

the land better cultivated in this province than in the United States, or in our sister colonies? We know very well that we have no cause for self-gratification on this head. I will read on this subject the opinion of Mr. Humphreys, an eminent English lawyer, which I recollect to have quoted last year. It is an extract from the preface to the second edition of his work on real property. He says he has "left out the comparison between primogeniture and equal partibility, because, since the former publication, he has perused the civil code of the Netherlands, and has traversed the country, in almost every direction. The one establishes equal partibility; the other exhibits a country cultivated like a garden, with a peasantry thoroughly at its ease." I protest, Sir, that I am unable to comprehend how the country would be better cultivated, if the eldest son inherited all his father's landed property, than if it descended to all the children equally. By the way, the King of the Netherlands and his nobility do not seem to find in the law of equal partibility those democratic tendencies which some of our sagacious and enlightened statesmen discern, although the former are enabled to judge not merely from theory, but also from actual experiment.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, the law of primogeniture is a relic of a barbarous age and of a system of military despotism, that was as hostile to the improvement as to the liberties of man. It was imposed on England by the strong arm of a military conqueror, and the men of Kent to this day, glory in their exemption from this badge of servitude and subjection, altho' for want of such a provision as this bill contains, it is said that, in some extreme cases, the law of Gavelkind, which prevails in that county, has in the long lapse of several centuries, produced a minute and inconvenient sub-division of property. The law of primogeniture is evidently a part of the feudal system. In