

Church, possessed an advowson which by law he might have a right to hold, of course he would be at liberty to appoint; but instances of that kind had nothing whatever to do with the present case.

The Clause inserted.

The House resumed—the Report to be received.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, August 25, 1835.

MINUTES.] Bills. Read a third time:—Marriage Act Amendment; Dominica Relief.—Read a second time:—Stamp and Assessed Taxes.—Read a first time:—Oaths' Abolition.

Petitions presented. By an HON. MEMBER, from Newcastle, in favour of the Church of Scotland.—By Lord GEORGE BENTINCK, from the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, for the Equalization of the Duties on East and West India Produce.—By Mr. POTTER, from Wigan; and Mr. WILKS, from Wareham, in favour of the Municipal Corporations' Bill.

PUBLICATION OF LECTURES.] The House in Committee on the Lectures' Publication Bill.

Mr. Wakley moved the omission of Clause 2nd.

Lord John Russell said, that his view of the matter was, that Lecturers should have the same protection as Authors had. At the same time he was of opinion that it should be fully competent to newspapers and other publications to make extracts from such lectures, and pass comments upon them, with a view of affording the public an opportunity of judging as to their merits. Unless this permission were accorded he should not support the Bill.

Mr. Wakley agreed with the noble Lord, that private Lecturers should have equal protection with authors; but he could not see that such Lecturers as those at St. Bartholomew's Hospital (who on the aggregate derived an income of 8,000*l.* a-year from this source) were in any respect entitled to a similar protection.

The Committee divided on the Clause: Ayes 29; Noes 9—Majority 20.

List of the NOES.

Airwood, T.	Ruthven, E. S.
Bridgman, H.	Ruthven, E.
Chalmers, P.	Tulk, C. A.
Crawford, S.	
Ector, C. J.	TELLER.
Emayne, D.	Wakley, T.

The remaining clauses agreed to, and the House resumed.

HOUSE OF LORDS,
Wednesday, August 26, 1835.

MINUTES.] Bills. Read a third time:—Illegal Securities; Clerk of the Crown; Special Constables; Wood Duties; Insolvent Courts; Savings' Banks (Scotland).—Read a second time:—Colonial Passengers; Sheriffs (Ireland); and Dominica Relief.

TITHES ON TURNIPS.] The Duke of Richmond moved the second reading of the Tithe on Turnips' Bill. It was scarcely necessary for him, after what occurred here a few days since, to trouble their Lordships at any length on this subject. He had no doubt that the decision given by his noble Friend (Lord Lyndhurst), when sitting in a Court of Law, that Turnips drawn from the ground to feed sheep were titheable, was quite correct, and therefore he thought the law ought to be amended; for such a law was a great injustice on the farmer. This Bill had been opposed as a Bill upon a matter affecting only an individual case—a matter not likely to occur again. If he believed that such a case as that on which his noble and learned Friend had decided would never occur again, he should not trouble their Lordships to give the Bill a second reading. But he anticipated on the contrary, that a claim of the sort recently established in a Court of Law, would again and again be brought into a Court of Justice; and such claims ought in justice to be prevented. He thought, too, that every friend of the Church must wish that the difficult and delicate question of tithes should be brought forward with as little prejudice as possible. The question of tithes was in itself already sufficiently complicated, and as a friend of the Church he wished that this new and ungracious claim, never before heard of, should not be added to the rest, to prejudice the minds of people on the discussion of the general question. He moved that the Bill be now read a second time.

Lord Ashburton could not consent in this case any more than in any other to proceed on any principle but that of right. He repeated that he objected to legislate on individual cases; at the same time he must admit that since the former stage of the Bill he had considered it more fully than on a former occasion, and that he must allow that the case on which it was founded was a case of considerable hardship; and that if cases of hardship could ever justify the Legislature in interfering, this was a case that would justify it. At