a few words from Mr. TENNANT and Mr. O'CONNELL.

Mr. BROUGHAM disclaimed having any intention, in his plan, of pulling down the judicial establishments of the country. He contended that the plan would not be attended with expense, but that, on the contrary, with the machinery of it was in complete action, the fees would be sufficient to defray the expensiveness; and, in proof of that assertion, he referred to the practice of the small courts in Scotland.

Mr. BRUCE asked where was the necessity for the appointment of the three new judges, if this statement of the Learned gent. (Mr. Brougham) was correct, that by this reform a great quantity of the business would be removed from the superior courts?

Mr. BROUGHAM, in reply, said that it would take two or three years to produce the change; he had stated, and that it would not be till the places of the judges who might drop. He wished to know where was the necessity for filling up the appointment in the Exchequer, where so little business was done?

Sir R. PEEL said that the object of the reforms which were about to be introduced was, amongst other things, to equalize the business in the three courts, and that with that view the business in the court of Exchequer would be diminished.

Mr. BROUGHAM said that nothing which human power could do would drive any business into the Court of Exchequer at present.

The motion was then agreed to, and leave was given to bring in the Bill.

Mr. M. A. TAYLOR intimated, that under no circumstances whatever would he defer to bring forward a motion for an alteration in the Court of Chancery.

Mr. LONG WELLESLEY presented a petition from (Chelsea), praying for the abolition of negro slavery.

Mr. PENDARVIS presented 198 similar petitions from different places in Cornwall.

THE CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER laid on the table accounts of the civil list expenditure, and moved that they be printed. Ordered.

THE CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER moved that the House should on Friday next resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House, to take into consideration that part of his Majesty's speech which related to the civil list.

Mr. HUME wished to know whether the Right Hon. Gentleman intended to move his resolutions on the first night, or merely to make a statement.

THE CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER thought that when the information contained in the papers laid on the table should be in the hands of Hon. Members, there could be no objection to his moving his resolutions in committee on Friday.

Mr. HUME would then feel it his duty to take the sense of the House on that occasion, if the Right Hon. Gentleman would not postpone putting his resolutions to vote until Monday.

Sir J. GRAHAM, referring to a motion of his for an address for accounts of all salaries and emoluments granted to official persons from the civil list, where they exceeded £1,000 per annum, and which had been agreed to on the 17th of May last, asked why such returns had not been made?

THE CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that every exertion had been made to complete them, and they would probably be ready to-morrow.

Sir JAMES GRAHAM hoped the House would not be called to come to a vote with regard to the civil list until those accounts were before them.

Mr. TENNANT, Mr. Leader, and Mr. Maberly, strongly supported the proposition of Mr. Hume; and after some conversation, it was finally determined that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should make his statement upon Friday, and that the House should not be pressed to vote until Monday.

The motion was then agreed to, and the House adjourned at a quarter past six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 11.

An immense number of petitions were presented by different Members against negro slavery.

Mr. O'CONNELL presented a petition from John Makone, stating that he had a right of voting for the election of a Burgess for the borough of Dundalk; that he had tendered his vote at the last election, but that instead of being received as a voter, he was assaulted by the police.

Mr. M'CLINTOCK defended the conduct of the magistracy in the neighbourhood of Dundalk.

Mr. O'CONNELL presented a petition from the haters and feltmakers of Carlou, complaining of distress, and praying for a repeal of the Legislative Union. He also presented a similar petition from certain persons resident in London, at the head of whom was Mr. Webb, a surgeon, who had desired him to state that he was not a radical reformer, but a friend to the Duke of Wellington's Administration.

SUBLETTING ACT.

Mr. O'CONNELL rose, pursuant to notice, to move for leave to bring in a bill to repeal the Statute 7 Geo. IV. c. 29, commonly called the Subletting Act. He pursued this course, because he was convinced that, if there was any thing objectionable in the Act—and it was admitted on all hands that there was—it would be better to bring in a new statute at once, than to attempt to patch up the old one. This statute was the law in Ireland, but it was not the law in England; and he thought he had a right to have the case made out why the law of landlord and tenant should be different in the two countries. This act had two objects in view, and it might be, for convenience—say, it ought to be, for convenience—divided into two statutes. The first part of the act related to existing leases and contracts; the second, to leases and contracts to be hereafter made. The first part of the act altered the nature of contracts as then subsisting, by giving a legal meaning to the words of contracts, whereas, a legal meaning, which is a different meaning, attached to those words before. This was an unjust, because an *ex post facto* law, and the object of it was to strike out of contracts a qualification which was advantageous to the tenants. If he knew that some gentlemen had said that they liked the principle of this act, though they objected to the details of it. Could any one say that he liked the principle of this part of the act, the dishonest principle of an *ex post facto* law, which violated existing engagements? The second part of the statute, he admitted, was purely prospective, and that was a legitimate mode of legislation, which the other was not. This part of the act prohibited the subletting of land in Ireland, except in three cases. The exceptions were, first, lands held on leases for lives, renewable for ever; secondly, lands held on a term of 99 years; thirdly, all lands belonging to the church. With these three exceptions, the act operated universally. Why, he should like to know, was the law to interfere between the landlord and the tenant? Why not allow the landlord and tenant to make what contracts they pleased between themselves? This act had taken away the freedom of the only trade they had in Ireland—namely, trade in land. He might be told that the act did not do this in words. He admitted this, but such was in fact the effect of the act. It said that the landlord should no longer distrain upon the under-tenant, and of course no landlord would consent to have the remedy of distraining upon the occupied land. The question, however, after all, came to this, ought the law to interfere between the landlord and the tenant? But it was said that this law was good, because it was beneficial to clear estates. This was the argument of heartless and unfeeling men, who thought it better to support upon an estate a great many harts, and very few human beings. However, let it be understood, that in applying for the repeal of this act, he did not propose to take away from the landlord the right of clearing his estate. That right would remain with the landlord still, who would exercise it if he thought proper, in its full extent; only it was not, he contended, the part of a considerate and humane government to make itself the auxiliary of the landlord, to compel him to clear his estate, and thus to take away from the landlord the right of humanity and hard-heartedness. He was free to confess, that he did not believe this act to have been an act of the government. He looked upon it as originating in some political misapprehension of the period of the nation until the present, all their statutes had for their object the oppression of the peasantry, and the giving advantages to the landlord. The statute which enabled the landlord to distrain growing crops, and which conferred upon him the power of ejecting a tenant at an extremely small expense, had been among the main causes of the evils of the poor in Ireland; and consequently the disturbances which had unfortunately taken place in that country. The statute first enabled the landlord to raise his rents, and then to turn him out cheaply. He might be told that this act was made for the purpose of creating large farms, and that he might have repeated to him long dissertations on the beneficial effects of large farms. If to cause universal mendicity among the peasantry was to produce a beneficial effect, then, indeed, there would be some truth in these dissertations, and some sense in the pages of evidence, which unfeeling men had given on this subject. Let him mention an act which gave him the greatest satisfaction to record. So great had been the increase of mendicity, that he knew for a fact the Mendicity Association of Dublin must have closed its doors if the Duke of Northumberland had not presented them with a donation of £1,000. He meant a donation not out of the public money, but out of his Lordship's private purse. (Hear, hear.) He could state further, that after that sum of £1,000 was exhausted, the association had been kept on by the private contributions of a member of his Lordship's family—a female, whose name he would not, of course, mention. He knew these facts to be as he had stated them. But to return to this statute, of which, he repeated, the effects had been to increase mendicity to an alarming extent, it was a political economy, not a government act. Its professed object was to create large farms, and this this the political economist said was a good object. He would meet these gentlemen upon the fact, that the act had not created large farms. It prevented labourers being employed, for if the landlord gave the labourer a holding, the labourer might keep it. Except, therefore, in the neighbourhood of exempted lands, no large farms could exist, because the owners would not risk the employment of the number of labourers to cultivate them. To the operation of this Act was to trace the enormous increase of mendicity that there was a superabundance of labour in Ireland. There was no natural superabundance of labour in that country; the superabundance of labour was artificial, and caused by bad laws and bad government. If such a state of things were allowed to continue, he apprehended (however dangerous the admission might appear) a terrible war in Ireland of the worst description. (Hear, hear.) The Hon. and Learned Member concluded by moving for leave to bring in a Bill to repeal the 7th Geo. IV. c. 29, commonly called the Subletting Act.

The motion having been seconded.

Mr. DOHERTY begged to remind the Hon. Member, that on passing this Act it was admitted on all hands that there was something in the condition of Ireland which required that the law of landlord and tenant in the two countries should be different. This he could show by authorities of a very high character; but in saying this, let it not be supposed that he was insensible to the propriety of generally assimilating as nearly as possible the laws of the two countries. (Hear, hear.)

The penalty for breach of covenant under this Act was, that the tenant to whom the land was sublet should not be liable to the payment of rent. The Learned Gentleman referred to Scotland for precedents for similar provisions against subletting. He thought there could be no greater boon to the peasantry of Ireland than this remedy against complicated and repeated distresses. Now was the time, when they had been freed from the influence of party motives and feelings, for them all in that House to co-operate cordially in the introduction of measures for the benefit of Ireland. The subject of the poor laws was one which they would have to consider; but without pronouncing any opinion on it, he thought it was one which they should approach slowly and with caution; for if such amendments were once adopted, they could not retract them.

He rejoiced to say that the Irish landlords had at length laid their shoulders to the wheel, and that they were determined to make every exertion to establish an independent and substantial peasantry in Ireland. This law was the first towards elevating the peasantry of Ireland to that condition. He implored, the Hon. Member for Waterford to reconsider his subject, from a conviction that if he pronounced to the people of Ireland the principle on which the Act was passed, he would do more benefit to their country than ever he (Mr. D.) could hope to do, even from the *Middleton* benefits, in consequence of the immense influence the Hon. Member possessed in that country. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. VILLIERS STUART recommended a modification of this act, but he was not in favour of its repeal. He contended that much of the evil which prevailed in Ireland would be alleviated, if this law were not to operate upon leases made prior to its enactment; and it appeared to him that it was better that the landlord should suffer from the imperfect working of the old law, than that the tenant should suffer from the operation of a new law.

In principle this act was perfectly equitable, but as regards the landlord and tenant, in the act itself he saw *ex post facto* grounds for the clamour which had been raised against it. The system of infinite and complicated distresses in Ireland, arising out of the subdivision of lands had been productive of misery, injustice, and outrage, and yet they were allowed to put an end to the recurrence of such monstrous evils. (Hear, hear.) If the subletting act afforded to the landlord security against fraud on the part of the tenants it afforded to the tenants a defence against injustice and extortion.

Colonel BRESFORD observed, that the principle of this act was the protection of the landlord against his country, and he maintained that no one had a right to interfere with a landlord in the distribution of his property. He must beg leave of the House to defend his Noble Relative (Lord Bressford) and his agent, from the attacks made upon him out of doors by the Learned Member opposite.

Mr. O'CONNELL rose, and said, that he could not well agree to the Honourable Gentleman's reply to what he had said out of doors, unless he was to be allowed to censure the House of the authority upon which he had made his statement.

Colonel BRESFORD said that he could not yield to the Learned Gentleman's proposition.—What Lord Bressford's agent had done had been at his own loss. He had let the lands to tenants without distinction of religious or political opinions. His farms averaged from 40 to 60 acres each.—Dr. Doyle had borne testimony to the conduct of this person; and he could say, that there was not a tenant about to leave the estate that was not two years' rent in arrear.

Mr. A. DAWSON said that it was a most glaring violation of principle to pass such a law for Ireland and not for England. This was dissimulating the laws of the two countries, and the population

men had given on this subject. Let him mention an act which gave him the greatest satisfaction to record. So great had been the increase of mendicity, that he knew for a fact the Mendicity Association of Dublin must have closed its doors if the Duke of Northumberland had not presented them with a donation of £1,000. He meant a donation not out of the public money, but out of his Lordship's private purse. (Hear, hear.) He could state further, that after that sum of £1,000 was exhausted, the association had been kept on by the private contributions of a member of his Lordship's family—a female, whose name he would not, of course, mention. He knew these facts to be as he had stated them. But to return to this statute, of which, he repeated, the effects had been to increase mendicity to an alarming extent, it was a political economy, not a government act. Its professed object was to create large farms, and this this the political economist said was a good object. He would meet these gentlemen upon the fact, that the act had not created large farms. It prevented labourers being employed, for if the landlord gave the labourer a holding, the labourer might keep it. Except, therefore, in the neighbourhood of exempted lands, no large farms could exist, because the owners would not risk the employment of the number of labourers to cultivate them. To the operation of this Act was to trace the enormous increase of mendicity that there was a superabundance of labour in Ireland. There was no natural superabundance of labour in that country; the superabundance of labour was artificial, and caused by bad laws and bad government. If such a state of things were allowed to continue, he apprehended (however dangerous the admission might appear) a terrible war in Ireland of the worst description. (Hear, hear.) The Hon. and Learned Member concluded by moving for leave to bring in a Bill to repeal the 7th Geo. IV. c. 29, commonly called the Subletting Act.

The motion having been seconded.

Mr. DOHERTY begged to remind the Hon. Member, that on passing this Act it was admitted on all hands that there was something in the condition of Ireland which required that the law of landlord and tenant in the two countries should be different. This he could show by authorities of a very high character; but in saying this, let it not be supposed that he was insensible to the propriety of generally assimilating as nearly as possible the laws of the two countries. (Hear, hear.)

The penalty for breach of covenant under this Act was, that the tenant to whom the land was sublet should not be liable to the payment of rent. The Learned Gentleman referred to Scotland for precedents for similar provisions against subletting. He thought there could be no greater boon to the peasantry of Ireland than this remedy against complicated and repeated distresses. Now was the time, when they had been freed from the influence of party motives and feelings, for them all in that House to co-operate cordially in the introduction of measures for the benefit of Ireland. The subject of the poor laws was one which they would have to consider; but without pronouncing any opinion on it, he thought it was one which they should approach slowly and with caution; for if such amendments were once adopted, they could not retract them.

He rejoiced to say that the Irish landlords had at length laid their shoulders to the wheel, and that they were determined to make every exertion to establish an independent and substantial peasantry in Ireland. This law was the first towards elevating the peasantry of Ireland to that condition. He implored, the Hon. Member for Waterford to reconsider his subject, from a conviction that if he pronounced to the people of Ireland the principle on which the Act was passed, he would do more benefit to their country than ever he (Mr. D.) could hope to do, even from the *Middleton* benefits, in consequence of the immense influence the Hon. Member possessed in that country. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. VILLIERS STUART recommended a modification of this act, but he was not in favour of its repeal. He contended that much of the evil which prevailed in Ireland would be alleviated, if this law were not to operate upon leases made prior to its enactment; and it appeared to him that it was better that the landlord should suffer from the imperfect working of the old law, than that the tenant should suffer from the operation of a new law.

In principle this act was perfectly equitable, but as regards the landlord and tenant, in the act itself he saw *ex post facto* grounds for the clamour which had been raised against it. The system of infinite and complicated distresses in Ireland, arising out of the subdivision of lands had been productive of misery, injustice, and outrage, and yet they were allowed to put an end to the recurrence of such monstrous evils. (Hear, hear.) If the subletting act afforded to the landlord security against fraud on the part of the tenants it afforded to the tenants a defence against injustice and extortion.

Colonel BRESFORD observed, that the principle of this act was the protection of the landlord against his country, and he maintained that no one had a right to interfere with a landlord in the distribution of his property. He must beg leave of the House to defend his Noble Relative (Lord Bressford) and his agent, from the attacks made upon him out of doors by the Learned Member opposite.

Mr. O'CONNELL rose, and said, that he could not well agree to the Honourable Gentleman's reply to what he had said out of doors, unless he was to be allowed to censure the House of the authority upon which he had made his statement.

Colonel BRESFORD said that he could not yield to the Learned Gentleman's proposition.—What Lord Bressford's agent had done had been at his own loss. He had let the lands to tenants without distinction of religious or political opinions. His farms averaged from 40 to 60 acres each.—Dr. Doyle had borne testimony to the conduct of this person; and he could say, that there was not a tenant about to leave the estate that was not two years' rent in arrear.

Mr. A. DAWSON said that it was a most glaring violation of principle to pass such a law for Ireland and not for England. This was dissimulating the laws of the two countries, and the population

driven from Ireland by the Subletting Act would naturally come over to England; they would not stop in Ireland to perish. It was not, however, the policy or impolicy of the law that he would direct his opposition, for he objected to it entirely upon principle.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL thought that, standing in his situation, it might be desirable for him to express his sentiments on this law, and in doing so, he could assure the House that he had no other wish than to assimilate, as much as possible, the laws of property in the two countries.

Mr. GRATTAN complained that the Hon. and Learned Gentleman who had just sat down, so far from proposing any amendment of the Subletting Act, had denominated that measure a boon to the Irish peasantry. He (Mr. Grattan) did not contemplate it in that light, and if the question came to a division (which he rather deprecated) he would certainly support the motion of the Hon. and Learned Member for Waterford.

Lord F. L. GOWER thought that this was hardly the occasion for entering into the details of the Bill, far if the House should determine with the Hon. Member for Waterford against the principle of the measure, it was unnecessary to go into the details; and if the House should decide differently, the proper time for discussing the matter in detail would be when a measure similar to his (Lord F. L. Gower's) Bill of last year should be introduced by his Right Hon. and Gallant Colleague, the present Secretary for Ireland.

Sir HENRY HARDINGE begged leave to state, that it was his intention to-morrow to move for leave to bring in a Bill to explain and amend the Statute 7 Geo. IV. c. 29, commonly called the Subletting Act. His measure would resemble, as nearly as possible, the Bill introduced by his Honourable Friend (Lord L. Gower) last year.

Mr. WYSE had heard with pleasure the intention expressed by the Right Hon. and Gallant Secretary to introduce a measure for the amendment of a bill which, whatever were its merits or demerits, had produced a vast deal of dissatisfaction in Ireland. The whole of the discussion appeared to him to be simply this: whether the old Bill should be amended, as proposed by the Right Hon. Secretary, or whether it should be thrown aside, and a new Bill substituted, in accordance with the motion of the Hon. Member for Waterford. As he was for simplicity in legislation, he felt disposed to follow the second plan. The question with every good government was, how best to raise the amount of capital to due proportion with the amount of population; and if a government were wise and powerful, and identified with the interests of the people, it would not be long till it discovered the means of effecting this object; but if a government were imbecile, dishonest, and disposed to palter with the happiness of the nation, it would more easily find means to reduce population to the level of capital, than to raise the latter in proportion to the scale of population. He did not say that such was the object of the Subletting Act. The object of that Act was to prevent the minute subdivision of land. Now, he was not one of those who praised small or large farms, abstractedly considered; the advantage of small or large farms depended upon various considerations. The present law saw in the middle-man principally the cause of all the disasters of Ireland; but the middle-man was not always mischievous. Ireland was at one period in a situation to require middle-men. She was in the situation of a conquered country, with absentee proprietors, and gladly availed herself of somebody to take their place. The middle-men of that day constituted the only link between the two orders of the state—almost the only link between the two countries. (Hear.) But another class of middle-men was generated by the high price of corn; and the result was too great a division of land in Ireland, and too high a price for land. (Hear.) When the war ceased, prices fell, and the alteration from a state of war with high prices, to a state of peace with low prices, was accompanied by great inconveniences. A similar effect was produced in Scotland after the union, according to Fletcher of Saltoun, in England in the reigns of James and Elizabeth, and might be now observed in Westphalia. He did not maintain that the Subletting Act had produced all the evil, but he was of opinion that it had caused a considerable part of it, especially as no reservoir was provided for the people's grief, in consequence of it. He strongly recommended the Right Hon. and Gallant Secretary not to bring in the Bill of which he had given notice, unaccompanied by some of the great measures of amelioration to which he (Sir H. Hardinge) had alluded. As to emigration, he (Mr. Wyse) did not approve of it as a remedial measure. He disapproved of sending away the flower of our population—the muscle and mind—leaving behind the bones and drags of the lower orders of the community. If asked for his remedial measures, he answered, he would remove the impediments of commerce—for instance, he would set free the coal trade, he would break down all monopolies, whether of Grand Juries or Corporations, and give an impulse to industry and employment, by loans and other salutary means.

Sir J. BURKE thought that the Subletting Act tended to prevent the improvement of waste lands in Ireland. He should be happy to give his assistance to the Right Hon. Secretary for Ireland in the Right Hon. Gentleman's endeavour to amend the Bill.

Lord BOYLE said he should vote against the motion of the Hon. Member for Waterford, not that he approved of the Subletting Act, but because, after the statement of the Right Hon. Secretary, he thought it his duty to await the result of the amended Bill.

Mr. RUTHVEN expressed his satisfaction at what was said by the Secretary for Ireland, of his intention to introduce a Bill to amend this Act, which had already produced so much mischief, but, as he understood, he would vote for the motion of the Hon. Member for Waterford.

Mr. O'BRIEN said a few words, we believe, against the motion.

Mr. O'CONNELL replied.

The House then divided—

For the motion 21
Against it 150
Majority 129

