parliament. Corn bill. Feb. 29. 334 were made on the subject. The proposition was agreed to. March 30. Mr Powys, moved that an humble address be presented to his majesty, that he would be graciously pleased to lay before the House of Commons, copies of all such information as had been received by the committee of privy council, relative to the present state of agriculture in Great Britain and Ireland, &c. His reason, he said, for requiring this information, was to ascertain whether or not the alsertion of some people was well founded, that neither Great Brite'a, nor Europe, produced a sufficient quantity of grain for the consumption of its inhabitants.

Mr Ryder objected, because some inconvenience would arise from divulging the price of corn at certain periods. He farther said, that the privy council had not gone into the state of agriculture in this country and Ireland. The motion was negatived; and Mr Powys gave notice that he should make a similar motion on Friday, April 1.

April 1. Mr Powys having accordingly made a similar motion in the house, is was negatived. He then moved, for an account of the quantities of corn, that had been imported from Ireland into Britain, and the quantities that had been exported from Britain into Ireland, for the last ten years .- Negatived.

Monday, April 4. In a committee on the corn bill, objections were made to the clause, subjecting velsels to forfeiture, by Mr Alderman Curtis and Lord Sheffield.-Opposed by the chancellor of exchequer, on a motion by Sir Peter Burrel, that L. 100 for every hundred tons of the burden, should be deposited in the hands of some proper person till it should be proved that the vessel was properly seized. The amendment was rejected ;---ayes 39, noes 64. Mr Powys then moved, that the ports should not be opened for the importation of foreign wheat, till the average price rose to 52s. instead of 48s. as proposed, contending that this would tend to encourage the agriculture of the country.

Mr Ryder strenuously opposed the motion. Lord Carysfort, Mr Pelbam, Mr Puliney, Mr Bastard, Lord Sheffield, Mr Harrison, Mr H. Browne, and Mr Fox, supported the amendment. By these gentlemen it was in general contended, that the scarcity complained of inlate years, had not been owing to a natural scarcity; but