

218-16



0325

6

AN
E S S A Y
ON THE
P O P U L A T I O N
O F
E N G L A N D,
From the REVOLUTION to the
present Time.

WITH
AN APPENDIX,
CONTAINING
REMARKS on the Account of the Popu-
lation, Trade, and Resources of the
Kingdom, in Mr. EDEN's Letters to
Lord CARLISLE.

THE SECOND EDITION,
With CORRECTIONS and ADDITIONS.

By RICHARD PRICE, D.D. F.R.S.

L O N D O N :
Printed for T. CADELL, in the Strand.
M. DCC. LXXX.

P R E F A C E.

THE following Essay was published last summer, at the end of Mr. Morgan's Treatise on the *Doctrine of Annuities and Assurances on Lives and Survivorships*.—Mr. Eden having, in his Fifth Letter to Lord Carlisle, made several objections to it, I now offer it to the Public in a separate tract, with an *Appendix* containing a reply to his objections.—At the end of the *Appendix* are added a few observations on Mr. Eden's account of the trade and resources of the kingdom. I feel myself deeply impressed with a con-

[iv]

viction of the importance of these observations; but at the same time, I know that I may be under the influence of those improper byasses to which Mr. Eden ascribes the apprehensions which many now entertain of the public danger. I therefore refer all I have said to the candid attention of those who may chuse to consider it, wishing them to pay no more regard to it than the evidence which will be laid before them shall render unavoidable.

May 8, 1780.

A D V E R -

[v]

ADVERTISEMENT

TO THE

SECOND EDITION.

I THINK it necessary to inform the Reader, that the principal corrections in this edition will be found in the account of the navy-debt, p. 78; and that the only additions of any consequence are the notes in p. 31, 67, and 73; the accounts of our trade, in p. 83, &c.; and the paragraph in the last page relating to the gold coin.

June 27th, 1780.

C O N -

C O N T E N T S.

*A*CCOUNTS of the number of houses in London and Middlesex, at different periods, with observations — p. 1, &c.
 Accounts of the number of houses in ENGLAND and WALES at different periods, with observations — — — p. 9, &c.
 Progress of depopulation, with facts confirming it — — — p. 17, &c.
 Causes of our depopulation - p. 29, &c.
 State of population in other countries, Sweden, Naples, France, &c. - p. 30, &c.
 APPENDIX, containing remarks on Mr. Eden's account of the population, trade, and resources of the kingdom — p. 36, &c.
 State and fluctuations of London from the Restoration — — — p. 55, &c.
 Present state of the kingdom with respect to its trade and resources — p. 64, &c.
 Comparison of the expence of the last war with the expence of the present war p. 70, &c.
 CONCLUSION — — — p. 73, &c.
 ACCOUNTS of the navy-debt, loan, unfunded debt, &c. in 1762 and 1780 p. 77, &c.
 Accounts of trade — — — p. 83, &c.
 Distribution of a hundred knights for the counties of England, &c. — p. 87

OBSER-

OBSERVATIONS

ON

The POPULATION of ENGLAND and WALES.

IT will be proper to introduce these observations with the following accounts of LONDON and MIDDLESEX.

Number of Houses in LONDON, SOUTHWARK, WESTMINSTER, and the COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX, in the Year 1777; from the Accounts of the Surveyors of the House and Window Duties.

Houses charged in 1777, having 25 windows and upwards	— —	12,560
Houses charged, having less than 25 windows	— — — —	61,080
Total of houses charged	— —	73,640
Uninhabited houses chargeable	—	3,368
Total of houses charged and chargeable	— — — —	77,008
Cottages not charged by reason of poverty	— — —	13,562
Total of houses	— —	90,570
		Number

Number of Houses in London, Southwark, Westminster, and the County of Middlesex, from the Survey mentioned by Dr. Brackenridge in a Paper read to the Royal Society in March 1758, and published in the Philosophical Transactions, vol. 50, p. 471.

Houses charged to the house and window tax in 1757	—	—	63,480
Houses uninhabited	—	—	4,810
Total of houses charged and chargeable			—
Cottages	—	—	19,324
Total of houses, including cottages			—
			87,614

R E M A R K S.

These accounts shew, that the number of houses in *London, Westminster, Southwark, and all Middlesex* had, in the course of about 20 years preceding 1778, increased 2,956 in the whole; but that the houses excused on account of poverty had decreased 5,762; from whence it follows, that the houses charged and chargeable had increased 8,718. —It should be considered, that most probably this is less than the real increase of

the best sort of houses; for the decrease of the cottages proves, that the meanest of the houses * which pay the tax must likewise have decreased; and this decrease is to be added to 8,718, in order to obtain the whole increase of the best houses; for it is obvious that, if the best houses had not increased as much as the worst decreased, the total of houses, instead of being greater in 1777, must have been less.—Perhaps, therefore, we shall reckon moderately enough if we reckon an increase within the last 20 years of 10,000 substantial houses in and about *London*; and this is a number that falls little short of the whole number of houses in *Liverpool* and *Manchester*.

The increase of buildings in *London* has for several years been the object of general

* That is, houses paying the house duty of 3s. only. The number of these houses in 1777 was 5,738; but I have no account of it for any preceding year. It will appear presently, that taking *England* in the gross, there has been a great decrease in these houses; and this makes it almost certain they must have decreased in *Middlesex*. —The decrease of cottages, or houses excused, since 1757, is the more remarkable, because the house and window duties have been increased since that year by three different acts of parliament, the first in 1758, the second in 1762, and the third in 1766.

4 *Observations on the Population.*

observation. It deserves particular notice that it is derived entirely from the increase of luxury; an evil which, while it flatters, never fails to destroy. It has been shewn from authentic accounts, that the decrease of the lower people in *London* and *Middlesex* has kept pace with the increase of buildings. The annual deaths also in the Bills of Mortality have for many years been decreasing, and are now near 6,000 *per annum* less than they were fifty years ago. In particular; it is observable with respect to that part of *London* which lies within the city walls, that, though always filled with houses, the births and burials, and, consequently, the inhabitants *, have decreased ONE HALF.—The just account of this must be, that those who cannot now satisfy themselves without whole houses, or, perhaps, two or three houses, to live in, used formerly to be satisfied with lodgings, or with parts of houses.

The number of houses in *London*, *Westminster*, and all *Middlesex*, in 1690, was

* See a particular account of this fact in my *Observations on Reversionary Payments*, page 190, 3d edit.

111,215,

of London and Middlesex. 5

111,215, according to Dr. *Davenant's* account from the hearth-books *.

I will only further observe concerning the preceding accounts, that they demonstrate that the number of inhabitants in *London* has been greatly over-rated. They have been sometimes estimated at a million. In an *Essay on the State of London, on Population, &c.* in the *Treatise on Reversionary Payments*, I offered evidence, which I thought little short of demonstration, to prove that they fell short of 651,000. But it now appears that, allowing 6 to a house, and including the whole county of *Middlesex*, their number in 1777 was only 543,420.

That six to a house for *London*, and five to a house for all *England*, is too large an allowance, will be proved by the following recital of facts.

* See Dr. *Davenant's* works, vol. 1st, page 38. This number does not include *Southwark*.—The average of burials for five years in *London* before the present year, or 1780, was 20779. The average for five years before 1690 was 22,742; that is, considerably greater than it has been for the last five years, though twelve parishes, now the most populous, were not then included in the Bills.

Observations on the Population

	Houses, Families	Inhabitants,	To a house, To a family
In Nottingham, according to a survey in Sept. 1779, exclusive of 294 in hospitals and workhouses	3,267 3,556	17,417	5 $\frac{1}{2}$ 4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Norwich, according to a survey in 1752	7,139	36,169	5
Shrewsbury, by a survey in 1750	3,078	13,328	4 $\frac{1}{3}$
Northampton, by a survey in 1746	1,083	5,136	4 $\frac{2}{3}$
The parish of Ackworth, Yorkshire, in 1767	184	728	4
Newbury, Berkshire, in 1768	930	3,732	4
Speen, adjoining to Newbury, in 1768	303	1,200	4
Aldwinckle, Northamptonshire, in 1772	96	402	4 $\frac{1}{3}$
The parish of Holy Cross, near Shrewsbury, in 1760	242	1,950	4 $\frac{1}{3}$
Altringham, Cheshire, in 1772	248	1,029	4 $\frac{1}{7}$
The Parish of St. Michael's, Chester, in 1772	127	618	4 $\frac{5}{8}$
The town and parish of Bala, North-Wales, in 1774	401	1,723	4 $\frac{3}{10}$
Fifty-nine Dutch villages mentioned by Struyk	12,005	45,888	3 $\frac{5}{8}$
Birmingham, in 1770	6,025	30,804	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
Liverpool, in 1773, including 400 in the Poor-house	6,340	34,407	5 $\frac{3}{4}$

of England and Wales.

	Houses Families	Inhabitants,	To a house, To a family
In Manchester and Salford, in 1773	4,338	27,246	6 $\frac{1}{4}$
Leeds, in 1775	4,996	17,121	4 $\frac{1}{3}$
The District of Vaud in Switzerland	25,778	112,951	4 $\frac{1}{3}$
Chester, in 1774	3,428	14,713	4 $\frac{3}{10}$
Rome, in 1770	37,449	158,442	4 $\frac{1}{4}$
Calne, Wiltshire	776	3,467	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Liverpool	8,002	34,407	4 $\frac{3}{10}$
Manchester	6,416	27,246	4 $\frac{2}{3}$
Bolton in Lancashire, in 1773, including Little Bolton	1,178	5,339	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Bury in Lancashire, in 1772	463	2,090	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
The parish of Bala in North-Wales, in 1774	401	1,723	4 $\frac{3}{10}$
Chippenham, Wilts, in 1773	483	2,407	5
Brenhill, near Calne, in Wiltshire	218	1,206	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
The Island of Sicily (see end of 2d vol. of Brydone's Travels)	268,120	1,123,163	4 $\frac{1}{3}$
Fourteen market towns mentioned by Dr. Short, Comparative History, page 58	20,371	97,611	4 $\frac{2}{3}$
Sixty-five country parishes, <i>ibid.</i>	17,208	76,284	4 $\frac{2}{3}$ In

Observations on the Population

	— Houses	139 — Inhabitants,	506 — To a house, 4 $\frac{1}{3}$.
In the Parish of Skelton, Yorkshire, in 1777	— Families	500 —	2,461 — To a family, 4 $\frac{1}{3}$.
The town and parish of Wycombe, Bucks	— Families	1,685 —	9,117 — 5 $\frac{2}{3}$.
Worley, Barton, Pendleton, Pendlebury, and Clifton, Lancashire, in 1778	— Families	2,370 —	9,731 — 4 $\frac{1}{10}$.
Parish of St. Cuthbert, Edinburgh, in 1743 (see Maitland's History of Edinburgh, page 171)	— Families	24,931 —	99,332 — 4 $\frac{1}{10}$.
In a number of small towns and parishes in the Generalities of Auvergne, Lyon, and Rouen, in France (see <i>Recherches sur la Population</i> , par M. Mesnange, pages 8, 26, and 62)	— Families	2,525 —	13,786 — 5 $\frac{1}{2}$.
Parish of Manchester, exclusive of the town, in 1774	— Houses	2,412 —	13,786 — To a house, 5 $\frac{1}{10}$.
Parish in the city of London (see Phil. Tract. part 2d, page 796)	—	—	— 6 to a house.

of England and Wales.

Number of Houses in England and Wales, from the Returns of the Surveyors of the House and Window Duties in 1761 and 1777.

	In 1761.	In 1777.
Houses charged, having 25 windows and upwards	— — — *32,595	— 32,595
Houses having 21, 22, 23 and 24 windows	— 12,404	— 14,623
Total of houses having more than 20 windows	44,999	47,218
Houses having from 12 to 20 windows	— 88,494	— 98,756
Total of houses having more than 11 windows	133,493	145,974
Houses having 8, 9, 10, and 11 windows	— 102,525	— 117,857
Total of houses having more than 7 windows	236,018	263,831

* In the returns for 1761 this number is wanting. I have, therefore, supposed it the same that it was found to be in 1777. But the truth is, that it must have been less, as will appear presently.

This return has been given by Mr. Grenville in his *Considerations on the Trade and Finances of the Kingdom*, as made in 1766; but I have been informed from the tax-office that it was made in 1761.

	In 1761.	In 1777.
Increase in 1777 of houses having from 8 to 24 windows — —	—	27,813
Houses charged having 7 windows — —*	—	131,950
Total of houses paying the window-tax —	236,018	395,781
Houses paying only the house tax of 3s. —	442,897	286,296
Total of houses charged	678,915	682,077
Increase in 1777 of houses charged — —	—	3,162
Houses uninhabited, but chargeable — —	† 25,628	19,396
Total of houses charged and chargeable —	704,543	701,473

* The number of houses in 1761, having exactly seven windows, was 400,273; but by the law, as it then stood, all such houses were exempted from the window tax. In 1766 the tax was extended to these houses; and the consequence was, that near two thirds of them were reduced to houses having only six windows.

† The decrease which may be here observed in the number of empty, but chargeable, houses, is an effect which could not but attend the greater demand for houses which produced the increase between 1761 and 1777, of houses having more than seven windows.

Decrease

	In 1761.	In 1777.
Decrease in 1777 of houses charged and chargeable — —	—	3,070
Cottages excused on account of poverty only	276,149	251,261*
Total of houses charged, chargeable, and excused — —	980,692	952,734
Decrease of houses charged, chargeable, and excused, from 1765 to 1777 — —	—	27,958
To this decrease add the increase of houses having from 8 to 24 windows, or — —	—	27,813

And the total will shew, that the number of houses not having *eight* windows was 55,771 less, in 1777, than it had been in 1761.

Again; from 27,813, the increase in 1777 of houses having from 8 to 24 windows, subtract 3,162, the increase of houses charged, having less than 25 windows; and it will appear, that in the houses charged, having 7 windows or less, there has been in the same period a decrease of 24,651 houses.

* Of these cottages, 7360 had been charged, but were discharged by appeal in 1777.

C

— But

— But this is by no means the whole decrease of houses of this sort. The increase of houses having more than 24 windows ought to be added; but the number of such houses not having been given in the return for 1761, it does not appear what this increase has been. It seems, however, past doubt, that there must have been such an increase, because all other houses having more than seven windows had increased.

NUMBER OF HOUSES IN ENGLAND AND WALES in 1759, from the Return of the Surveyors of the House and Window Duties.

Houses charged in 1759	— —	679,149
Uninhabited houses in 1759 chargeable	— — — —	24,904
Houses excused on account of poverty only	— — — —	282,429
Total of houses in 1759	—	986,482
————— in 1761, see p. 11.		980,692
————— in 1777, see p. 11.		952,734
Diminished in 18 years from 1759	— — — —	33,748
Number of houses charged in 1756	— — — —	690,702
		Number

Number of houses charged and chargeable in 1750*	— —	729,048
Deduct 25,000, and the charged houses in 1750 will be	—	704,048
Total of houses according to the Hearth-books of Lady-day, 1690 †	— — —	1,319,215
Total of houses from the Hearth-books in 1666 ‡	—	1,230,000

* In the former edition of this essay, I had, on the authority of Dr. Brackenridge, (in the Philosophical Transactions, vol. 49, part 1st, p. 270,) given this as a return in 1710; but I have lately been informed from the tax office that it was made in 1750, and that it includes the chargeable houses.

† This account is given on the authority of Dr. Davenant. See his works, vol. 1st, page 38, where the number of houses, and also of hearths, is given separately for each county.—In page 136 he says, that “the hearth-tax had given a view *certain enough* of the number of families in the kingdom.”

‡ See Tindall’s Continuation of Rapin’s History, vol. 1st, page 53.—Dr. Davenant says, that from 1666 to 1688 there had been about 70,000 new foundations laid. See his works, vol. 1st, page 370.—It is probable that the civil war in the time of King Charles the First, and the emigrations which then took place, lessened the number of people in the kingdom; and therefore, in Queen Elizabeth’s time, or about the Reformation, the number of inhabitants in England might have been greater than it was even at the Revolution, agreeably to the facts mentioned at the end of my *Appeal to the Public on the Subject of the National Debt*, page 87, &c.

OBSERVATIONS on the foregoing Accounts.

First. The first of these accounts makes the number of houses in England and Wales in 1777 to be 952,734. Let it, however, be stated at a MILLION. Five persons to a house is too large an allowance, as appears from the accounts in page 6, &c. It follows, therefore, that the number of inhabitants in *England* and *Wales* must be short of FIVE MILLIONS.

In the kingdom of SWEDEN the number of inhabitants was 2,446,394, in 1763.—In the kingdom of NAPLES (one of the *Two Sicilies*) it was 4,311,503, in 1777.—In all FRANCE, 25,741,320, in 1772*.

These

* The account here given of *Sweden* is taken from actual surveys of the kingdom in 1757, 1760, and 1763. In the first of these years the inhabitants, of all ages, were found to be 2,323,195; in the second 2,367,498; in the third, 2,446,394. See a Memoir by M. Wargent in the 15th vol. of the *Collection Academique*, printed at Paris, 1772. The account of the kingdom of *Naples* is also given from surveys made there every year, and published in the Court Calendars.—In 1766, the number of inhabitants was 3,771,234; in 1772, 4,040,680; in 1777, 4,311,503.

The Intendants of provinces in *France* were, in 1770, 1771, and 1772, ordered to make returns of the number of deaths, births, and marriages in their respective districts.

These facts shew, in a striking light, the superiority which arts, commerce, science, industry, and liberty give to a people.

ENGLAND

districts. The annual average of deaths for these three years was 780,040. See a *Treatise On the Legislation and Commerce of Corn*, printed at Paris in 1775, and translated into English, and published in London in 1776, page 42.—I have been assured by the ingenious author, now the Director-general of the finances of *France*, that this account may be depended on as rather below the truth; and it affords a decisive proof that the number of inhabitants in *France* cannot be less than that stated above, or 25,741,320, which is the product of the average of deaths multiplied by 33. That this is the least multiplier which ought to be used will appear undeniably from the following facts.—In *Sweden*, the average of deaths for 9 years ending in 1763, was 69,125, or a 35th part and two-fifths nearly of the inhabitants. See M. Wargent's Memoir just referred to.—In the kingdom of *Naples*, the average of deaths for 5 years before 1778, was 115,412, or a 37th and a third of the inhabitants.—These facts (and many others of the same kind may be found in the *Treatise on Reversionary Payments*, page 200) convince me that the average of annual deaths in *France* might have been multiplied by 35 instead of 33, and this would have brought out the number of inhabitants 27,301,400.—The same conclusion nearly may be drawn from the births in *France*, the average of which for five years ending in 1774, was 928,918. See *Recherches sur la Population de la France*, par M. Moheau, printed at Paris in 1778, page 147.—In *Sweden*, the average of annual births for 9 years, ending in 1763, was 90,240, or a 27th part and a tenth of the inhabitants.—In the kingdom

ENGLAND does not consist of many more inhabitants than the kingdom of NAPLES; but in respect of dignity, weight and force, the kingdom of NAPLES, compared with it, is *nothing*. Not long ago, this little island, with its dependencies, like the state of ATHENS formerly among the *Greeks*, was the arbiter of EUROPE, and more than a match for all the three kingdoms I have mentioned, with SPAIN added to them.

Secondly. The great disparity between the numbers of people in the higher and the lower ranks of life seems to deserve particular observation, as it may be collected from the foregoing accounts. Families living in houses having *seven* windows or less, must consist of persons in the lowest stations; and yet the number of these houses was 688,903 in 1777. Add to these such of

dom of *Naples*, the average of annual births for 5 years, ending in 1777, was 166,808, or a 25th part and four-fifths of the inhabitants. The medium is $26\frac{1}{2}$, which multiplied by 928,918, gives 24,616,327.—But it is certain, that a greater multiplier than $26\frac{1}{2}$ ought to be used in this case, because the births exceed the deaths considerably less in *France* than in either *Sweden* or *Naples*.—Upon the whole, therefore, I reckon that it appears with sufficient evidence that the inhabitants of *France* may very moderately be stated at the number I have given.

the

the lowest people as live in the remaining 263,603 houses; and it will appear, that the people of property and opulence in the state, compared with the rest, are indeed a very small body. And yet their number is *now* greater in this country than it ever was; and, very probably, it is much greater in this country than in any other*.—It is proper to add, that this observation shews us distinctly why no taxes in a state can be very productive which do not reach the lower as well as higher ranks of people.

But, thirdly, What requires most to be attended to is the certain evidence which the preceding accounts give of the progress of depopulation in this kingdom.—The number of houses in ENGLAND and WALES

* In ENGLAND, the houses having more than *seven* windows are above a *fourth* of all the houses. In SCOTLAND, the number of houses having more than *five* windows, and paying the house and window duties, was, in 1777, only 16,206; and consequently could not be above a *fifteenth* of all the houses.—Agreeably to this poverty, the people of SCOTLAND, though more than a *fifth* of *Britain*, do not contribute more than a *fiftieth* to the revenue.—And it is also remarkable that of 4,876,171*l.* gold coin deficient between six and three grains, and brought in by the proclamation in 1774, to be re coined, only 52,984*l.* was brought from SCOTLAND. The sum brought in from IRELAND, in consequence of the same proclamation, was 394,201*l.*

was

was at the REVOLUTION 1,319,215. The number of houses now is not a *million*. Our people, therefore, since that era, have decreased near a *quarter*.—This appears distinctly, as far as Dr. Davenant's account is to be depended on*. The following facts and observations will confirm this account, and furnish us with some additional evidence on this subject.

First. It appears, that there has been a very great decrease, since the Revolution, in the produce of a tax called the *hereditary and temporary excise*. This excise (almost the only one that existed before the Revolution) consists chiefly of 2*s.* 6*d.* per barrel on all strong beer or ale above 6*s.* the barrel, and 6*d.* on every barrel of ale sold at 6*s.* or less; and also a duty of 2*s.* 6*d.* per hoghead on cyder and perry; a duty on mead, strong waters, and low wines and spirits. The gross annual produce of this tax for three years, ending at 1689, was (as appears from the Excise books) 740,147*l.*

* Some may suspect that Dr. *Davenant* has, by mistake, taken from the Hearth-books the number of *houses* in the kingdom, when he ought to have taken the number of *families*. But this is improbable; and if true, will make no great difference, as may be inferred from the accounts in page 6, &c.

—Its gross annual produce for four years, ending in 1768, was 527,991*l.* It has decreased, therefore, 212,156*l.* *per annum*. One of the reasons of this decrease has been, that in 1736 the duties on low wines and spirits (amounting then to 70,000*l.* *per ann.*) were taken from the Hereditary and Temporary Excise, and carried to the Aggregate Fund: Deduct*, therefore, 70,000*l.* from 212,156*l.*; and the real decrease will be 142,156*l.* And this decrease will appear more remarkable, when it is considered how much less the currency and wealth of the kingdom were before the Revolution than they are now.—It may be said, that more wine is now drunk; but this, being confined to the higher classes of people, makes no great difference.—It may with more reason be objected, that the lower people drink now greater quantities of spirituous liquors, and therefore less ale. With respect to this, it seems sufficient to observe,

* This is too great a deduction; for the use of spirituous liquors was in 1736 so much increased, that it became necessary to restrain it by additional duties.—The produce of that part of this Hereditary and Temporary Excise which consists of the tax upon beer only, was 674,387*l.* in 1688; and 694,476*l.* in 1689. See Dr. *Davenant's* works, vol. 1st. page 175.

that it appears from the Excise Books that the use of spirituous liquors never sunk the produce of this excise more than about 40,000*l.* in a year; and that since 1751 it has been so much checked by new regulations, additional duties, and other causes, that most probably it does not prevail much more now than it did at the Revolution. After allowing, therefore, for the operation of this cause *, (and also for the increased use of wine) there will remain a diminution unaccounted for, of at least 100,000*l.* *per annum.*

In conformity to this fact, it appears that there has been a proportionable diminution in the quantity of beer brewed for sale, and in the number of victuallers.—For three years, ended in 1689, the annual average of

* The following facts will confirm what is here said, and shew the progress of gin-drinking in the kingdom.—The use of spirituous liquors prevailed most in 1750 and 1751; and the *annual* average of spirits drawn from malted corn, cyder, melasses, and brewers' wash in those two years was 11,326,976 gallons.—In 1752 and 1753 it was 7,500,000 gallons.—In 1767 and 1768 it had sunk to 3,663,568 gallons.—In 1730 and 1731, it was 6,658,788 gallons.—In 1692 and 1693, it was 2,329,487 gallons.

In 1767 and 1768 the annual average of exciseable brandy imported was 1,612,631 gallons.—In 1688 and 1689, it was 1,713,974.

strong

strong barrels brewed for sale was 5,055,870. The average of small barrels was 2,582,248.—For three years, ended in 1768, the former * average was 3,925,131; the latter 1,886,760.—The average of common victuallers in the whole kingdom for the former three years † was 47,343; for the latter three years, 34,867.—This last fact seems of particular consequence, because victuallers in both periods include all that keep houses for selling any strong liquors;

* It is natural to suspect that this decreased consumption of beer must have been owing to the increase of the taxes upon it. But this does not appear; for in 1761, (after an addition in 1760 of 3*d.* per bushel to the duty on malt) an addition was made to this tax of 3*s.* per barrel, and yet it produced in the following years rather more in proportion than it did before.—The quantity likewise of strong beer brewed for sale increased a little afterwards; though these two additions were so considerable as to bring into the revenue near 900,000*l.* *per annum.* In 24 years from 1740 to 1764, the taxes were more than doubled, and yet at the end of this term there was hardly a single tax which did not produce more than ever.

† For 10 years before the check given to the use of spirituous liquors in 1751, the victuallers in the kingdom amounted to near 48,000, though the quantity of strong beer brewed annually for sale was then less than it has been for the last 15 years. This, I suppose, must have been owing to the vast numbers of shops for selling gin, which, during that period, were opened every where.

D 2

and

and because also there is reason to believe, that the private brewery *, of which no account is taken, was greater formerly than it is now.—I cannot help adding, as a farther fact, indicating a particular degree of populousness at the Revolution, that King William wanting, in 1689, to raise 23 new regiments for the war in Ireland, the levies were completed in six weeks. See Sir John Dalrymple's Memoirs of Great Britain, vol. 1st, page 384.—But what is most of all decisive in the present question is, the depopulation which has certainly taken place *lately* in this kingdom.

* The number of common brewers in the whole kingdom in 1687 and 1689 was 776; in 1767 and 1768 it was increased to 1083. One reason of this must be, that fewer victuallers and private people now brew their own beer.—It is remarkable, that the number of brewers in London *decreased* during the same period from 187 to 157; and also that the quantity of small and strong beer brewed for sale *decreased* from 1,958,859 to 1,533,242 gallons. And this seems to confirm what has been already suggested, that even London is less populous now than it was at the Revolution. See page 4.

This decrease was gradual and slow till 1726. After 1726 it became considerable; and for some years before 1750, the quantity of beer consumed in London was about 100,000 gallons *per annum* less than it is now, in consequence, undoubtedly, of the excessive use of spirituous liquors which then took place in *London* more than any where else.

From

From the preceding accounts it appears, that between the years 1761 and 1777 a destruction has taken place of at least 55,771 houses having less than 8 windows; which is equal to the loss of above a *quarter of a million* of those inhabitants who furnish recruits for our navy and army, and trading ships; and who, therefore, constitute the main strength of the kingdom.

I am not sensible that any thing can be objected to the evidence from which this conclusion has been drawn, except that there is an uncertainty in the returns of the cottages, because the surveyors, though directed to include them in their returns, take their number with less accuracy, no duty being paid for them. But it should be observed,

First, That this uncertainty does not at all affect the evidence for the diminution of houses *charged* having less than eight windows, and of which exact accounts are kept.

Secondly, The returns of the cottages, have not, I suppose, been made with less care for 1777 than for 1761; and it is the difference only on which the conclusion I have drawn depends.

But, thirdly, The diminution which there has certainly been in the houses *charged*

charged having less than eight windows, proves undeniably, that there must have been a proportionable decrease in the cottages *not* charged.

Between the years 1759 and 1761 there appears in the returns a diminution of only 234 in the houses charged. But it should be remembered, that the higher sort of houses having increased between 1761 and 1777, the causes (which will be explained presently) of that increase must probably have begun to operate sooner, and checked the decrease, which (as may be distinctly seen in the *Postscript*) had been going forward before that period.

Before 1759 it appears that the houses *charged* had diminished 25,899 in nine years; and that since 1759, houses having less than eight windows have diminished 61,561 in *eighteen* years. These are facts which shew plainly, that the depopulation since the Revolution cannot have been less than it is stated in page 18.

The Honourable Mr. Grenville, in a pamphlet entitled *Considerations on the Trade and Finances of the Kingdom*, after giving the same account with that here given of the houses in *England and Wales* in 1759

6

and

and 1761, expresses the utmost surprize at the proofs of depopulation which it afforded, and observes, “ that the destruction of
“ 5790 houses in so short a space as * *eight*
“ *years*, is such a symptom of distress as
“ requires every attention to check the pro-
“ gress of the evil.—Relief to the landed
“ interest is now (he adds) no longer the
“ concern of individuals only who are to
“ receive that relief, but is become an im-
“ portant national concern.”—What would he have said, had he known that the depopulation which shocked him was proceeding so rapidly as I have shewn; that no attention would be given to it; that the public burdens, instead of being lessened, would increase; and that he himself had laid the foundation of such an increase of them as would, in a few years, bring the nation to the brink of ruin?

The increase in the higher classes of houses has been for some time obvious to every one. It may be imagined, that this implies such an increase of people in the middle and higher ranks of life, as makes

* It should be remembered here, that the return which I have given in p. 9, &c. for 1761, was understood by Mr. Grenville to have been a return for 1766.

amends

amends for the depopulation among the lowest ranks. But the truth is, that no such conclusion can be drawn. One of the principal causes of this increase has been that very evil which has destroyed the common people; or the increase of luxury. This, I think, has been demonstrated, by the account I have given of London *. See page

* The following circumstance may perhaps deserve some notice here.—By the new regulations of the window-tax in 1776, particular inducements were given to divide buildings deemed *single* houses, but holding *several* families, into houses having only one family in each; and this, as well as luxury, may have contributed to increase the number of houses without increasing the number of inhabitants.

For instance. By dividing a house having 30 windows, and containing *three* families, into *three* houses or tenements, having ten windows, and one family in each house, only 9*s.* per annum would have been saved before 1766; but since the alteration in the tax that year, 1*l.* 14*s.* per annum may be got by such a division.—In like manner. By dividing such a house into two houses, having one family in each, and 15 windows, 3*s.* per annum would have been *lost* before 1766; but now 15*s.* per annum may be *saved* by it.

N. B.—Before 1766, houses having from eight to eleven windows paid 1*s.* per window; and houses having more than eleven windows paid 1*s.* 6*d.* per window, besides 3*s.* for the house.—By the new regulations in 1766; besides the old duty of 3*s.* for every house, all houses

page 4. It must, however, be acknowledged, that in many of our towns, and particularly our manufacturing towns, there has been a great increase of people as well as of houses; but it should be considered, that it has been derived from the depopulation of country parishes and villages, the inhabitants of which, by removing to these towns, and many of them thriving there; and living in better houses, have increased the number of such houses at the expence of meaner houses. This increase of people, therefore, in our towns has either quickened depopulation; or, if not, it must have been owing entirely to the increase of trade. From the accounts of the exports at the Custom-house it appears, that * for some years before

houses having seven windows pay 2*d.* per window. Houses having 8, 9, &c. to 13 windows, pay respectively 6*d.*—8*d.*—10*d.* &c. to 1*s.* 4*d.* per window.—Houses having from 14 to 19 windows pay 1*s.* 6*d.* per window.—Houses having 20, 21, &c. to 24 windows, pay 1*s.* 7*d.*—1*s.* 8*d.* &c. to 1*s.* 11*d.*—Houses having above 24 windows, pay 2*s.* per window.

* See *The Additional Observations on Civil Liberty*, page 113. The annual average of exports for four years ending in 1764, was 15,793,158*l.*—In 1773, the average for nine years had sunk to 14,814,074*l.* But the imports had increased from 10,110,870*l.* to 11,996,769*l.*—The decay

fore 1765 they were at the highest, and that they have since decreased. This decrease, however, has been more than compensated by the increase of our *home-consumption*, occasioned by a vast increase † of luxury; and this, though it has operated fatally among the body of the lower people, has, in one way, contributed to retard the progress of depopulation; I mean, by furnishing an increase of employment, and consequently of the means of subsistence, for our manufacturers and artizans. But though depopulation has been thus checked, yet it has proceeded rapidly; and if we ascribe one half

decay of foreign trade may farther be understood from hence. In 1764, the drawbacks on exportation amounted to 2,264,820*l.*—The average for ten years after 1764 was 1,843,404*l.*—but in 1776 they sunk to 1,544,300*l.*—In 1777, to 932,860*l.*—In 1778, to 868,600*l.*

† The following account will shew how great this increase has been.—The *net annual* amount of all the excise duties for two years, ending 1768, was 4,431,075*l.* For two years, ending in 1773, it was 4,712,265*l.*—For two years, ending in 1777, it was above FIVE MILLIONS, after deducting the new taxes for 1776 and 1777.—The great increase of our importations, while the exportations have decreased, as mentioned in the last note, is another certain proof of the increase of luxury; and has probably been the means of turning the balance of trade against us. See *Additional Observations on Civil Liberty*, p. 116, &c.

of

of the increase in the higher classes of houses to this cause (or a real increase of people) and the other half to luxury, as before explained, we shall, I think, reckon very moderately; and it will appear, that in eighteen years near 200,000 of our common people have been lost.

I will only observe farther, that since the Revolution, most of the causes of depopulation have prevailed so much as to render it an evil which could not but happen. The causes I mean are—the increase of our navy and army, and the constant supply of men necessary to keep them up—a devouring capital, too large for the body that supports it*—the three long and destructive continental wars in which we have been involved—the migrations to our settlements abroad, and particularly to the East and West Indies—the engrossing of farms—the high price of provisions—but above all, the increase of luxury, and of our public taxes and debts.

I have given a particular account of these causes of depopulation in the Supplement to

* PARIS cannot contain so much as a *fiftieth* part of the inhabitants of *France*. LONDON contains a *ninth* of the inhabitants of *England*; and consumes *annually* about 7,000 persons, who remove into it from the country every year, but without increasing it.

the Observations on Reversionary Payments, page 371, third edition.—I will here only observe, that the depopulation they have produced is the more mortifying, because it seems, in some degree, peculiar to this nation.—In FRANCE, (in the principality of *Dombes*, the diocese of *Vaison*, and the six generalities of *Auvergne**, *Lyon*, *Rouen*, *Bourgogne*, *Provence*, and *Alençon*, containing 2152 parishes) the average of annual births before 1764 had increased in 60 years from 54,827 to 59,894, or in the proportion of 100 to 109.—The average for five years of annual births in the whole kingdom of *France*, (as mentioned in the note, page 15) had been 928,918, in 1774, of which 479,649 were males, and 449,269 females.—The average of deaths, as mentioned in the same note, had been 780,040 for three years, ending in 1772. But Mr. MOHEAU has given the average for five years, ending in 1774†; and it was 793,931. The annual

* See *Recherches sur la Population*, printed at Paris in 1766, page 274, and page 19, &c. See also on this subject M. MOHEAU's *Recherches & Considerations sur la Population de la France*, printed at Paris in 1778; where, in page 276, &c. the account of the increase of the generalities of *Auvergne*, *Lyon*, and *Rouen* is continued to 1774.

† MOHEAU's *Recherches*, &c. page 65.—The average of marriages was 192,180.

excess

excess of the births above the deaths was, therefore, 134,987; or near a seventh of the births; and this is probably an excess which in *France* more than counterbalances the destruction occasioned by emigration, war, and the sea-service.

The increase in SWEDEN and the kingdom of NAPLES has been distinctly mentioned in the note just referred to.

In the English colonies in NORTH AMERICA there has for many years been an increase scarcely ever before known among mankind*.

Thus unhappily distinguished are we in this country. Nor will it appear wonder-

* An account of this increase may be found in my Treatise on Reversionary Payments, p. 206, &c. 3d. edit. Another account of it is given in an important tract just published, and entitled, *A Memorial humbly addressed to the Sovereigns of Europe on the Present State of Affairs between the Old and New World*; where the following facts are stated as authentic:

In Massachusetts Bay the inhabitants increased	from 94,000 in 1722, to 300,000 in 1773
In Connecticut	from 129,994 in 1756, to 257,356 in 1774
In New-York	from 96,776 in 1756, to 182,251 in 1774
In Virginia	from 173,316 in 1756, to 300,000 in 1774
In South Carolina	from 64,000 in 1750, to 115,000 in 1770
In Rhode-Island	from 15,302 in 1730, to 28,439 in 1745
In Philadelphia the houses in 1749 were 2076. In 1769 they were 4474.	

ful,

ful, when we consider how unhappily we are distinguished by some of the worst causes of depopulation; and with what particular force they have been operating for the last *twenty* years. At present we are sinking under new incumbrances and difficulties. The most valuable of our dependencies are lost. Another foreign war is begun. Trade is declining; our strength is wasting; and at the same time, that load of debts which has pressed so heavily on our population, is increasing faster than ever.—Never, certainly, were the resources of a state so anticipated and mortgaged*—Never before did imprudence and extravagance bring a great kingdom into such peril.

“ Our

* The terms of the loan for the present year will throw some light on what is here said.—A 3 per cent. stock has been sold at 40 per cent. discount, to which has been annexed an annuity of $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. for 29 years, at ten years purchase, but really worth (when the 3 per cents. are at 40 per cent. discount) $15\frac{1}{10}$ years purchase.—The public, therefore, besides subjecting itself to the necessity of paying at redemption 40*l.* more than it has received for every 100*l.* stock, has given a present premium on the short annuity of near 33 per cent. And even on these terms, (with the profits of a lottery added) only *seven millions* could be got, though above ten millions and a half (including 2,176,000*l.* increase of navy debt in 1778) were wanted for defraying the necessary expences, exclusive of the usual vote of credit for a million.—These deficiencies

“ Our late delusions (says Mr. HUME *)
 “ have much exceeded any thing known in
 “ history, not even excepting those of the
 “ Crusades. For there is no arithmetical
 “ demonstration that the road to the Holy
 “ Land is not the road to Paradise; as there
 “ is, that the endless increase of national
 “ debt is the direct road to national ruin.
 “ —So egregious, indeed, has been our
 “ folly, that we have even lost all title to
 “ compassion under the numberless calami-
 “ ties that are waiting us.”

deficiencies must be made good; and at least *eleven* or *twelve millions* more borrowed at the beginning of the next year, for which, very probably, if the war continues and spreads, a higher interest and still higher premiums must be given.—The national debt is now considerably greater than it was in 1776, when Mr. *Hume* wrote the words quoted in the next page; and it is advancing fast towards *two hundred millions*. It may signify little how a nation, in such circumstances, borrows money; but I am mistaken if I have not (in the *Supplement* to the *Additional Observations on Civil Liberty*) proposed regulations by which the loan of this year might have been procured at an interest of 5 (or, at most, $5\frac{1}{2}$) per cent. and consequently an expence of 100,000*l.* per annum for 29 years saved; which saving, properly applied, might have discharged, in 28 years, either the capital of *five millions* bearing *four* per cent. interest created in 1777, or a larger capital in the *three* per cents.

* See *History of England*, vol. 5th, page 475.

P O S T.

P O S T S C R I P T.

The Favour of a Friend has lately procured for me, from the Tax-Office, the following Particulars in the Returns for 1756 and 1759, mentioned in Page 24.

	In 1756.	In 1759.
Houses charged having less than 10 windows	482,533	475,147
Houses charged having from 10 to 14 windows	105,153	103,610
Houses charged having from 15 to 19 windows	55,457	53,193
Houses charged having 20 windows or more	47,559	47,199
Total	690,702	679,149

This account scarcely needs a comment. A comparison of it with the returns in page 9, &c. for 1761 and 1777, will shew distinctly, that before 1759, houses of all sorts were decreasing; but that afterwards an increase (produced by increased trade

P O S T S C R I P T. 35

and luxury, as explained page 25, &c.) begun among the higher classes of houses, which soon became considerable; but was all along accompanied with a decrease much more considerable in those inferior classes of houses which constitute near four fifths of all the houses in the kingdom.

A P P E N D I X.

IN the preceding Essay I have offered a good deal of evidence to prove that, while other countries are increasing, this country, in consequence of the causes of depopulation which have unhappily distinguished it, has for many years been decreasing. This is a fact so melancholy, that every person who loves this country must wish that the evidence for it could be fairly overthrown. Mr. Eden, in his fifth letter to Lord Carlisle, has made many objections to this evidence; and his means of information, as well as abilities, are such as entitle all that he says to particular attention.

My design in this Appendix is to give a brief account of his arguments; and, with all the respect due to him, to offer my reasons for not being convinced by them.

In p. 10, &c. it has been shewn from the accounts in the tax-office, that between the years 1761 and 1777 the number of houses
in

A P P E N D I X. 37

in the kingdom having less than eight windows had decreased 55,771. This evidence seems to be direct and full, and it is the evidence on which I have laid the principal stress. The objections which Mr. Eden has made to it, are the two following.

First, He observes, that the account in the tax-office of the number of cottages excused on account of poverty are uncertain and defective. To this I have, in page 23, &c. given an answer, which appears to me clear and decisive.

Secondly, He intimates a doubt whether the returns made of even the charged houses can be relied on; and the reason he assigns is the irregularity in the following returns. "The houses, he says, returned as *charged* and *chargeable* in 1750 were 729,048, and in 1756 only 690,702, but in 1759 they were 704,544."* But Mr. Eden has here fallen into an incorrectness of considerable consequence. The number for 1756 consists of the *charged* houses only. Adding, therefore, 25,000 for the *chargeable* or *uninhabited* houses, these three returns (with those for 1761 and 1777) will be as follows:

* See the Fifth Letter to Lord Carlisle, page 65.

Charged and chargeable

houses in	—	—	1750—729,048*
			1756—715,702
			1759—704,053
			1761—704,543
			1777—701,473

There is no irregularity in these returns, which gives them any appearance of incredibility. On the contrary they afford as strong a proof of progressive depopulation as actual surveys can give. The decrease, which appears before 1759, must have been occasioned in part by the shocking havock, which had been made for many years among the lower people by the use of spirituous liquors, and the progress of which has been stated in the note, p. 20. After this year the number of the best sort of charged houses began to increase; but at the same time the houses excused, or paying only the 3s. duty, went on to decrease so fast as to over-balance that increase. The chief reason of this increase I have, in page 26, stated to be

* In the Tax-office accounts this is called, “the total number of houses in the respective counties, chargeable with the duties on houses and windows.” And the number for 1756 is called, “the number of houses in England, &c. charged with the duties, &c.”

luxury;

luxury*; and of this we have a distinct proof in the returns for London, where, though the increase of new buildings has been so great as to overbalance a decrease of 5,762 in the houses excused, yet the number of inhabitants, if we may judge from the bills of mortality, has diminished. But of this more will be said presently.

The decrease of cottages has for many years been an object of general observation. It is an effect which could not but arise from the inclosing of common fields, the engrossing of farms, the high price of provisions, the raising of rents, and that inequality in the division of property, which has lately prevailed among us more than ever.

I will just mention here the following facts.

In 1689 the houses in the kingdom called cottages, and having only *one* hearth, and which, therefore, I suppose, answer to the houses now denominated cottages, were — — † 554,631
The houses denominated cottages in 1777, were — — ‡ 251,261

* Promoted and accelerated by an influx of *wealth*, during this period, from the EAST-INDIES.

† See Dr. Davenant's works, Vol. II. p. 203.

‡ See p. 10.

In

In 1686 the whole expence of maintaining the poor was— *665,362*l.*
 In 1778 this expence (exclusive of 137,656*l.* for county rates, &c.) amounted to — †1,556,804*l.*
 In 1777 no less than 7,360 houses, which had been brought into charge, were discharged by appeal on account of poverty.

These facts seem to me to indicate a growing distress among the lower people, which did not take place formerly. They also lead us to carry our views as high as the *Revolution* for the commencement of depopulation among us. In the preceding Essay I have given a particular account of the evidence which has determined me to believe this to be the truth; and it is against this evidence that Mr. Eden has chiefly directed his objections.

First. He is unwilling to allow Dr. Davenant's authority in this instance; and in opposition to it observes, that Dr. Halley (whose authority, he says, is at least equal to Dr. Davenant's) estimated the number of houses in 1691 to be 1,175,951. Mr. Eden

* See Dr. Davenant's works, Vol. I. p. 39.

† See abstract of the returns made by the overseers of the poor, in pursuance of an act passed in the 16th year of his present majesty's reign.

may, perhaps, have good reasons for ascribing this estimate to Dr. Halley; but I wish he had said what they are. All I can find is, that it is given in a collection on *Trade and Husbandry* published by Mr. Houghton, in weekly numbers, in 1693*. But it is not said from what authority it was taken, nor in what year it was made; and it is given among other accounts, most of which are too vague and conjectural. Till, therefore, I am better informed, I must think that it deserves no particular regard. And as to Dr. Davenant, it is proper to observe, that on such a subject as this there can scarcely be an equal authority; that his account is derived from materials which might have

* See Houghton's *Husbandry and Trade improved*, Vol. I. N^o. 26, for Saturday, Feb. 3, 1693. — In N^o. 24, Mr. Houghton has mentioned an assistance which he had received from Dr. Halley, and published a letter from him written ten years before, containing an account of a method of computing, within a million or two, the number of acres in all England. But Mr. Houghton has said nothing that implies he had received his account of the number of houses in England from Dr. Halley.—Dr. Davenant's account from the hearth-books was published three years afterwards, in his *Treatise on Ways and Means*, and is frequently referred to in some of his subsequent treatises; but he never takes notice of Mr. Houghton's account, which, therefore, I suppose, was not much regarded.

furnished him with the particular information which he gives on this subject; and that in the writings which followed that in which he gives this account (and particularly in his Observations on the People of England, published in 1699) he frequently refers to it, and reasons upon it, as an information of importance in political arithmetic, about which there was no reason to doubt*.

Secondly. It is farther objected by Mr. Eden, that Dr. Davenant meant to give the number of *families*, and not of *houses*. I have already in the note, page 18, taken notice of this objection. He that will consider the table in page 6 †, must see that in most places

* "The wealth of a whole people is a great matter to consider; but in time it may be compassed, especially when there is such a footing to fix our reasonings upon, as is the *certain* knowledge of the numbers of the people, which it is hoped some abler head will hereafter so improve as to make all points, relating to the strength and power of England, much clearer than they seem at present." Davenant's works, Vol. I. page 373.—Of the hearth money, he says, in page 136, "that it had given a view certain enough of the number of families in the kingdom, which was the very ground-work in political speculations."—And that "the accounts of it were fairly kept and stated, and had been under exact management."

† The numbers in this table are given from actual surveys. It cannot therefore be proper to call them, as Mr. Eden

places there is very little difference between the number of *houses* and *families*; and, consequently, that, supposing Dr. Davenant to mean families, their number now in the kingdom must be far short of their number at the Revolution. But Dr. Davenant, at the head of the table which contains the particulars of this account †, calls it the number of *houses*. In reasoning upon it afterwards he generally does the same; and in his ‡ account of Mr. King's observations (which

Eden does, *estimates*, and to represent them as uncertain? Mr. Eden objects farther to this table, that due attention has not been given in it to the numbers in schools, docks, hospitals, and prisons.

This remark is wrong as far as it respects *schools*. As for *prisons*, *hospitals*, and *docks*, the numbers in them are little or nothing to the whole kingdom. In 1779 the number of persons confined in prisons and houses of correction, including all debtors, felons, and petty offenders, was 4,375, according to an accurate account, which the public owes to the unexampled benevolence of Mr. Howard. See the State of the Gaols, page 449. 8vo. edit.

† See his works, Vol. I. page 29.

‡ Mr. Eden quotes the following passage to prove that Dr. Davenant meant *families* and not *houses*. "Though it appears from the books of hearth-money, that there are not above 1,300,000 *families* in England; and, allowing six persons to a *house*, one with another, which is the common way of computing, not quite eight millions of people; and though (as likewise appears from the hearth-books) there are 500,000 poor fami-

(which he represents as more to be relied on than any thing that had been done in political arithmetic, and which appear indeed to have been the result of particular enquiry united to great sagacity) he makes the number of families to be 1.349,586; the number of persons to a family $4\frac{1}{3}$, and the number of people in the kingdom 5.500,000.—The truth is, that Dr. Davenant considered the number of houses and families as so nearly the same, that he did not think it ne-

“ lies in the nation, living in cottages, who contribute little to the common support, yet, &c.” Dr. Davenant’s Essay on Ways and Means, published in 1695. (See his works, vol. I. p. 27.) It is evident that he makes use in this passage of round numbers without aiming at accuracy, or chusing to distinguish between houses and families. But afterwards, in the same tract, page 53, he speaks with more precision, and in a manner that demonstrates he meant *houses* and not *families*. “ If,” says he, “ 111,215 houses in and about London, with no more ground than what they stand upon, are in rent one million and a half *per annum*, it is hardly possible but that the 1.208,000 houses in the country, with all the land about them, and all the benefits that attend land, must be in rent 13,500,000l.”—Dr. Davenant’s allowance of six to a family deserves no regard, for it is certainly wrong; and he was himself afterwards (as observed above) better instructed by Mr. King’s Observations, published in 1699 in an Essay on the probable method of making a people gainers by the balance of trade. See his Works, Vol. II. page 185, &c.

cessary to be careful in distinguishing between them.

I have in page 18, &c. as a collateral evidence in this question, given an account of the decrease in the produce of the temporary and hereditary excise upon beer since the Revolution.—Mr. Eden objects to this,

First, That there was an alteration of the measure at the Revolution which diminished the produce of this excise, and also that a duty on coffee had formed a part of it which was then taken off. The alteration in the measure is mentioned by Dr. Davenant (see his Works, Vol. I. page 185, &c.) and its effect in diminishing the excise estimated at 20,000*l. per annum*. As for the duty on coffee, it was only 4*d.* a gallon*, and therefore so trifling as not to deserve notice. Neither of these causes therefore can account for the decrease stated in page 19th, and their effect has been counterbalanced by an exorbitant deduction of 70,000*l.* which I have made from the produce of this excise at the Revolution, on account of its including then a duty on low wines and spirits, which was taken from it in 1736. The average of the gross annual produce of this excise for

* This duty is now three shillings per pound, and produces about 30,000*l. per annum*.

46 APPENDIX.

three years ending in 1689 was 740,147*l.* of which the excise on beer alone produced 679,590*l.* *. The difference is 60,550*l.* and consisted not only of duties on low wines and spirits, but also on mead, cyder, perry, chocolate, sherbet, and beer and cyder imported. Had, therefore, a deduction of only 40,000*l.* been made, I should probably have exceeded the truth, and the decrease would have appeared 30,000*l.* more than I have made it.

Mr. Eden has objected farther, that though the conclusion I have drawn is countenanced by a comparison of the produce of this excise at present with its produce at the Revolution, yet a different conclusion may be drawn by comparing it with the produce of the same excise at several periods since the Revolution. This is Mr. Eden's principal argument, and the following table will represent it in its greatest force †.

* See Davenant's Works, Vol. I. page 175.

† It must be remembered here, that this table gives the GROSS ANNUAL PRODUCE of the hereditary and temporary excise, with a deduction from it (on account of the duties on low wines and spirits) of 40,000*l.* till 1710; of 50,000*l.* for the two years ending at 1719; and of 70,000*l.* for the two years ending at 1736.

Three

APPENDIX. 47

	£.
Three years ending at 1689	— 700,147
Two years ending at — 1695	— 438,573
	* 1699 — 381,886
	1703 — 473,799
	1710 — 449,666
	1719 — 509,370
	1736 — 515,400
	† 1746 — 495,749
	1753 — 527,091
	1761 — 575,280
For four years ending at 1768	— 527,991
	1774 — 520,613
	1778 — 554,460

It may be observed in this account, that during King William's wars the produce of this excise sunk greatly, that it rose at the subsequent peace, that it sunk again a little during Queen Ann's wars, and that ever since it has been rising except about the time when gin-drinking was most prevalent, but

* I have taken the whole of this account from the Excise books, except the average for the four years ending in 1774 and 1778, which I have copied from Mr. Eden's fifth letter, page 67.

† The fall in 1745 and 1746 might also be owing to the shock given the nation by the rebellion in those years. This was a shock that was very near proving fatal to public credit

but that it has always kept far below what it was at the Revolution.

The quantity of *beer* brewed for sale at these different periods, and the number of *victuallers* in the kingdom, correspond in a great measure to this account. The remarkable excess in all these instances, which took place at the Revolution, when joined to the evidence arising from Dr. *Davenant's* account of the number of *houses* or *families*, appeared to me to afford a very striking proof

credit. In order, at the beginning of 1746, to raise two millions on the land-tax, subscriptions (as had been usually practised in preceding years) had been opened in the city. But only half a million could be procured. In this distress the BANK was applied to, but such was the alarm which had taken place, that it could then scarcely support its own credit. In order, therefore, to enable it to lend a million to government, this sum in *Exchequer-bills* was converted into *Bank-stock*, and a call of 10 per cent. made on the proprietors as the payment for so much stock at *par*, one half to be paid in two months, and the *Lady-day* dividend to be reckoned a part of payment. But even on these advantageous terms the payments could not be easily made, and it became necessary to allow the proprietors farther time. In April the rebellion was crushed, and soon afterwards the panic occasioned by it ceased entirely and credit recovered its former vigour. The three per cents. in particular, which when the rebels were at *Derby* had been as low as 60, rose before August to 89, and continued between this price and 82 during the whole remainder of the war.

of

of an excess likewise of populousness at that period. Nor did I think it necessary to take notice of the sudden fall exhibited in the preceding table, because I thought there were such particular and obvious reasons for it, as rendered it a circumstance not necessary to be mentioned in this enquiry.— Since, however, Mr. Eden has laid great stress upon it, and even intimated that it affords an argument for an increased population, it is necessary I should enter into an explanation of it.

Every one knows, that the productiveness of taxes depends chiefly on the quantity of money in a kingdom. A smaller number of people will be able to pay more in taxes than a greater number, if they are better supplied with a circulating medium. During King William's wars, the trade of the kingdom sunk; all the public securities, which should have circulated as money, lost their credit; and the greatest part of the current coin was either miserably clipped, or sent away to pay armies and subsidies in foreign countries. In 1694 the Bank was established; but for several years continued so weak, as to be incapable of giving the public much assistance by supplying it with a substitute for coin.—In these circumstances it was impossible that the people should

should be able to make their usual payments. The taxes, therefore, fell near one half; and government became distressed to a degree of which we have now no conception*.

In the subsequent peace trade revived, and began to bring in silver and gold. Those public securities which had been a dead stock, recovered activity, and the taxes of course became less deficient.—But the war in Queen Ann's time soon renewed the former distresses, and the taxes again sunk.

From the Accession to 1764 trade increased fast, and brought in a large favourable balance.

* Tallies and malt-tickets were in 1696 discounted at several rates from 25 to 50 per cent.—In 1694 and 1695 the annual import of brandy, which had been 1,713,974 gallons, was only 54,081.—The whole revenue, which in 1689 had been 2,001,855*l.* was in 1693 only 1,570,318*l.* though new duties had been added which produced 466,203*l.* See Dr. Davenant's Works, Vol. I. p. 20.

The Bank Account (as delivered to the House of Commons on Dec. 4, 1696) stood as follows:

DEBTOR to sundry persons for sealed bills standing out	—	—	£.	s.
			893,800	
For notes for running cash	—	—	764,196	: 10
To money borrowed in <i>Holland</i>	—	—	300,000	
To interest due on Bank-bills standing out	—	—	17,876	
Balance	—	—	125,315	: 2
			2,101,187	: 12
			CREDITOR	

lance. Public credit acquired vigour, and foreigners threw in great sums into our funds. The BANK at the same time increased its emissions; and so powerfully did it co-operate with an increasing trade and flourishing credit, that in the two last wars, notwithstanding the treasure they carried out and the additional taxes they occasioned, none of that distress took place (except for a few months at the end of 1745, and the beginning of 1746), which had been felt in the two former wars.

Since 1764 there is reason to apprehend that an unhappy change has taken place, and that the balance of payment between us and the rest of the world has been turned against us, by the increase of luxury, our quarrels with

CREDITOR by tallies on several parliamentary securities	—	—	£.	s.
			1,784,576	: 16
By half a year's deficiency of the fund of 100,000 <i>l.</i>	—	—	50,000	
By cash, pawns, mortgages, &c.	—	—	266,610	: 16
			2,101,187	: 12

In Queen Ann's war the Bank had got out of this state of infancy; but still it was so far from being very strong, that the apprehension of an attempt to invade *Scotland* in 1708, produced a run upon it that might have ruined it, had not Lord Godolphin, the Duke of Marlborough, and other great men, offered considerable sums to support it; and had not also the Directors increased the interest of their sealed bills from 3 to 6 per cent. and made a call upon the proprietors of 20 per cent.

H the

the Colonies, and the payments due to foreigners from our funds. But the increase of our paper circulation has concealed this change, and counteracted its effects; and now so abundantly are we supplied from this source, that we find ourselves able to sustain a load of taxes, which at the beginning of this century would have at once overwhelmed us*.—Still, however, and though much better supplied than ever with the means of paying taxes, we find that the hereditary and temporary excise produces near a *quarter* less than it did before the Revolution.—Others may think as they please; but I cannot see that this is fairly to be accounted for on any other supposition than that the common people, who chiefly pay this tax, are diminished in number.

Mr. Eden, as a farther objection to this evidence, chuses to compare the present produce of this tax, not with its average produce for *three* years, but for *fifteen* years

* This account has been given more at large in the *Additional Observations on Civil Liberty*, Part III. Sect. I. p. 113, &c. It is natural to infer from it, the usefulness of banks of circulation; and they are, without doubt, attended with great temporary conveniences; but they give a complexion rather florid than healthy; and, by subjecting a kingdom (as Dr. Davenant speaks) to *apoplectic* disorders, may prove in the end the greatest of evils.

before the Revolution; and from this comparison it appears that there is no considerable difference, the former average having been 554,000*l.* and the latter 520,000*l.*—But nothing can be justly inferred from such a comparison. The kingdom, in consequence of recovering tranquility after the distractions of the civil war, made a quick progress in all kinds of improvement. Between the *Restoration* and *Revolution*, an addition of 70,000 was made to the number of smaller houses in the kingdom. Ten millions and a half in bullion (an overflowing produced by foreign trade) was carried to the mint to be coined, and the current specie increased to eighteen millions and a half*.—These, and several other par-

* “As to plate, it may be safely affirmed, that there was more wrought for use in families from 1666 to 1688, than had been fabricated for 200 years before.—As to inhabitants, such as are versed in political arithmetic have sufficient grounds to believe that the people of England were about 300,000 more in 1688, than they were in 1665, notwithstanding the last great plague.—As to the common people, there is no country in the world where the inferior rank of men were better clothed and fed, and more at their ease.—As to buildings, during that time, not only many stately edifices have been erected, but farm-houses have been kept up; and besides, from the books of hearth-money, and for other reasons, it appears, that of smaller tenements from 1666 to 1688, there have
H 2 “ been

particulars of the same kind, are stated by Dr. Davenant, in his discourses on the revenue and trade of the kingdom, published in 1698.—With respect to this tax in particular, he shews that its produce, during this period, had been always on the increase; partly in consequence of an increase of people and of money; and partly in consequence of improvements in the methods of collecting it. When it was granted to Charles the II. as a compensation for the profits of the court of wards and tenures by knight-service, it was not understood; and the people, being then not ha-

“been about 70,000 new foundations laid, &c. &c.” Davenant’s Works, Vol. I. p. 370, &c. In p. 374, &c. this author computes that the stock of the kingdom was more than half doubled between 1666 and 1688. “Not long ago, he says, (referring to King William’s war) we must have been impotent for the war, but that it has been all the while and is still supported by a stock formerly gathered, and not yet exhausted.”—How far he thought this stock diminished by Queen Ann’s war, appears from the following words in a report he made in 1711 to the commissioners for stating the public accounts:—“It is plain to all who are not resolved to shut their eyes, that we have nine millions less in coin than we had in 1688.” Davenant’s Works, Vol. V. p. 451. This must have soon crippled the kingdom, had it depended entirely on its coin; but the BANK had then acquired some strength; and trade also, notwithstanding the war, was on the increase.

bituated

bituated to taxes, paid it reluctantly. At first it was farmed, and a considerable part lost by improper management. But for some years before the Revolution, the kingdom had been reconciled to it, and the collection of it had been brought under more strict and regular management.—Dr. Davenant shews, that this likewise was the case with the tax upon hearths. When first granted to King Charles the II. it produced no more than 100,000*l. per ann.*; but it grew from time to time, till at the Revolution it came to yield net 240,000*l. per ann.**—In such instances, and, in general, in all cases where an increase or decrease takes place, it is evidently improper to argue from any averages for long terms.

I have observed in the preceding essay, that there is reason to believe, that even LONDON was more populous at the Revolution, than it is now. The number of houses in the bills of mortality, as given from the hearth-books by Sir William Petty in 1687; and in *London, Middlesex, and Westminster*, as given by Dr. Davenant in 1690; compared with the accounts now kept by the surveyors of the house duties, gives a direct and posi-

* See Dr. Davenant’s works, Vol. I. p. 209.

tive

tive proof of this *. And it is confirmed by a comparison of the annual average of burials within the bills of mortality, for *five* years before the Revolution, with the average for the same number of years at present. See the Note, p. 5.—Mr. Eden has objected only to the last of these arguments; and, in order to overthrow it, he compares the annual average of burials for *fifteen* years before the Revolution (which was 21,657), with the annual average for *seventeen* years ending in 1778, which was 22,763.—Here a remark just made must be repeated. This is one of the cases in which averages for long terms prove nothing. LONDON, after

* “The number of houses in London appears by the register to be 105,315; whereunto adding $\frac{1}{8}$ part, or 10,531 as the least number of double families that can be supposed in London, the total of families will be 115,846.” *Essays on Political Arithmetic* by Sir William Petty, published in 1687, p. 74.—“By certificate from the hearth-office, I find the houses *within the bills of mortality* to be 105,315.” *Ibid*, p. 79.—This agrees with Dr. *Davenant*, who from the same hearth-office gives 111,215 as the number of houses in *London, Westminster, and Middlesex*, on Lady-day, 1690. See his *Works*, Vol. I. p. 39.—Mr. Maitland tells us, that he took, with incredible pains, the number of houses in London in 1737, and found them to be 95,968. He also then took an account of the omissions in the burials, which he found to be 3,038, including the burials in *Marybone* and *Pancras* parishes. See his *History of London*, Vol. II. p. 744.

the

the fire in 1666, rose from its ruins with great improvements, and increased very fast; and, at the beginning of the period for which Mr. Eden's average is taken, two of the principal parishes in Westminster, namely, *St. James* and *St. Anne*, were not included in the bills.—On the contrary, during the second period, LONDON appears to have been decreasing. For five years, at the beginning of it, or from 1762 to 1766, the annual average of burials was 25,084. For the five years ending in 1772, it was 22,950; and for five years ending in 1778, it was 20,835.—It is, therefore, only the average at the end of these two periods, that furnishes any evidence in the present question.

It is again objected, that *Pancras* and *Marybone*, two of the most populous parishes in London, are not included in the bills.—In answer to this, it is enough to say, that there were at the Revolution twelve * other parishes omitted; and that

* These parishes were *St. John Wapping*, added to the bills in 1698.—*St. Mary le Strand*, added in 1726.—*St. George Hanover-Square*, *Christ Church Spitalfields*, *St. George Ratcliffe-Highway*, and *St. George the Martyr*, added in 1729.—*St. Ann, Limehouse*, in 1730.—*St. George, Bloomsbury*, and *St. John, Westminster*, in 1731.—*St. John, Southwark*, and *St. Luke, Old-Street*, in 1733.—*St. Matthew, Bethnal-Green*, in 1746.

these

these omissions, together with the omissions of the burials among Dissenters, must, probably, have occasioned *then* much greater deficiencies in the bills than exist *now*. In these twelve parishes there were buried, in the years immediately succeeding those in which they were taken into the bills, 5000 annually. In *Pancras* and *Marybone*, the annual burials for ten years, ending in 1772, were 1041. See *Treatise on Reversionary Payments*, p. 204, 3d Edit.—It is, therefore, of little consequence in the present enquiry, that these two parishes are out of the bills. The increase of buildings has, by no means, been confined to *them*. It has extended itself to most of the principal parishes *within* the bills; and yet the number of burials is considerably lower than it was when this increase began. The increase, therefore, has been merely an increase of buildings, arising from luxury; and this has been distinctly exhibited to us in that part of London which lies within the walls, where, though the number of houses cannot be much less, the burials have sunk gradually from 3139 (the annual medium at the Revolution) to 1428, the annual medium for five years ending in 1779.

It has been farther observed, that London is healthier now than it was. See fifth Letter to Lord Carlisle, p. 61. This probably

bably may have had some effect in diminishing the burials; but it could not produce a diminution of any consequence, compared with that which has taken place. London is not now, in this respect, very different from what it was seventeen years ago; and yet, even within this period, the burials have fallen near a fifth. The rate of mortality, or the value of lives in London, (that is, its healthiness) is determined with precision, by tables of observation formed from the proportions of the numbers dying at all ages. See *Observations on Reversionary Payments*, Chap. III. Essay IV.—But these tables, whether they are formed from the bills as they are *at present*, or as they were *fifty years ago*, will give the values of lives nearly the same; but yet very different from the values of lives determined, in the same method, from registers of mortality in small towns, and country parishes and villages. The truth seems to be, that though London must be healthier now, than it was when the inhabitants were more crowded together; yet the principal causes which shorten life in great towns, (namely, the irregular modes of living and the foulness of the air) having continued much the same, the law according to which life wastes, and the values

60 A P P E N D I X.

of lives in London, have not sensibly varied.

It is also objected, that the bills are very erroneous—but the observation just made, demonstrates that they are not erroneous in the degree which is often supposed. Were they so, the values of lives deduced from them would be continually varying, which is not the case. They are, indeed, defective; but in consequence of a great decrease of Dissenters, they are less so than they used to be.

The fluctuation of London from the RESTORATION to the present time, may, in some measure, be collected from the following table:

Annual medium of burials for five years ending in 1664, when, besides other omissions, 17 parishes, including <i>Marybone</i> and <i>Pancras</i> , were omitted in the bills	— — —	17,019
Annual medium for 5 years ending at 1689, 14 parishes omitted		22,742
Annual medium for 5 years ending at 1698, or at the conclusion of King William's war, 13 parishes omitted	— — —	20,487
		Annual

A P P E N D I X. 61

Annual medium for 5 years, ending		
	in 1715—	22,177
	* in 1725—	26,512
Three parishes omitted in 1739—		26,039
Marybone and Pancras only omitted	—	
	in 1748—	23,884
	in 1760—	19,839
	in 1765—	23,992
	in 1770—	22,688
	in 1777—	21,087
	in 1779—	20,743
	I have	

* With this table, let the following account of the quantity of coals imported to London be compared.

	Chaldrons.
Annual medium for 3 years, ending in 1715—	382,629
	in 1725—
	460,138
	in 1739—
	469,786
	in 1748—
	476,902
	in 1760—
	500,343
	in 1765—
	584,856
	in 1770—
	621,477
	in 1777—
	683,457
	Single year 1778—
	637,744

It appears, from hence, that between 1760 and 1777, the consumption of coals in London increased so fast, as at last to exceed the consumption *fifty years* ago near one half, though the burials were then near 6000 *per ann.* more than they have been lately. It is remarkable, that this great increase in the consumption of coals, happened at the very period when from other evidence (the increase of buildings, increased produce of the taxes, &c.) it appears, that luxury became particularly prevalent in the

I have chosen to bring these particulars to view, because they may help to illustrate some of the preceding observations. Were we to judge from the splendid shew which the new buildings round London make, we could not avoid believing, that there never was a time when it was so populous. But splendour and refinement have never favoured population. The state in which mankind increase most, is that in which they lead simple lives, are most on an equality, and least acquainted with artificial wants. Luxury in Society renders it a rank soil, which favours the growth only of noxious plants and weeds.—In p. 29, I have mentioned this, among the other causes, which have produced the destruction which has

the nation.—The late improvements in agriculture, the cultivation of barren wastes, &c. have been mentioned to prove that our population has increased; but this is the same kind of argument with the increase of buildings and of the consumption of coals in London, for the increase of London.

It may deserve to be further mentioned here, that the increase of coaches has kept pace with the increase of the consumption of coals in London; for the annual medium of the duty of 1*l.* per wheel on carriages, for two years ending 1750, was 56,091*l.*—In 1761, the same medium was 62,513*l.*—In 1768, it was increased to 75,132*l.*—And in 1778, to 94,002*l.*

taken

taken place among our people. But Mr. Eden seems to think, that none of these causes have any great effect; and, if he is right, a country may be growing populous, in which they all operate to a degree scarcely ever before known in any country. It would be to little purpose to enter into a discussion of this subject. I will, therefore, only observe, that due attention has never been given to one of the causes I have mentioned; I mean, the very disproportionate size of our capital. Towns in general, and great towns in particular, do more towards obstructing the increase of mankind, than all plagues, famines, and wars; and they have been generally largest in the declining periods of states. I have often thought, with pity and surprise, of the zeal with which Sir William Petty, and after him Mr. Maitland, contended in opposition to some French writers for the superiority of London to Paris, or any other city in the world. They did not consider, that they were only maintaining that England had a greater evil in it than any other kingdom.

In offering these remarks, I have no other intention, than to contribute the little in my power to inform the nation of its true state.

state. I think this, in the present instance, of particular importance; for if, indeed, there has been such a progressive decrease in the numbers of our people as the facts on which I have insisted seem to prove, the worst internal evils are operating among us; and all possible means ought to be employed to remove them.

I hope I shall not do wrong, if, with views of the same kind, I take this opportunity to mention a few more particulars, in which my ideas of our situation differ from Mr. Eden's.

He is unwilling to allow that we have any one mark of decay upon us. The *loss of trade*, and *diminished resources*, as well as a *decrease of population*, he enumerates among *the chimeras which haunt the joyless imaginations of some speculative men among us*. — I shall think it strange if, after perusing the foregoing remarks, any one can think this a censure justly applicable to those who think our population has declined. That our trade also has declined, can scarcely be doubted, by those who will recollect, that we have lost the *Mediterranean*, the *African*, the *Spanish*, a considerable part of the *Irish*, and, above all, the *North American* trade.

I must

I must add, that the *Newfoundland* fishery in particular (our great nursery of seamen, and the very trade which we have endeavoured to extend by destroying the *New-England* fishery) is so much diminished, as to be in the way to total and irreparable ruin.

Mr. Eden's chief argument for the prosperous state of our trade, is taken from the productiveness of the Customs for the last year. The truth is, that the annual payments into the Exchequer from the Customs, which, for five years before 1776, were 2,521,768*l.* had fallen in 1776 to 2,460,402*l.* in 1777 to 2,199,105*l.* and in 1778 to 2,131,458*l.*; but that, in 1779, they had risen to 2,502,273*l.* The causes of the advance in the last year were, the addition of 5 per cent. to all the customs, a new tax upon wines in 1778, an extraordinary importation of Portugal wines in 1779, and particularly, the captures of our privateers, and the importation from the northern countries of naval stores, which, when imported from the colonies, *lessened* the revenue by *bounties*, but now *increase* it by the payment of high duties. The last of these causes, though it helps the revenue, has plainly the most pernicious operation; and, in general, it may be observed, that the customs being drawn from our importations, their most flourish-

flourishing state is consistent with a state of public affairs the most threatening.—During the last peace, the annual produce of the customs increased near *half a million*; but this increase has been the effect of a most unfavourable change in the state of our trade; a change, which, since the commencement of our disputes with the colonies, has been growing every year more and more conspicuous and alarming. To speak more plainly; while luxury has been keeping up our importations, and increasing the revenue, our exportations have been decreasing to such a degree, as to make our trade an evil, which supplies artificial wants, and feeds vice and extravagance at the expence of the treasure and strength of the kingdom. A proper attention to the following table will illustrate and prove these assertions.

Annual average of	Imports.	Exports.	Excess.
in 1738 and 1739	7.634,166	10.892,430	3.258,264
1747 and 1748	7.626,582	11.896,741	4.270,159
1756 and 1757	8.607,460	12.977,962	4.370,502
1761 and 1762	9.207,069	15.250,000	6.043,000
1770 and 1771	12.519,466	15.713,899	3.194,434
1774 and 1775	13.412,030	15.559,350	2.147,320
1776	11.696,754	13.729,731	2.032,977
1777	11.841,577	12.653,363	0.811,786

Of the imports and exports in 1778 and 1779, I know no more than what Mr. Eden has told the public, “ that in January last
“ the

“ the accounts of them were not adjusted;
“ but that there was good reason to believe
“ that their average might be safely esti-
“ mated by the account for 1777.” Fifth Letter to Lord Carlisle, p. 25. *

There are several melancholy truths which must force themselves on the reflection of those, who will compare the latter part of this table with the former part; but my present views allow me only to point out the demonstration it affords of the deplorable effects of this war. It appears, that both our exportations and importations have been diminished; but the former so much more than the latter, as to produce a *certainty* that we are now carrying on a losing trade. It is universally known, that the Custom-House entries give the importations *less*, and the exportations *greater*, than they are. The single article of smuggled tea (amounting, according to the estimate mentioned by Mr. Eden †, to a million *per annum*) when added to the imports, will

* Since the former edition of this tract, I have learnt that the *imports* for 1778 were 10.086,536*l.*; and the *exports* 11.507,525*l.*—The latter, in 1774, were 15.916,343*l.*; and the average for four years ending in 1774 was *sixteen millions*. The exports, therefore, have decreased *four millions and a half*. An account of this decrease in some of the chief branches of our trade will be given at the end of the *Appendix*.

† Fifth Letter to Lord Carlisle, p. 36.

K

make

make them almost equal to the exports. How greatly then would they exceed the exports, were all other smuggled articles added?— Nothing can be more pernicious, than such a state of trade to a kingdom which has such a debt to support as we have, and a tribute of about a million and a half *per annum* to pay to foreigners.—What renders this a consideration yet more mortifying is, that it appears from the preceding table, that during the wars which begun in 1740 and 1755, our trade went on uniformly increasing; and that at the end of the last war in particular, it was risen to its highest pitch, and must have brought in a very large favourable balance, which contributed to replace the treasure carried out, kept money at a moderate interest, and enabled government to prosecute the war with vigour, and to finish it with dignity and honour. The reverse, in every respect, is true of the *present* war. It appears, that the first approaches of it have operated on our trade like the grasp of death; and that now, instead of bringing *in*, as our trade used to do, a constant supply of treasure in return for our manufactures, it is continually carrying *out* our treasure, and uniting with the demands of foreigners from our funds, and the expence of

of armies in distant countries, in draining and impoverishing us*.

It will be asked, how it comes to pass, that a state of affairs so detrimental, is not more felt in a diminution of the revenue; in an unfavourable course of foreign exchanges; and in a scarcity of cash, attended with difficulties in raising money by public loans?—The answer to this enquiry is obvious. Distress has not yet forced us to any great retrenchment of luxury; and the exertions of the war, the profits of contracts, and the successes of our cruizers, have enriched many individuals, and occasioned an extraordinary expenditure, which has kept up the revenue. Remittances of balances due to our merchants withdrawing from trade; the sale of French sugars, and other prize goods abroad; and the subscriptions of foreigners to our loans, have prevented the course of exchange from becoming unfavourable. The high interest given by government for money, draws all that can be collected of it from trade, and land and private securities. But above all;

* Mr. Eden, in his Fifth Letter to Lord Carlisle, p. 24. has acknowledged, that our export trade has suffered a great diminution; and he seems to think this an effect which could not but arise from the present war. But why, in our two former wars, did just the contrary effect take place?

our paper credit supplying us with the most* convenient kind of money, we can spare our coin, which is now become an incumbrance generally avoided, and of use only to make up odd fums, and to carry on small traffic.

But to proceed to some observations of a different nature.

The last war was attended with an expence which far outwent the experience of all former wars; but it produced an increase of commerce and of territory, which raised the kingdom to a situation of dignity and eminence which astonished and alarmed *Europe*. The effect of the present war on the dignity of the kingdom, and the extent of its territories, I leave to the sorrowful reflexion of the reader. My present purpose is only to contrast, in a few particulars, the *expence* of it with the expence of the last war.

At the end of 1762 (the last and most expensive year of the last war) the navy-debt, including transport service, was 5.929,124*l.* and the increase of it within the year, 2.157,148*l.*—At the end of 1779,

* In the course of the year, from Lady-day 1780 to Lady-day 1781, TWENTY-FIVE MILLIONS AND A HALF, consisting of the loan, the taxes, the lottery, and the vote of credit, will be paid into the *Exchequer*. This, though a sum which, *in coin*, did it exist in the nation, could be conveyed to the *Exchequer* only in carts, will be taken thither in pocket-books.

the

the navy-debt was 8.357,877. The increase of it within the year was 3,178,877; and its increase in the present year (1780) will not probably be much less than three millions and a half*.

In 1762 the extraordinaries of the army amounted to 3.080,000*l.*—In 1779, they amounted to 3.418,000*l.* †

In 1762, the public borrowed TWELVE MILLIONS at an interest of FOUR AND A HALF *per cent.* ‡.—In the present year the public has borrowed TWELVE MILLIONS, but at an interest of SIX *per cent.*

The whole expence, ordinary and extraordinary, of 1762, was TWENTY MILLIONS

* See Note A at the end.

† These extraordinaries, from Christmas 1761, to Feb. 19, 1763, that is, for a year and 55 days, were 3.540,005*l.* including the vote of credit. Deduct 460,000*l.* for 55 days, and the remainder, or 3.080,000*l.* will be the extraordinaries for 1762. See Public Accounts of Services and Grants, by Sir CHARLES WHITWORTH, p. 68.

A million was granted in 1762 (and also in the preceding year) towards paying for bread, forage, &c. for the combined army under Prince FERDINAND. But this, if I am not mistaken, was a grant or allowance for a service to be performed in the year in which the grant was made and provided for in the supplies of that year. It cannot, therefore, be reckoned an *extraordinary*, which is an exceeding of grants for specific services; or a debt contracted without the consent of parliament, and provided for in the supplies of some subsequent year.

‡ See Note B.

AND

AND A HALF *.—The whole expence of this year, exclusive of the interest of the public debts, will be TWENTY-THREE MILLIONS AND A HALF.

The unfunded debt at the end of the last war was FIFTEEN MILLIONS AND A HALF †.—The unfunded debt at Christmas next will be TWENTY-ONE MILLIONS AND A HALF.

The last war increased the national debt near SEVENTY-ONE MILLIONS AND A HALF ‡.—The present war has already made a further addition to it of SIXTY-FOUR MILLIONS; and at Christmas next will make it up nearly to a HUNDRED AND NINETY-SIX MILLIONS.

It should be remembered, that this war is but *beginning*; that it will probably last for *years*, as Mr. Eden intimates; and that the more years it continues, the greater the expence of every year will become. To what then is the expence of it likely to grow; and HOW LONG SHALL WE BE ABLE TO BEAR IT?—This very dark prospect will be

* See Note C. In these sums is included the deficiencies of the new taxes, and of the land and malt-tax, which, in 1762, amounted to 393,567*l.*; but in 1779 to near a million.

† See Note D.

‡ See Additional Observations on Civil Liberty, Part III. Sect. II. p. 147. See also Note E.

rendered

rendered darker, if we consider how much we were loaded before the war begun, and that we are entering into it with almost all the burdens of former wars upon us.

It is often said, that the great men in opposition want to force themselves into power. But it is scarcely possible they should be so foolish.—Involved in a most expensive and hazardous contest with two of the first powers in *Europe*—surrounding nations *hostile* to us in a degree which leaves us without a *friend*, or even a *well-wisher* * among them—a
consider-

* “ The mother country now rises to offensive war against all these combined powers; not only without an ally, but almost without a *well-wisher*, from the extraordinary jealousy her greatness had inspired.” See An Account of some Particulars relative to the meeting at York, on Thursday, Dec. 30, 1779. By Leonard Smelt, Esq;—We have a recent proof of this in the confederacy now forming among the neutral powers of *Europe*, for the purpose of establishing a new maritime code of laws, and making the ocean *free*; or, in other words, for rendering themselves general carriers of goods and stores for our enemies, and depriving us of our long boasted empire of the sea.—“ Powers (says *Montesquieu*) established on commerce may subsist long in *mediocrity*; but are not durable in *grandeur*.—They raise themselves imperceptibly; but when they become so great as to draw attention and to signalize themselves, they excite jealousy; and all other powers will endeavour to deprive such a nation of a superiority which it has acquired, as it were, by surprize.”—*Causes of the Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Chap. iv.—*Montesquieu*
3 had

considerable part of our strength torn from us, and converted against us—our resources mortgaged beyond the hope or possibility of redemption—a debasing and wasteful luxury destroying public virtue, and producing a dissipation and venality in *private* life, and an extravagance in the expenditure of *public* money, which were † never equalled—and, at the same time, a monstrous debt pressing us, and increasing rapidly, without any other support than a frail credit, which the first disaster or panic may break.—In SUCH CIRCUMSTANCES, wonderful must be that ambition which can render the management of our affairs an object of contention.—No enemy of our present ministers can wish them a greater punishment, than their *continuance* in power to conduct the war a few years, must prove.—Mr. Eden, indeed, thinks they are able

had a particular view in this observation to *Carthage*; and he introduces it with another observation worth mentioning. “The *Spaniards*, he says, had been oppressed under the government of *Carthage*. This “made them regard the *Romans*, when they entered “*Spain*, as their deliverers; the consideration of which, “and of the vast sums the *Carthaginians* spent in the “war under which they sunk, may convince us that “injustice is always the worst policy.”

† See a striking representation of this extravagance in a pamphlet lately published, and entitled, Facts addressed to Landholders, stockholders, merchants, farmers, manufacturers, &c.

to

to extricate us. At a juncture of unparalleled embarrassment and danger, he has undertaken to give us comfort. He exhorts us, taking things as we find them, to prosecute the war with vigour, assuring us that we have not upon us any symptoms of decay which should discourage us; that we can bear much more, and have still sufficient resources left*.—Entertaining other apprehensions, I have taken another course.—The difference between us is great; but there is one circumstance attending it, which, if I have been misled, will relieve me.—My representations will not be much regarded; or if they should, they can do harm only by putting the nation too much on its guard, and leading it to measures for recovering peace, and preserving its independence, which the necessity of its affairs does *not* require.

* In enumerating these resources, Mr. Eden (in his Four Letters, p. 101) has proposed *one* (mortgaging the peace revenue) to which we cannot have recourse, without the dissolution of all government; and expressed himself, I think, with too much doubt about *another* (the reduction of places, pensions, emoluments of office, &c.) to which the general expectation of the kingdom is directed; a resource with which our enemies are making war against us, in a manner that threatens us more than all their armies and navies; and which, while it bore a part of the expence of the war, would help to secure our liberties, and to *restore* the constitution.

L

—On

—On the contrary, Mr. Eden's weight in the state, and his abilities and character, command attention; and the counsel he gives will be followed. Should it, therefore, happen that he is wrong, and that our situation is perilous in the degree I have represented, he has been urging us towards a precipice, and the consequences may prove fatal.

—In this respect, we are like two persons observing a friend who totters under a burden plunging into a deep water, one of whom, believing that he is not in a condition to combat danger, calls upon him to come back: and the other, believing the contrary, advises him to go on. If he takes the former advice, he will, at worst, be only over-cautious. But if he takes the latter advice, and should find himself deceived, he will lose his life.

After all. Did I apprehend that we were in a situation which admitted of no retreat, I should, however I might lament the misconduct which has brought us to it, think myself bound to be silent. But our circumstances are not, I hope, so desperate. A retreat is, probably, still practicable by the same measure which would *certainly* have saved us not long ago—I mean, by withdrawing from that country where all our troubles have originated; and yielding to
the

the colonies that blessing, which we are employing our armies to force from them, but which every country values above all blessings, and the loss of which we ourselves are now deprecating as the greatest calamity that can happen to us.

ACCOUNTS referred to in the preceding APPENDIX.

(A) Calculation of the Increase of the Navy Debt in 1780, and of its probable Amount at the end of the year.

FROM accounts laid before the House of Commons, it appears, that on the 30th of Sept. 1779, the navy-debt was 7.262,415l.; and on the 31st of December following, 8.357,877l. It increased, therefore, in three months, 1.095,462l.; or at the rate of 4.381,848l. in a year. From this increase, deduct a million and a half ordered to be paid off, and included in the grants for this year. The remainder (or 2.881,848l.) added to 8.357,877l. will give 11.239,725l. the amount of the navy-debt at Christmas next; supposing it to increase this year as it did in the last quarter of the last year.

It deserves to be farther mentioned, that the navy-debt having increased 1.379,153l. in 1777—2.175,487l. in 1778—and 3.178,877l. in 1779, it seems not unreasonable to expect that it may increase above four millions in 1780.

Again; the Parliament has ordered for the service of this year 85,000 seamen, which makes the number to be maintained 15,000 more than it ever was; and will therefore produce a proportionably greater increase of debt.

I mentioned these facts in the former edition of this tract, as evidences to prove that the amount and increase of the navy-debt at Christmas next will not be less than the sums now stated. But I have lately found reason to suspect, that the number of seamen in service this year will not in reality be greater than it was last year, and that the pay provided for the additional number will be

only an additional supply for maintaining the same number of seamen; and therefore, instead of accelerating, may retard the increase of the navy-debt. For this reason, and to avoid the danger of exaggeration, I now chuse to state the amount and increase of this debt at Christmas next, at a million less than the sums given at the beginning of this note; that is, the amount at 10.239,725l. instead of 11.239,725l. and the increase at 3.381,848l. instead of 4,381,848l.

(B) Calculation of the different Rates of Interest at which Government borrowed Twelve Millions in 1762 and 1780.

In 1762 the public gave for TWELVE MILLIONS in money,

First, Twelve millions three per cent. stock,	£.
worth, reckoning interest at 4½ per cent. or the 3 per cents at 66⅔	— — 8.000,000
2. A short annuity of 120,000l. for 19 years, worth, at the same rate of interest, 12⅓ years purchase	— — 1.512,000
3. A long annuity for 98 years of 120,000l. worth, at the same rate of interest, 21⅞ years purchase	— — 2.628,000
4. Commencement of interest before the completion of payment, and discount (amounting to 46,539l.) for prompt payment	— — — 200,000
	<hr/> 12.340,000

N. B. This loan was settled in Dec. 1761, and the interest upon it began from Jan. 5th following. The value of this stock and the premiums annexed, at 5 per cent. is 11.219,000l. or 6½ per cent. less than the money paid for them.

In 1780 the public has given for TWELVE MILLIONS in money,

1. Twelve millions 4 per cent. stock, worth, reckoning interest at 6 per cent.	£. 8,000,000
2. A long annuity for 80 years of 217,500l. worth, reckoning interest at 6 per cent. 16½ years purchase, or	3,588,750
See <i>Smart's Tables</i> , or Table II. at the end of the <i>Treatise on Reversionary Payments</i> .	
3. Commencement of interest before payment, discounts for prompt payment, and profits of a lottery	450,000
Total	12,038,750

N. B. This loan was settled in March 1780, but the interest upon it began from Jan. 5th preceding. The value of this stock, and the premiums annexed, is, at 5 per cent. 14,313,000l. or 19¼ per cent. more than the money paid, besides a larger profit at redemption.

(C) *Comparison of the whole Expence of 1762, with the whole Expence of 1780.*

Supplies in 1762, including 1,500,000l. old exchequer bills, vote of credit for 1761, and the new vote for 1762.—See Public Accounts of Services and Grants, by Sir Charles Whitworth	£. 18,625,046
Add the increase of navy-debt within the year, beyond the debt discharged *	322,123
Add the value of the premium given to the lenders of twelve millions. See last note	4,140,000
Deduct old Exchequer bills renewed, and the vote of credit for 1761	2,500,000
Remains the expence of the year	23,087,169

* Navy-debt on the 31st of Dec. 1762	5,929,124
Ditto, Dec. 1761	5,607,001
Difference	£. 322,123
Supplies	

Supplies in 1780, exclusive of the vote of credit for 1779 *	£. 19,678,250
Add vote of credit for 1780	1,000,000
Add the increase of navy-debt beyond 1,500,000l. included in the supplies. See note (A)	1,881,848
Add the value (at 5 per cent.) of the premium given to the lenders of twelve millions. See note (E)	4,263,000
Deduct Exchequer bills renewed	26,823,098
Remains expence of the year, exclusive of the interest of the public debts	3,400,000
	23,423,098

(D) *Comparison of the Unfunded Debt at the end of the last war, with the Unfunded Debt at the end of the present year; supposing the war not to be continued beyond it.*

Navy-debt at Christmas 1780. See note (A)	£. 10,239,725
Exchequer bills	3,400,000
Extraordinaries of the army, reckoned not to exceed those in 1779	3,418,000
Extraordinaries of the ordnance, reckoned likewise not to exceed those in 1779	591,000
Anticipation of the sinking fund	500,000
Calling home troops †, and many expences which cannot immediately cease with the operations of war	3,500,000
Total of unfunded debt at Christmas next	21,648,725
Unfunded debt at the end of the last war	15,639,793
See Additional Observations on Civil Liberty, p. 145.	

* This was the amount of these supplies, as they were stated in March last by Lord North in opening the budget.

† This is the sum which was borrowed in 1763 for discharging these expences; and it is included in the unfunded debt at the end of the last war, as here stated. The preliminaries of the last peace were signed at Paris, Nov. 3, 1762.—The navy in 1763 consisted of 14,000 sailors more; and the army in British pay (for near a third of the year) of 82,000 men more, than the ordinary peace establishment.

Calcu-

(E) Calculation of the amount of the National Debt, supposing the war not to be continued beyond the present year.

Amount of the national debt in 1775, exclusive of the unfunded debt.—See Additional Observations on Civil Liberty, Part III. Sect. II.	—	—	—	£.
Added in 1776, 1777, 1778 and 1779	—	—	—	26,487,500
See Facts addressed to the Landholders, &c. Chap. II.				
Four per cent. stock, created in 1780 *	—	—	—	12,000,000
Long annuity 1780 of 217,500 <i>l.</i> for 80 years, which, though sold to the subscribers to the loan in 1780, at 16½ years purchase, is worth, when money is at 5 per cent. 19⅓ years purchase	—	—	—	4,263,000
Unfunded debt. See last Note	—	—	—	21,657,725
				<hr/>
				196,751,276

* For this stock only eight millions were received (See note B); but the public is bound to return for it twelve millions. Such are our methods of borrowing.

ADDI-

ADDITIONAL ACCOUNTS.

IN P. 61, I have given an account of the annual importation of coals into London. In 1776 it was 697,608 chaldrons, and had increased gradually near 200,000 chaldrons in 17 years. In 1777 it was 692,034 chaldrons. In 1778 it was 637,744; and I am just now informed that in 1779 it was 590,765. In the two last years, therefore, it has decreased considerably, in consequence perhaps of some check which the decline of trade and the difficulties of the times have given to luxury.

ACCOUNTS referred to in Page 67.

A F R I C A.

	Imports.	Exports.
In 1775	- - - £. 67,328	- - - £. 786,168
1776	- - - 99,674	- - - 470,779
1777	- - - 62,740	- - - 239,218
1778	- - - 81,951	- - - 154,086

I R E L A N D.

	Imports.	Exports.
In 1775	- - - £. 1,486,325	- - - £. 2,169,608
1776	- - - 1,516,532	- - - 2,178,227
1777	- - - 1,502,893	- - - 1,931,800
1778	- - - 1,360,688	- - - 1,470,671

M H O L L A N D.

[84]

HOLLAND.

	Imports.	Exports.
In 1775	£. 513,561	£. 1,887,400
1776	381,098	1,427,396
1777	581,632	1,080,644
1778	346,357	1,390,174

TURKEY.

	Imports.	Exports.
In 1775	£. 168,882	£. 226,997
1776	249,738	215,756
1777	225,586	177,214
1778	148,919	50,128

ITALY.

	Imports.	Exports.
In 1775	£. 818,171	£. 1,003,528
1776	910,354	873,448
1777	774,099	846,160
1778	395,742	555,532

ANTIGUA.

	Imports.	Exports.
In 1775	£. 353,563	£. 168,092
1776	297,535	169,436
1777	134,068	114,028
1778	160,635	107,344

JAMAICA.

	Imports.	Exports.
In 1775	£. 1,653,735	£. 786,728
1776	1,359,033	632,315
1777	1,303,289	536,574
1778	1,372,677	486,870

GRENADÉS.

[85]

GRENADÉS.

	Imports.	Exports.
In 1775	£. 486,035	£. 139,946
1776	370,884	163,366
1777	360,088	95,209
1778	374,689	85,829

St. VINCENTS.

	Imports.	Exports.
In 1775	£. 164,199	£. 69,246
1776	135,919	45,993
1777	130,195	40,230
1778	112,252	25,914

DOMINICA.

	Imports.	Exports.
In 1775	£. 185,131	£. 62,945
1776	257,775	64,697
1777	177,397	47,230
1778	162,408	31,813

PORTUGAL.

	Imports.	Exports.
In 1775	£. 367,893	£. 632,989
1776	372,439	530,784
1777	382,708	554,449
1778	340,576	430,936

The Imports in this trade for the last 50 years have varied little; but the exports before 1765 used to be more than double those here given.

GERMANY.

	Imports.	Exports.
In 1775	£. 660,763	£. 1,545,014
1776	666,080	1,460,776
1777	709,599	1,323,419
1778	588,198	1,214,929

M 2

FRANCE.

FRANCE.

	Imports.	Exports.
In 1775	£. 67,481	£. 258,157
1776	56,865	178,319
1777	71,495	139,802
1778	23,260	29,411

SPAIN.

	Imports.	Exports.
In 1775	£. 564,386	£. 1,205,215
1776	561,071	1,191,477
1777	533,641	843,075
1778	415,702	980,352

The *Exports* to NOVA SCOTIA, for 1776, 1777, and 1778, were 245,036*l.* 934,164*l.* and 332,156*l.*; the *Imports* 6,529*l.* 8,030*l.* and 5,329*l.*—NEW-YORK, the *Exports* for the same years respectively were 57,294*l.* 26,449*l.*; the *Imports* 2,318*l.* 8,429*l.* 16,192*l.*—FLORIDA, *Exports* 174,175*l.* 137,607*l.* 64,165*l.* the *Imports* 30,628*l.* 48,322*l.* 48,236*l.*—This is all that, in these three years, remained of a trade with the colonies, which, before the America war, brought in (exclusive of the trade to *Canada*) a favourable balance of above a *million and a half* annually; the annual medium of *Exports* for four years ending in 1774, having been 3,039,042*l.*; and of *Imports* 1,354,563*l.*

The Reader is desired to correct the account in P. 66. of the *Imports* and *Exports* for 1777, which should have been as follows:

Imports £. 11,721,327—*Exports* £. 12,632,522—
Excess, £. 911,194.

T H E

THE addition of a hundred knights to represent the counties in parliament being a measure now much talked of, I have, by the desire of some friends, framed the following table for shewing, as nearly as the nature of the case will allow, the additional number to which the population and consequence of each county would entitle it, were such a measure carried into execution.

After allowing for SCOTLAND eight knights, because in the same proportion to a hundred that 45 is to 558, there would remain for ENGLAND and WALES *ninety-two*, out of which number

Middlesex, including LONDON and Westminster, would be entitled to	10
Yorkshire	8
Norfolk	3
Devonshire	3
Lancashire	3
Suffolk	3
Surrey and Southwark	3
Somersetshire	3
Lincolnshire	3
Kent	3
Essex	3
Gloucestershire	3
Wiltshire, Worcestershire, Warwickshire, Suffex, Hampshire, Staffordshire, Salop, Northamptonshire, Cornwall, Cheshire, Durham, and Northumberland—two each	24
Leicestershire, Berkshire, Bucks, Cambridge-shire, Bedfordshire, Cumberland, Derbyshire, Dorsetshire, Herefordshire, Hertfordshire, Huntingdonshire, Nottinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Monmouthshire, Glamorganshire, and five other Welch counties—one each	20
Rutlandshire, Westmoreland, and six Welch counties	6
	92

This distribution was proposed in the former edition of this Tract. I have been since favoured with some remarks upon it, and I am sensible that it may be liable to objections. I still think it, however, a proper distribution; and, therefore, have chosen to continue it.

I shall take this opportunity to add, for the information of those who may have attended to the account of the gold coin in the *Introduction* to the two Tracts on Civil Liberty, p. 31, and in the Second Tract (Part II. Sect. I.) that about two millions of the coin brought in by the proclamations in 1773, 1774, and 1776, were purchased and melted into bars by the Bank; and that Mr. Eden says, (in his Fifth Letter, p. 40.) this sum is not included in the total (or 15,563,593*l.*) brought to account under those proclamations.

F I N I S.

0373

