

0253

101-7



2.

A
LETTER

TO

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

GEORGE CANNING, M.P.

&c. &c. &c.

RELATIVE TO A

**FREE TRADE IN CORN,
IN GREAT BRITAIN.**

BY

W.M. KEER BROWN.

Second Edition.

"His Majesty commands us not to conclude without congratulating you upon the continued improvement in the state of the Agricultural Interest, the solid foundation of our national prosperity."

SPEECH AT THE OPENING OF PARLIAMENT, FEB. 3, 1825.

LONDON:

HARDING, ST. JAMES'S STREET; RIDGWAY, PICCADILLY;
LODER, WOODBRIDGE; RAW, DECK, IPSWICH; DECK, BURY;
BERKS AND KINNEBROOKE, MATCHETT AND
STEVENSON, NORWICH; AND ALL
OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1826.

LETTER.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

GEORGE CANNING, M.P.

*His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for
Foreign Affairs, &c. &c. &c.*

SIR,

NOTHING, I believe, has had a greater tendency to bring the Executive branch of the Government, of which you are so distinguished a member, into a high degree of estimation, than the great attention that, for a considerable period, has been paid by it to an amelioration of the burthens of the people, and to the fostering of the agriculture and general commerce of the country; which, under Providence, with the exception of the unhappy spirit of combination, that exists among our artizans, and an equally unhappy one for unlimited speculation among certain portions of the mercantile community, exhibits an extent of unanimity and prosperity that rarely

before has been the case. Notwithstanding this auspicious state of things, a considerable degree of anxiety has been created by the probability that a preliminary step, at least, towards establishing a free trade in corn in this country, will be taken in the next session of Parliament; a proposition than which one of greater magnitude and difficulty it is considered never was, nor ever will be, presented to the attention of the British Legislature, and upon which every argument which the ingenuity, the varying interests, and possibly, the passions of the people can prompt, will no doubt, be lavished. From a humble individual like myself, some apology is necessary for presuming to enter the lists on so grave an occasion; and did I not feel more confidence in the strength of the facts I shall adduce upon it, than in that of my reasoning, I should assuredly, Sir, consider myself exposed to all the derision that presumption and arrogance are ever most justly visited with; but I rest assured, Sir, that no individual, however humble his station or standard of abilities, will be unmeritedly exposed to such a visitation, who deferentially submits any thing to the

public attention, tending, in the remotest degree, to elucidate only one point of political economy, that may be brought into the discussion of a measure, which, if carried, must vitally affect an interest, declared from the Throne itself, *to be the solid foundation of our national prosperity.*

I would premise, that all writers upon a free trade in corn, have, hitherto, assumed two positions in its favour, which ought only to be viewed as hypothetical—at least they are not so strongly grounded upon facts, as to serve for a basis in the discussion of so important a question as the one of an *entire* alteration of the British corn laws:

First,—The perpetuity of peace.

Secondly,—That the progressive state of the demand from abroad for British commodities, caused by a general extension of civilization and knowledge, will be such as to answer to the supply that can be created by the extended, *and continually extending*, capital, skill, and industry of this great manufacturing country. In plain terms—that we shall find a foreign customer for our commodities, as fast as we can manufacture them.

From these two assumptions of fact, the

point has been deduced, that the cultivation of the poorer soils of England ought to be relinquished, as more capital and industry are expended upon them, according to the views of the writers in favour of a free trade, than their produce is worth, compared with the price at which England could, by a free trade, purchase foreign agricultural produce; independently of preventing, by such cultivation, an exportation of her manufactures to those countries from whence she could import corn in return, and a consequent transfer of the labourers employed upon poor soils to the more *profitable* employment of manufacturing.—Doctrines so plausible, that it ceases to be a wonder, considering the indefatigable zeal with which they are promulgated, that the proselytes to them are so numerous as they are found to be.

The Edinburgh Review, in a former article upon the corn laws,* states this point in rather more qualified terms. The Reviewer says he is prepared to shew that by the removal of the present corn laws, the cultivation of a single acre of land in

* Letter No. 3. to W. W. Whitmore, Esq. M.P.

England, that could be profitably cultivated, need not be abandoned; but unfortunately for this declaration, it is more difficult to ascertain, from the speculation of the closet, what lands in England can or cannot be profitably cultivated,* than it

* The subject of a difference of soils is a very difficult one to intermeddle with.—Many of the soils in England, either lying in whole districts or interspersed among other soils, are naturally poor. Should the former cease to be cultivated, independent of the loss of an internal supply of food, whole bodies of the labouring community must be thrown out of employ. Should the latter cease to have the necessary culture bestowed upon them, a course of husbandry introduced into this country, not a century since, from which the best effects have arisen, (the cultivation of turnips, first grown upon the Townshend estate in Norfolk,) would lose much of its value—whether as increasing the growth of corn or that of cattle, sheep in particular.

The growth of sheep has so much increased within the last half century, that the value of British wool, alone, as I shall hereafter be enabled to point out, can be estimated at little short of ten millions sterling annually, which supply mainly contributes to the manufacture of woollens in this country, *to the amount of nearly forty millions sterling per annum*; and should the turnip lands be deteriorated in their cultivation, the growth of sheep must decrease, to the great detriment of commerce, as regards the supply of wool, and of the community at large, as regards the supply of corn and animal food.

was the precise meaning of a lately much used agricultural phrase "remunerating prices;" as in the latter case, though not avowed, it was no doubt intended by many to mean prices for agricultural produce, adequate to remunerate purchasers for the speculative prices given for land during the late war, which prices were to fix the standard of those for agricultural produce during a period of peace; and had the legislature fully sanctioned such views, the manufacturing and commercial interests would have been placed as much at the mercy of the agricultural one, as the latter, by a free trade, *without a previous reduction of agricultural burthens*, will be, notwithstanding all arguments to the contrary, at the mercy of the former.

Should the commerce of the country go on progressively increasing, as it has for some time past done, an increase in the consumption of corn and other necessaries of life must be a sequent. The question then arises, whether the increasing demand is to be met by a proportionate improvement of the British soil, (and here I include Ireland) which is to be done if due encouragement be given—or by going to the

foreigner for the purpose, more particularly when it is considered that the supply from the latter must be chiefly paid for in specie, as the corn imported will, in most instances, be from the poorer states of Europe, who cannot receive many British productions in return.

The latter point, from recent occurrences, it behoves the Bank of England, for their own preservation, well to look to.

It is here to be noticed, Sir, that nothing in this world is stationary, for what does not progress must retrograde; and as the agriculture of England is charged, for national purposes, with the support of the national church, the poor, and other items of expence, from which foreign agriculture is free, should a competition between British and foreign agriculture once take place, *with such charges upon the former*, it is not difficult to surmise which must retrograde; and such retrogression once began, no one knows how far it would operate—commencing with the abandonment of the cultivation of what by eminence, are termed the poorer, it probably would not cease until it had reached the richer soils of this country. Thus, ultimately, we should be mainly

dependent upon a foreign supply of the necessaries of life (for with a diminution in the supply of corn would be a diminution in the supply of animal food) the wealth that ought to have remained in the agricultural districts, to have given life and vigour to the whole body politic, would be transferred to foreign soils, and the nation, for the want of internal means of support, left at the mercy of any foreign league that might be formed against her liberties and happiness.

Did the exportation of British manufactures depend, in any great degree, upon the importation of foreign corn, *as a measure of reciprocity*, a different question would arise; but this is evidently not the case—our foreign commerce, *as has been stated by the highest authority*, was never in a more flourishing condition; a liberal and healing policy has been adopted by his Majesty's Ministers, and certainly this state of things, no experimental measures, as regard a foreign, instead of a domestic, supply of the necessaries of life, ought to expose to a reverse.

The advancing of the opinion at this prosperous moment, that Great Britain is

approaching a period when a slower extension of the demand for her manufactures from abroad, than the means she possesses of producing them, may possibly take place, will no doubt, place me on the unpopular side of the argument, yet some consideration of the subject is calculated to make such a prospective state of things appear less problematical than at first sight it may do; and here another most important point presents itself for consideration—whether it is prudent to hazard the *experiment* of directly or *indirectly* encouraging any further transfer of a portion of the labouring community from agricultural to manufacturing pursuits, it being evident that should any re-action in our foreign commerce take place, a considerable portion of such persons must be thrown back upon the soil for their maintenance, whilst the latter, by a diminished cultivation, will have proportionably less means to maintain them; for it is to be considered that uncultivated land, *like the disused loom*, cannot be brought into *immediate profit*.—On the contrary, however urgent the necessity, a certain process is necessary to bring land, when once it is neglected, again into a profitable state of cultivation.

That the final establishment of the independence of the South American and Brazilian states will greatly encourage British industry is evident—yet of these markets we had for a long time such a command, as approached nearly to a monopoly of them; the Methuen treaty with Portugal having been made as much on our part, if not more, with a view to obtain the supply of the Brazils, as that of the mother country; most of the goods formerly sent from Great Britain to Lisbon, having been re-shipped from that port by the Portuguese for the Brazils, and we in return received the wines (not the corn) of Portugal, and the rich productions of the Brazils. A similar trade with the colonies of Spain, was also carried on by Great Britain, through the ports of Cadiz, Seville, &c. Thus in the vast regions mentioned, we shall have only extended, not *new* markets. North America has adopted the policy of manufacturing for herself, though her progress will necessarily be slow; and if, Sir, the attention of the nation is turned to the Continent generally, no rational hope can exist, *even should peace continue for a series of years*, that any great increase, *if any*, can take place in the exportation of British

manufactures to that quarter, unless Ministers can prevail upon the Sovereigns of Europe to relinquish the restrictive system they have adopted with regard to the importation of foreign commodities, which independent of a certain *malus animus* against this country, has been adopted with a view to advance the manufactures of their own states; *and not as has been assumed, except in a few instances, because Great Britain does not allow a free trade in corn.*

Much confusion has arisen in the discussion of the Corn Question, from the idea of a free trade in corn having been confounded with that of an open trade. A free trade is one in which the Legislature does not interfere in any way beyond the mere fiscal regulation of an entry at the Custom-house, upon the payment of a nominal duty, of an article imported or exported, such as sheep's wool and cotton wool.* Could the burthens upon the

* As a proper definition of terms is essential to true reasoning, the author, when speaking in these pages, of a free trade in corn, is to be understood as meaning corn admitted into this country at all times—either at a nominal duty, or at such a low one, as must inevitably bring the British agriculturist into a *continual*,

British soil be removed, and foreign corn was then allowed to come in, under similar regulations, a *perfect* free trade in corn would be established, as well for the English as for the foreign agriculturist; but foreign corn coming into this country under a law fixing a permanent protecting duty upon such corn, would be only an open trade, as compared with the present conditional prohibitory one—one act of the Legislature in fixing such duty (should it be done) upon foreign corn, only counterbalancing the effects of other Legislative acts, which had *previously* disenabled the English agriculturist from meeting the foreign one upon equal terms.

That, hitherto, no tangible case for a radical alteration in the corn laws has

and probably, a ruinous competition with the foreign one in the British Market. The consideration of the question—how far an *open* trade in corn, *viz.* corn at all times admitted into this country, upon the payment of what really, *not nominally*, would be a protecting duty, could be made more *beneficial* to the country at large, than the present conditional prohibitory corn law, an open trade for all British commodities throughout the continent of Europe, *south as well as north*, being made a *preliminary* to such an *open* trade in corn being allowed in Great Britain, is very different to the consideration of the question, a *free* trade in corn.

been made out by the advocates of such a measure, is evident from the following propositions:—

First,—Seeing that out of *three hundred and twenty-five million quarters of grain and pulse* consumed in this country, since the closing of the ports in February, 1819, (fifty millions per annum according to Mr. Wm. Jacob's calculation, made, I think, in 1814) only two million five hundred thousand quarters of foreign grain, &c. have come into the British market, *viz.*—

	QUARTERS.
Left in the market upon the closing of the ports in February, 1819, about.....	1,000,000
Imported since (oats).....	1,100,000
Released from bond in 1825, ...	400,000
	2,500,000

about four hundred thousand quarters annually, a quantity so small as scarcely to enter into the general scale of consumption.

Secondly,—Seeing that the advocates for a free trade have urged, *whether correctly or not is another question*, that such a measure will not have the effect of materially lowering the price of corn from the standard of the two last years in this country—

of course their arguments on this head are to be taken, according to the common principles of ratiocination, for *an admission* that no necessity for an alteration in the present corn law exists, *upon the ground that such an alteration will have the effect of reducing what, by many persons, is considered too high a price for corn in England.*

Thirdly,—Seeing, that if an alteration in the corn laws is contemplated, as a mean of increasing the exportation of British manufactures to the Continent, it is considered there will be no difficulty in proving that such an object cannot be obtained, unless Ministers can procure the abolition of the rigid restrictive system at present almost generally established upon the Continent, as regards the introduction of British commodities there,—*consequently* the corn imported under the new system if carried into effect, must be, as has hitherto principally been the case, paid for in specie, to the great injury of the nation at large.

Fourthly,—Seeing, that the extent of the *home* trade in all British manufactures, arising there is no doubt, in a great degree, from the present improving state of the agricultural interest, is unprecedentedly great, and in a ratio exceeding the

export trade not generally known, nor calculated upon.

Fifthly,—Seeing, that a re-action in such a prosperous *internal* trade would prove extremely disastrous—for any great increase in the exportation of British manufactures, as a consequent of an alteration of the corn laws, *is evidently too problematical* even to allow of its being taken into calculation, when such an important and *national* a measure, (leading as such a measure will, if carried into effect, to an alteration in the value of all the Agricultural property of the kingdom) is contemplated.*

* The great extent of the home trade in woollens in this country, as compared with the export one, is evident from the following statement, drawn up with as much precision as possible, from official and authentic materials, which statement will no doubt, also serve as a tolerable criterion of the comparative amount generally of the home and export trade in most other British manufactured articles.

The growth of English wool was stated by Mr. John Maitland, in his pamphlet on the Wool Question, page 61, to have been (by evidence given before the House of Commons, previously to the publication of the pamphlet in 1817,) 600,000 packs annually, equal to 144,000,000lbs. of which two-thirds consisted of short clothing wool, and one-third of long combing wool; since which period an increase has taken place in the growth of wool, to an extent not easily calculated upon—admitting it, however, to be 50,000

The assumption of the fact, that an increase in the export trade from Great Britain, will be a consequent if a free corn trade pervades, indeed lies at the root of all

packs, the growth of English wool last year was 650,000 packs, or 156,000,000lbs. which, at 1s. 2½d. per lb. about the estimated average price of English wool of all qualities for the year 1824, £ s. d. makes 9,425,000 0 0 Foreign wool imported into England, for the year ending the 5th of January, 1825, as by the Custom-house return to the House of Commons, dated the 21st day of April, 1825, 22,558,222lbs. average price 2s. 9d. per lb. make 3,101,755 10 6

Value of British and foreign wool, to be manufactured for the foreign and domestic market 12,526,755 10 6 Amount of woollens exported from Great Britain, to all parts of the world, for the year ending the 5th of January, 1825, as by the Custom-house return to the House of Commons £6,926,115—two-thirds of which it is calculated to have consisted of labour, &c. and one-third of raw material, wool 2,308,705 0 0

Value of wool that remained to be manufactured for the home market of Great Britain, in 1824. 10,218,050 10 6

This value according to Lord Shef-

the arguments that have been advanced by the advocates of the latter measure.—One

field's principle of a five-fold increase in the manufacture of long spinning wool, and to Mr. John Maitland's principle of a three-fold increase in the manufacture of short clothing wool, (vide Mr. Maitland's pamphlet, p. 34) makes the home trade in woollens for 1824. £35,466,184 5 2

VIZ.

One-third of £10,218,050 10s. 6d.— £3,406,016 13s. 6d. value of long spinning wool, according to Lord Sheffield's principle of a five-fold increase in the manufacture, is. . 17,030,084 4 2 Two-thirds of £10,218,050 10s. 6d. —£6,812,033 13s. 6d. value of short clothing wool, according to Mr. John Maitland's principle of a three-fold increase in the manufacture, is 18,436,101 1 0 £35,466,185 5 2

Allowances in deduction being made for a certain portion of foreign wool re-exported from this country, and for a certain portion of wool exported in articles comprised in the Custom-house return, under the head of "all other articles," (vide Appendix—Custom-house return, No. 1.) It must also be considered that a considerable glut of foreign wool at this time exists in the wool market, of which great complaints are made by the growers of English fine wools; but every allowance being made, the home trade in woollens may, it is considered, be fairly calculated at not less than

writer in favour of free trade* has stated, "that it is as advantageous to purchase "foreign produce and goods by money, as "by changing our manufactured goods for "foreign goods." And his argument is, "that money had previously been purchased "by manufactured goods."

That, money in commercial States, is *originally* purchased by, or, more properly speaking, exchanged for some commodity, either raw or manufactured, is a perfect truism. Lord Bacon says, "it is likewise "to be remembered, that forasmuch as the "increase of any estate must be upon the "foreigner, (for whatsoever is somewhere "gotten is somewhere lost,) there be but "three things which one nation *selleth* "unto another: the commodity as nature "yieldeth it; the manufacture; and the "vecture or carriage: so that if these "three wheels go, wealth flows in as a "spring tide."

30,000,000 sterling, for the year ending the 5th of January, 1825, to compare with the export trade of £6,926,115.—presuming the data of Lord Sheffield and Mr. John Maitland, as to the portions of labour and material used in the manufacture of woollens, to be correct.

* Mr. Roper.—In the *Farmer's Journal*, April, 1825.

So in proportion to this *increase upon the foreigner*, or, more plainly speaking, the exportation of goods from one nation to another, and the return to the exporting nation in the precious metals, or in commodities, of a multiplying quality, in the manufacture, *viz.* silk, wool, &c. is a nation enriched; and the fewer edible commodities, and the more materials for manufacturing that are imported (*foreign markets being kept open to an equal extent—to which such materials, when manufactured, can be re-exported*) in exchange for goods exported, in the so much greater degree do the riches of a nation increase.

Thus Great Britain has obtained her wealth:

First,—By exporting her commodities as nature yielded them: her iron, her lead, her tin, &c. then by the manufacture of several of these articles, in addition to her wool, formerly sent to Flanders to be manufactured,* and lastly by the vecture or

* To such an extent was the manufacture of woollens formerly carried on in the Low Countries, that at Louvaine, I think, the great bell of the town used to ring just previously to meal times; in order to warn the women to keep their children within doors, to prevent their being trampled upon in the rush made by the weavers from their workshops.

carriage of them to foreign parts by her shipping; and by receiving the returns for them chiefly in the precious metals, or in valuable materials for manufacturing—for most non-manufacturing articles imported, however they may furnish those luxuries and elegancies which *previously* obtained wealth enables her to purchase, in place of increasing, rather tend to decrease the riches of a nation; which is evidently pointed out, by the many sumptuary laws made against their use *in poor States*.*

* A distinction between the importation of consumable and manufacturing articles, does not appear to have been so clearly made as it ought to have been, by writers upon political economy.

The former imported articles, when consumed, become extinguished—indeed are entirely lost, *except* as they may have been used as luxuries or articles of necessity—wine for instance, by some considered a luxury by some a necessary; but wine must be imported into this country, particularly from Portugal, inasmuch as being a staple commodity in that country, we are obliged to import it, in part payment for our manufactures exported there, Portugal not being in a situation to pay us for the goods imported by her all in specie, or in manufacturing commodities.—If the wine imported by Great Britain, in place of being consumed at home, was re-exported to a third country, that would pay for it in specie or in manufacturing commodities, such as cotton or silk, though it were sold for half what it cost us, we should be gainers to that amount; the *luxury* of drinking the wine would how-

It is again assumed, that although the countries from whence corn would be imported into England, by a free trade, cannot by their poverty take many goods, but must have specie in return for it, yet other countries will take them; and this, Sir, as I have before with deference submitted, is more than a doubtful position. The new world is fully stocked, indeed overstocked, with British manufactures; and the Continent, I think, I can venture to assert, cannot import more than they do, *under the*

ever be lost. But every large exporting nation *must be luxurious*, as the nations to which she exports her commodities have many *consumable articles*, which they must exchange in part for the goods imported by them; and these articles, for the want of a third market generally to export them to, are of necessity consumed by the original exporting nation, therefore in proportion as nations export, do their consumption of imported luxuries increase.—Holland has been adduced, by many writers upon free trade, as an example that a nation may import, even the first articles of necessity, without decreasing her riches. But the wealth of Holland was obtained—first by her fisheries, and then by her shipping, (the Dutch having at one period been the great carriers of Europe,) *both specie trades*. Thus she was never under the necessity of importing commodities, in part payment of her fish and freights, therefore could live just as economically as she pleased, and preserve a store of specie by her to purchase corn or cattle at her will and pleasure, which is not the case with Great Britain.

present restrictive system—notwithstanding they could do it, and amply so, *were the system modified*, as the exportation of British manufactures and produce to the whole Continent of Europe, for the year ending the 5th of January, 1824, only amounted to £19,532,914. 2s. 1d.* which, estimating the population at two hundred millions, was about *two shillings* for each individual. Therefore if corn to the value of only one million sterling per annum, was imported regularly by a free trade, it would require great ingenuity to find the markets where one million additional in manufactures could be exported to from this country, in payment for such corn; and to establish a free trade in corn, to be paid for in specie, because manufactured goods had first brought our national stock of specie, would be just as reasonable as that a man who had gained an estate, should dissipate such estate upon strangers, *in place of husbanding it for his family*, because his skill and industry first enabled him to realize it.

If the advocates for a free trade in corn will *first* find the markets, at which this nation can procure a large additional stock

* *Vide* Appendix—Custom-house return, No. 2.

of money in exchange for her produce and manufactures, issue might then be joined upon this part of the question; but until this is done, the British Legislature will there is no doubt, be too wise to allow that the money, or equivalents for it, which Great Britain, by her unexampled industry and enterprise, has realized, should be lavished upon foreigners; for the purchase of the first article of necessity, *which, in the average of years, she is enabled to provide herself with from her internal resources*; for should so dangerous a traffic once commence, it would probably go on, until not an ounce of gold was left in the country.

To point out a strict analogy between the circumstances of one nation and those of another is impossible; but allowance being made for a difference of religion, times and manners, it has been generally admitted that, in parts of the outline, on two countries, in modern times, ever resembled each other in political situation so, much as Spain, (in the zenith of her glory, soon after the discovery of South America,) and this country at the present moment. Spain, at the period alluded to, was, as

this country now is, rich in her agriculture, her manufactures, and in her commercial marine. She certainly, in the first instance, did not procure the additional treasures she became possessed of in South America, by the peaceful exchange of the productions of her industry, but she seized them with the sword of the Conqueror—still she had them, and fortunately for this country she did not retain them; for, at no distant period from the epoch mentioned, in place of fostering her internal resources, *agriculture in particular*, by the preservation and internal circulation of the precious metals, she began to neglect her domestic industry, under the idea that it would be better at all hazards, to search for gold in the mines of America, than to nurse her agriculture and manufactures; as such, her gold, so injudiciously procured in various instances by the sacrifice of better pursuits, in place of remaining with her, was sold to, or, commercially speaking, exchanged with foreigners for many leading articles of necessity, which had she been wise enough to have continued to provide herself with by her own industry, in place of

being one of the poorest and weakest states of Europe, she would, at this moment, probably, have been one of the richest and most powerful.

“When the importation into Spain of
 “(those) various articles from her colonies,
 “first became active and considerable, her
 “interior industry and manufactures were
 “in a state so prosperous, that with the
 “product of these, *she was able to purchase*
 “*both the commodities of the New World,*
 “*and to answer its growing demands.—*
 “Under the reigns of Ferdinand and Isa-
 “bella, and Charles V. *Spain was one of*
 “*the most industrious countries in Europe.*
 “Her manufactures in wool, and flax, and
 “silk, were so extensive, as not only to
 “furnish what was sufficient for her own
 “consumption, *but to afford a surplus for*
 “*exportation.* When a market for them,
 “formerly unknown, and to which she
 “had alone access, opened in America, she
 “had recourse to her domestic store, and
 “*found there an abundant supply.** This

* Many remarkable proofs occur of the advanced state of industry in Spain, at the beginning of the sixteenth century. The number of cities in Spain was considerable, and they were peopled far beyond

“new employment must naturally have
 “added vivacity to the spirit of industry.
 “Nourished and invigorated by it, the ma-
 “nufactures, the population, and wealth
 “of Spain might have gone on increasing
 “in the same proportion as the growth of
 “her colonies. Nor was the state of the
 “Spanish marine at this period less flou-
 “rishing than that of its manufactures.

the proportion that was common in other parts of
 Europe. The causes of this I have explained, Hist.
 of Chas. V. i. 158. Wherever cities are populous,
 that species of industry which is peculiar to them
 increases, and artificers and manufactures abound. The
 effect of the American trade in giving activity to these
 is manifest, from a singular fact. In the year 1545,
while Spain continued to depend on its own industry,
 for the supply of its colonies, so much work was
 bespoke from the manufacturers, that it was supposed
 that they could hardly finish it in less than six years.
 Campom. i. 406. Such a demand must have put
 much industry in motion, and have excited extra-
 ordinary efforts. Accordingly, we are informed, that
 in the beginning of Philip II's reign, the city of Seville
 alone, where the trade with America centered, gave
 employment to no fewer than 16,000 looms in silk and
 woollen work, and that above 130,000 persons had
 occupation in carrying on these manufactures. Cam-
 pom. ii. 472. But so rapid and pernicious was the
 operation of the causes which I shall enumerate, that
 before Philip II. finished his reign, the looms in Seville
 were reduced to 400. Uztariz, c. 7.—*Note 63, vol.*
3, page 414.

“In the beginning of the sixteenth cen-
 “tury, Spain is said to have possessed
 “above a thousand merchant ships, (Camp.
 “ii. 140.) a number probably far superior
 “to that of any nation in Europe. By the
 “aid which foreign trade and domestic
 “industry give reciprocally to each other
 “in their progress, the augmentation of
 “both must have been rapid and exten-
 “sive, and Spain might have received the
 “same accession of opulence and vigour
 “from her acquisitions in the New World,
 “that other powers have derived from
 “their colonies there.

“But various causes prevented this.—
 “*The same thing happens to nations as to*
 “*individuals.* Wealth, which flows in
 “gradually, and with moderate increase,
 “feeds and nourishes that activity which
 “is friendly to commerce, and calls it
 “forth into vigorous and well conducted
 “exertions; but when opulence pours in
 “suddenly, and with too full a stream, it
 “overturns all sober plans of industry,
 “and brings with it a taste for all that is
 “wild and extravagant, and daring in busi-
 “ness or in action.”—*Robertson's History*
of America, vol. 3, page 309, and onwards.

After detailing a variety of causes that contributed to the decay of the Spanish Empire, the Historian goes on to say,—
 “*Even agriculture, the primary object of industry in every prosperous state, was neglected, and one of the most fertile countries in Europe hardly raised what was sufficient for the support of its inhabitants.*”

It is impossible, Sir, *for they do not exist*, that the *exact* causes which produced such effects in one of the first Empires of modern times, can produce similar effects in this country; but, Sir, is there not existing here some comparative contempt for the pursuits of slow, though permanent creative industry, particularly for that peaceful, but prolific one of agriculture? And is there not daily to be found, some of that ephemeral opulence, “*which pours in suddenly, and with too full a stream, overturning all sober plans of industry, and bringing with it a taste for all that is wild and extravagant, and daring in business or in action?*”

I confidently, though most respectfully, appeal to you, Sir, as to the necessity of applying, *in a small degree I admit*, some

circumstances pointed out by the Historian in the situation of Spain, at the commencement of the decline of her grandeur and riches, to the situation of this country at the present moment*—but God forbid that the same melancholy results should follow; this, however, possibly may be the case, if certain theoretical doctrines, now in vogue, are allowed to act upon the noble parts of our political system, as a barrier to which, a prophetic injunction may not be improperly applied: “*Set up the way-marks, make the high heaps; set thine heart toward the high-way, even the way which thou wentest.*”

But in whatever degree various schemes of the day are to be condemned, it is to be regretted, that many well-founded hopes of an enlarged and permanent trade to the Continent, formed from a variety of causes at the peace, in 1814, have, by no means, been realized, which has caused much disappointment, as well as a considerable

* The author trusts it will not be considered, that he here intends to insinuate, that Great Britain has attained the altitude of her power and prosperity; on the contrary—but it is as essential to the welfare of the body politic, that the incipient principles of decay in it, should be watched the same as similar principles are in the natural body.

diminution in the legitimate employment of British capital and industry. Very soon after the period mentioned, the same disposition was evinced by the continental Sovereigns to exclude, as much as possible, British productions from entering their States, as had been by the late Ruler of France; and, with the exception of the facilities which the guaranteed freedom of certain cities in Germany gives to the introduction there of British manufactures, the exclusive system is nearly as effective upon the Continent generally, as it was in the time of Napoleon.

On this head I submit the testimony of a gentleman, well versed in continental trade;* and the official return of the exportation of British manufactures to many of

* "In the like manner, regulations are made to prevent the introduction of British goods in many parts of the Continent. In some they are strictly prohibited; and it would appear that the continental system, commencing in the Berlin and Milan decrees, is still kept in force, *but with more effect than during the late wars*; for in place of returning to those regulations which were in existence before the war, the different European governments, all of which had either been supported, or placed in power by the blood and treasure of England, took measures to attack our trade. Scarcely was the ink dry by which the treaties of Vienna were signed, ere they

the Continental states, for the year ending the 5th of January, 1824,* (the return

"all, as if actuated by the same motive, resumed their hostile system. Russia, to which country an immense trade used to be carried on in woollens, has prohibited the importation of all coarse cloth by enormous duties, except what is ordered by the Government itself for their own troops.

"*The King of Sardinia, having his Italian dominions restored to him by British valour, and Genoa with its territories added to his dominions, has not only deprived this country of some of the great privileges she formerly enjoyed in her commercial intercourse with Genoa, but has laid almost prohibitory duties on the importation of British goods.*

"The Emperor of Germany has prohibited the introduction of all woollen and cotton manufactures into his Italian states. Other countries have adopted a similar policy."—*Mr. John Maitland's pamphlet on the Wool Question, published in 1817—Mr. James Bischoff's letter to Mr. Maitland, page 69.*

In confirmation of what has been stated in these extracts, respecting the restrictions upon British trade at Genoa, particularly the woollen one, I beg leave to refer to a pamphlet of mine, printed in 1823, relative to the trade between Great Britain and Genoa, &c. the spirit of which pamphlet is comprised in a review of it, given by the *Morning Chronicle*, on the 5th of July, 1824, and in some observations explanatory of the review (*vide Appendix*.) The facts stated, I am ready to confirm by my personal testimony, whenever I am officially called upon so to do. With respect, however, to the Continental restrictive system generally,

* *Vide Appendix—Custom-house return, No. 2.*

for the year ending the 5th of January, 1825, which will exhibit some increase, is not yet made out,) will fully bear out the observations of Mr. Bischoff; additionally also, when the state of the export trade in woollens, since the peace in 1814, is taken into consideration. Indeed it is to be doubted, whether any increase in the quantity, though there was in the value, took place in the exportation of this most ancient and valuable branch of British industry, in the years 1822, 1823, and 1824, as compared with the years 1765, 1766, and 1767, notwithstanding a very large and a very gratifying one undoubtedly did in the home trade; as the increase in the importation of foreign wool, and in the growth of English wool, will fully demonstrate; and long may it continue so, and may the foreign trade be also revived in the same proportion.

it must justly be admitted, that the entire right of regulating the introduction of foreign commodities into a state, exists in the government of such state; and it is only when such commodities are prohibited, contrary to the faith of treaties, or an understanding, probably in honour equivalent to treaties, that an excluded nation has any reason to complain.

W. K. B.

Annual average exportation of woollens from Great Britain, according to official value, for the years 1765, 1766, and 1767, £4,630,384.

Kent wool, in 1780, 5*d.* per lb.

Average importation of foreign wool, from the year 1781 to 1789, 2,660,828*lbs.*

Annual average exportation of woollens from Great Britain, according to official value, for the years 1822, 1823, and 1824, £6,501,248.

Kent wool, average about 10*d.* per lb.

Annual average importation of foreign wool, for the same years, 20,336,238*lbs.*

Thus, calculating the prices of wool and labour in the years 1765, 1766, and 1767, (which were about the same as they were in 1780,) and the same prices in the years 1822, 1823, and 1824, it may fairly be presumed, that as many woollens in quantity were exported in the former, as in the latter periods.*

* The following comparative view of the exportation of woollens from, and importation of wool into Great Britain, at various periods, from the year 1700 to the year 1825, may contribute towards a farther elucidation of the extent of the home consumption in woollens, particularly for the last four years.

It is also a question whether, with the exception of cotton articles, the manufacture of which has created a perfectly new era in the annals of British commerce, any great increase, if any increase at all, has taken place in general exportation of British productions since the years 1765, 1766, and 1767, when the amount was about fifteen millions annually—cotton

Exportation of Woollens from Great Britain.		Importation of Wool into Great Britain.	
Average of Years.	£. s. d.	lbs. Avoirdupois.	
from 1700 to 1720.....		869,727	
1765 to 1767—4,630,384 0 0.....			
1781 to 1789.....		2,660,828	
1800 to 1810—6,003,688 0 0.....		7,470,584	
Year ——— 1814—5,628,001 0 0.....		15,712,517	
		1821—6,029,973 0 0.....	16,63,2028
		1822—6,433,908 0 0.....	19,072,364
		1823—6,140,257 0 0.....	19,378,129
		1824—6,926,117 0 0.....	22,558,222

The exportation of woollens in this comparative statement, is put at the official value in place of the declared value, as in the first edition; and it is to be noticed, that an increase in the exportation of woollens, since the peace in 1814, must be calculated upon, up to the difference of the prices of wool and labour between war and peace, the war prices of course being the greatest.

N.B. The importation list down to the 5th January, 1821, includes the importation of wool from Ireland; but from that period the importation from Ireland is not included. W. K. B.

goods then estimated at about two hundred and fifty thousand pounds per annum.

Exportation of British and Irish produce and manufactures, to all parts of the world, for the year ending the 5th day of January, 1825, as by the Custom-house

	£.	s.	d.
return	51,718,606	17	8
Deduct cottons and cotton twist and yarn.....	30,795,356	0	0
	<hr/>		
	£20,923,250	17	8

Balance of exportation £20,923,259. 17s. 8d. of British produce and manufactures, to compare with £15,000,000, the amount about half a century since. The difference in the prices of labour and materials in the two periods to be calculated upon; and, taking the home trade in woollens at about thirty millions sterling, for the year 1824, as before estimated, it appears that such trade alone exceeds, by about nine millions sterling, the exportation of all British productions and manufactures, with the exception of the fabrics of cotton, to the whole world, in the year 1824—a fact, Sir, which, doubtless, will have its full weight, whenever the comparison between the British home and foreign trade is brought into discussion.

Our trade with Russia, from whence corn no doubt in considerable quantities would, by a free trade, be imported here, is, what is termed, an indifferent one; as we imported her rough produce, in the year ending the 5th of January, 1824, to the amount of £2,611,617. 0s. 8d.*—whereas she only took of Great Britain, in manufactures, &c. to the value of £1,174,722. 3s. 6d. and foreign and colonial merchandize to the value of £666,552. 10s. leaving a balance to be paid for in specie to the amount of £770,342. 7s. 2d.; which balance would, there is every reason to believe, be increased against this country to the amount of all the corn imported from the Russian states by a free trade.

With Prussia the British trade, though small, is a better one—as we imported from her only to the amount of £504,150. 8s. 2d. and she bought of us produce and manufactures to the amount of £224,036. 1s. 5d. and foreign and colonial merchandize to the amount of £410,038. 7s. 7d.; leaving a balance in favour of Great Britain, of £129,934. 0s. 10d.—And, although it may be admitted that the introduction of

* Vide Appendix—Custom-house return, No. 2.

Prussian corn here, by a free trade, would be the means of increasing, *in some degree*, the exportation of British productions to Prussia—yet her resources are too limited to allow of any great increase, at least for a number of years, as the articles exported from this country, must be chiefly considered by her in the light of luxuries; therefore the bulk of the corn imported would necessarily have to be paid for in specie. Having thus, Sir, plainly pointed out the limited exportation of British productions to the two countries, from whence the greatest part of the corn would be imported here, by a free trade, allow me to say, that the more a survey is taken of the British trade to the Continent southward, the greater, by the return, will such trade be found to be—in many instances to countries, from whence the importation of corn here could be but trifling; and in other cases, to countries from whence none could be imported, for the most obvious of all reasons, *because they are obliged to import for their own subsistence*. Thus the arguments of the advocates for a free trade in corn are entirely overthrown, so far as they go to prove that an increase in the

exportation of British productions is prevented by the *baneful* operation, as it is termed, of the British corn laws. On this head I again refer to the amount of the exportation of British productions, as it appears from the official return, to Germany, generally, to France, (but trifling, considering her riches and extent of territory) to Portugal, Spain, Gibraltar, Italy, Turkey, &c.

The pursuits of Agriculture, during a period of peace, are affected alone by the vicissitudes of seasons, and, when not interfered with by the influence of speculative doctrines, present a different aspect to the unavoidable fluctuations which mark those of a commercial nature, particularly at a period, when the modes of accumulating wealth are becoming generally known, and each State, in a certain stage of refinement, becomes emulous of obtaining some share of the profits of manufacturing and commercial enterprise.

In the ruder ages, commerce was little more than the exchange of the rough produce of one state for that of another. By degrees, the exchange of the precious metals for produce intervened; and in process

of time, some nations, more fortunate than others, were enabled to appropriate to themselves the advantages of manufacturing raw productions of home or foreign growth, so in proportion to the exportation of these manufactures, joined to an exportation of raw materials, did the wealth of such nations increase. Still limits will be set to the permanent engrossing by any nation of more than an ordinary share of the trade in manufactures, above the share of other nations; inasmuch as the latter when aware of, and are capable of availing themselves of the advantages to be derived from manufacturing (which is pretty much the case in many parts of the Continent, and in America) will turn their attention to it.

I know of no idea, Sir, likely to be more prejudicial at this moment, than the prevailing one here of an increase in the demand from abroad for British manufactures to the extent that is argued upon, which is almost implying that we are, as if by prescription, in possession of nearly all the mechanical genius of the world, and it is thought, that an impartial reference to the commercial state, both of the Continent

of Europe and the United States of America, will evince that the British trade in manufactures to those parts, has nearly, if not altogether, risen to its maximum, *presuming no alteration takes place in the commercial policy of either*; the opinion which also has been very industriously spread abroad, that the manufacturing system in America has originated in a similar cause to that of the Continental restrictive system, *viz.—the exclusive nature of the British corn laws*, appears to be a most erroneous one.—In this instance an effect has been ascribed to a wrong cause, as there is no doubt that in America, *as in other states that find themselves able to do it*, manufacturing has been resorted to, not only for its immediate advantages, but from the natural desire every state has of rendering itself independent of a foreign supply of those articles which can be procured by domestic industry.

For a long period British wool was exported to the Continent to be wrought up for British consumption; and it is upon record that the first subsidy ever granted in this country, was one in wool to Edward III. which was sold by him to

the Flemings, in order to raise the supplies necessary to enable him to carry on the war he was about to wage against France, in support of what he considered his claim to that throne. In process of time, however, we became manufacturers both of woollens and silks, the causes of this, I admit, were different to those which have made various states commence manufacturing,* and their effects much more instantaneous than any that can be expected in times, when the principles of civil and religious liberty are better understood and practised, than they were in former periods; in place, therefore, of importing woollens for our own consumption, we very soon supplied ourselves by native industry, and for more than two centuries have been great exporters of them to most parts of the world.

It is inconceivable, Sir, that America will, *without limit*, send her cottons to be manufactured in Europe for her own con-

* *Viz.*—The persecution under the Duke of Alva in the Low Countries, which compelled the Flemings, the woollen manufacturers; and the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, which compelled the silk manufacturers of France to flee for refuge in this country.

consumption ; or that with the powers she possesses,* she will not import raw materials to manufacture, not only for home consumption, but ultimately to export the same, when manufactured, with the fabrics of her native material, as has been the case with Great Britain, for the page of history every where points out commerce as being in a state of ebbing and flowing ; the permanence therefore of Agricultural pursuits appears to be necessary to give proper stability to a nation. Lord Bacon has declared "that the cultivation of the soil, though slow, is the most natural mode of obtaining riches;" and, certainly the less it is made to partake of a speculative character the better. Moreover, Sir, there are circumstances of a national import relative to agriculture, which are beyond mere pecuniary calculations, when the miasma, both moral and physical, that is engendered by the dense population of our manufacturing cities and towns is considered.

With respect to America, it will certainly

* The total of water power, within twenty miles of Baltimore, has been stated, in the North American Review, at one million six hundred thousand spindles.

require a more active exertion upon her soil than at present exists, to bring forward the quantum of population necessary to carry on an *extended* manufacturing system, if, as has been stated in an American paper, four-fifths of the American population are employed for the purpose of procuring subsistence for themselves and the remaining one-fifth ; adding the quantity of edible commodities exported by America, which does not appear to have been allowed for in the statement. In England, the same paper states, that only one-third of the population (but here Ireland cannot be included) is employed in producing the same effects that follow from the labours of four-fifths of the population of the United States of America.* Indeed

* *American Statistics.*—"The whole number of people in the United States, by the late census, is 9,629,000, of which number it is stated that 2,065,000 are engaged in agriculture, 349,000 in manufactures, and 72,000 in commerce.—Only the efficient, or labouring persons in each class appear to have been enumerated: add the women, the children, and the invalids, and the number will be found about 8,000,000 in the agricultural class, 200,000 in the commercial, and 1,300,000 in the manufacturing. In England the agricultural class does not exceed one-third of the whole population. This one-third is not only sufficient

the following statement of the extent of country and population of Great Britain, as compared with France, must point out the immense value of agricultural industry in this country, not only absolutely in itself, but as compared with that of any state in the world:—

British Traveller, 8th April, 1825.—
“The *Journal des Debats*, gives the following, as the amount of population and extent of territory of the five great European powers.*

	Square miles.	Population.
England.....	5,554.....	21,400,000
France.....	10,016.....	30,749,000

It results from this statement, that Great Britain maintains upon her surface, nearly half the quantity of population more than

to produce bread, stuffs, (it is supposed vegetables are here meant) and provisions enough for themselves and the other two-thirds, but also wool enough for all the extensive woollen manufactories in the kingdom, with the exception of a small quantity of fine quality. The wool produced, amounts annually to twenty-eight million dollars. Four-fifths of our nation are employed to produce the same effects that follow from the labours of one-third of the British nation.”—*American Paper.*

* *Viz.*—England, Russia, Austria, France, and Prussia.

France does upon hers; and it may be inferred, Sir, that much of the wealth of this country originates in the circumstance of so limited a portion of the population producing so great a quantity of the necessaries of life, and that from so small a surface of soil to labour upon, in comparison with the surface of other states, particularly that of France, the nation the most proximate to England, not only by local situation, but by similitude in the various points of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce; in consequence, we have large portions of the population left to bestow their labours in procuring valuable raw materials, and in manufacturing them when procured; also these portions of the population being fed nearly from *internal* resources alone, of course, in the same degree, the multiplications of labour produced by converting a raw material of home production into a manufactured one, become a profit to the state when exported, which would not be the case if we had to go to the foreigner for a supply of the necessaries of life. In the class of entire profitable articles of exportation from this country, may be enumerated woollens and linen (when all

made of British wool and flax, iron, steel, brass, copper, &c.

A very great stress, as respects an alteration in the corn laws, has been laid upon the liberal policy which has been adopted by his Majesty's Ministers, referring, as it does, to the different branches of our foreign commerce, *viz.*—that because it has been considered politically necessary to modify certain laws regarding the introduction of different articles of foreign growth and manufacture, which introduction will nevertheless interfere with the same articles of our own growth and manufacture, a radical alteration of the corn laws must follow. A reference, however, to the luminous speech of the Right Hon. the President of the Board of Trade, made in the last Session of Parliament, will point out that the leading view of his Majesty's Government, in allowing certain articles to be imported into this country, which before had been wholly prohibited, or had such duties fixed upon them as nearly amounted to a prohibition, was to do away with the giant smuggler. It appears impossible to trace any thing that was said on this subject by Mr. Huskisson, implying

that the importation of many foreign commodities was not injurious, but that to attempt to keep them out by an absolute prohibition, or by duties amounting nearly to a prohibition, (without considering the tendency of these fiscal regulations towards giving to various foreign articles a fashionable value they would not otherwise possess,) was impossible; therefore it was thought better that they should be allowed to come into this country by lawful means, *as a minor evil*, than by the instrumentality of the contrabandist, *as a major one*—circumstances that can by no means apply to the importation of foreign corn, for it cannot be more fashionable as regards corn, to eat the production of a foreign soil, than it is that of our own, nor can corn be smuggled into a country in the way that many articles can. Independent of which considerations, a great—an incalculable difference must be made between altering laws regarding, in most instances, the superfluities of life, and altering those which vitally affect the *subsistence* of a whole nation; as should the supply of corn of domestic growth be once lessened in England, to any great degree, the consequences would be very soon felt

in the supply of the other necessaries of life; and however slightly the alteration of the present conditional prohibitory corn law, to one allowing an open trade in corn, *viz.* corn imported under a protecting duty system may be viewed (even should the effects of this alteration not materially differ from those arising out of the present system,) the alteration would be a *radical* one, in a law which, notwithstanding its defects, to all reasonable appearances, has fairly answered the purpose of giving that share of protection to agriculture it was intended by the Legislature to do.

The annual agricultural produce of the United Kingdom has been variously stated; the lowest probable calculation may, it is thought, be taken at two hundred millions sterling. For the sake of argument, Sir, I will take the minor amount; and presuming that from an alteration in the corn laws, a decrease in the home supply of our general agricultural produce were to take place, equal to only a twentieth part of the consumption, either ten millions sterling must go to the foreigner, in some shape or other, to make up the deficiency, or certain results must follow not necessary here to

detail; but where, Sir, can markets possibly be found additionally to export British commodities to, for the payment even of this limited demand upon the foreigner; for limited I call it as compared with the whole consumption of the British nation. Ten millions sterling is nearly one-fifth part of our whole annual exportation of British productions and manufactures to all parts of the world,* and, without this additional fifth, in many instances, our manufacturers complain of over-stocked markets. Are such markets to be found, Sir, upon the Continent, under the present restrictive system; in South America, in its present exhausted state; or, in North America, with her determined disposition to manufacture for herself, as early and as much as possible? The simple idea, isolated as this nation is, of being compelled to pay the foreigner for such a supply of the necessaries of life, altho' in the small proportion of only one-twentieth part of our annual consumption, must reach the fears, if it does not the understanding, of the most flippant reasoner upon an alteration of the

* *Vide* Appendix—Custom-house return, No. 2.

corn laws; and, with our increasing population, so far from its appearing to be sound policy to throw any of the British soil out of cultivation, it will, no doubt, be considered the safest step, consequently the wisest one, to continue the fostering care of the Government to our agriculture, "the *primary* object of industry in every prosperous state," that more land may be brought under the hand of the cultivator, in order to meet the growing demands, which, in the present improving state of the country, must inevitably be made for all the necessaries of life.

The desire, if possible, of bringing the prices of agricultural produce to a more steady scale than for some years has been the case, has been stated as one leading object in proposing an alteration in the corn laws. That steadiness of prices in the very first articles of necessity, is essential to the proper fixing of the value of labour and of bargains connected with labour, there can be no doubt; but the bringing of foreign corn into the British market, is not, it is thought, the proper mean to obtain so desirable an end, which appears

much better arrived at by the workings of the present corn law. For nearly three years past, the prices of corn in England have generally been remarkably steady, particularly as contrasted with those fluctuations that have marked the prices of many other commodities, the speculations in which commodities, in some instances by their daring character, and in others by their sportive variety, have astonished and amused the more prudent part of the community; and it may be fairly presumed, that had foreign corn been allowed regularly to have entered the British market, the Corn Exchange would have exhibited the same disastrous scenes as have taken place in other places of commercial resort—scenes that ever will, at times, be exhibited, when superabundant capital is ready to be embarked in any speculation, however hazardous in its nature, or serious in its consequences.

The effect of an importation of foreign corn, is different from that of any other foreign produce introduced into the British market, and one that requires to be traced in all its ramifications. Any given quantity of a foreign article that might annually

be imported here, altho' this quantity were greater in proportion to our own growth of the same article than the quantity of foreign corn imported might be to that of English growth, would not lower so much the price of the British article, as the smaller quantity of corn would British corn, obviously for these simple reasons; most foreign articles imported being compact in form, can be conveyed, at an easy cost, to most parts of the kingdom, and will there blend with the sale of a similar article of home growth; therefore, unless the quantity be very great, do not greatly depreciate the price of the latter. Not so with corn, which being a bulky article, and not removable from the port it is imported at, without great expence, lays generally as an *incubus* upon the sale of British corn at such port, particularly in London, where, if the importation be great, a depression, not easily calculated upon, takes place throughout all the markets in the kingdom; and should speculations be entered into in foreign corn, by a free trade in lieu of corn being at the equable price it has for a considerable period been, we probably might see it sometimes as high as

one hundred shillings per quarter, at others as low as forty shillings; for it would be impossible to keep up that steady system of cultivation in this country, necessary to produce steadiness of prices, in the face of variable and continual speculations in foreign grain, carried on at the very market which regulates the prices of the Agricultural produce of the whole kingdom.

The discussion of the subject of an alteration in the corn laws is so interesting, that topics almost, *ad infinitum*, might be interwoven with it; notwithstanding this, probably it may be considered, Sir, that already I have far exceeded the boundary that ought to have been fixed to the present one. But whatever its demerits are in this or in other respects, I, at least, hope that nothing has been unfairly stated or reasoned upon, however feeble the reasoning may have been; I shall therefore, Sir, crave additional indulgence only for offering a few remarks, rather of a constitutional nature than otherwise, strongly bearing upon the all important question, about to be submitted to the attention of the British legislature.

First,—That by a free trade in corn, the prices of agricultural produce will be greatly reduced, without any proportionate decrease in the poor rates and other agricultural burthens, and as a necessary consequence no reasonable balance can accrue to the agriculturist for the payment of rent—thus the second state of the realm, composed as it is of the landed interest, will be unduly weakened, and this probably, though at a distant period, will produce unfavourable results to the British Constitution, as it was established at the Revolution, in 1688.

Secondly,—That as rich commercial states have ever been the objects of jealousy to their neighbours, it is necessary that they should always place themselves in a defensive position, the means for which are most surely provided by internal resources, as was completely exemplified by Great Britain, during her last arduous contest.

Thirdly,—That the strong arm of national defence is the agricultural population,—many of the mechanical arts, though favourable to the increase of its wealth and knowledge, having generally a tendency to decrease the physical strength of a nation.

“The greatness of a state in bulk and territory doth fall under measure; and the greatness of finances and revenue doth fall under a computation; the population may appear by musters; and the number and greatness of cities by cards and maps; but yet there is not any thing among civil affairs more subject to error than the right valuation and true judgment concerning the power and forces of an estate.”

“Walled towns, stored arsenals, and armories, goodly races of horses, chariots of war, elephants, ordnance, artillery, and the like: all this is but a sheep in a lion's skin, except the breed and disposition of the people be stout and warlike—nay number (itself) in armies importeth not much where the people is of weak courage, for, as Virgil saith, ‘it never troubles the wolf how many the sheep be.’”

“It is certain that the sedentary and within door arts and delicate manufactures, (that require rather the finger than the arm) have in their nature a contrariety to a military disposition; and generally, all warlike people are a little idle, and love danger better than travail; neither must they be too much broken of it, if they are

to be preserved in vigour."—*Lord Bacon—
Essay on the Greatness of Kingdoms and
Estates.*

The whole train of argument I have pursued on the present occasion, will, doubtless vindicate me from the supposition that the latter extracts have been made with a view to promote a hostile feeling, or, in the slightest degree, to repress a well-directed commercial one, as they are simply adduced to point out the policy of preserving an effective agricultural population (not a mere numerical one) as an arm of defence—the best preservative of peace being a state for repelling aggressions from abroad.

I have the honour to be,

With great deference,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

WM. KEER BROWN.

November 1, 1825.

APPENDIX.

TRADE BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND GENOA.

(*Morning Chronicle*, 5th July, 1824.)

“OUR attention has been drawn to this subject by the perusal of a justificatory pamphlet, which was printed and privately distributed by a gentleman last year, who was acting British Consul at Genoa, in the years 1816 and 1817.”

“The author (Mr. Brown) states, *of course officially*, that in the years 1814 and 1815, and when he commenced his duties at Genoa, on the 25th of January, 1816, the Consular fees were at the rate of 2,500*l.* per annum; but that on the 30th of June, 1817, when he quitted office, they only amounted, without any alteration in

the tariff by which they were collected, to about 600*l.* per annum. From this first principle, a great decrease of the British trade at Genoa, must naturally be inferred."

"The author states this decrease to have arisen from two causes, *first*,—from the peace made by Great Britain with the Barbary powers in 1816: the humanity or propriety of this peace is not, however, in the slightest degree, impugned in the pamphlet; but its obvious effect was the destruction of the carrying trade of the Mediterranean by British vessels, and a consequent creation of a great mercantile marine by the Genoese and other Italians, but principally by the former, who have since such peace, until a recent period, securely navigated the Mediterranean under their respective flags; and *secondly*, from the restrictions imposed upon commerce at Genoa, by the Sardinian government. Under the latter head, the author proceeds *ab origine*, as he considers that the special article of the Treaty of Vienna, the foundation of the present commercial relations of Genoa with other powers, is not sufficiently explicit to be properly acted upon—the freedom of the Port and Duchy, a

privilege, having, in the article, been confounded with the free port (Porto-Franco) or bonding warehouse,* *a locality only*, and from this defect, if any British Representative at Genoa is anxious to fulfil his duty, with justice to his country, differences between him and the authorities of Genoa will inevitably arise, as the interpretation given by the Sardinian government to the article, carried to its utmost limit, would totally prohibit the introduction of any goods into the interior by way of transit, the great source of trade at Genoa. The author does not say that such is or has been the case, but the transit trade was, whilst he was in office, greatly harrassed by the regulations of the Sardinian government, founded upon their view of the terms of the article; and it was principally with the view to attract public attention to the ambiguity of the article, and its consequent effects, that the pamphlet was printed—it is therefore hoped, that the author's efforts in this difficult task will not ultimately prove fruitless."

* Or, more properly speaking, an enclosure of Warehouses, held by individuals under the regulation of Officers appointed by the Government.—W. K. B.

“ Indeed the article, had it been incontrovertibly specific, can only be considered declaratory, and in order to its being properly carried into effect, at whatever period such may be the case, it appears necessary, as the author states, that the laws and regulations of the free port of Genoa, under the Republic, should be clearly ascertained, and upon them, by the medium of a commercial treaty or convention, a clear and fixed body of fiscal laws should be established, in place of the present variable ones, which are founded upon the simple ordinances of the Court of Turin, and of course are revocable at the pleasure of that Court, without the shadow of legislative or other interference.”

“ There are other facts of importance stated in the pamphlet (indeed the whole pamphlet is a submission of facts) worthy of that attention and discussion, which, when known, we have no doubt they will meet with, particularly from the portion of His Majesty's Ministers, in whose departments such matters rest. We have the greater confidence that the latter will be the case, from the known attention they of late granted to all commercial subjects.”

The following table exhibits the difference between the late and present tariff of duties (12th June, 1824,) upon cotton goods at Genoa. By former tariffs most woollen goods were excluded there:—

	OLD TARIF.	NEW TARIF.
White and raw goods..	3f. 0c. per Kill ^{gme} .	4f. 0c.
Coloured and dyed.....	3f. 50c.	5f. 0c.
Printed.....	4f. 0c.	5f. 50c.
Cotton mixed with wool	6f. 0c.	8f. 0c.
Cotton twist 1 25....	2f. 0c.	2f. 0c.
26 49....	0f. 25c.	1f. 50c.
50 and above	0f. 25c.	1f. 0c.

EXPLANATORY OBSERVATIONS.

First,—With respect to the diminution of Consular fees, as connected with the carrying trade of the Mediterranean by British vessels, some statement of the origin of their large amount, in 1814 and 1815, and of their subsequent decrease in 1816, will probably place this portion of the business in a clearer point of view than it at present stands.

In March 1814, when the Italian states were, with other European states, invited to exert themselves against the then common enemy, the naval and land forces of

Great Britain presented themselves before Genoa, and a proclamation was issued by His Excellency Lord William Bentick, which induced the Genoese to admit the British forces, the French having previously evacuated the City. The Barbary powers were at this period warmly pursuing their depredations, and for some political reasons, it was judged expedient to allow the use of the British flag to Italian vessels, by which protection they were enabled securely to navigate the Mediterranean.

These vessels paid fees at the British Consulate the same as real British vessels, and the system continued, notwithstanding the remonstrances of the ship-owners of England, during the years 1814 and 1815; but in March, 1816, the latter succeeded in obtaining orders from His Majesty's Government to the British Consuls and Vice-Consuls, within the Strait of Gibraltar, to discontinue the practice of granting the British flag to foreign vessels, it being contrary to the provisions of the Navigation Act—the ship-owners naturally expecting at the time, that the protection of the British flag being no longer allowed

to such vessels, real British ones would for the future be employed as the carriers of the Mediterranean, and this certainly, *in part*; would have been the case had not the peace with the Barbary powers, in 1816, intervened. Thus, as respects the Consular fees, real British vessels would have paid them in place of foreign ones under the British flag.

This subject was, however, so fully discussed in various articles inserted in the Public Ledger, in the months of February and March, 1816, which articles form part of the appendix to the pamphlet, that it would be superfluous for me further to enlarge upon it.

Under the second head of reduction of fees and of British trade at Genoa, *viz.*—*from the restrictions imposed upon commerce by the Sardinian Government*—it is necessary to explain the nature of the free-port of Genoa, as it existed under the Republic, in order to point out the distinction between the liberal system adopted with regard to commerce during the existence of that form of government, and the limited one which has, more or less, prevailed since the annexation, by the Treaty of

Vienna, of the state of Genoa to the Sardinian dominions.

By the ancient laws, which certainly the special article of the Treaty, in spirit if not in the letter, intended also to be the governing ones under the new political relations—all goods, coming foreign, except salt and tobacco, which were and still are government monopolies, were allowed to be deposited in the Porto-franco or bonding warehouse of Genoa, for one year and one day, duty free; and at any time within that period every person, native or foreign, was at liberty to abstract goods from the warehouse, for two purposes—*first*, for the consumption of the city and territory, at not a very high duty,* and, *secondly*, at a nominal one only, all those destined for such interior countries as were then supplied through Genoa; every additional facility having also been granted for the transit of goods through the territory, towards their several destinations.

The Sardinian government, however, when I was in office, adopted a different policy—they levied heavy duties on all goods abstracted from the Porto-franco, whether intended for the consumption of

* About Eight to Ten per Cent. *ad. val.*

the city and territory, or for transit through them, and the difficulties respecting the latter, were at one period so great, as nearly to annihilate this branch of commerce; but since the political occurrences which took place in Genoa, Piedmont, &c. in 1821, some relaxation from the severity of the transit laws, have, I believe, taken place. Whether the new tariff of duties upon cotton goods, which was issued at Genoa on the 12th of June, 1824, applies to the transit trade through, or only to the consumption of the Genoese territory, is not stated; in either case the measure is highly injurious, not only as respects the commerce of Genoa, but as further evincing and promoting that hostile commercial system which has been adopted upon the Continent since the peace in 1814.

WM. KEER BROWN.

*Lord Sheffield's Report, made at the Lewes Wool Fair, 1815.**

I had flattered myself that, after the failure of the American embargo and non-

* This report is inserted as a document of facts regarding the importation of Foreign wool into, and the exportation of woollens from, Great Britain, at various periods.

importation measures, and also of Bonaparte's attempts by decrees to ruin our trade, and that the difficulties respecting our Foreign intercourse were removed, that the trade in wool and woollens would return to its former state, and proceed steadily as heretofore; but the mischief I had foreseen, and had repeatedly represented, and the necessity of checking that mischief, has increased in a most extraordinary degree, and infinitely beyond even what had been apprehended. I had the honor of representing to you at former meetings, that on an average of twenty years in the beginning of the last century, when we plumed ourselves so much on our great staple manufacture of wool, the importation of foreign wool was only 869,727*lbs.* and at that time the manufactures of cotton had not interfered with those of wool: that the average of eight years previously to the French Revolution, *viz.* ending 1789 exclusive, was 2,660,828*lbs.* and the average of eight years, ending the 5th of January, 1811, was 7,729,929*lbs.* I have now to state the enormous importation of Foreign wool in the last year, 1814, which amounted to no less than 15,712,517*lbs.* and in the

quarter ending the 5th of April, 1815, to 3,624,925*lbs.* This increased and increasing importation, and particularly the unexampled importation of last year, is so alarming, that notwithstanding my age, and forty-six year's attention to all country matters, entitled me to decline all meetings, I once more beg leave to trouble you with my opinions on a subject so interesting to you all, as well as to the public, and to repeat the necessity of an application to the Legislature for protection for our fine wools, from which this kingdom, for many centuries, derived extraordinary benefit, and its manufactures great credit.—The article wool is the only produce of the island which is not protected, all other Foreign articles that interfere with the growth or manufactures of this country are restricted by protecting duties; and it is most just and politic, thus to encourage the produce and manufactures of the country. It is now perfectly established, that as fine wool as is usually imported, may be grown in this country; and I have already observed to you, that rating the import so low as 2*s.* 6*d.* *per lb.* we paid to foreigners last year for wool, £1,964,064. 12*s.* 6*d.* and

this consideration is surely worthy the attention of the legislature. It may be observed, that notwithstanding the prodigious increase in the importation of wool, the manufacture does not seem to have increased in proportion: for on an average of ten years, ending 1808, the broad and narrow cloths milled in the West Riding of Yorkshire, the only branch of the trade of which a precise knowledge can be obtained, amounted to nearly 15,000,000 of yards: and the quantity milled in the year ending 25th March, 1815, on the return of peace, when an extraordinary demand might be expected, was only 16,701,963 yards: and the official value of the woollen manufactures exported from Great Britain, on an average of years from 1800 to 1810, both exclusive, was £6,063,688; and the official value of woollens exported in 1814, was £5,628,001.

Extract from Mr. Tooke's evidence before the Commons' Committee of Inquiry into Agricultural Distress.—(Agricultural Report, folio 352, 1821.)

“Have you any observations to make respecting wool?”

“The depression in the price of wool in the last two years is, in fact, greater than appears on the face of the quotations, inasmuch as the new duty attached since October, 1819. But great as the depression is, I am inclined to think that the fall beyond ten *per cent.* may be partly accounted for by the excessive importation which took place prior to that period, and partly by the diminished exportation of cloth; which diminished export may, perhaps, be ascribed, in some degree, to the additional duty on wool.*

“Of late the market for fine wool has improved, and I have been told, by a manufacturer of the West of England, that the clothing business is reviving in that quarter.”

CUSTOM-HOUSE RETURN—No. 1.

An account of the value, as calculated at the official rates of all British and Irish produce and manufactures, exported from Great Britain, in each of the three years,

* Or, more probably to the restrictions abroad upon the introduction of British manufactures.—W. K. B.

ending 5th January, 1825, distinguishing the leading branches of the manufactures and produce exported.

Branches of Manufacture.	YEARS ENDING		
	5th Jan. 1823.	1824.	1825.
Brass and Copper Manufactures	£. 626,084	£. 585,136	£. 585,126
Cotton Manufactures	24,815,276	24,417,533	27,553,510
Twist and Yarn	2,522,500	2,633,327	3,241,846
Glass & Earthenware of all sorts	269,492	279,688	285,820
Hardware & Cutlery	601,975	598,180	699,115
Iron and Steel, wrought and unwrought	1,402,221	1,463,387	1,392,697
Linen manufactures	2,616,430	2,678,665	3,316,790
Silk manufactures	205,182	182,014	172,652
Sugar British, refined	1,076,685	1,316,030	1,251,654
Woollen Goods	6,437,374	6,140,256	6,926,115
All other articles*	5,879,395	5,992,076	6,293,282
	46,452,614	46,286,292	51,718,607

*The manufactured articles embraced in the miscellaneous head of "all other articles," amount to about £2,000,000.

April 22, 1825.

CUSTOM-HOUSE RETURN.—No. 2.

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS.

Return to an Order of The Honourable House of Commons, dated 21st February, 1825:—for AN ACCOUNT of the official value of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures, and of Foreign and Colonial Produce and Manufactures, EXPORTED from Great Britain, distinguishing the several Countries; together with the IMPORTS into Great Britain from the same Countries; for the Year ending 5th January, 1825.

COUNTRIES.	OFFICIAL VALUE OF IMPORTS.						OFFICIAL VALUE OF EXPORTS.								
	OF IMPORTS.			OF EXPORTS.			British and Irish Produce and Manufactures.			Foreign and Colonial Merchandize.			TOTAL EXPORTS.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Russia	2,611,617	0	8	1,174,722	3	6	666,552	10	0	1,841,274	13	6	1,841,274	13	6
Sweden	130,751	0	1	37,668	8	8	165,016	18	7	202,685	7	3	202,685	7	3
Norway	86,493	15	8	86,062	8	11	45,533	8	7	131,595	17	6	131,595	17	6
Denmark	35,881	4	6	185,135	5	1	194,996	17	8	380,132	2	9	380,132	2	9
Prussia	504,140	8	2	224,086	1	5	410,038	7	7	634,074	9	0	634,074	9	0
Germany	961,460	6	11	5,784,947	12	8	1,744,009	8	8	7,528,957	1	4	7,528,957	1	4
Holland	785,073	5	4	1,486,344	9	9	57,688	18	11	2,044,033	8	8	2,044,033	8	8
Flanders	298,685	8	11	1,263,832	3	0	749,377	11	7	2,013,209	14	7	2,013,209	14	7
France	1,102,739	5	0	241,029	4	4	743,336	7	1	984,565	11	5	984,565	11	5
Portugal, the Azores, and Madeira	566,353	13	2	1,959,441	19	5	187,031	12	8	2,146,473	12	1	2,146,473	12	1
Spain and the Canaries	808,748	7	0	305,903	8	0	146,979	11	9	452,882	19	9	452,882	19	9
Gibraltar	81,698	8	7	1,644,606	5	2	929,481	10	6	1,974,087	15	8	1,974,087	15	8
Italy	1,123,344	13	10	3,278,912	19	6	655,650	18	9	3,934,563	18	3	3,934,563	18	3
Malta	37,334	16	5	426,680	14	5	72,899	18	3	499,580	12	8	499,580	12	8
Ionian Islands	93,538	1	11	8,131	16	6	81	4	9	8,213	1	3	8,213	1	3
Turkey and the Levant	446,902	12	8	1,170,233	6	1	104,004	10	8	1,274,237	16	9	1,274,237	16	9
Isles, Guernsey, Jersey, Alderney, and Man	183,952	3	2	255,225	15	8	68,763	11	0	323,989	6	8	323,989	6	8
ASIA: East Indies and China	9,858,714	12	0	19,532,914	2	1	6,841,643	7	0	26,374,557	9	1	26,374,557	9	1
New Holland	6,918,539	19	2	3,751,390	15	7	604,047	3	1	4,355,437	18	8	4,355,437	18	8
AFRICA: Cape of Good Hope	51,376	18	0	137,908	6	10	42,807	18	2	180,716	5	0	180,716	5	0
Other Parts of Africa	154,147	15	0	373,909	10	11	59,563	11	1	433,473	2	0	433,473	2	0
AMERICA: Brit. Col. in North America	185,250	5	3	195,167	17	10	147,656	3	8	342,824	1	6	342,824	1	6
Columbia River and N. W. Coast	864,944	2	2	1,514,138	19	4	252,399	1	0	1,766,538	0	4	1,766,538	0	4
British West Indies	7,971,145	16	4	4,339,699	13	8	283,104	19	11	4,622,804	13	7	4,622,804	13	7
United States	5,459,736	13	11	5,986,845	4	3	154,605	7	4	6,141,450	11	7	6,141,450	11	7
Foreign West Indies	790,236	16	1	1,655,706	10	7	46,491	12	11	1,702,198	3	6	1,702,198	3	6
Brazil	1,053,327	2	11	3,357,173	1	2	68,151	15	6	3,425,324	16	8	3,425,324	16	8
Mexico	221,825	16	9	337,368	6	6	12,408	13	0	369,776	19	6	369,776	19	6
Columbia	45,275	8	10	285,372	14	10	20,248	16	10	305,621	11	8	305,621	11	8
Peru	15,316	12	9	399,450	2	2	9,422	10	4	408,872	12	6	408,872	12	6

EUROPE, exclusive of IRELAND.

136	585,126
533	27,553,510
327	3,241,846
688	285,820
180	699,115
387	1,392,697
665	3,316,790
014	172,652
030	1,251,654
256	6,926,115
076	6,293,282
292	51,718,607

d in the miscel-
amount to about

CUSTOM-HOUSE RETURN.—No. 2.

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS.

Return to an Order of The Honourable House of Commons, dated 21st February, 1825:—for AN ACCOUNT of the official value of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures, and of Foreign and Colonial Produce and Manufactures, EXPORTED from Great Britain, distinguishing the several Countries; together with the IMPORTS into Great Britain from the same Countries; for the Year ending 5th January, 1825.

COUNTRIES.	OFFICIAL VALUE OF IMPORTS.			OFFICIAL VALUE OF EXPORTS.			TOTAL EXPORTS.
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	
Russia.....	2,611,617	0	8	1,174,722	3	6	1,841,274 13 6
Sweden.....	130,751	0	1	37,668	8	8	202,685 7 3
Norway.....	86,493	15	8	86,092	8	11	131,595 17 6
Denmark.....	35,881	4	6	185,135	5	1	380,132 2 9
Prussia.....	504,140	8	2	224,086	1	5	634,074 9 0
Germany.....	961,460	6	11	5,784,947	12	8	7,528,957 1 4
Holland.....	785,073	5	4	1,486,344	9	9	2,044,033 8 8
Flanders.....	298,685	8	11	1,263,832	3	0	2,013,209 14 7
France.....	1,102,739	5	0	241,029	4	4	984,565 11 5
Portugal, the Azores, and Madeira.....	566,353	13	2	1,959,441	19	5	2,146,473 12 1
Spain and the Canaries.....	808,748	7	0	305,903	8	5	452,882 19 9
Gibraltar.....	81,698	8	7	1,644,606	5	2	1,974,087 15 3
Italy.....	1,123,344	13	10	3,278,912	19	6	3,934,563 18 3
Malta.....	37,334	16	5	426,680	14	5	499,580 12 8
Ionian Islands.....	93,538	1	11	8,131	16	6	8,213 1 3
Turkey and the Levant.....	446,902	12	8	1,170,233	6	1	1,274,237 16 9
Isles, Guernsey, Jersey, Alderney, } and Man.....	183,952	3	2	255,225	15	8	323,989 6 8
ASIA: East Indies and China.....	9,858,714	12	0	19,532,914	2	1	6,841,643 7 0
New Holland.....	6,918,539	19	2	3,751,390	15	7	604,047 3 1
AFRICA: Cape of Good Hope.....	51,376	18	0	137,908	6	10	42,807 18 2
Other Parts of Africa.....	154,147	15	0	373,909	10	11	59,563 11 1
AMERICA: Brit. Col. in North America.....	185,250	5	3	195,167	17	10	147,656 3 8
Columbia River and N. W. Coast.....	864,944	2	2	1,514,138	19	4	253,399 1 0
British West Indies.....	7,971,145	16	4	7,968	12	7	263 16 3
United States.....	5,439,736	13	11	4,339,699	13	8	283,104 19 11
Foreign West Indies.....	790,236	16	1	5,986,845	4	3	154,605 7 4
Brazil.....	1,033,327	2	11	1,655,706	10	7	46,491 12 11
Mexico.....	221,825	16	9	3,357,173	1	2	68,151 15 6
Columbia.....	45,275	8	10	357,368	6	6	12,408 13 0
Peru.....	15,316	12	9	285,372	14	10	20,248 16 10
Chili.....	9,719	19	6	399,450	2	2	9,432 10 4
Buenos Ayres and Monte Video.....	388,338	6	10	471,726	3	11	17,875 13 3
The Whale Fisheries.....	592,967	11	11	777,679	5	11	25,558 13 2
Seized Goods, &c.....	11,800	11	8	46	13	4	803,237 19 1
IRELAND.....	34,591,264	9	1	143,144,466	1	6	8,588,995 18 0
TOTAL, exclusive of Ireland.....	5,821,036	1	11	3,141,825	11	0	1,359,376 6 5
GRAND TOTAL.....	40,412,200	11	0	46,286,291	12	6	9,948,372 4 5

Note.—The proportional Value of the Trade carried on with each Country during the year ended 5th January, 1825, cannot at present be stated, as it is ascertained by applying the Official Rates individually to the numerous Articles of Import and Export of which the Trade may in each case consist; an operation of such extent and labour as unavoidably to occupy a period of several months after the termination of the year. The Account containing the distinction of the Trade with each Country is therefore submitted for the year ended 5th January, 1824, and an Abstract is subjoined of the Total Official Value of the Imports and Exports in the year ended 5th January, 1825, as the best Return which it is practicable to furnish at the present time, in relation to the Trade of the last year.

YEAR ended 5th JANUARY 1825.

Total OFFICIAL VALUE of IMPORTS into Great Britain£. 41,729,485 17 9

Total OFFICIAL VALUE of EXPORTS from Great Britain, viz.—

British and Irish Produce and Manufactures£51,718,606 17 8 }
Foreign and Colonial Merchandize 11,506,665 9 10 } 63,225,272 7 6

Inspector General's Office, }
Custom House, London, 30th March, 1825. } WILLIAM IRVING,
Inspector General of Imports and Exports.

CUSTOM-HOUSE RETURN.—No. 3.

WOOLLENS.

Return to an Order of the Honorable the House of Commons, dated 12th April, 1821;—for

AN ACCOUNT of the total declared value of all Manufactured Woollens and Woollen Yarn, exported from Great Britain to all parts of the World; from 5th January, 1814, to 5th January, 1821, distinguishing each Year.

YEAR Ending	WOOLLEN MANUFACTURED GOODS.	WOOLLEN YARN.	TOTAL Declared Value of Manufactured Wool- lens and Woollen Yarn exported from Great Britain.
	£.	£.	£.
5th Jan. 1815	7,443,462	126,044	7,569,507
..... 1816	10,096,071	104,856	10,200,927
..... 1817	8,336,829	67,698	8,404,528
..... 1818	7,884,415	74,512	7,958,927
..... 1819	8,975,181	72,779	9,047,960
..... 1820	6,801,985	97,758	6,899,694
..... 1821	6,188,098	91,066	6,279,164*

* The shillings and pence are omitted in this return for want of space.

Note.—The declared Values of British Manufactures of all sorts were not officially ascertained until the passing of the Act 53 Geo. 3, c. 98; and the Return of the declared Value of all Manufactured Woollens and Woollen Yarn, exported from Great Britain, cannot therefore be stated previous to the Year ending 5th January, 1815.

WILLIAM IRVING,
Inspector General of the Imports and Exports of Great Britain.

Custom-House, London,
16th April, 1821.

Continuation of Return.

YEAR Ending	TOTAL
5th Jan 1822	£.
1823	6,437,374
1824	6,140,256
1825	6,926,115

CUSTOM-HOUSE RETURN.—No. 4.

AN ACCOUNT of the Quantity of SHEEP and LAMBS' WOOL, imported into Great Britain, between the 5th January, 1800, and the 5th January, 1821, distinguishing the amount in each year.

YEAR Ending 5th January.	From Foreign Countries.	Produce of Ireland, Isles of Guernsey, Jersey, Man.	TOTAL.
	lbs.	lbs.	lbs.
1801	8,609,384	5,900	8,615,284
1802	7,369,993	17,114	7,387,107
1803	7,622,970	78,548	7,701,518
1804	5,889,834	115,958	6,005,792
1805	7,909,551	240,042	8,151,593
1806	8,079,964	462,012	8,541,976
1807	6,763,622	570,371	7,333,993
War. 1808	11,473,661	295,265	11,768,926
1809	2,279,956	73,769	2,353,725
1810	6,782,614	63,319	6,845,933
1811	10,931,667	4,557	10,936,224
1812	4,732,646	7,326	4,739,972
1813	6,992,034	22,833	7,014,917
1814	Records destroyed by Fire		
1815	15,490,134	222,363	15,712,517
1816	13,634,520	1,357,185	14,991,705
1817	7,517,487	600,377	8,117,864
Peace. 1818	14,051,788	664,055	14,715,843
1819	24,720,139	1,685,347	26,405,486
1820	16,094,999	95,344	16,190,343
1821	9,770,103	273,643	10,043,746

Continuation of Return (Ireland not included.)

YEAR Ending 5th January.	lbs.
1822.....	16,632,028
1823.....	19,072,364
1824.....	19,378,129
1825.....	22,558,222

CUSTOM-HOUSE RETURN.—No. 5.

WOOL.

AN ACCOUNT of the quantity of British Wool exported, from 1st December, 1824, to the latest period to which the same can be made out.

Quantity of British Sheep or Lambs' Wool exported from Great Britain, between the 1st December, 1824, and the 5th January, 1825, under the provisions of Act 5, Geo. 4. c. 47.	}	lbs. 18,367
--	---	----------------

Inspector General's Office, Custom-House, London, 23d February, 1825.	}	<i>William Irving,</i> Inspector General of Imports and Exports.
---	---	---

EMENDATIONS SECOND EDITION.

Page 35.—Kent Wool, 1s. 1½*d.* per lb. in 1822, 1823, and 1824, in place of 10*d.* per lb. first edition.
Page 46.—Numerically the comparative extent of territory between England and France must be erroneous, though the principles deduced remain the same; it should it is presumed, be—
England.....55,554 Miles
France.....100,016 ditto.

ERRATA.

Page 7, line 5, for speculation read speculations.
— 26, — 18, for gold read more gold.

FINIS.

Printed by J. Loder, Woodbridge.