small property that was only worth five thousand would be no temptation to a lord or duke, who has perhaps a clear income of a hundred thousand a-year, and whose object is not to get money, but to get more land. That the abolition of entails would lead to the sale of land in such portions as would be convenient to the purchaser,—that a farmer, for instance, who had been saving and successful, could go to his landlord and buy his farm at a fair market-price, as he would buy a house or a ship,—we certainly do not anticipate; for if the farm lay in the centre of an estate, the proprietor would not sell it for ten times its estimated value, nay, he would not sell it at all. The mere abolition of entails, therefore, although in itself a good and proper measure, would not be calculated to work any great change for the general welfare. It might relieve some spendthrift families from the inconvenience of estates which they were unable to manage or redeem, and it might infuse new capital into the agricultural improvements of the country; but that it would materially affect the mass of the rural population to their advantage is by no means probable. At the same time, the total abolition of every remnant of the feudal system and of feudal practice in land conveyance is perhaps the first step to improvement.

Another proposed remedy is the formation of peasant properties,—a measure that has vehement advocates, and quite as vehement opponents, even among those who are supposed impartially to have investigated the subject. Mr M'Culloch, carried away with the one idea of cultivation on a large scale, assures us that anything like peasant proprietorship would submerge us into a sea of pauperism. Mr Joseph Kay, on the contrary, whose ability we take to be quite equal to that of Mr M'Culloch, and whose opportunities for extensive, accurate, and personal observation we apprehend to have been even superior, assures us that the measure would tend to make our poorer classes happy, prudent, and prosperous.