

221-5



0381

A N  
I N Q U I R Y  
I N T O T H E  
Present State of Population  
in England and Wales;  
A N D T H E P R O P O R T I O N  
Which the present Number of Inhabitants bears  
to the Number at former Periods.

B Y  
WILLIAM WALES, F. R. S.  
And Master of the Royal Mathematical School in Christ's Hospital.



---

L O N D O N,  
Printed by G. Bigg, Denmark Court, Strand,  
For C. NOURSE, in the Strand.  
M, DCC, LXXXI.

---



---

A N

INQUIRY into the PRESENT STATE

O F

POPULATION IN ENGLAND.

**T**H E subject of the following sheets is obviously of such great concern to every one who has the prosperity of his country at heart, that if the importance of the subject were alone a sufficient apology for a man's printing his thoughts on it, I should want none for making them public. But I have always thought that the more important any subject was, the more careful every man ought to be that he publishes nothing relating to it which may not answer some useful purpose; much more ought he to be careful that what he publishes may not be productive of a bad

B one.

( 2 )

one: and, from considerations, like these, I am very unwilling to hazard my reputation, small the stock of it may be, without endeavouring to point out which way I think this publication may be useful.

Truth ought at all times to be the object of our researches; but it is a truth, notorious even to a proverb, that it ought not, at all times, to be made public. And surely, at no time whatsoever could publications, which tend to depress the spirit of the nation, be more improperly introduced than now, when we are surrounded by numerous and powerful enemies, through whom we must fight our way, or sink into the most humiliating state of insignificance, or perhaps contempt, amongst the nations of Europe. But if publications of this nature, stamp'd with the authority of persons of great respect and influence, be built on partial or false information, it becomes the duty of every member of society to use his utmost endeavours to stop the effects of such misrepresentations. And those gentlemen, who have written with good intentions, will be pleas'd to see truth established on either side of the question in so respectable a branch of human knowledge; and, as fellow subjects, must receive great satisfaction.

( 3 )

tion in discovering that the state of population, at this period, and that part of our resources which depend on it, are not so bad as they had been led to conceive them.

I was first induced to set on foot this inquiry, by reading the ingenious Essay on the same subject which was published at the end of *Mr. Morgan's* Book on Assurances, in the Spring of the year 1779. The state of the kingdom, there laid before us, is so deplorable, that I think it must affect every one who reads it. I soon discovered that no very material objections could be made to the calculations in that performance; and the objections which have hitherto been made to it, only shew that the author is not to be confuted on the ground which he has chosen to stand on. But it was no less evident to me, that the returns which are made by the window-surveyors are by no means sufficient to support calculations of this nature, even where the chargeable houses are returned with the greatest exactness. Cottages are seldom returned; and but in some places when they are demanded, as was the case in the year 1777: and, where they are returned, it is generally from conjecture, or from some old duplicate, which was, perhaps, the conjecture

( 4 )

of 20 or 30 years before. I am very credibly informed, that the true number of the cottages were purposely withheld in some parts of Yorkshire, Nottinghamshire, and others of the midland counties; and it is very likely in more places than these, through an apprehension that they were then required with a view of extending the tax on windows, or forming a new one. And to a suspicion of this nature I attribute the obstruction which I met with, in my endeavours to collect the number of houses, which will be mentioned bye and bye.

With respect to the calculations, which are founded on the increase or decrease of the excise and customs, it may justly be said, that a man must see and know but little of what passes in the kingdom, at this time, who is not aware that the pernicious practice of smuggling is carried to too great a length, not to be most severely felt in these two articles of the revenue; and, therefore, that no dependance can be placed in calculations founded on them.

Convinced, as I was, that no dependance could be placed on calculations, founded on either of the two considerations which have been discussed above, and that a tolerable degree

( 5 )

degree of exactness could be expected only from an actual survey, made on the spot, by persons in no wise interested in this affair, or any others which have the least connection with it, or with any article of the revenue; I began to consider in what way authentic information, of this kind, though of a more limited extent, might be procured. I observed that the advocates for a depopulation suppose that the destruction has fallen chiefly, and of late years, wholly upon the cottages; and that it was allowed, on all hands, that the principal manufacturing and trading towns have *increased*; and some of them, as Manchester, Leeds, Birmingham, Seffield, Liverpool, and Bristol, most amazingly. It was moreover obvious, that many cottages would not be found in large towns where there are no manufactures; consequently the desolation must have happened chiefly in small country towns and villages; in which places I knew it would be very easy for a person, who lived on the spot, to inform himself exactly of the present number of houses; and, if he had spent his whole time in the place, to recollect every material alteration which had been made in it for thirty or forty years past.

In

( 6 )

In consequence of these considerations, I addressed the following queries to every acquaintance which I had in the country, as well as to every other person that I could get recommended to.

1. The number of houses which there are now in the township, or village.

2. The number of houses there were in it about the year 1750.

3. The number of houses which have been built since that time, where none stood before.

4. The number of houses which have been suffered to decay, and become uninhabitable since 1750; in the place of which none have yet been rebuilt.

5. By how many the total number of houses have been lessened by putting two, or more, into one.

6. By how many the total number of houses have been increased by separating large old houses into smaller ones.

7. The number of houses that are assessed to the window tax.

8. Whether, in the several surveys that have been made, but especially in 1777, the surveyor returned the number of houses which were *not* assessed, as well as those which were.

Lastly,

( 7 )

Lastly, To take the opinion of two or three sensible persons, who have lived the whole time in the village, &c. whether, since that period, the number of the inhabitants has increased or decreased.

To these letters I had many answers, and some procured me the information which I wanted, as will be seen farther on. But it would be almost incredible, were I to relate the opposition which this scheme of numbering the houses met with. My friends, in some parts of the country, were assailed, not only with persuasions, but by threatenings of every kind; such as loss of employment, prosecutions, and even blows. The letters which I have received from some of them are so extraordinary, that, I confess, I should almost have doubted the truth of them, if I had not experienced the same treatment myself, in some places, during a tour that I made last summer on this business. In a large manufacturing town, in the West Riding of Yorkshire, I was beset by a crowd of women, who had taken an alarm from the nature of my inquiries, and perhaps, escaped, the fate of *Orpheus*, by whispering one of the good women, who had set upon us, that his Majesty might possibly settle small annuities on every poor

( 8 )

poor man and his wife, who brought up a certain number of children, to be useful members of society. The news flew like wildfire, and I met with no farther opposition there.

I cannot forbear relating another rebuff which I met with in the course of these inquiries, because of the singularity of it. I had written on this subject, to a very intimate friend, a dissenter of the independant church, without receiving any answer to it; but on a second application, rather more pressing, he vouchsafed to write as follows. "Sir, I have received your two letters of the 2d and 15th instant, and, in answer to them, refer you to 1. *Chron. chap. xxi. v. 1.*" It will be readily imagined that I was not long in looking for my answer, nor without surprize, when I read, "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked *David* to number Israel." To this laconic epistle I replied, "that he had not only mistaken persons, but situations; and that he was so far from being in the situation of *David*, and I in that of Devil, tempting him to number the people, as he supposed, that I was really *David's* representative, preparing to stop the sword of the destroying Angel which had lately

( 9 )

lately made such a dreadful devastation amongst us. My friend was convinced of his mistake, and has since furnished me with a great variety of the most useful information.

The opposition which I met with in making inquiries of this kind, convinced me that I should never be able to carry them to any great extent; and happening to recollect some hints which I had formerly seen in the *Philosophical Transactions*, relating to the use which might be made of parish registers for this purpose, I immediately set about making collections of that kind, and soon found that I had now to do with men of more enlarged minds, and of a more liberal way of thinking. I should indeed be greatly wanting, in gratitude, if I did not acknowledge, that I have met with the utmost readiness to assist me wherever I have applied; and I am assured, from my own experience, that a general invitation to the clergy, and the appointment of a proper place for the reception of their communications, would procure materials sufficient to determine this arduous problem, in political arithmetic, with great certainty. Those, therefore, who may find themselves disposed to look on this

C

publication

publication as incomplete, and not sufficient to exhibit a true state of the nation, with regard to the increase or decrease of its inhabitants, will do well to assist in collecting the registers from a greater number of parishes, rather than attempt to contradict what these appear to prove, by arguments drawn from such imperfect data as the returns of the window surveyors; or from accounts which are most glaringly wrong.\* What I have given will shew how much a single person, who is disposed to do it, may perform; and I hope yet to be able to add much more.

I shall deliver the materials which I have collected in the order they came to hand; namely, the information I received concerning the number of houses, and the comparisons of those accounts, with the returns made by the window surveyors first, proceeding

---

\* It has been said, from Dr. *Davenant*, who formed his estimate from the *Hearth-Books*, that the number of houses in *London*, *Westminster*, and all *Middlesex* were 111215, in the year 1690; and that they were no more than 90570, according to the returns of the window-surveyors, in 1777, including also the Borough of *Southwark*. But no unprejudiced person will suppose that there were more houses in *London*, *Westminster*, and *Middlesex*, 80 or 90 years ago, than there are, at this time, in *London*, *Westminster*, *Middlesex*, and *Southwark*, whatever the number of inhabitants might be at these two periods.

proceeding from the north towards the south; and the abstracts of the parish registers afterwards. But before I say any thing concerning the kingdom in general, I beg leave to state a few circumstances, which relate to the present number of the inhabitants of the city of *London*, as well as to the proportion which that number bears to the number of them at the Revolution, and also to the number at some other periods between these two: because I am persuaded these points have not been properly represented before.

With respect to the former, namely, the absolute number of the inhabitants, I think it an object of small importance, when compared with the other; for whatever their number might be at the time of the Revolution, we are well assured, now at least, that no material inconvenience arose from it; and, consequently, unless that number be greatly altered since, we may presume none can arise from it now: especially if I shew, as I trust I shall, that other parts of the kingdom are not greatly changed for the worse: beside, this point is more difficult to determine than the other, with any tolerable degree of exactness: I am therefore ready to acquiesce in

( 12 )

the number, at which they have been stated by the very ingenious *Dr. Price*, in his *Essay* on this subject, printed in his *Observations on Reversionary Payments*; that is somewhere from 591,580 to 671,580. But I must here observe, that the reason which he gives for thinking both these numbers too high, appears, to me, at least, not well founded. He supposes there is a greater defect in the baptisms than there is in the burials, and supports his opinion by very forcible arguments. On this supposition the number of inhabitants will appear to be less than if we suppose the defect in each equal: he therefore concludes that the number of inhabitants are less. But it may be remarked, that if the births are considerably more defective than the burials, the expectation of life, by which the number of those births is multiplied, will be greater, and especially at this time, when the number of the births approaches so much nearer to the number of the burials than they did at the period, from which *Dr. Price* has deduced the expectation of life which he makes use of; and I cannot help expressing my surprize, that this circumstance should escape the observation of such an able and attentive computer.

But

( 13 )

But to shew that I do not acquiesce in the above conclusion without reason, I shall compute the number of inhabitants two different ways, according to my own notion of things.

1. In the year 1737, *Mr. Maitland*, by a very careful and exact survey, the particulars of which are related in his *History of London*, vol. 2, p. 719, &c. made the number of houses 95,968. I believe we shall not exceed the truth, if we allow that 4032 have been added to that number since his time; and if so, their present number is 100,000. It appears from p. 205 of *Dr. Price's Observations on reversionary payments*, 3d edit. that when a survey of that part of the parish of *Pancras*, which joins to *London*, was taken in *March*, 1772, there were in it very near 7 persons and one-third to every house. But because a few of those persons, who live in and about *Percy Street* and *Charlotte Street*, may leave town in summer, we will allow that two persons out of every three houses in that part of the parish which was surveyed, leave *London* for half a year; and then the average of persons to a house, for the whole year, will be exactly seven. The same ingenious gentleman mentions another parish in *London*, at p. 8, of his *Essay on the Population of England*, in which  
the



( 14 )

the number of persons to a house were 6. Let the medium between this number and the former be taken, which is  $6\frac{1}{2}$ , and multiplied by 100,000, the number of houses, it will give 650,000 for the number of inhabitants. I am firmly persuaded, that neither the number of houses, nor the number of persons to a house, here given, is too great: the latter I am convinced is not. For notwithstanding *London* has of late years spread itself over much more ground, than it formerly stood on, there is a great number of houses, to my knowledge, which contain two, three, and some even four families each; which any one may be convinced of by examining the parishes of *Clerkenwell, Old Street, Spittlefields, White-chapel, &c. &c.* and it is much to be wished, that many more families than do, had it in their power to indulge themselves in the LUXURY of a single house, were it ever such a small one.

2. It will be shewn presently, that the births, according to the bills of mortality, are now 18698, on a medium, annually, and the burials 22227: they therefore exceed the births by 3529, which is not  $\frac{1}{5}$ th part. Between the years 1759 and 1768 the burials exceeded the births, according to the bills,  
by

( 15 )

by more than  $\frac{1}{4}$ th part of themselves, and accordingly the *Rev. Dr. Price* formed his tables of the probabilities of lives, in *London*, on a supposition that the burials did exceed the births by one-fourth part,\* allowing the overplus to compensate for the greater defect, which may be supposed to be in the births than in the burials brought into the bills. And, according to these tables, the expectation of life, which belongs to a child just born, is somewhat less than twenty years and three quarters. But it has been shewn that the burials do not now exceed the births by one-sixth part; and, probably, when a proper allowance is made for the greater defect in the births than in the burials, the latter may not exceed the former by more than a twelfth or thirteenth part of themselves; and this may be made to appear in the following manner.

*Mr. Maitland*, in the year 1729, discovered 2620 omissions in the account of burials, given in the bills, rejecting those which were buried in the parishes of *Pancrass* and *Marybone*, which I have brought to account in another place; we cannot add less than 1000  
to

\* See *Observations on Reverfionary Payments*, p. 248, 1st. edit. or p. 253, 3d. edit.

( 16 )

to this number for emigrants, persons who are carried to a greater distance than he extended his researches to, those who are not buried at all, and the greater numbers, which are buried out of *London* now than formerly; consequently, the addition to be made to the bills will be now 3620, and the true number of burials 25847. Dr. *Price* states the defect in the number of births, above that in the number of burials, at 2000. I do not think that defect now so great as it was formerly; but the reasons, which the Doctor has given, convince me that it cannot be much less: we will suppose it 1750, and the whole defect in the births will be 5370, the true number of the births 24068, and the recruits from the country only 1779, or not quite  $\frac{1}{4}$ th of the burials. If this be a true state of the case, and it appears to me to be so, the expectation of a child, just born, must be much greater than 20 years and three quarters, and approach very nearly to what it would be, if all that are buried were born in *London*, which expectation, by Dr. *Price's* 12th table, is upwards of 25 years and three quarters. I cannot stop to calculate what it will be exactly, nor does the business merit it; but I conclude however, that it cannot be much less

( 17 )

less than 24 years; and  $24 \times 24068$  is 577.632, which would be the number of the inhabitants, if all who die in *London*, were born there: but it has been shewn that about 1779 come, every year, to supply the annual loss, occasioned by the excess of the deaths above the births. These, we may suppose, all arrive between the ages of 15 and 45, for after that age, as many retire out of *London*, as come in and settle there; but, because much the greatest part comes in under 25 years of age, and almost the whole before they are 30, it will not be unreasonable to grant that they all come in between 15 and 35; and the medium of the expectations of life, at these two ages, by Mr. *Simpson's* table, at p. 255, of his *Select Exercises*, is 26,7 years; by which multiplying 1779, the product is 47499, for the number to be added to 577.632 on account of recruits from the country, and this makes the number of the inhabitants in *London* 625.131.

The second point, which I wished to discuss before I enter on any calculations, that relate to the kingdom in general, is the proportion which the present number of the inhabitants of *London* bears, to the number of them at the Revolution. In this disquisition I shall confine myself entirely to arguments

D

drawn

( 18 )

drawn from the bills of mortality; which, imperfect as they are, are by far the best, and I believe the only tolerable data, which we have to go upon. But before I proceed farther, I cannot help expressing my surprize, that those who have made this comparison before me, should confine themselves to arguments drawn from the burials alone; whereas, I think, the births must be, of the two, the more certain criterion. Many circumstances, I am convinced, have contributed to render the number of deaths fewer in *London*, than they were formerly, in proportion to the number of people. At the Revolution, *London* stood on little more than half the ground which it occupies at present; of course the inhabitants, supposing them not much more numerous, are not crowded together in the manner they were then, and the air must be purer, and more healthful. Many parts, of the city especially, are made more open by pulling down houses; and all the streets much more airy and wholesome by removing the signs, which in many places, met in the middle of the street, in such a manner as to make it difficult to determine which side of the way they belonged to. The streets are also better, and more regularly

( 19 )

regularly cleansed; and, by the addition of several new works, water is become much more plentiful than it was heretofore; and this has been a great means of contributing, not only to greater cleanliness in our houses, but also towards purifying the air by washing the filth out of the kennels and common shoars. Nothing, I am convinced from much experience, contributes so much to health as cleanliness; and I am persuaded that in the *Resolution*, we owed more to *Captain Cook's* care, in this respect, than every other cause put together. Nothing perhaps has contributed so much to cleanliness in the *City of London*, and consequently to the healthfulness of it, as so many families having quitted lodgings, and living in whole houses. It is impossible to preserve any tolerable degree of this wholesome discipline in houses where there are many families; and those who have branded the present custom of taking whole houses with the opprobrious name of *Luxury*, can never have felt the disagreeable inconveniences of living otherwise.

But although I have been able to enumerate many reasons why the burials are fewer than formerly. I do not recollect any causes that can add to the number of births, which

are not said to be operating more strongly against us at this time, than at any former one; and therefore, we might expect to find the number of births in *London*, fewer now than they were at the Revolution, which is not a fact, as will appear from what follows. And notwithstanding luxury, extravagance, and dissipation are at a very high pitch, it by no means follows that they are carried higher now than they were formerly; or that they are of a more wicked nature, or of a more dangerous tendency. It was always the custom to praise the past, and speak ill of the present times; and, therefore, when I hear gentlemen declaiming in this manner, I am no more convinced of the truth of what they advance, than they are themselves by the authors who lived in, and wrote with the same severity of the manners of the ages, which it is now the fashion to extol so much. Dress is not more expensive; nor are places of public amusement more numerous now, than formerly. Excessive gluttony and drunkenness, the grossest, and perhaps the most pernicious to population of all others, are by no means the leading vices of the present age: indeed, there are very few, except amongst the lowest of mankind,

mankind, who would not be ashamed to be thought guilty of them. In short, when I cast my eye over the several pursuits, fashions, amusements, and vices of the present age, and compare them with those of former times, as I find them described by the moral writers, who lived in them, I can only conclude that the circuit of these things is changed, but not enlarged; and that providence has cast my lot in an age which is as desirable as any that have preceded it for many generations.

I know it has been urged, that there are fewer Dissenters in London, than there were at the Revolution, and that, on this account, fewer baptisms are omitted in the bills, than were omitted formerly. But after the strictest inquiry into this matter, I cannot find that it is so: on the contrary, it seems to be a general opinion that although some of the old sects are diminished, yet the new ones which have lately risen up, have more than compensated for that decrease, and that Dissenters, including all sorts, are, at least as numerous now, as at any time since the Restoration.

It may also be said, that the births can only measure the child-bearing part of the inhabitants—not the whole. To this I answer,

( 22 )

fewer, those who insist that the number of inhabitants are diminished, contend also that those who marry, and of course are, in general, the child-bearing part of the community, are still more diminished, in proportion to the whole; owing to the contempt which is shewn to the state by people of fashion; by the difficulties which are thrown in the way of providing for a family by bad management in our superiors, excessive taxes, and want of employment; and by the passion for luxury and extravagance which universally prevails at this time. It may therefore be reasonably presumed, that if the child-bearing part of the inhabitants have not suffered a diminution, the whole have not.

There is however one cause why the number of births may be higher now than formerly, without supposing a greater number of people to produce them, although, as far as I know, it has never been adverted to before; and which, with all due submission to the opinions of medical people, is this. Will not every cause which produces a greater degree of mortality, impair the bodily faculties of the living, before it produces death? and, amongst others, the procreative faculties also? if it will, and if there  
were

( 23 )

were some cause which produced a greater degree of mortality formerly in the City of London than now, as the following tables seem fully to shew, that cause would operate to produce fewer children formerly than are produced now, when that cause appears not to operate so strongly in producing absolute mortality, as it has done before. But I beg leave to observe, that I advance this only as the Roman Catholic Philosophers are glad to do the motion of the Earth, and other heretical opinions; that is, not *per Thesim*, but *per Hypothesim*; and let the advocates for depopulation make the most of it. I proceed to facts.

London

	Births	Burials	Waste of hu- man Life.
London Bills, from 1686, to 1690. — — —	14843	22391	
Marybone Bills — — —	9	29	
Pancras Bills — — —	18	60	
Middle year of the 5, is 1688.	14870	22480	7620
London Bills, from 1722, to 1726. — — —	18916	27214	
Marybone Bills — — —	88	165	
Pancras Bills — — —	58	133	
Middle year of the 5, is 1724	19062	27512	8450
London Bills, from 1740, to 1744 — — —	14650	27254	
Marybone Bills — — —	184	484	
Pancras Bills — — —	36	261	
Middle year of the 5, is 1742	14870	27999	13129
London Bills, from 1743, to 1747 — — —	14582	24151	
Marybone Bills — — —	197	495	
Pancras Bills — — —	40	279	
Middle year of the 5, is 1745	14819	24925	10106
London Bills, from 1746, to 1750 — — —	14496	25353	
Marybone Bills — — —	213	571	
Pancras Bills — — —	45	304	
Middle year of the 5, is 1748	14754	26228	11474
London Bills, from 1775, to 1779 — — —	17456	20743	
Marybone Bills — — —	1008	1145	
Pancras Bills — — —	234	339	
Middle of the 5, is 1777.	18698	22227	3529

This table can need very little comment; for if no foreign causes intervened, it is plain that the number of people, at any one time, would be to the number of them, at any other, as the number of births at the first to the number of births at the latter. The number of inhabitants would be also as the number of deaths at the one time, to the number of deaths at the other; and, in this case, it would be indifferent, whether we made use of the births or the burials; for each of them would give the same proportion. But as both these are liable to be influenced by accidental circumstance, (although, for reasons given above, I think the births less than the burials) it may be best to suppose that the proportion between the number of the inhabitants of London, at the Revolution, and their number, now, is compounded of the proportion which the births at that time bore to the births at this, and of the proportion which the deaths, then, bore to the deaths now: that is, that the number of the inhabitants, at that time, were to the number of the inhabitants at this, as the square root of  $14870 \times 22480$  is to the square root of  $18698 \times 22227$ ; or as 182833 to 2038603; which is as 9 to 10, exceeding near.

E

But

But notwithstanding the deductions from the preceding table are so easy and evident, I am aware that the table itself will, by some, be thought to stand in need of a defence. In forming it, I have brought the births and burials of the parishes of Marybone and Pancras to account; against which, I am persuaded, nothing can be objected. But it has been observed, that "twelve parishes, *now the most populous*, were not included in the "bills at the Revolution, but are now." It might be replied, that admitting this to be the case, which it is not, the populousness of these parishes *now* is wholly out of the question, and only the births and burials which these parishes produced at the Revolution can have any influence on it. But the truth is, the births and burials of every one of these parishes came as regularly, and, I make no doubt, as truly into the bills then as they do now. For it ought to be remembered, that the parishes of Christ-Church, Spittlefields; St. Anne's, Limehouse; St. George's, in the East, and St. Matthew's, Bethnal Green, were all taken out of St. Dunstan's, Stepney. That St. John's, Wapping, was taken out of St. Mary's, White-Chapel; St. Luke's, Oldstreet, out of St. Giles's, Cripplegate; St. George's,

George's, Queen-square, out of St. Andrew's, Holborn; St. George's, Bloomsbury, out of St. Giles' in the Fields; St. James's, Westminster; St. Ann's, Soho; St. George's, Hanover-square; and St. John the Evangelist, out of St. Martin's, in the Fields; and St. John's, Southwark, out of the parish of St. Olaves. The baptisms and burials of these parishes came, therefore, into the bills through the mother churches, until the new ones were consecrated, or made parochial; and it is remarkable, that, in every instance, the baptisms and burials, from the new churches, were inserted, separately, in the bills, the very first month after the separation took place.

The old church of St. Mary le Strand was pulled down in 1549, by *Edward*, Duke of Somerset, uncle and protector to *Edward* the sixth; who made the parishioners a promise that he would build them a new one, but never performed it. They were therefore under the necessity of joining themselves to the parishes of St. Clement Danes, and St. Mary in the Savoy, at which places they baptized and buried until their own church was rebuilt in 1723. The objection, therefore, which has been made on this account is of no weight.



I have only to add farther concerning this table, that the fourth column, entitled "The "waste of Human Life," and which contains the number of persons that died annually, at different periods, in this great city, more than were born in it, displays, in the most forcible manner, the good effects which have arisen from the improvements and alterations that have been lately made, and from the mode of living which has been adopted by the inhabitants. (See pag. 19.) Surely it must afford the most pleasing sensations to every friend to mankind, as well as to every one who has the least regard for the interests of this country, to observe, that instead of about 13000, the number of lives which this city devoured annually about the year 1742, little more than 3500 suffice now: and, in all probability, half of that number ought to be deducted, on account of the greater defect which there is in the registers of the baptisms, than in the registers of the burials; which is a much less number than is destroyed annually by any other capital city in Europe. It is for the sake of such as can take pleasure in a prospect like this, that I have added the following table, which exhibits, more fully, the steps by which this dreadful

mor-

mortality arose to such an alarming height; and how it has gradually diminished, as the late improvements have been made, and the town has been laid open and extended.

A TABLE, shewing the Waste of Human Life within the Bills of Mortality of the City of London, at different Periods, since the great Fire in 1666.

Years inclusive.	Mean Number of Births.	Mean Number of Burials.	Waste of Human Lives.
From 1666 to 1670 -	11180	17098	5918
From 1671 to 1675 -	12119	17982	5863
From 1676 to 1680 -	12532	20252	7720
From 1681 to 1685 -	14035	22335	8300
From 1686 to 1690 -	14843	22391	7548
From 1691 to 1695 -	14528	21534	7006
From 1696 to 1700 -	15349	20006	4657
From 1701 to 1705 -	15758	21091	5333
From 1706 to 1710 -	15485	21832	6347
From 1711 to 1715 -	16204	22178	5974
From 1717 to 1721 -	18209	25982	7773
From 1722 to 1726 -	18916	27214	8298
From 1727 to 1732 -	17450	26888	9438
From 1733 to 1738 -	16880	26677	9797
From 1740 to 1744 -	14650	27254	12604
From 1745 to 1750 -	14426	24676	10250
From 1751 to 1757 -	14926	21084	6158
From 1758 to 1763 -	14978	21757	6779
From 1764 to 1769 -	16361	23073	6712
From 1770 to 1774 -	17180	22561	5381
From 1775 to 1779 -	17456	20743	3287

This Table shews, that before the late improvements were made, and London began to extend itself over more ground, the loss of human lives in it increased and decreased, in a great measure, as the number

of



of inhabitants increased or decreased; but since that time, notwithstanding the number of inhabitants have obviously increased, the annual loss of lives has been continually decreasing. It seems farther to suggest, that the body politic, as well as the body natural, is endowed with an inherent power of throwing off a disease, when it arrives at such a state as to endanger its existence. London, about the year 1740, was become so full of inhabitants, and they were so crowded together, as to be intolerable to, and destructive of one another; and they were absolutely *driven* to seek refuge in the neighbouring fields.

It must be observed, that by the number of inhabitants, I mean the medium of the numbers which are in London at the two seasons of the year, when it is fullest and most deserted. What these seasons are, and the proportion which the number of people in London, at one of them, bears to the number at the other, may be gathered from the two following tables, which I have more willingly inserted, as they point out some other curious and useful, particulars, which I omit mentioning, because they are foreign to the subject in hand.

A TABLE

A TABLE of the Number of Christenings in each Month, from the Year 1753, to the Year 1764, both inclusive, collected from the Monthly Bills of Mortality for the City of London.

Year.	Jan.	Feb.	March.	April.	May.	June.	July.	August.	Sept.	October.	Novem.	Decem.
1753	1194	1228	1646	1261	1190	1395	1220	1412	1155	1159	1202	1344
1754	1205	1165	1515	1195	1484	1123	1061	1367	1386	1098	1276	1099
1755	1479	1358	1148	1210	1591	1126	1055	1329	1176	1360	1029	1172
1756	1433	1244	795	1480	1167	1091	1337	1072	1108	1343	1181	1419
1757	1068	1179	1158	1359	1101	1053	1267	1023	1302	1192	1067	1321
1758	1096	1134	1387	1102	1131	1340	1082	1014	1553	1154	1146	1311
1759	1183	1081	1371	1130	1107	1324	1005	1320	1005	1132	1310	1088
1760	1231	1526	1264	1127	1038	1029	1118	1377	1180	1404	1221	1232
1761	1574	1373	1353	1283	1126	1125	1181	1165	1003	1581	1207	1227
1762	1468	1384	1384	1527	1190	1083	1245	1050	1010	1190	1133	1505
1763	1614	1150	1150	1179	1070	1084	1121	1524	1903	1224	1213	1223
1764	1372	1396	1507	1508	1283	1516	1244	1241	1250	1337	1621	1267
Means	1326	1268	1306	1280	1207	1191	1168	1241	1256	1264	1217	1267

A TABLE of the number of Burials each Month, from the Year 1753, to the Year 1764, both inclusive, collected from the Monthly Bills of Mortality for the City of London.

Year.	Jan.	Feb.	March.	April.	May.	June.	July.	August.	Sept.	October.	Nov.	Decem.
1753	1602	1702	1943	1506	1439	1689	1267	1489	1391	1630	1636	2081
1754	1703	1911	2436	1966	2466	1750	1529	1740	1515	1704	2180	1903
1755	2388	2000	1873	1709	1876	1639	1398	1726	1454	1859	1629	1891
1756	2081	1675	1621	1974	1608	1511	1763	1300	1415	2068	1810	2497
1757	2104	2008	1910	2241	1612	1483	1732	1513	1750	1432	1500	1807
1758	1477	1478	1679	1409	1445	1595	1166	1171	1601	1364	1303	1961
1759	1653	1503	1842	1427	1297	1718	1300	1874	1665	1542	2034	1861
1760	1912	2324	1744	1609	1485	1454	1254	1464	1321	1735	1516	1516
1761	1732	1563	1623	1709	1597	1480	1475	1398	1566	2222	1781	1915
1762	2362	2005	1970	2523	2502	1904	2041	1909	1944	2175	1994	2419
1763	3352	2370	1938	1914	1964	2064	2042	2042	3002	1860	1722	1882
1764	2051	1944	2376	1695	1641	2050	1582	1984	1895	1784	2300	
Means	2035	1874	1913	1807	1744	1695	1546	1597	1710	1781	1784	1976

I cannot quit this part of my subject without taking notice of a circumstance relating to the Hospital in which I live. *Dr. Price* has very truly said\*, that the average number of children in this house, for 30 years, before 1770, was 831; and that the number of those who died annually was  $11\frac{4}{5}$ , or one out of  $70\frac{2}{5}$ . The average number of children, that have been in the house for the last 20 years, has been 851, and the annual deaths have been  $10\frac{1}{4}$ ; or somewhat less than one in 83. For the last 10 years, the average number of children has been 894, and the annual number of deaths  $8\frac{2}{10}$ , or about one in every  $100\frac{1}{2}$ . When I reflect, that this hospital is situated in the very centre of London, and that there cannot possibly be any error, either in the number of children, or in the number of those which have died; I cannot help considering the above circumstance as a very strong proof,—indeed an irrefragable one, of the greater healthiness of *London* now than formerly. It must be owned, that several openings

\* See Observations on Reversionary Payments, 3d. edit. p. 255.

openings and improvements have lately been made, by the direction of the Governors, both within the hospital, and in its neighbourhood, which, it is hoped, may contribute to the greater health of the children in future; but they have all been made within the compass of the last two years of this period; and in those two years the burials have been 18, which is rather above the medium of the last ten: these improvements have, therefore, had no influence on the numbers given above.

I shall now proceed to enquire into the state of population in the kingdom at large. And here I must observe, as it had been asserted that the depopulation had proceeded with quicker steps in the last 20 or 30 years, than it had done before, and as I could not hope to carry my first inquiries much farther back than the year 1750, I confined them wholly within that limit: and, indeed, for some time after I began collecting the registers of parishes, I did not extend them to any earlier period. My proof will not, therefore, be so complete for all the time since the Revolution, as it will for the time since that. However, if it appear that there are no grounds

grounds to suppose the inhabitants have decreased since the year 1750, in which time it is supposed the decrease has been the greatest, but on the contrary, that there has been a very great increase; we may fairly conclude, no very substantial reasons can be brought to prove that such a diminution had place, before that time; and especially, as the facts, which I have collected, tend to prove the contrary.

F 2

Villages

Villages in the North-Riding of *Yorkshire*.

Names of the Villages.	No. of Houses in 1780.	New Foundations since 1750.	Decayed and not re-built.	Increase or Decr. by alterations.	No. of Houses in 1750.	Increase or Decrease of Inhabitants.
Ayton	183	8	6	+	3	178 Increased
Bretton	79	12	4	+	0	71 Increased
Broughton -	85	5	1	+	5	76 Increased
Coatham -	85	41	2	+	2	44 Increased
Elton -	65	10	6	+	13	48 Increased
Hinderwell -	43	6	1	+	5	33 Increased
Hutton -	139	20	2	+	8	113 Increased
Kirby -	37	3	2	+	1	35 Doubtful
Kilton -	24	0	2	+	0	26 Doubtful
Lackenby -	24	4	4	+	7	17 increased
Lazenby -	21	0	3	+	6	18 Doubtful
Lofthouse -	165	11	20	0	0	174 Decreased
Lythe -	116	18	13	+	2	109 Doubtful
Marsk -	114	17	10	+	9	98 Increased
Newby -	32	3	0	-	2	31 Doubtful
Newton -	34	6	5	0	0	33 Increased
Normanby -	25	0	0	+	6	19 Increased
Ormsby -	71	31	12	+	3	49 Increased
Pinchinthorp	14	2	0	0	0	12 Doubtful
Plunswick -	60	7	6	0	0	59 Increased
Potto -	37	0	3	0	0	40 Decreased
Redcar -	108	23	4	+	10	79 Increased
Rudby -	14	2	5	0	0	17 Decreased
Saltburn -	14	8	0	0	0	6 Increased
Sandfend -	88	8	12	+	11	81 Increased
Seamour -	52	1	2	-	1	54 Decreased
Skelton -	172	18	3	+	31	126 Increased
Upleatham -	46	11	0	+	1	34 Increased
Wilton -	38	0	2	+	4	36 Doubtful

The

The remarks which I have to make on the above account are, that Plunswick Redcar, and Saltburn are fishing towns, and inhabited chiefly by fishermen and their families. Allum-works have long been established at *Lofthouse*, which now belong to Sir *Laurence Dundas*; but, I believe, they are not carried on with much spirit. About the year 1763 or 1764, Allum-works were also begun at *Skelton*, by *John Hall Stephenson*, Esq; and carried on for some time, with great spirit, which caused a great influx of inhabitants to that place; but these works have been discontinued for several years: there are, however, few or no empty houses, and it is not supposed that many of the inhabitants have left the place on that account. All the other villages in the preceding list may, very properly, be called farming villages, as no manufacture of any moment, is carried on in any of them.

The total number of houses in 1750 was 1716; at present the number of houses is 1985: there appears, therefore, to have been an increase of 269 families in the last 30 years; or one-seventh part of the original number, nearly.

According to the best accounts that I can obtain, the several surveyors *did* return the number

number of houses which were not chargeable, as well as those which were, in this district in the year 1777: and my correspondents make the number of those, not chargeable, over and above those which are inhabited by persons who receive assistance from the parish, and fishermen, who are exempt from all taxes of that nature, 752. But I must observe that some of the persons who ought to have been most ready, and had it undoubtedly most in their power to assist these inquiries, did all they could to prevent and disappoint them: no dependence must therefore be placed in this part of the account, and my correspondent says, that from the best accounts which he could obtain, he thinks not more than half the number of houses are charged.

Villages in the West-Riding of Yorkshire.						
Names of Villages.	No. of Houses in 1780.	New Foundations since 1750.	Decayed and not re-built.	Increase or Decrease by Alterations.	No. of Houses in 1750.	Increase, or decrease of Inhabitants.
Belton on Dearn	88	9	0	0	79	Increased
Brampton	113	16	0	0	97	Increased
Hoyland	101	10	0	0	91	Increased
Rawmarsh	204	50	0	0	154	Increase much
Swinton	103	24	0	0	79	Increase much
Thorp	120	18	0	0	102	Increased
Wath	115	20	0	0	95	Increased
Wentworth	99	12	0	0	87	Increased

The number of houses, at present is 943: in the year 1750, they were 784. The increase is very great indeed! And I am assured the increase of the inhabitants is, at least, equal to that of the houses. I have not been able to learn how many are assessed to the window-tax.

These villages are almost wholly employed in agriculture, except that there is a small pottery at Rawmarsh, and a manufacture of the same kind, and a small colliery carried on at Swinton. I shall add, here, a few circumstances, relating to this Riding, which may contribute towards ascertaining the state of the population of this part of the country, either immediately, or at a future period.

1st. The total number of houses, in the two divisions of Agbride and Morley, as delivered in by Mr. Woodcock, surveyor of the windows, in 1761, which was one of the years, when a general survey was required

17764

By the same gentleman in 1767

20526.

In 1779, Mr. Cooper,\* the present surveyor, found the total number to be

21929

Of

\* It would be ingratitude not to mention the readiness with which this gentlemen gave me such information as was in his power.

Of these 4697 are charged with the window-tax, 8135 with the house duty of 3s. and 9097 are excused on account of poverty. Moreover, out of 12832, the chargeable ones, only 56 were empty in July 1779. It may be farther observed, that these two divisions, which contain five market towns, and some of them very capital ones, have very near  $\frac{3}{7}$ ths of their houses, such as pay neither the window or house tax.

2d. In the year 1750, by a very careful survey, the houses in Wakefield, of every denomination, were found to be 1059. I have been promised the exact number of them at present, as well as of the inhabitants, but have not yet received it.

3d. To the table which Dr. Price has given at p. 6. of his Essay on the Population of England, the following accounts of towns, in the neighbourhood of Leeds, may be added. They were taken immediately after the survey of Leeds, which he mentions; and by some of the gentlemen who were concerned in it.

Towns.	Families.	Souls.	To a family:
Armley	359	1715	4 $\frac{3}{4}$ +
Beefton	192	862	4 $\frac{3}{4}$ -
Bramley	311	1378	4 $\frac{3}{4}$ +
Farnley	116	540	4 $\frac{3}{4}$ +
Headingley	143	667	4 $\frac{3}{4}$ +
Holbeck	508	2045	4 $\frac{3}{4}$ +
Hunflit	806	3367	4 $\frac{3}{4}$ +
Wortley	196	894	4 $\frac{3}{4}$ -

Villages in *Derbyshire*.

Names of Villages.	Number of houses in 1780.	New Foundations since 1750.	Decayed, and not rebuilt.	Increase or Decr. by Alterations.	Number of houses in 1750.	Increase or decrease of inhabitants
Alton	61	11	8	+ 7	51	Increased
Barrow	41	10	3	+ 1	33	Increased
Breedon	100	37	11	+ 13	61	Incr. much
Cattle Dunning- Caulk [ton	305 14	70 2	18 4	+ 66 + 2	187 14	Incr. much Doubtful
Ingleby	24	4	5	+ 6	19	Increased
Melbou ne	209	97	21	0	133	Incr. much
Milton r	30	10	7	0	27	Doubtful
Newton	52	8	6	1	49	Decreased
Repton	181	39	10	+ 12	140	Incr. much
Stanton	26	3	8	+ 2	29	Increased
Stenfon	14	2	1	+ 2	11	Decreased
Swarkstone	37	3	1	+ 3	32	Increased
Ticknall	168	34	10	+ 8	136	Increased
Tonge	36	1	5	+ 5	35	Increased
Twyford	15	1	1	1	14	Decreased
Willfon	35	6	4	+ 3	30	Decreased

The total number of houses in these villages was 1001 about the year 1750, at present they are 1348; so that we may suppose in the last thirty years, there has been an addition of 347 families, which is more than one-third of the original number. I am not informed what number of these houses are assessed to the window tax; but as much the greater part of them are small, and inhabited by poor people, it may be supposed that they are near the proportion which has been shewn to exist amongst the others.

Villages

Villages in *Northamptonshire*.

Names of Villages.	Houses in 1780.	Houses in 1760.	Houses in 1750.	Houses with two families.	Houses with three families.	Houses with four families.	Houses charged to window-tax.
Ailfeworth	38	38	40	1			24
Ashton	17	17	17				14
Bainton	30	32	32	1	1		23
Barnack	62	62	63	6			54
Castor	78	78	78	7	1		45
Dogsthorp	43	40	40				38
Eastfield and Newark	32	32	32	2			31
Etton	21	21	21				18
Eye	99	96	96	14	1		62
Glington	63	63	63	6			54
Gunthorp	11	13	13				7
Helpston	65	70	70	7		1	28
Longthorp	36	38	38				23
Marham	12	12	12	3	1	1	8
Maxey	60	60	60	8			48
Norborough	45	46	46	1			38
Pafton	18	18	18				10
Peakirk	34	34	34	3			13
Pilsgate	17	18	18		2		13
Southorp	17	17	17				13
Sutton	23	23	24	1			17
Thornhaugh	33	30	30	8			16
Ufford	26	26	26				19
Upton	10	14	15				5
Walton	28	27	27	1			16
Werrington	76	75	75	9			54
Wittering	30	31	31	2			15



This district contained 1036 houses about the year 1750 and contains only 1024 now: there has been of course a diminution of 12 houses; and the number which is charged to the window tax, is 706. The inhabitants are wholly employed in agriculture, and administering to the immediate wants of one another. The gentleman who favoured me with this account, and who has resided all his life in the neighbourhood, adds as follows.

“ Whatever the number of houses may  
 “ be, the number of the inhabitants has en-  
 “ creased. I have many houses—Indeed  
 “ almost the whole of many villages, under  
 “ my care; and whenever a house happens  
 “ to be at liberty, I have many applications  
 “ for it. Where I to build more cottages,  
 “ they would soon be let; our poor families  
 “ being obliged, frequently, to crowd toge-  
 “ ther, two or three families in a cottage,  
 “ because each cannot get one to itself. Very  
 “ few landlords chuse to build, unless for  
 “ particular conveniency, because the rents,  
 “ though higher than formerly, do not  
 “ answer the expence”.

Villages

Names of Parishes.	Houses in 1780.	Houses with two Families.	Houses with 3 Families.	Total Number of Families.	Increase of Families since 1750.	Houses charged to Window-tax.
Blythford	21	7	1	30	1	20
Bramfield	62	17	2	83	4	59
Henham	15	7	1	22	1	15
Holton	41	19	3	66	8	37
Sotherton	24	6	0	30	0	17
Spexhall	15	2	1	17	0	15
Swilland	21	6	1	29	2	21
Tuddenham	27	4	6	43	6	15
Wangford	47	10	3	63	6	47
Wenhafton	56	23	4	87	13	56
Wetterfield	24	7	5	41	1	20
Westhall	45	12	2	61	1	43
Wiffett	38	14	1	54	1	36
Witnesham	50	12	8	78	7	38

The total number of families living, at present, in the above 14 parishes, is 704. The increase of families, since 1750, is 51; consequently the number of families, in 1750 was 653: and it is the general opinion of the inhabitants that they have increased considerably, in number, since that time. They are almost wholly employed in agriculture and supplying the wants of one another. I have not been able to discover whether



ther the unchargeable houses were, or were not, returned in 1777; nor how many of the houses in Swiland and Westerfield are charged to the window tax; but if we suppose that forty, out of the 45, are, the total number of houses will be 486, and those which are affected to the window tax, 438, which is a much greater part of the whole, than I have found in any other part of England; and it is most probably owing to the great number of families which are crowded together into one house, and therefore require many windows.

Parishes in *Suffex*: the Hundred of *Gueftling*.

Names of Parishes.	No. of Houses in 1780.	New Foundations since 1750.	Decayed and not rebuilt.	Incr. or decr. by Alterations.	No. of Houses in 1750.	Increase or Decrease of Inhabitants.
Fairlight	63	19	0	5	39	Increased
Gueftling	66	12	0	6	48	Increased
Ickletham	63	10	1	10	44	Increased
Pett	31	9	0	9	13	Increased

The number of houses in this hundred, at present, is 223; in 1750, it was 144: we may therefore reckon an increase of 79 families in the last 30 years; or more than half the original number.

The

The parishes of Ickletham and Pett are chiefly rich marsh-land, which has been left by the sea. Fairlight and Gueftling are mostly high land, partly arable, and partly grazing: the former has been greatly improved within the last 30 years. The inhabitants are supposed to have increased greatly, and there was not, last Summer, an empty house in the whole hundred of Gueftling. I am not informed what number of houses are chargeable to the window tax; but those which are not, were not returned in 1777. In the parish of Gueftling, there are 34 houses, which are not charged; and it is supposed that the proportion between the charged and uncharged houses is nearly the same in the other parishes.

Villages in *Somerfetshire*.

Names of Villages.	No. of Houses in 1780.	New Foundations since 1750.	Decayed and not rebuilt.	Incr. or decr. by Alterations.	No. of Houses in 1750.	Increase or Decrease of Inhabitants.
Ashill	55	2	4	0	57	Doubtful.
Clapton	23	0	4	-2	29	Decreased.
Ilminster	283	5	25	-1	304	Decreased.
Wayford	27	0	12	+1	38	Decr. much.

The

The number of houses in these four townships was 428 in the year 1750; at present, they are only 388: we may therefore presume that there is a loss of 40 families, or somewhat more than one-eleventh part of the number that were in them in 1750. The number which are charged to the window-tax is 134, or little more than one-third of the whole number, and the uncharged houses were *not* returned in 1777. Let us now bring into one view the state of all these accounts.

	1750.	1780.
North Riding of Yorkshire,	1716	1985
West Riding of Yorkshire,		
Agbride and Morly Divisions, 1761, } 17764	21929	
Eight Villages in the West Riding,	784	943
Derbyshire,	1001	1348
Northamptonshire,	1036	1024
Suffolk (Families)	653	704
Suffex,	144	223
Somerfetshire.	428	388
Total	23526	28544

That is, the present number of houses, in these districts, is to the number which were in them, about the year 1750, as 28,544 is to 23,526; or, as 28 to 23 nearly.

The prospect is here flattering: let us see what farther comfort the Bills of Mortality seem to afford us.

The

The average annual Number of Baptisms and Burials in various Parishes, about, or soon after the Revolution.

Counties.	Parishes.	Years.	Baptisms	Burials.
Anglesea	Beaumaris	1676 to 1603	16,87	21,78
	Pentraeth	1672—1679	12,85	13,25
Berks	Lamborn	1682—1691	45,10	
	Shefford	1682—1691	11,20	
	Wilford	1682—1691	20,10	
Devon	Axminster	1688—1697	31,50	42,00
Kent	Chalk	1689—1698	3,90	6,00
	Northfleet	1689—1698	11,50	16,50
Lancaster	Nurstead	1689—1698	10	10
	Bowden	1653—1662	57,30	
	Liverpool	1700—1710	212,70	
	Manchester	1720—1724	339,40	336,50
	Middleton	1663—1672	38,80	36,70
	Rochdale	1684—1693	156,70	211,80
	Warrington	1716—1722	140,14	147,00
Leicester	St. Mary's	1720—1726	60,00	54,71
	Norton	1716—1725	3,90	2,90
Northampton	Peterborough	1688—1697	105,10	111,00
Nottingham	Broughton	1690—1699	6,30	4,10
	Kinlton	1720—1730	6,00	8,00
Somerset	Chard	1688—1697	36,30	60,70
	Ilminster	1688—1697	36,60	47,30
	Puckingham	1694—1703	1,90	2,30
	Wayford	1688—1697	3,30	3,60
	Wellington	1688—1697	81,70	70,10
	Gueftling	1687—1696	4,90	4,00
	Ackworth	1644—1737	14,24	11,24
Suffex	Bawtry	1654—1734	16,80	18,57
	Bolton on Dearn	1619—1737	13,14	10,02
	Brodsworth	1692—1735	6,09	5,19
	Darfield	1653—1737	38,84	33,22
	Felkirk	1647—1683	25,06	18,81
	Heath	1654—1739	7,89	6,58
	Hemsworth	1685—1738	14,45	11,68
	Hooton Pagnell	1650—1738	8,67	7,99
	Kirby	1648—1737	20,27	17,26
	Sheffield	1680—1734	169,50	152,37
	Wath	1673—1734	28,13	25,00

Total annual births and deaths in these 38 parishes — 1807,24 1513,24

H

The

The average annual Births and Deaths in the same Parishes at present, or very lately.

Counties.	Parishes.	Years.	Baptisms	Burials.	
Anglesea	Beaumaris	1764 to 1771	41,00	31,12	
	Pentraeth	1764—1771	18,63	11,25	
Berks	Lamborn	1752—1756	69,80		
	Shefford	1752—1756	12,80		
	Welford	1752—1756	24,00		
	Axminster	1770—1779	50,60	45,40	
Kent	Chalk	1771—1780	6,70	10,00	
	Northfleet	1771—1780	33,90	39,00	
	Nurstead	1771—1780	2,00	1,10	
Lancaster	Bowden	1763—1772	212,70		
	Liverpool	1762—1771	1001,00		
	Manchester	1770—1779	1278,50	994,80	
	Middleton	1763—1772	157,70	99,30	
	Rochdale	1771—1780	478,70	415,50	
	Warrington	1770—1773	337,25	311,75	
	St. Mary	1770—1779	104,30	90,20	
Leicester	Norton	1770—1779	5,60	2,70	
	Peterborough	1770—1779	121,10	124,00	
Northampton	Broughton	1770—1779	6,80	4,80	
Nottingham	Kinolton	1770—1779	10,40	5,50	
	Chard	1770—1779	49,50	36,50	
Somerset	Ilminster	1770—1779	42,30	30,80	
	Puckenhams	1770—1779	4,50	1,70	
	Wayford	1770—1779	7,20	4,10	
	Wellington	1770—1779	55,90	48,00	
	Gueftling	1770—1779	10,80	6,00	
	Ackworth	1757—1767	21,20	15,60	
	Bawtry	1770—1779	15,40	21,30	
Suffex York	Bolton on Dearn	1770—1779	19,10	10,80	
	Brodsworth	1770—1779	7,00	5,00	
	Darfield	1770—1779	39,50	24,60	
	Felkirk	1770—1779	30,70	20,10	
	Heath	1770—1779	21,90	16,20	
	Hemsworth	1770—1779	21,40	13,50	
	Hooton Pagnell	1770—1779	11,00	6,30	
	Kirby (South)	1770—1779	31,80	19,10	
	Sheffield	1770—1779	1046,90	983,30	
	Wath	1770—1779	38,22	25,10	
	Total annual births and deaths in these 38 parishes —			5384,68	3537,62

According to the baptisms, the number of people, in these 38 parishes, at present, is to the number which were in them at the Revolution, as 538468 is to 180724: that is, near three times as many as they were then. If we take the burials as a guide, the present number of inhabitants is to the number of them at the Revolution, as 353762 is to 151824, or somewhat more than  $2\frac{1}{2}$  times their number at that time. If we take an arithmetical mean between the two, the present number of inhabitants, will be to their number at the Revolution, as 446115 is to 166274: but if a geometrical mean be taken, which some may prefer, they will be only as 436451 to 165644. That is, their present number is somewhat more than  $2\frac{2}{3}$  their number at the Revolution.

I shall now proceed to inquire into the proportion, which the present number of inhabitants, in as many parts of England as my materials extend to, bears the number

H 2

which

which was in the same places, between the years 1740 and 1750. And here, through the kind assistance of many good friends, I shall be able to take a wider field than I have done above; and such a one as will, I flatter myself, convince most unprejudiced persons, that we have no reason to fear our number is diminished since that time; but, on the contrary, that we are considerably increased.

The

The Average annual Number of Baptisms and Burials in various Parishes, about the Year 1745.

Counties.	Parishes.	Years.	baptism	Burials
Anglesea	Beaumaris	1710 to 1717	29,5	26,5
	Llanddyfnan	1750—1757	13,9	6,0
	Llanfadurn	1750—1757	7,9	6,2
	Llanvair	1732—1739	8,5	8,4
	Pentraeth	1740—1747	12,5	10,6
Cambridge	Papworth Agnes	1740—1749	2,4	1,3
	Papworth Ever.	1740—1749	4,0	2,2
Cornwall	Breage	1740—1749	65,5	41,1
	Cury	1740—1749	9,1	6,5
	Germoe	1740—1749	8,1	12,6
	Gunwalloe	1740—1749	5,8	3,5
	St. Hillary	1740—1750	49,7	36,3
	St. Martin's	1740—1749	7,4	6,2
	Mawgan	1740—1749	12,9	12,9
	Sithney	1740—1749	29,1	24,9
	Axminster	1742—1749	43,6	38,6
Devon Essex	Arkesden	1740—1749	9,5	8,6
	Clavering	1740—1749	18,2	14,4
	Heydon	1740—1749	6,7	3,9
	Langley	1740—1749	8,4	4,5
	Quendon	1740—1749	3,9	1,9
	Stensted	1740—1750	17,1	14,5
	Montfitchet			
	Ugley	1740—1749	10,2	5,1
Herts	Wendens Ambo	1740—1749	6,9	4,1
	Brent Pelham	1740—1749	5,6	6,1
Huntington	Furneux Pelham	1740—1749	13,2	10,0
	Folksworth	1736—1745	4,2	3,8
	Lutton	1740—1749	4,0	3,7
	Morborne	1740—1749	1,0	0,5
Kent	Yelling	1740—1749	5,1	4,4
	Chalk	1741—1750	6,0	6,4
	Northfleet	1741—1750	27,2	31,9
	Nursted	1741—1750	0,4	0,0

Lan-

Counties.	Parishes.	Years.	Bap- tisms.	Burials.	
Lancaster	Manchester	1740—1749	643,2	560,7	
	Rochdale	1741—1750	330,8	301,4	
	Warrington	1736—1745	168,2	158,6	
Leicester	Foxton	1740—1749	12,6	9,2	
	Lubenham	1740—1749	9,9	7,4	
	St. Mary's	1740—1749	66,9	65,4	
	Norton	1740—1749	4,4	2,3	
	Theдингworth	1740—1749	7,3	5,4	
	Thornby	1731—1740	4,8	3,1	
	Westdeeping	1740—1749	3,9	3,6	
Lincoln	Jallington	1740—1749	6,2	5,7	
	Brancafter	1750—1759	14,1	9,6	
Norfolk	Docking	1750—1759	9,9	2,8	
	Fitcham	1755—1760	8,5	4,3	
	Hilborowe	1740—1749	6,5	4,6	
	Hillington	1740—1749	5,4	5,4	
	Titchwell	1750—1759	3,5	1,8	
	Northampton	Castor	1740—1749	15,7	17,1
	Clipston	1731—1740	15,2	10,7	
	Cottesbrooke	1731—1740	6,5	7,4	
Northampton	Glinton	1740—1749	9,9	7,3	
	Guilsborough	1740—1749	13,4	7,7	
	Helpston	1740—1749	8,6	6,9	
	Marham	1740—1749	1,3	2,2	
	Marston Truffel	1740—1749	5,0	3,4	
	Maxey	1740—1749	14,6	15,1	
	Nafeby	1740—1749	12,8	9,0	
	Peterborough	1740—1749	101,5	127,4	
	Ravensthorp	1740—1749	12,6	10,7	
	Nottingham	Broughton Sul-	1741—1750	8,9	7,6
		Carlton [ney	1741—1750	8,4	9,6
		Kinolton	1741—1750	6,0	4,5
	Salop	Holy Crofs	1751—1760	33,1	29,0
		Chard	1740—1749	42,0	57,9
	Somerset	Curry Rivel	1740—1749	24,9	22,8
Drayton		1740—1749	10,1	10,3	
Ilminster		1740—1749	28,8	39,8	
Puckington		1740—1749	3,3	2,0	
Wayford		1740—1749	6,3	5,0	

Counties.	Parishes.	Years.	Baptisms	Burials.	
Somerset	Wellington	1740 to 1749	57,5	63,2	
	Stafford	Alrewas	1741—1750	24,5	16,3
Stafford	Barton under } Needwood. }	1741—1750	19,7	16,2	
	Burton on Trent	1741—1750	95,7	76,8	
	Elford	1741—1750	6,7	5,3	
	Rugeley	1741—1750	43,4	33,6	
	Stapenhill	1741—1750	22,1	20,1	
	Tatenhall	1741—1750	9,6	7,9	
	Walton on Trent	1741—1750	6,5	2,9	
	Yoxall	1741—1750	28,8	21,2	
	Suffolk	Aldham	1740—1749	3,9	4,1
		East-Bergholt	1740—1749	23,2	20,5
		Brockley	1740—1749	7,4	5,2
		Elmsfet	1740—1749	7,9	8,4
		Groton	1740—1749	12,3	10,3
		Hadleigh	1740—1749	51,2	40,7
		Hawkedon	1740—1749	6,4	3,7
Kerfey		1740—1749	12,4	10,7	
Layham		1740—1749	16,1	7,9	
Lindfey		1740—1749	5,0	4,0	
Reed		1740—1749	3,4	3,2	
Semer		1740—1749	5,7	3,7	
Stratford (St. Mary's)		1740—1749	13,4	12,2	
Somerton		1740—1749	3,3	2,0	
Whatfield		1740—1749	7,1	5,7	
Barrow		1740—1749	15,2	9,1	
Denfton		1740—1749	5,9	4,3	
Suffex		Depden	1740—1749	7,1	4,1
	Fairlight	1750—1759	5,8	3,6	
	Gueftling	1740—1749	9,4	5,9	
	Hastings } All Saints }	1750—1755	24,8	24,5	
	Hastings } St. Clements }	1742—1747	30,7	22,5	
	Ickletham	1750—1759	7,9	4,1	
	Pett	1750—1759	3,8	2,3	
	Westfield	1750—1759	16,2	10,3	

Counties.	Parishes.	Years.	Baptisms	Burials.
York	Ackworth	1747 to 1757	12,7	10,7
	Adwick de Street	1740—1749	7,3	5,5
	Arksey	1740—1749	23,8	20,8
	Auſtin	1740—1749	9,9	8,4
	Barmborough	1740—1749	8,8	6,5
	Bawtry	1740—1749	15,6	17,5
	Blyth	1740—1749	28,7	19,0
	Bolton on Dearn	1740—1749	13,4	7,7
	Brodſworth	1740—1749	6,7	3,8
	Burgh-wallis	1740—1749	2,2	2,7
	Campfall	1740—1749	34,6	32,6
	Clayton cum Frickley	1740—1749	4,1	3,3
	Crofton	1741—1750	12,3	7,0
	Darfield	1740—1749	37,3	31,0
	Dewsbury	1740—1749	142,0	92,3
	Doncaſter	1740—1749	96,6	92,1
	Felkirke	1740—1749	23,3	14,6
	Firbeck	1740—1749	4,8	3,8
	Halifax	1740—1749	266,8	232,6
	Heath	1758—1767	19,8	13,4
	Hemſworth	1740—1749	19,2	15,4
	Hooton Pagnell	1740—1749	10,8	5,4
	Methley	1740—1749	26,0	15,1
	Normanton	1740—1749	20,1	14,8
	Pontefract	1740—1749	110,7	92,8
	Rawmaſh	1740—1749	18,6	13,7
	Rotherham	1740—1749	110,7	96,1
	Scrooby	1740—1749	5,6	4,9
	Sheffield	1740—1749	544,0	498,4
	Skelbrooke	1740—1749	2,2	1,4
	South Kirby	1740—1749	24,0	16,4
	Tadcaſter	1740—1749	31,8	27,4
	Thruſſcoe	1740—1749	4,0	3,8
	Wakefield	1741—1750	209,6	185,9
	Wath	1740—1749	32,2	21,4
	Total		4712,0	4067,0

The Average annual Number of Baptisms and Burials in various Parishes, for Years lately paſt.

Counties	Parishes	Years	Baptisms	Burials
Angleſea	Beaumaris	1764 to 1771	41,0	31,1
	Llandyfnan	1764—1771	19,2	13,5
	Llanfadurn	1764—1771	8,6	8,5
	Llanvair	1764—1771	12,6	9,6
	Pentraeth	1764—1771	18,6	10,0
Cambridge	Papworth Agnes	1770—1779	3,5	1,3
	Papworth Everard	1770—1779	2,0	2,0
Cornwall	Breage	1770—1779	75,0	42,6
	Cury	1770—1779	5,9	5,8
	Gerino	1770—1779	17,6	10,5
	Gunwallce	1770—1779	6,6	3,0
	St. Hillary	1770—1780	66,2	34,6
	St. Martins	1770—1779	8,1	7,7
	Mawgan	1770—1779	17,0	12,8
	Sithney	1770—1779	37,3	19,9
Devon.	Axminster	1770—1779	50,6	45,4
Effex	Arkeſden	1770—1779	9,9	8,5
	Clavering	1770—1779	21,2	12,8
	Heydon	1770—1779	6,7	5,1
	Langley	1770—1779	7,4	2,8
	Quendon	1770—1779	5,1	2,4
	Stenſted	1770—1780	32,4	24,0
	Montſitchet			
	Ugley	1770—1780	10,9	4,9
	Wendens Ambo	1770—1779	6,3	4,4
Herts.	Brent Pelham	1770—1779	5,8	2,3
	Furneux Pelham	1770—1779	15,9	11,2
Huntington	Folkſworth	1770—1779	3,4	2,2
	Lutton	1770—1779	6,3	3,3
	Morborne	1770—1779	1,5	1,5
	Yelling	1770—1779	5,9	3,8
Kent	Chalk	1771—1780	6,7	10,0
	Northfleet	1771—1780	33,9	39,0
	Nurſted	1771—1780	2,0	1,1
Lancaſter	Manchester	1770—1779	1278,5	994,8
	Rochdale	1771—1780	478,7	415,5
	Warrington	1770—1773	337,2	311,8
Leiceſter	Foxtan	1770—1779	12,8	11,9

Counties	Parishes	Years	Baptisms	Burials
Lincoln	Lubenham	1770 to 1779	15,9	12,4
	St. Mary's	1770—1779	104,3	90,2
	Norton	1770—1779	5,6	2,7
	Thedingworth	1770—1779	7,0	5,1
	Thornby	1770—1779	4,9	3,5
	West Deeping	1770—1779	5,8	4,7
	Jallington	1770—1779	7,4	5,0
Norfolk	Brancafter	1770—1779	17,7	12,2
	Docking	1771—1780	18,1	10,5
	Fitcham	1771—1780	8,5	5,7
	Hilborowe	1771—1780	12,2	6,8
Northampton	Hillington	1771—1780	7,1	5,1
	Titchwell	1771—1780	2,5	1,2
	Castor	1770—1779	18,6	17,0
	Clipfton	1770—1779	15,7	12,0
	Cottestbrooke	1770—1779	7,0	5,3
	Glinton	1770—1779	11,0	8,5
	Guilfborough	1770—1779	18,4	14,3
	Helpfton	1770—1779	5,8	5,9
	Marham	1770—1779	2,3	2,2
	Marfton Truffel	1770—1779	7,2	5,5
	Maxey	1770—1779	13,3	9,2
	Nafeby	1770—1779	14,5	11,4
	Peterborough	1770—1779	121,1	124,0
	Ravenfworth	1770—1779	14,5	8,7
	Broughton Sulney	1770—1779	6,8	4,8
Nottingham	Carlton	1770—1779	15,9	10,6
	Kinolton	1770—1779	10,4	5,5
Salop	Holy-Crofs	1761—1770	38,2	36,5
	Chard	1770—1779	49,5	36,5
Somerset	Curry Rivel	1770—1779	25,8	13,9
	Draton	1770—1779	10,0	5,0
	Ilminster	1770—1779	42,3	30,8
	Puckington	1770—1779	4,5	1,7
	Wayford	1770—1779	7,2	4,1
	Wellington	1770—1779	55,9	48,0
Stafford	Alrewas	1771—1780	29,5	18,3

Counties.	Parishes.	Years.	Baptisms	Burials.	
Suffolk	Barton under } Needwood. }	1771—1780	23,0	16,1	
	Burton on Trent	1771—1780	141,8	98,1	
	Elford	1771—1780	13,1	5,6	
	Rugeley	1771—1780	51,2	37,3	
	Stapenhall	1771—1780	35,3	16,0	
	Tatenhall	1771—1780	15,4	7,8	
	Walton on Trent	1771—1780	9,5	4,7	
	Yoxall	1771—1780	31,3	22,2	
	Aldham	1770—1779	6,5	4,1	
	East-Bergholt	1770—1779	28,0	22,9	
	Brockley	1771—1780	10,0	4,9	
	Elmfet	1770—1779	11,2	8,8	
	Groton	1770—1779	17,7	14,0	
	Hadleigh	1770—1779	63,5	63,9	
	Hawkedon	1771—1780	5,8	3,8	
	Kerfey	1770—1779	18,7	15,3	
	Layham	1770—1779	20,0	14,3	
	Lindfey	1770—1779	6,1	3,8	
	Reed	1771—1780	6,1	3,1	
	Semer	1770—1779	5,9	4,1	
Stratford (St. Mary's)	1770—1779	14,0	8,5		
Somerton	1771—1780	2,9	2,9		
Whatfield	1770—1779	6,3	4,1		
Barrow	1771—1780	22,7	15,2		
Denfton	1771—1780	9,8	5,9		
Depden	1771—1780	7,9	5,0		
Suffex	Fairlight	1770—1779	9,6	3,8	
	Gueftling	1770—1779	10,8	6,0	
	Haftings } All Saints }	1766—1771	31,3	24,7	
	Haftings } St. Clements }	1766—1771	32,2	22,0	
	Icklefham	1770—1779	9,7	5,0	
	Pett	1770—1779	5,6	2,7	
	Westfield	1770—1779	20,8	11,1	
	York	Ackworth	1757—1767	21,2	15,6

Counties.	Parishes.	Years.	Baptisms	Burials.
York	Adwick de Street	1770 to 1779	10,1	4,3
	Arksey	1770—1779	28,3	19,2
	Austin	1770—1779	11,8	7,0
	Barnborough	1770—1779	11,2	5,6
	Bawtry	1770—1779	15,4	21,3
	Blyth	1770—1779	41,7	26,0
	Bolton on Dearn	1770—1779	19,1	10,8
	Brodsworth	1770—1779	7,0	5,0
	Burgh-wallis	1770—1779	3,6	2,4
	Campfall	1770—1779	46,0	27,0
	Clayton cum Frickley	1770—1779	9,8	4,0
	Crofton	1770—1779	13,4	7,6
	Darfield	1770—1779	39,5	24,6
	Dewsbury	1770—1779	232,6	139,3
	Doncaster	1770—1779	144,2	129,6
	Felkirke	1770—1779	30,7	20,1
	Firbeck	1770—1779	6,0	3,7
	Halifax	1770—1779	361,9	342,5
	Heath	1770—1779	21,9	16,2
	Hemsworth	1770—1779	21,4	13,5
	Hooton Pagnell	1770—1779	11,0	6,3
	Methley	1770—1779	30,3	21,9
	Normanton	1770—1779	18,5	12,4
	Pontefract	1770—1779	159,3	123,1
	Rawmarsh	1770—1779	37,2	21,2
	Rotherham	1770—1779	184,1	139,9
	Scrooby	1770—1779	7,2	4,9
	Sheffield	1770—1779	1046,9	983,3
	Skelbrooke	1770—1779	2,3	1,4
	South Kirby	1770—1779	31,8	19,1
Tadcaster	1770—1779	57,1	36,6	
Thrumcoke	1770—1779	6,0	3,3	
Wakefield	1770—1779	308,0	221,1	
Wath	1770—1779	38,2	25,1	
	Total		7179,1	5689,1

In the former of these periods; namely, from about the years 1740 to the year 1750, the average, annual number of births in the above 142 parishes was 4712; of deaths, 4067. In the latter period; that is, from about the year 1770 to the year 1780, the average, annual number of births was 7179: of deaths 5689. If, therefore, we suppose the mean number of the inhabitants, in the latter period, to be to the mean number of them, in the former, as the births in the latter are to the births in the former, they will be as 7179 is to 4712; or somewhat more than as 3 to 2. If the deaths be taken to express the proportion between the inhabitants at these two periods, they will be as 5689 is to 4067; or nearly as 7 to 5. If the arithmetical means be taken between the two, as was done before, the proportion will be as 12868 to 8779: if the geometrical mean be taken, the proportion will be as 63908 to 43776; and, in either case, the proportion will be between the former two.

I shall



I shall now add two tables, which have been communicated to me by a gentleman, who collected them some time ago, one of them for ascertaining, in the best manner he could, the effect which the late marriage act had on the population of this kingdom; and the other for comparing the state of Population, in the diocese of *St. David's*, for the first 30 years of the present century, with the state of it in the second 30 years; and also with the years 1761, 1762, 1763, and 1764.

A Table

A TABLE of the Baptisms in fundry Parishes for ten Years immediately before, and ten Years immediately after the Year 1754; being that Year in which the Marriage-Act took Place.

Counties.	Parishes.	1754		
		Before.	After.	
Brecknock	St. John's Brecon	479	457	
Cardigan	Cardigan	265	285	
Carmarthen	Abergwilly	292	297	
	St. Ishmael's	168	136	
	Llandilo-vawr	921	954	
	Llandingat and Llatvair-ar-y-bryn }	396	501	
	Devon	Clehangar	62	62
	Oakford	121	114	
	Stoodleigh	86	83	
Effex	West-Ham	1074	1196	
Hants	North Stoneham	143	137	
Kent	Blean	110	83	
	Chilham	169	201	
	Deptford, St. Nicholas	1747	1789	
	Fordwich	63	70	
	Greenwich	2314	2265	
	Harbledown	129	138	
	Hardres ( <i>Little</i> )	54	57	
	Hearn	297	293	
	Ickham	89	95	
	Molash	82	89	
	Rackington	14	24	
	St. Stephens	57	65	
	Middlefex	Chelsea	1132	1094
	Pembroke	Haverfordwest }	317	288
St. Mary's }				
Wilts	Warminster	990	1031	
		11571	11804	

The increase in these twenty-six parishes is very small indeed: the mean number of the inhabitants, in the former ten years, being to the mean number of them in the latter, as 11571 is to 11804. The parishes are, it is true, such as no great increase could be expected in, as they are all, Deptford and West-Haverford excepted, without either trade or manufacture; and, moreover, the length of time between the two periods is very short. The table, however, tends to shew that whatever number of parishes are taken, indiscriminately; or for whatever time or length of time, the result will be, that the inhabitants have increased.

A TABLE

A TABLE of the Average, annual number of Baptisms and Burials, in the several Parishes, within the Diocese of St. David's, from 1700 to 1730; from 1730 to 1760; from 1760 to 1763, in the seven first Deaneries, and from 1760 to 1764, in the remaining ones.

Deaneries.	1700—1730		1730—1760		1760—1763 or —4.	
	Births	Bur.	Births	Bur.	Births	Bur.
Melineth	100,1	103,5	187,0	147,8	182,0	168,3
Elvel	75,8	73,0	158,1	118,8	163,0	118,3
Builth	47,6	42,2	92,4	76,1	93,3	66,7
Hay	67,6	60,7	144,3	130,1	161,0	124,0
I. Brecon	49,7	45,5	133,4	114,6	127,7	103,0
II. Brecon	57,7	47,1	107,7	85,6	113,3	104,7
III. Brecon	73,2	70,3	171,5	148,6	177,3	158,3
Gower	120,5	99,8	137,4	118,2	164,8	128,2
Llandiloe	258,8	227,8	257,7	215,6	308,0	266,3
Carmarthen	138,8	127,3	165,3	146,5	226,2	189,0
Kidwelly	109,9	96,5	140,0	106,0	154,7	124,0
<i>Parishes.</i>						
St Mary's West } Haverfordwest }	28,0	10,3	31,4	20,3	28,8	20,0
Narberth	13,5	11,2	10,7	11,9	21,7	23,3
Cardigan	16,0	8,3	23,1	15,1	31,0	9,7
Llandewy	30,8	23,2	30,3	22,9	41,0	28,0
Caron	24,1	17,6	21,6	16,6	22,3	17,5
Llampeter } Pont Stephen }	16,8	13,4	14,0	13,4	13,5	14,3

The total of the average annual births, in the diocese of St. David's, from 1700 to 1730 was 1228,9: of the deaths (1077,7.) From 1730 to 1760 the births were annually (1825,9) and the deaths 1508,1. From 1760 to 1763, or 1764, the average, annual births were 2029,6: the deaths 1663,6. Hence, taking the births as the measure of the inhabitants, the mean number of them, between the years 1700 and 1730, was to the mean number between the years 1730 and 1760, as 1228,9 to 1825,9; and to the mean number between 1760 and 1763, or 1764, as 1228,9 to 2029,6. If the deaths be taken as the standard, the mean number of the inhabitants, in this diocese, between the years 1700 and 1730, was to the mean number of them between the years 1730 and 1760, as 1077,7 to 1508,1; and to the mean number between 1760 and 1763, or 1764, as 1077,7 to 1663,6. If the arithmetical means be taken, as they were in former instances, the mean number of inhabitants, in the said diocese, between 1700 and 1730 was to the mean number of them between 1730 and 1760, as 1153,3 to 1667,0; and to the mean number of inhabitants between 1760 and 1763, or 1764, as 1153,3 to 1846,6. If the geometrical means be taken, the proportions will be as

1150,8

1150,8 to 1659,4, and as 1150,8 to 1837,5. Either of which is nearly as 2 to 3 in the first proportion, and as 5 to 8 in the latter.

The few following comparisons of actual enumerations are all that have come to my knowledge. No remarks on them can be necessary.

Counties.	Towns.	Year.	Inhabit.	Year	Inhabit.
Chester.	Altringham	in 1750	1000†	in 1772	1029
Lancast.	Manchester	in 1757	19839	in 1773	27246
	Liverpool	in 1700	5714	in 1773	34407
Norfolk.	Norwich	in 1693	28881	in 1752	36196
	Nottingham	in 1740	11000	in 1779	17711
Salop.	Holy Cross	in 1755	1049	in 1770	1046*
Surry.	Farnham‡	in 1741	1716	in 1780	2123
Warwick.	Birmingham	in 1700	15032	in 1770	30804
York.	Ackworth	in 1757	603	in 1767	728
	Leeds	in 1770	16380	in 1775	17121
			101214		
				168411	

It will not be amiss if I bring the foregoing particulars into a narrower point of view.

1st. The number of inhabitants in London, during the last 5 years, were to the number

† Somewhat less.  
 \* Between these two years 38 persons had been driven out of the parish by pulling down their houses to build a bridge; there being no other houses to receive them.  
 ‡ These two enumerations were made by Mr. John Clarke of this place: the former at the request of Dr. Adee, of Oxford, who very obligingly communicated the result; and the latter, at my desire, the beginning of the present month of January.

( 68 )

of inhabitants during 5 years about the time of the Revolution, as 203860,3 to 18283,3. That is, as 10 to 9 nearly.

2d. The number of houses, or families, in certain towns, taken indiscriminately, and in a considerable variety of countries, are now, to the number which was in the same towns in 1750 as 28544 to 23526: or as 7 to 6 nearly.

3d. The present number of inhabitants in 38 parishes, taken indiscriminately, in different parts of England, according to the registers of births and burials in these parishes, is to the number which was in the same thirty-eight parishes at the Revolution, as 446115 to 166274: or as 8 to 3 nearly.

4th. The present number of inhabitants, in 142 parishes, taken in the same manner as in the last article, is to the number which were in the same parishes between the years 1740 and 1750, as 12868 to 8779: or as 10 to 7 nearly.

5th. The baptisms in twenty-six parishes, for ten years immediately before the year 1754, when compared with the baptisms in the same twenty-six parishes for ten years immediately after 1754, gave the proportion between the number of inhabitants in the latter ten years

( 69 )

years to the mean number of them in the former ten years, as 1157,1 to 1180,4.

6th. According to the baptisms and burials in the diocese of St. David's, the mean number of the inhabitants, between the years 1700 and 1730, was to the mean number of the inhabitants, between the years 1730 and 1760, as 1153,3 to 1667,0: or as 2 to 3 nearly; and to the mean number of the inhabitants which were in the said diocese between the years 1760 and 1763, or 1764, as 1153,3 to 1846,6; or as 5 to 8 nearly.

Lastly, From actual enumerations, the number of inhabitants in ten cities, towns, and villages, at a former period, were 10,1214; at a latter they were 168411.

In every instance the places have been taken indiscriminately; that is, just as I could procure them; and I have omitted no place which I could procure: it may, therefore, be fairly concluded that they represent, justly, the state of the Kingdom in general; and this argument cannot be overturned but by producing a greater number of parishes which tend to prove the contrary; or an equal number of facts of a more certain nature.

Although

( 70 )

Although all arguments drawn from conjecture must submit to the foregoing matters of fact, yet the following ones appear to me so forcible, that I cannot help submitting them to the public. It has been urged that the inhabitants have decreased in country towns and villages, because employment has decreased in those places, and that the decrease of employment has been caused by enclosing common fields, and putting several small farms into one great one. That both these circumstances may have tended to lessen employment amongst husbandmen, in some parts of the kingdom, I will not dispute; but I believe, by no means, in that degree which those, who argue for a decreased population, imagine. The farmer, where he is at liberty to act as he thinks proper, will not be governed by considering whether his land is open or enclosed, in affigning the proportion between arable and grazing grounds, but by the profits which this or that state of his land produces: consequently, whether land be enclosed or not, the proportion between the quantity of land which is on tillage, and that which is in grass, will always be determined by the proportion which the price of corn bears to the price of cattle, as it always was.

It

( 71 )

It is true, great quantities of the newly enclosed common fields have been *laid down*; and the reason is plain. For every acre of common field land that has been enclosed, there have been enclosed two acres of commons, and other waste grounds; almost every acre of which has, necessarily, had the plough thrown into it, in order to cultivate and improve it. The price of corn must therefore have sunk to nothing, and the price of cattle have risen to an extravagant rate, if other lands had not been laid in to grass to feed them.

It may be farther observed, that hitherto, inclosures have been so far from lessening employment, that they must have greatly increased it. The enclosed commons and waste land, being so much more in quantity than the common fields which have been taken in; and requiring, at the same time, so much more labour, to bring them into order, than it required to work lands, already cultivated, must greatly have increased employment. We may add the great increase of labour in fencing, and dividing both sorts of enclosures, as well as the additional employment of keeping them continually in repair, and in cultivating, continually a quantity of  
land

land so much greater than was under cultivation before, as well as keeping a considerable part of that land in a higher state of cultivation: it being well-known, and reasonable to suppose, that more care and pains are employed in the cultivation of enclosed lands, than on those which are not enclosed. In short, the whole inconvenience which has arisen from enclosing, and which has given rise to all these complaints, is, that where the enclosures have been chiefly, or wholly, of common fields, employment has declined: whilst it has increased in a much greater proportion, in those parts where the enclosures have been chiefly or wholly, waste lands; and, consequently, the people have been obliged to remove from one place to another, after their employment.

With respect to the engrossing of farms, there can be little doubt, but that it has been a real grievance to many individuals; and so, likewise, has many other things been, which have proved very advantageous to the kingdom in general. Every considerable alteration in the internal policy and management of a state, whether it be for the better or worse, in general, must be a hardship to those individuals who are obliged, in consequence of it, to seek a new employment; but it does not, therefore, follow

follow that every such alteration is for the worse. Whether the change, under consideration, has been for the better, or worse, can only be determined by experience, and the observations of men who are judges of, and conversant in these matters. Mr. *Young*, the very ingenious author of many excellent publications on this subject, and who has certainly considered these things as much, and, perhaps, understands them as well as any other person in England, is clearly for large farms; and has advanced such arguments in their favour, as seem difficult to confute: and, to his works, I wish to refer those who chuse to inquire farther into this affair. It is obvious enough, that the division of land into small farms, may be extremely proper at one time, and as highly improper at another. Such a division may also be proper in one state, and not in another. For example, it would be very proper to encourage it in those states where the form of government is feudal, and where they have no manufactures or commerce; but it seems very absurd to employ more hands than are necessary, in cultivating the ground, in states which depend chiefly on arts, manufactures, and foreign commerce for their support, as is the case with England at

( 74 )

present. If that unhappy time should ever arrive when these are lost, farms will naturally subdivide themselves again, and become as small as they have been formerly.

As it is undoubtedly of the utmost importance in every state, to promote population, so nothing contributes to it so much as encouraging marriage amongst all ranks of people; but especially amongst the lower, and middling ones. To this end, the means of providing for a family ought not to be too difficult and laborious: such provision ought, however, to be obtainable by as few ways as possible without labour. It is by wealth, acquired by the slow means of industry, that a kingdom is enriched, because it is then more equally distributed, and the inhabitants become, by that means, more hardy, robust, active, and, I may add, ingenious, quick-sighted, and penetrating; and, of course, more useful. That wealth which flows easily, and suddenly into a kingdom from mines, or by any other means, independent of labour, tends only to render its inhabitants weak, inactive, and timorous. We have a sufficient proof of this in Spain; and I sincerely hope that England will never be possessed of any such ruinous and destructive means of acquiring it.

But

( 75 )

But notwithstanding I think that wealth ought not to be acquired without labour, it certainly should be in every ones power, who endeavours earnestly, to procure it with honesty, and even honour; or, at least, that every one should have a prospect of obtaining a sufficiency to maintain him in ease, when he arrives at old age. Cut off from the pleasing hope of something like this, a man has no spur to industry beyond the cravings of hunger—he becomes dispirited, and unable to exert his faculties, either with that power, or to that extent which he might otherwise have done.

Much has been said by *Doctor Short*, as well as other writers on this subject, in favour of sumptuary laws for promoting population: I believe they would have little effect. There can be no doubt but that such laws would be useful, could we depend on their being properly executed. For example, no father ought to be allowed to disinherit his child, on the score of marriage. I do not say that he ought not to do all in his power to prevent his children from marrying improperly; but there is a wide difference between prevention and punishment.

L 2

That

( 76 )

That custom which prevails of giving all, or the major part to the eldest son, is pernicious to population, and of course to the state which suffers, or encourages it.

Marriages between persons of disproportioned ages is another very great hindrance to population, and ought absolutely to be prohibited; or, at least, a heavy tax laid on it to ease, in some measure, the burthens of the publick, in other respects. There are means which might be used to come at the ages of most persons, and those who appear to come within this objection, should be obliged to produce the proper proofs.

Some laws of this kind may also be very necessary for the other sex; and especially those of middling rank; who, when luxury and extravagance, especially in dress, happen to be the reigning passion of the times, are more apt to run into the extremes of it than men. It must be owned, however, that men, of the same rank, do but too much encourage this propensity, by paying the most attention to those who are most extravagant in that respect; although, at the same time, the dread of the expence, which attends it, prevents their engaging with them in the more intimate connections of marriage; well knowing that  
few,

( 77 )

few, who have once given into a rage for dress, would not rather run the risk of ruining their husbands, than yield the palm to another, whom they have been used to vie with, in this respect.

A pamphlet has lately been written, by a person for whose talents and ingenuity I have the greatest respect, proposing a public *census*. Such a circumstance would certainly be very agreeable to every speculative mind, intent on the inquiry after truth, in any branch of natural knowledge; and, perhaps, at some future time, such a project may be put in execution without any fear of bad consequences resulting from it, on any account whatever: at present, such an inquiry may not be adviseable. Our enemies have always been used to estimate us at seven or eight millions: and, notwithstanding the foregoing facts seem fully to prove that we are more numerous at this time, than at any former one, yet it by no means follows that we amount to that number, even now. If, therefore, such an enumeration should take place, and we should be found short of the number which they have been used to take us at, they might probably, instead of reflecting that they have a stronger adversary to contend with than  
formerly,



( 78 )

formerly, only consider that we are weaker than they had imagined, and take fresh courage from that consideration, and especially, as such an enumeration would determine nothing with respect to our number at any former time. However, if such a proceeding should be thought adviseable at this, or any future time, I am clearly of opinion the most eligible persons to perform it are the parochial clergy; and, by them, it would be performed in a very few weeks. I have heard the opinions of the ministers of some of the most extensive parishes in England, who think it might be done, even in their parishes, with ease and certainty, in two months; with the addition of age, situation and profession of each individual.

But the point, which is of most consequence to us, is to inquire whether we are, at present, an increasing, or a decreasing people: and this, I am persuaded, can only be effected, to any purpose, by the means which I have been pursuing; and mean to pursue still farther. I shall therefore conclude with requesting, that such of the clergy as this little tract may fall into the hands of, will oblige the author with the annual number of baptisms, marriages and burials,

( 79 )

rials, in their respective parishes, for ten years, as near the time of the Revolution as possible; the same things for ten years between the years 1740 and 1750, and for the ten years ending with 1780, directed for him, in Christ's Hospital, London.

T H E E N D.

0422

