

64-4



0401

A
CLEAR, FAIR,
AND
CANDID INVESTIGATION

OF THE
Population, Commerce,

AND
AGRICULTURE

OF THIS KINGDOM;
With a full Refutation of all Mr. Malthus's Principles,

PROVING,
FROM INFALLIBLE DOCUMENTS,
That our Population is rapidly decreasing,

FROM THE
HIGH PRICE OF GRAIN,

AND THE
Long and unfortunate War;

And if not remedied,
ENGLAND MAY FALL.

ALSO
Shewing the great Impolicy of the late CORN BILL,
AND
THAT THE HIGH PRICE OF GRAIN
Has been the cause of the late Blights.

London:

Printed for J. MAWMAN, in the Poultry, and J. RICHARDSON, 91,
Royal Exchange,

By B. SCOTT, in the Market-Place, CARLISLE.

1810.

A CANDID
 INVESTIGATION, &c.

MR. Malthus's Essay on the Principle of Population having called forth a great deal of attention and public disquisition, I shall therefore endeavour to investigate it, and see upon what foundation it rests. Mr. Godwin in his work on Political Justice, like many theorists, who rest their opinions upon one point, without duly reflecting upon the various circumstances upon which it rests, endeavours to establish a system of equality; a beautiful system, founded on humanity, and the melioration of society. Under his system of general marriages, population would be carried to its utmost stretch. Mr. Malthus, reflecting upon this circumstance alone, of the great extent of population which would in consequence undoubtedly take place, sits down to write a book in opposition to it, runs into the opposite extreme, and endeavours to prove that the world is too populous for its food or subsistence; that all the misery in the world results from this circumstance, and

that God has ordained it to be so, (though one of his first commands is to increase and multiply) in order to keep down the great spring of population, which is always pushing mankind into vice and misery. Vice and misery is his great controul over population. This great hydra, which Mr. Malthus calls population, is in his eyes constantly carrying mankind into the depth of vice and misery; and therefore, according to him, it should be the great political barometer of the legislator to keep down this hydra-headed monster, if possible, by every cruel and inhuman proceeding that can be devised.

Mr. Godwin's system is founded on humanity, justice and benevolence. Mr. Malthus's on cruelty, injustice and avarice. The one is founded upon the wise system of christianity; the other directly opposite to it, which I hope I shall clearly and fully prove.

As all writers were sensible that the strength of a nation depends upon the number of its people, and not upon extent of territory (which Mr. Malthus allows) therefore their great political object was to increase population. But Mr. Malthus, with his new lights, is endeavouring to form the opposite opinion. He acknowledges himself that he had not read the principal authors upon this interesting subject, but he merely takes up the idea of the policy of forcibly suppressing population, in order to the counteracting the popularity

of Mr. Godwin's Political Justice; hoping thereby to raise his fortune and his fame.*

He begins by giving an ill digested account of the population of the different countries of the world, their births, deaths and marriages. From these statements it appears that some countries are gaining and some losing in population. But I shall not here enter minutely into the investigation of so ill digested a mass of information, partially selected from particular authors, as they suit his purpose; but my principal object in this publication is carefully to examine the present state of this island in these respects; (the political importance of which is of the utmost consequence,) as Mr. Malthus seems to have led the kingdom into the grossest errors, which are, in my opinion, pushing it into the most fatal misfortunes that a nation can encounter: they are more alarming than the gigantic power of France, directed by so able a man as Buonaparte.

He begins his chapter on England by shewing, as he justly says, "that the preventive check to population operates with considerable force throughout all the classes of the community," and

* These new lights he acknowledges have been thrown out by different writers, yet it appears that this idea was given more as a speculative one, that might take place, rather than that it had. But all these authors go upon this principle, that it is political in every state, according to the present circumstances, to push population.

as he shews is proved, by "the annual marriages in England and Wales are to the whole population as 1 to 123 and one fifth, a smaller proportion of marriages than obtains in any of the countries which have been examined, except Norway and Switzerland.

"In the early part of the last century, Dr. Short estimated this proportion at about 1 to 115. It is probable this calculation was then correct;" and he acknowledges that the returns of the marriages are accurate. When I shall come to speak of Norway and Switzerland, I shall shew there must be a gross error in his opinion of their few marriages.

He says, vol. i. p. 454, "Dr. Short mentions the opinion of an eminent judge, that the growth and increase of mankind is more stunted from the cautious difficulty people make to enter into marriage, from the prospect of the trouble and expences in providing for a family, than from any thing in the nature of the species. And in conformity to this idea, Dr. Short proposes to lay heavy taxes and fines on those who live single, for the support of the poor."

These opinions Mr. Malthus holds in great derision; the policy, according to him, is to suppress population.

Mr. Malthus also says, p. 456, "If we divide the existing population of England and Wales by the average of burials for the five years ending in

1800, it would appear that the mortality was only 1 in 49; but this is a proportion so extraordinarily small, considering the number of our great towns and manufactories, that it cannot be considered as approaching to the truth.

"Whatever may be the exact proportion of the inhabitants of the towns to the inhabitants of the country, the southern part of this island certainly ranks in that class of states where this proportion is greater than 1 to 3; indeed there is ample reason to believe it is greater than 1 to 2. According to the rule laid down by Crome, the mortality ought to be 1 in 30; according to Susmilch, 1 in 33."

But when we consider that these calculations were made for Europe, and that in England, where the towns are so very numerous, owing to our great manufactories, where the inhabitants are so amazingly crowded, and the unwholesomeness of some of our great works, and where the window tax confines people to so little air, and that the children are obliged to work so young, and even during the whole night, with the immense dearth of provisions, not being half fed. Also when we consider the fatal epidemics which have lately so frequently inflicted mankind; nervous and scarlet fevers, and many others, which are now become so general, we must suppose the mortality much greater in this island.

Speaking of Scotland, he says, p. 498, "Low

nervous fevers, and others of a more violent and fatal nature, are frequently epidemic, and sometimes take off considerable numbers." He quotes another writer, who says, p. 502, "Formerly every householder could command a draught of small beer, and killed a sheep now and then out of his own little flock; but now the case is different. The frequent want of the necessaries of life among the poor, their damp and stinking houses, and dejection of mind amongst the middling classes, appear to be the principal causes of the prevailing distempers and mortality of this parish. Young people are cut off by consumptions, and the more advanced by dropsies and nervous fevers."

This same picture universally prevails in England. All the diseases are of the debilitating kind, requiring bark and port wine. The inflammatory ones of our forefathers are scarcely known. All our fevers being of the low putrid kind, and dropsies, palsies and consumptions being so frequent, that these diseases may be said to be general, and at all times; so that the human system is regularly breathing infection, and that with an impoverished and debilitating constitution to resist it. It has been generally remarked by the faculty, of the fevers, measles and other diseases, that the rich, well-clothed and well-fed children have them often as mild diseases, while, with the poor, they have been generally mortal.

Though the rich are better able to resist the present type of diseases, yet they are exposed to general contagion; and great luxury often produces the same debility as poverty does.

Mr. Malthus quotes Dr. Price; he says of him, "In general he (Dr. Price) thinks that the mortality in great towns may be stated as from 1 in 19 to 1 in 22 and 23; in moderate towns from 1 in 24 to 1 in 28; and in country villages from 1 in 40 to 1 in 50.

"The tendency of Dr. Price to exaggerate the unhealthiness of towns, may perhaps be objected to in these statements, but the objection seems to be only of weight with regard to London. The accounts from the other towns which are given, are from documents which his particular opinions could not influence."

Mr. Malthus, after this candid acknowledgment, endeavours to argue against it. He brings in a calculation of Dr. William Heberden's, p. 462, that Dr. Price's calculation "of the years from 1759 to 1768, from which Dr. Price calculated the probabilities of life in London, indicate a much greater degree of unhealthiness than the registers of late years." I can but smile at Dr. Heberden's calculations: he draws his data from the late returns according to the population act. Now I would ask every candid man, how can the population of London be taken by enumeration? Is it to be taken in the winter season, as

it is called, when the parliament and all the rich families flock to it, and continue in it a few months, and the rest of the year go into the country? or is it to be taken in the height of summer, when all in a manner desert it? Besides people often retire into the country in mortal diseases for the benefit of the air, and some females go into London to lie in. Then how is it possible to enumerate its population? It is truly farcical.

Besides I know it is a fact that the enumeration for the population act was principally done by the parish officers, at the fire-side, throughout the kingdom; in towns, going to some houses in the principal streets, but leaving the crowded ones to conjecture; and it was well known it would please the government to have it a high population, as we were engaged in such an unfortunate war, so destructive to our army and navy. Besides the natural pride of each parish officer to have his town or district a populous one. Therefore Dr. Heberden having this false data to go upon, with the results of the population act published by government, than which nothing can be more erroneous.

Also in the same page Mr. Malthus arraigns the calculation of the results of the population act. With respect to London he says, "the proportion of the mortality for London, mentioned in the observations on the result of the population act, is smaller than the truth. It is only made 1

in 31. There certainly seems to be something in great towns, and even in moderate towns, peculiarly unfavourable to the early stages of life."

He also says, p. 464. "At a time when our provincial towns were increasing much less rapidly than at present, Dr. Short calculated that nine-tenths of the married were strangers. Of 1618 married men, and 1618 married women, examined at the Westminster Infirmary, only 329 of the men, and 495 of the women, had been born in London.

"Dr. Price supposes that London, with its neighbouring parishes, where the deaths exceed the births, requires a supply of 10,000 persons annually. Graunt, in his time, estimated this supply for London alone at 6000; and he further observes, that let the mortality of the city be what it will, arising from plague or any other great cause of destruction, that it always fully repairs its loss in two years.

"As all these demands, therefore, are supplied from the country, it is evident that we should fall into a very great error if we were to estimate the proportion of births to deaths for the whole kingdom; by the proportion observed in country parishes, from which there must be such numerous emigrations.

"We need not however, accompany Dr. Price in his apprehensions, that the country will be de-

populated by these emigrations, at least as long as the funds for the maintenance of agricultural labour remain unimpaired."

But what will London require now, when the numbers and mortality are so much increased; allowed by all the faculty? * And I would ask if the funds for the agricultural labourer is not impaired, being the same wages as formerly, though provisions and taxes have increased three-fold? So that the whole tenure of Mr. Malthus's volumes are directly to hinder the labourer from marrying; nay, indirectly that he should not be allowed.

He says, vol. i. p. 466, "If we divide the present population of England and Wales by the average number of baptisms for the last five years, it will appear, that the baptisms are to the population as 1 to very nearly 36."

He also says, p. 467, "Dr. Short estimated the proportion of births to the population of England, as 1 to 28." He says dissenters christenings are not included in the calculation; but in this he is mistaken, as according to an act of parliament, passed I think about 1782, they keep regular re-

* Dr. Willan says, upon consulting the registers, that one 7th or 8th of the deaths which take place in London, are from the direct effect of drunkenness. It is the same throughout the kingdom, that baneful effect of spirits, which vice is so predominant among the lower classes; which makes so many women barren, and which was scarce known amongst our temperate forefathers.

gisters, which are given to those who make the estimates.*

Then to shew how widely the late returns of the population act err: it appears that the births, according to them, are as 1 to 36; and the burials as 1 to 49. Also that the agricultural part of the community in these returns are, he says, "not one fifth part of the whole," therefore he justly doubts their accuracy. And it will appear that the greatest errors are in the great towns. I am accurately informed that the enumeration was made at the fire-side.

He says, p. 468, "In the *Observations on the Results of the Population Act*, it is remarked that the average duration of life in England appears to have increased in the proportion of 117 to 100, since the year 1780. So great a change in so short a time, if true, would be a most striking phenomenon. But I am inclined to suspect, that the whole of this proportional diminution of burials does not arise from increased healthiness, but is occasioned, in part, by the greater number

* Speaking to some clergymen with respect to the accuracy of the registers of births and christenings, they told me that there could be no inaccuracies, as the act of parliament made the clergyman who made the omissions liable to a very severe punishment. Nay, an action would lie against the clergyman who made the omission; for it might so happen that the child might lose a legacy from it. They supposed that there were not five annual omissions in the year throughout England.

of deaths which must necessarily have taken place abroad, owing to the very rapid increase of our foreign commerce since this period; and to the great number of persons absent in naval and military employments, and the constant supply of fresh recruits necessary to maintain undiminished so great a force. A perpetual drain of this kind would certainly have a tendency to produce the effect observed in the returns, and might keep the burials stationary, while the births and marriages were increasing with some rapidity."

He says, p. 473, "On an average of the five years ending in 1800, the proportion of births to marriages is 347 to 100. In 1760 it was 362 to 100." Then I should think that every one upon the least reflection must be fully sensible of the gross errors of the population act; and that the errors consist in making the population too numerous, and by taking away one fifth or more from the number returned, we will then make the marriages, births and burials all correspond, and be similar to other countries, and even this country in former times.

He says, p. 470, "The effects of the late scarcities are strongly marked in the returns of the Population Act by a decrease of births and an increase of burials, and should such seasons frequently recur, they would soon destroy the great excess of births which has been observed during the last twenty years." And he allows through

all his work, that marriages are contracted later in life, than formerly: and along with this, our numerous accumulated great towns, from manufactories. Then how can it be conceived, all these circumstances taken together, that population is increased? All these leading facts are taken even from Mr. Malthus's statement of them, and must directly shew how erroneous has been the enumeration, for they all forcibly center in one point, that it has widely erred in excess.

He says, p. 474, "In the years 1710, 1720, and 1730, it appears from the returns, that the deaths exceeded the births; and taking the six periods ending in 1750, including the first half of the century, if we compare the sum of the births with the sum of the deaths, the excess of the births is so small as to be perfectly inadequate to account for the increase of a million, which, upon a calculation from the births alone, is supposed to have taken place in that time. Consequently, either the registers are very inaccurate, and the deficiencies in the births greater than the deaths; or these periods, each at the distance of ten years, do not express the just average. These particular years may have been more unfavourable with respect to the proportion of births to deaths than the rest; indeed one of them, 1710, is known to have been a year of great scarcity and distress. But if this suspicion which is very probable, be admitted, so as to affect the first six periods,

we may justly suspect the contrary accident to have happened with regard to the three following periods ending with 1780, in which thirty years it would seem, by the same mode of calculation, that an increase of a million and an half had taken place. At any rate it must be allowed, that the three separate years, taken in this manner, can by no means be considered as sufficient to establish a just average; and what rather encourages the suspicion that these particular years might be more than usually favourable with regard to births is, that the increase of births from 1780 to 1785, is unusually small, which would naturally be the case without supposing a slower progress than before, if the births in 1780 had been accidentally above the average."

Add to this, only reflect how their calculations are made from the births and deaths as they appear upon the registers. These registers are pretty accurate in respect to births; for will not every christian get his child christened? But in respect to burials, where are the soldiers and sailors who die abroad registered; the sailors of merchantmen, and the immense numbers required in peopling our extensive colonies; our immense emigrations, and that spirit of adventure which carries Englishmen over all the world, besides many other reasons which might be named? therefore, calculating from the births and burials, is highly erroneous.

Also in making calculations, the births have been more generally calculated upon than the burials, as an epidemic may be fatal at one period and not at another; therefore the births are more steady and more uniform, and certainly more to be depended on, particularly in England, where so many die out of their country.

But see in what manner he endeavours to argue against the births, p. 477. "The assumption of the uniform proportion of births, on which they are founded, is false on the face of the calculations themselves. According to these calculations, the increase of population was more rapid in the period from 1760 to 1780, than from 1780 to 1800; yet it appears that the proportion of deaths about the year 1780, was greater than in 1800 in the ratio of 117 to 100. Consequently the proportion of births before 1780 must have been much greater than in 1800, or the population in that period could not possibly have increased faster. This overthrows at once the supposition, of any thing like uniformity in the proportion of births.

"I should indeed have supposed from the analogy of other countries, and the calculations of Mr. King and Dr. Short, that the proportion of births at the beginning and in the middle of the century was greater than at the end."

What opinion, candid reader, can you have of an author who, in the course of eight pages, di-

rectly contradicts himself? (See p. 11) where he argues against the supposition; a most absurd one I call it. But here he brings this duration of life as increased from 117 to 100, as an argument against calculating from the births, while just before he has shewn it was erroneous. But these inconsistencies run through all his volumes.

He says, "no doubt that the proportion of births were greater in the beginning and middle of the century than at the end." It appears in the returns (see p. 13) that "the years 1710, 1720, and 1730, that the deaths exceeded the births." Then how can Mr. Malthus suppose such a rapid increase of population during this century, and how he clearly and obviously contradicts it himself? But he is the most obscure and ignorant author, that I will venture to say, ever wrote on the subject.

Knowing that the register of births cuts up all his opinions of the increased population of this island, he endeavours to argue against it. He says, p. 479, "It must indeed have appeared to the reader in the course of this work, that registers of births or deaths, excluding any suspicion of deficiencies, must at all times afford very uncertain data for an estimate of population. On account of the varying circumstances of every country, they are both precarious guides. From the greater apparent regularity of the births, political calculators have generally adopted them as the

ground of their estimates in preference to the deaths. Necker, in estimating the population of France, observes that an epidemic disease, or an emigration, may occasion temporary differences in the deaths, and that therefore the number of births is the most certain criterion. But the very circumstance of the apparent regularity of the births in the registers will now and then lead into great errors. If in any country we can obtain registers of burials for two or three years together, a plague or mortal epidemic will always shew itself, from the very sudden increase of the deaths during its operation, and the still greater diminution of them afterwards. From these appearances, we should of course be directed, not to include the whole of a great mortality in any very short term of years. But there would be nothing of this kind to guide us in the registers of births; and after a country had lost an eighth part of its population by a plague, an average of the five or six subsequent years might show an increase in the number of births, and our calculations would give the population the highest at the very time that it was the lowest. This appears very strikingly in many of Sussmilch's tables, and most particularly in a table for Prussia and Lithuania, which I shall insert in a following chapter, where, in the year subsequent to the loss of one third of the population, the births were considerably in-

creased, and in an average of five years but very little diminished; and this at a time when, of course, the country could have made but a very small progress towards recovering its former population.

“ We do not know indeed of any extraordinary mortality which has occurred in England since 1700.”

That in a country as England, where deaths from war; from the most extensive colonies, she having peopled half the American globe, and part of the East, and where commerce carries her British sons to all parts of the world; we should therefore form our calculations from the births; but it is from these absurd calculations of burials, that the observations published by government are founded our increase of population. Nay, in our great penetrating spirit, where Englishmen are seen in all parts of the world, it is absurd to form any data from burials. The births are the only certain data to go upon. But even these must be received with great limitation, as mortality is greatly increased in this island, as I have before shewn. Can any demonstration be clearer, that they are the best criterion (at least next to enumeration correctly taken) from the great regularity of the births? But this writer, who differs from every one that has gone before; nay, and who differs from common sense and reason; is restrained by no barriers, all is levelled to

his new lights, who has just emerged from the confined precincts of a college, beats down all before him. He says, p. 476, “ I do not think that we can depend upon any estimates of past population, founded on a calculation from the births till after the year 1780, when every following year is given, and a just average of the births may be obtained.”

Here then he allows that the births are correctly registered; yet it appears from these correct registers we are declining in population, this certainly ought to have restrained and shewn him the fallacy of his hypothesis. He moreover says, p. 470, “ The effects of the late scarcities are strongly marked in the returns of the Population Act by a decrease of births and an increase of burials, and should such seasons frequently recur, they would soon destroy the great excess of births which has been observed during the last twenty years.”

Here then he acknowledges the effects of the late scarcity, or more properly the dearness of provisions; for I will, I hope satisfactorily, prove hereafter, that since the year 1800, we have had no scarcity of provisions, but that it has been entirely owing to artifice, unjust management, and from a deluge of paper currency, that the price has been kept up; and it is from this year 1800, which he alludes to, “ that the effects of the late scarcity are strongly marked in the returns of

the registers, by a decrease of births, and an increase of burials." When Mr. Malthus wants to introduce any extraordinary hypothesis, he rakes out some highly overcharged calculation from some author. He here refers us to Sussmilch's tables, vol. ii. p. 32, where there is some wonderful calculations; for after the country had lost one third of its population, the following year it doubled its marriages; and in that year there was 32,522 births; and in the following year it had more than its proportion of marriages before the plague, yet in that year it had only 22,970 births. Now in this case, the first year of these abundant marriages they must have all principally taken place in the first three months of the year, and they must all have become immediately pregnant. Such marriages and such pregnancy, after such burials, we are perfect strangers to in England. For as Hamlet says,

"The funeral bak'd meats
Did coldly furnish forth the marriage tables."

But he even acknowledges himself that we have had no extraordinary mortality in England since 1700, therefore we have no occasion to argue upon such foolish data. For in the returns of the births in the Population Act, the strong argument for their correctness is from their uniformity.

Sussmilch, in these calculations, commits the same gross blunder that many authors do, in not allowing for those who are killed by war, and its pestilential effects, where all are tumbled into one common grave, without registering; and for the number who die out of their own country. And it is particularly unpardonable in Sussmilch, for in his calculations he includes the great Frederick's wars, which almost depopulated his kingdom; but the deaths occasioned by them are not taken into the account. The answers to the Population Act are almost guilty of the same gross errors, not sufficiently accounting for those who are not registered, being killed either by disease or the sword in foreign countries; or by that great grave for Englishmen, the sea, which they so much inhabit, being the supreme masters of that great element.

Before 1800 our manufactories were going on rapidly, we commanding the trade, commerce, and were the manufacturers for all the world, the disasters of the continent having ruined theirs. Therefore as our trade is the life, soul and vitals of the great power, influence and consequence of this country, its population still was partly going on, notwithstanding corn was greatly raised. But since 1800, a systematic rise in the price of corn has taken place, and our manufactories rapidly declining. Our population is also rapidly declining: for during the early part of the war, we

were the manufacturers for all the world; and though great towns favour mortality and celibacy, men so easily gratifying their passions without the expence of a family. Yet under all these disadvantages, population was going on, at least not much decreasing. But now it is rapidly declining, born down by our land-owners, by raising the price of corn to such unheard of prices. But I will inform them it is killing the goose for the golden eggs.

That Mr. Malthus will never deviate from his point, though the instances he brings must appear, I think, to every rational man, as directly contradicting his hypothesis. It is in Switzerland where is his strong hold, from thence he brings his leading arguments, which we shall now examine.

He says, p. 392, "The situation of Switzerland is in many respects so different from the other states of Europe; and some of the facts that have been collected respecting it are so curious, and tend so strongly to illustrate the general principles of this work, that it seems to merit a separate consideration.

"About 35 or 40 years ago, a great and sudden alarm appears to have prevailed in Switzerland, respecting the depopulation of the country; and the transactions of the Economical Society of Berne, which had been established some years before, were crowded with papers deploring the

decay of industry, arts, agriculture, and manufactures, and the imminent danger of a total want of people. The greater part of these writers considered the depopulation of the country as a fact so obvious as not to require proof. They employed themselves therefore chiefly in proposing remedies, and among others, the importation of midwives, the establishment of foundling hospitals, the portioning of young virgins, the prevention of emigration, and the encouragement of foreign settlers.

"A paper containing very valuable materials was, however, about this time published by a Mons. Muret, minister of Vevey, who, before he proceeded to point out remedies, thought it necessary to substantiate the existence of the evil. He made a very laborious and careful research into the registers of different parishes up to the time of their first establishment, and compared the number of births which had taken place during three different periods of 70 years each, the first ending in 1620, the second in 1690, and the third in 1760. Finding, upon this comparison, that the number of births was rather less in the second than the first period, (and by the help of supposing some omissions in the second period, and some redundances in the third) that the number of births in the third was also less than in the second, he considered the evidence for a con-

nued depopulation of the country from the year 1550 as incontrovertible.

"Admitting all the premises." He admits the premises, but begins with his *supposed* calculations, which take place in other countries. He says, p. 396, "In the present instance, the sum of the births in 17 parishes, during the first 70 years, is given as 49,860, which annually would be about 712. This, multiplied by 26, would indicate a population of 18,512. In the last period the sum of the births is given 43,910, which will be about 626 annually. This, multiplied by 36, will indicate a population of 22,536: and if the multipliers be just it will thus appear, that instead of the decrease which was intended to be proved, there had been a considerable increase."

Good heavens! what authority has he for his supposed multipliers! Why, reader, none but in his vague imagination, from his dear beloved absurd hypothesis.

M. Muret observing that in some districts the number of births, according to the population, exceeded those of others, was at a loss to account for it; but Mr. Malthus, according to his absurd paradoxes, pretends to account for it, that deaths produce births. Then according to his favourite simile of a man wanting to breed cattle upon his farm, (see vol. ii. p. 308.) He should begin by killing them, in order to increase their number. He brings from Muret's statement two parishes,

Leyzin and St. Cergue, where he says, quoting Muret, p. 399, "But whence comes it," he says, "that the country where children escape the best from the dangers of infancy, and where the mean life, in whatever way the calculation is made is higher than any other, should be precisely that in which the fecundity is the smallest? How comes it again, that of all our parishes, the one which gives the mean life the highest, should also be the one where the tendency to increase is the smallest.

"To resolve this question I will hazard a conjecture, which, however, I give only as such. Is it not, that in order to maintain in all places the proper equilibrium of population, God has wisely ordered things in such a manner, as that the force of life in each country should be in the inverse ratio of its fecundity.

"In effect, experience verifies my conjecture. Leyzin (a village in the Alps) with a population of 400 persons, produces but a little above eight children a year. The Pays de Vaud, in general, in proportion to the same number of inhabitants produces 11, and the Lyonois 16. But if it happen, that at the age of 20 years, the 8, the 11, and the 16, are reduced to the same number."

Mr. Malthus says, speaking of Leyzin, p. 401, "From the calculations of M. Muret, the accuracy of which there is no reason to doubt, the

probability of life in this parish appeared to be so extraordinarily high as 61 years." And he says, "Also the average number of the births being for a period of 30 years almost accurately equal to the number of deaths." P. 404, "The births were only about a 49th part of the population; and the number of persons above sixteen was to the number of persons below that age, nearly 3 to 1."

When speaking of the parish of St. Cergue, M. Muret says, "the births were a 26th part of the population, and the number of persons above and below sixteen just equal."

"Judging of the population of these parishes from the proportion of their annual births, it would appear, he says, that Leyzin did not exceed St. Cergue by above one fifth at most; whereas, from actual enumeration, the population of the former turned out to be 405, and of the latter only 171."

Then can any thing be clearer? it is almost equal to demonstration that the population of Leyzin was principally formed of servants above sixteen; and when they were going to be married, they left the parish and service; the farmers not choosing to have their houses stocked with married people, which is the case in England, and in all pasture countries.

The rational explanation is clearly this: that those different parishes breed according to their employments. Leyzin is situated in the high

lands, where it is all pasturage, which he allows himself. Now in those mountains he says, in the winter, they are obliged even to get grass roots to feed their cattle, and where each farmer has a large district; therefore he must have a number of servants, which he gets from the low countries. But these servants when they marry, must leave their service, and go back again into the low countries; to the Lyonois for instance, for no farmer takes families into his house. Here then is this great fact which runs through all his volumes rationally accounted for. It is directly similar in England; and it is upon this fact, see his appendix, that he fixes his strong hold, the basis of his hypothesis. It was Switzerland where he was first taught his principles of population; see p. 416, where the mistress of an inn, immediately upon seeing Mr. Malthus, began in complaining that girls were marrying that ought to have been at school. I suppose some girl had cheated the more advanced lady of her lover. And a peasant took the same tone of complaint, from the same cause. I suppose some boy had made his mistress jilt him. But this chapter upon Switzerland, which he builds so much upon, seems to be a very unfortunate chapter for him. He says, p. 411, "In the town of Berne, from the year 1538 to 1654, the sovereign council had admitted into the Bourgeoisie 487 families, of which 379 became extinct in the space of two

centuries, and in 1783 only 108 of them remained. During the hundred years, from 1684 to 1784, 207 Bernoise families became extinct. From 1624 to 1712, the Bourgeoisie was given to 80 families. In 1623, the sovereign council united the members of 112 different families, of which 58 only remain.

“The proportion of unmarried persons in Berne including widows and widowers is considerably above the half of the adults, and the proportion of those below sixteen to those above is nearly as 1 to 3. These are strong proofs of the powerful operation of the preventive check.

“The peasants in the canton of Berne have always had the reputation of being rich, and without doubt, it is greatly to be attributed to this cause. A law has for some time prevailed which makes it necessary for every peasant to prove himself in possession of the arms and accoutrements necessary for the militia, before he can obtain permission to marry.”

Here then it appears that population could not be stopped from poverty, as the peasants are rich; therefore according to his great leading principles it could not have been for the want of subsistence.

As to the law requiring each peasant, before he marries, to be possessed of arms; why, the expence of them would not be equal to a licence for marriage in England, or equal to blankets to

cover the happy pair. But such is his trifling arguments.

How comes it, Mr. Malthus, that so many of our first families are extinct? See your picture of Rome,* vol. i. p. 292, where corruption and luxury did more than your want does in poor families. See, Sir, in America, that strong hold of yours, that in the towns similar to ours, that they can scarce keep up their numbers, as you allow. But they must certainly have corn enough, for it comes there to be shipped for other countries, and the price of labour is so high in America.† That

* “It is impossible to read the speech of Metellus Numidicus in his censorship without indignation and disgust.” ‘If it were possible,’ he says, ‘entirely to go without wives, we would deliver ourselves at once from this evil; but as the laws of nature have so ordered it that we can neither live happy with them nor continue the species without them, we ought to have more regard for our lasting security than for our transient pleasures.’

† Dr. Smith, says, in his Wealth of Nations, vol. ii. p. 399, “Every colonist gets more land than he can possibly cultivate. He has no rent, and scarce any taxes to pay. No landlord shares with him in its produce, and the share of the sovereign is commonly but a trifle. He has every motive to render as great as possible a produce, which is thus to be almost entirely his own. But his land is commonly so extensive, that, with all his own industry, and with all the industry of other people whom he can get to employ, he can seldom make it produce the tenth part of what it is capable of producing. He is eager, therefore, to collect labourers from all quarters, and to reward them with the most liberal wages. But those liberal wages, joined to the plenty and cheapness of land, soon make

she has every advantage to population. In the interior, their morals and habits are all rural; the

those labourers leave him, in order to become landlords themselves, and to reward, with equal liberality, other labourers, who soon leave them for the same reason that they left their first master. The liberal reward of labour encourages marriages. The children, during the tender years of infancy, are well fed and properly taken care of, and when they are grown up, the value of their labour greatly overpays their maintenance. When arrived at maturity, the high price of labour, and the low price of land, enable them to establish themselves in the same manner as their fathers did before them.

"In other countries, rent and profit eat up wages, and the two superior orders of people oppress the inferior one. But in new colonies, the interest of the two superior orders obliges them to treat the inferior one with more generosity and humanity; at least, where that inferior one is not in a state of slavery. Waste lands, of the greatest natural fertility, are to be had for a trifle. The increase of revenue which the proprietor, who is always the undertaker, expects from their improvement, constitutes his profit; which in these circumstances is commonly very great. But this great profit cannot be made without employing the labour of other people in clearing and cultivating the land; and the disproportion between the great extent of the land and the small number of the people, which commonly takes place in new colonies, makes it difficult for him to get this labour. He does not, therefore, dispute about wages, but is willing to employ labour at any price. The high wages of labour encourages population. The cheapness and plenty of good land encourages improvement, and enable the proprietor to pay those high wages. In those wages consists almost the whole price of the land; and though they are high, considered as the wages of labour, they are low, considered as the price of what is so very valuable. What encourages the

country teeming with subsistence; besides the immense emigrations from Europe; also their immense number of slaves. But you see in their maritime towns, similar to England, their luxury and morals stop population, amidst this superfluity of corn, and where labour is so high.

But I shall just quote what you say of Holland, vol. ii. p. 410, "The exception of Holland, if it were an exception, would arise from very particular circumstances—her extensive foreign trade, and her numerous colonial emigrations, compared with the smallness of her territory; and the extreme unhealthiness of a great part of the country, which occasions a much greater average mortality than is common in other states. These, I conceive, were the unobserved causes which principally contributed to render Holland so famous for the management of her poor, and able to employ and support all who applied for relief."

Now I flatter myself this is stronger ground for me, than you have fortified yourself in America. Here a country which grows no corn, and has a fuller population than any country in the world, and manages her poor so well. This country cuts up your boasted system, your new lights, by the root.

progress of population and improvement, encourages that of real wealth and greatness."

But can Mr. Malthus apply this picture to the present state of England? when he says in it no labourer can maintain a family, therefore ought not to marry; yet he is applying the American multiplier of population to England.

Sir, we have comparatively a more extensive foreign trade, and more colonial emigrations than Holland; and as to the unhealthiness of the great part of the country, according to your boasted pages, it should impoverish her more than any other cause. As in unhealthy countries the mortality must fall most upon the weak, that is children; and your laboured volumes shew, that children dying exhausts the wealth of a country; as all those that die, the expences are lost to the community, as they do not arrive at maturity to benefit the state. Yet, Sir, here is a country formed of marshes, obtained from the sea, having a population, wealth, power and commerce above any other country of the same extent; till this hydra-headed monster, war, and Mr. Pitt's politics have almost ruined it.

Sir, I will confidently tell you, that this industrious country directly overthrows your weak supercilious hypothesis, viz. that commerce has outstripped agriculture; which I find is now the cant phrase of our agriculturists. The Hollanders grow no corn, Sir, experience no famine, have bread at a regular and low price, and their industry pours wealth into their country; and happily they have no agricultural societies to keep up the price of grain. You see, Sir, the great Hume, whom such a feeble author as you should reverence, was right when he says, "that the riches of a country consist in its industry," though you, with your new lights, contradict it.

Holland, Sir, confirms his opinion, and though you may be puffed by all these societies, it will avail nothing, you and your volumes must fall into oblivion.

The great Sir William Petty was so impressed with the commerce and the industry which he saw in Holland, that he thought it would be better for England if part of her acres were buried in the sea; and I add, our agricultural societies (I do not mean the members along with them.)

Your volumes abound with the most gross and absurd paradoxes. You say that population is a hydra, that the more you kill of the people, the more numerous they grow. That it is easier for a country, as Holland, to import all her corn, than England should import a part; though you acknowledge she is the best country for importation, as commanding so powerful a navy. You say, Index, "A nation which in average years draws but a small portion of its corn from abroad, much more precariously situated as to the constancy of its supplies, than states which draw almost the whole of their consumption from that source."

Holland has all the world for her market; she can go to the cheapest; she has no landowners to make a monopoly to force her to theirs. Sir, if England was to place a part of her country in the same state as Holland, Lancaster for instance, and that county to live entirely upon foreign

corn, how beneficial it would be to it, having its ports open; and Lancashire pays more to government than any other county. Every mechanic paying such a considerable tax for every thing he consumes; in spirits, malt, soap, salt, candles, leather, window duty and income tax, besides the duty upon what he manufactures for foreign countries.

I can but smile at the absurdity of our writers upon agriculture; they never once hint or allude to our manufacturers, it is all how their own labourers may live and be supported, as if we had not a manufacturer in the kingdom. But let me tell them, this is a commercial nation of manufacturers and merchants; they are the life, soul and vitals of the state. It is through them we have such a commanding navy, and such extensive colonies. There is a trading company who has more subjects, and considerably more wealth than this island and Ireland, if they were confined solely to their land, viz. the East India company. Buonaparte has subjects and land owners ten fold that this island possesses. The Population Act told this tale, which should be most firmly impressed on our legislator; that not one fifth of the population belongs to agriculture. Then what are we to do if the other four-fifths become paupers upon the land owners?*

* Our land owners are already too much alarmed with the number they now have. I see in the Agricultural Papers, pub-

our revenue? as every individual that eats and drinks and is clothed, pays so much to government. Besides, it is his trade that supports the revenue.

France calls us a nation of shopkeepers; let us glory in the name; he would give ten landholders for one shopkeeper. See what a small speck we are upon the globe, and what a figure we have lately cut upon the continent. The only power that has resisted Buonaparte. But let us become a nation confined to our barren soil and lands, purely agriculturalists, and even Holland's barren marshes, with trade, would be superior to us. In the cool disquisition of argument, what is a land owner? a country gentleman, a respectable man, but a mere drone in the state. No; it is the merchant, the manufacturer that is the active and valuable member of the state. It is them that has given England such consequence. See in the course of history what small states in the Mediterranean, the figure they have made. Even the barren marshes of Holland have often contended alone with England.*

lished by the society, they say, raise the price of corn, never mind what paupers it throws upon the parish; they, from the same motives, will hereafter say, the burthen of the poor laws is too enormous, they must be abolished.

* The difficulty that the great Alexander found in his conquest of Tyre, a maritime town, which so long withstood his power; that power which had rapidly over-run the world, shews what commerce is capable of. Mr. Rollin in his Antient

The greatest honour bestowed on Themistocles was not for the splendid victories he achieved over the Persians; it was for making his country a maritime one.* No state can be powerful, populous and wealthy, as an agricultural one. England, which is the best cultivated country, does not employ, according to the Population Act, one fifth of the people in agriculture. Then according to Mr. Malthus's plan, what is to be-

History, vol. iv. p. 436, "It was then Alexander, discouraged at so vigorous a defence, debated seriously, whether it would not be proper for him to raise the siege, and go for Egypt: for after having over-run Asia with prodigious rapidity, he found his progress unhappily retarded; and lost, before a single city, the opportunity of executing a great many projects of infinitely greater importance. On the other side, he considered that it would be a great blemish to his reputation, which had done him greater service than his arms, should he leave Tyre behind him, and thereby prove to the world, that he was not invincible.

* Mr. Rollin says, vol. ii. p. 493, "The reader has undoubtedly observed in Themistocles two or three principal strokes of his character, which entitle him to be ranked amongst the greatest men. The design which he formed and executed, of making the whole force of Athens maritime, shewed him to have a superior genius, capable of the highest view, penetrating into futurity, and judicious to seize the decisive point in great affairs. As the territory belonging to Athens was of a barren nature and small extent, he rightly conceived, that the only way that city had to enrich and aggrandize herself was by sea. And indeed that scheme may justly be looked upon as the source and cause of all those great events, which raised the republic of Athens in the sequel to so flourishing a condition.

come of the other part? The poor laws should be abolished, he says; then they must be literally starved. What will become of our revenue, and what will become of our kingdom, when it has lost its population? But the strongest argument that I can put to the land owner, what will become of his produce? there will be no home market to take off its surplus; no monopoly. It will then be an exporting nation of corn, which Mr. Malthus so anxiously wishes, and no revenue by which he can get a bounty; his corn must then be below in price the produce of the continent; as there would be the expence of shipping it for their market. Besides every country that has no inhabitants but agriculturists, must be liable to famine; for when the crops fail, as they are the only riches of the country, there will be no wealth to purchase foreign corn.

It is from England being a commercial country, that Mr. Young observes, she scarce ever experiences a famine, while France is so subject to one. But her late scarcities I shall hereafter prove, have been owing to the farmer pushing the ground to produce more corn than nature will allow of. Nay England, as being so much of a corn country, will still experience some inconvenience; whereas Holland, as having nothing to do with tillage, or the production of corn, can never experience famine. All the world is her tiller of the ground, and she always can go to the cheap-

est market, while her trade brings her in wealth and specie to go to market with.*

At a time when Buonaparte's great power has shaken the continent to its centre, and has made England almost tremble for her existence; at a time when England's powerful exertions are the wonder of the world, her commanding wealth and powerful navy, and all from her commercial wealth; at a time when her commercial greatness is the jealousy of all the world; at a time when the land owner is getting three times the value for his produce than is given in other countries. At this time, I say, it is that our avaricious half-witted agriculturists are exerting all their power and influence to stab her commerce, her wealth, her population, by literally starving the people, by making provisions so high; that people which by their great exertions, labour and ingenuity have brought the kingdom to this great prosperity. It is literally killing the goose for the golden eggs.

What makes an acre of ground of so much more value in England than in any other country?

* As it is allowed that this kingdom can only contend with the immense overgrown power of France, by having a superior navy; and therefore whatever trade breeds seamen, is essential to her safety. This is the reason why we think the dangerous coal trade of Newcastle is so necessary to the state; therefore the shipping employed in importing corn would equally be of service.

It is her commerce. What makes an English land owner so rich, that when he travels in foreign countries he is called "my Lord Anglois," teeming full of wealth? It is her commerce. Colonel Pinkney in his travels in France, just published, says, "The land is only about one tenth of what such land would cost in England."

The great Bacon, when England had little or no commerce, the population formed of a poor peasantry, living all together upon the land, formed of very small farms, endeavoured by all the ingenuity he was master of, to get this superfluous population taken from the tillage, and placed in towns to encourage trade. Also the great Elizabeth gave those towns peculiar privileges, by way of encouragement. And it was these towns that broke the power of the great barons, and by introducing commerce, civilized us from a state of barbarism and intestine war.

It is from these towns that the middle ranks of people were formed. That as they got wealth, purchased land from the great barons, and laid the foundation of our house of commons. The king, to keep down the power of these too powerful barons, admitted the towns to a share in the legislator. And it was these towns that aided the barons to keep down the over great power of the crown, and obtained our glorious constitution. And it is these towns and freeholders of the counties, if they would properly exert them-

selves, and return a pure house of commons, would stem this tide of corruption which is overwhelming our liberties and rights.

There is no part of the community where our rights can be so properly placed as in the middle ranks of the people. They are so far removed from government, that they can have no interest in any measure that is injurious to the country. It is implanted in the human breast for individuals to extend their power; therefore the people should always be jealous of the influence of the crown; and they should always be jealous of the influence of the great and leading families of the state. They are both so immediately near the seat of government, that they will be anxious for power. But those of the middle ranks, as they have no ambition to gratify, will look solely to the good of the state, and be attached to those ministers who are most likely to benefit the country. In short, they are the people where the liberties, religion and morals of the country are most properly deposited.

But one thing I must seriously invoke my countrymen, to adhere most reverentially and sacredly to our constitution; not to make any change in this unhappy age of revolutions; reform it when time has made innovation, but not overthrow it. It is a constitution formed by the blood of our forefathers, which has carried this country to its present height of grandeur, free from mo-

narchial or aristocratical tyranny, or democratic anarchy; therefore it should be revered with sacred regard.

But how is the state of this country since the time of Bacon? the principal part of the people being employed in trade. According to the Population Act, not one fifth being employed in agriculture. The formation of great farms, and the improved husbandry, by employing fewer hands; and also the improved machinery, where fewer hands are required; so that agriculture is a quite secondary employment. In every view we consider it. Hence the French call us a nation of shopkeepers; yes, we are a nation of traders, *a most great, powerful, and commercial nation, the wonder and envy of the whole world.* All nations are a nation of agriculturists; even the barbarian Poland; his country is a granary for Europe, though it is aided by no agricultural societies.

The French say, and justly, that we have been the principal means of carrying on the European war for these last sixteen years; and they as justly say, that we make all nations tributary to us. But we do not do it by tyrannically seizing upon their territories, but from our industry; the profits we receive by our trade and manufactories—an honourable and just way. It requires no sword to enforce it. But it is equitable and respectable, conferring reciprocal benefit. And I think all

governments ought to take a lesson that peace is the only way to make a country happy. What has England suffered from these unfortunate wars, during these sixteen years? And as Mr. Sheridan justly observed of our immense national debt, one part has been accumulated by fighting against the Bourbons; and the other part, the most considerable, in fighting for them.

Had the great and immortal Fox's peaceable, comprehensive spirit ruled this kingdom, what a happiness it would have been to Europe! Buonaparte's all-powerful military spirit would not have had an opportunity to be called into action. The old balance of Europe would have been entire; and what blood and treasure would have been saved. But, alas! Mr. Pitt's mad and frantic war horse prevailed. O England! your children, free from the frenzy which has overpowered their fathers, will sadly lament over the scene with a cool and dispassionate eye.

In all countries the act of the legislature has been divided in not allowing, or allowing the exportation of corn. The subjects claiming a natural right to the food produced in their country, before those of foreigners. But our land owners, which make so great a part of our legislature, not satisfied with having the power of exporting corn, have also demanded the most extraordinary and singular act to be allowed a bounty for the importation; making the people pay a bounty for

the express purpose of making the article dearer. Dr. Smith says, vol. i. p. 272, "In 1688 was granted the parliamentary bounty upon the exportation of corn. The country gentlemen, who then composed a still greater proportion of the legislature than they do at present, had felt that the money price of corn was falling. The bounty was an expedient to raise it artificially to the high price at which it had frequently been sold in the times of Charles I. and II. It was to take place, therefore, till wheat was so high as forty-eight shillings the quarter; that is, twenty shillings, or five-sevenths dearer than Mr. King had in that very year estimated the grower's price to be in times of moderate plenty. If his calculations deserve any part of the reputation which they have obtained very universally, eight-and-forty shillings the quarter was a price which, without some such expedient as the bounty, could not at that time be expected, except in years of extraordinary scarcity. But the government of King William was not then fully settled. It was in no condition to refuse any thing to the country gentlemen, from whom it was at that very time soliciting the first establishment of the annual land tax.

"The value of silver, therefore, in proportion to that of corn, had probably risen somewhat before the end of the last century; and it seems to have continued to do so during the course of the greater part of the present; though the necessary

operation of the bounty must have hindered that rise from being so sensible as it otherwise would have been in the actual state of tillage.

“ In plentiful years, the bounty, by occasioning an extraordinary exportation, necessarily raises the price of corn above what it otherwise would be in those years. To encourage tillage, by keeping up the price of corn even in the most plentiful years, was the avowed end of the institution.

“ In years of great scarcity, indeed, the bounty has generally been suspended. It must, however, have had some effect upon the prices of many of those years. By the extraordinary exportation which it occasions in years of plenty, it must frequently hinder the plenty of one year from compensating the scarcity of another.

“ Both in years of plenty and in years of scarcity, therefore, the bounty raises the price of corn above what it naturally would be in the actual state of tillage. If, during the sixty-four first years of the present century, therefore, the average price has been lower than during the sixty-four last years of the last century, it must, in the same state of tillage, have been much more so, had it not been for this operation of the bounty.

“ But without the bounty, it may be said, the state of tillage would not have been the same. What may have been the effects of this institution upon the agriculture of the country, I shall endeavour to explain hereafter, when I come to treat

particularly of bounties. I shall only observe at present, that this rise in the value of silver, in proportion to that of corn, has not been peculiar to England. It has been observed to have taken place in France during the same period, and nearly in the same proportion too, by three very faithful, diligent, and laborious collectors of the prices of corn, Mr. Duprè de St. Maur, Mr. Messance, and the author of the *Essay on the Police of Grain*. But in France, till 1764, the exportation of grain was by law prohibited; and it is somewhat difficult to suppose, that nearly the same diminution of price which took place in one country, notwithstanding this prohibition, should in another be owing to the extraordinary encouragement given to exportation.

“ It would be more proper, perhaps, to consider this variation in the average money price of corn as the effect rather of some gradual rise in the real value of silver in the European market, than of any fall in the real average value of corn. Corn, it has already been observed, is at distant periods of time a more accurate measurer of value than either silver, or perhaps any other commodity. When, after the discovery of the abundant mines of America, corn rose to three and four times its former money price, this change was universally ascribed, not to any rise in the real value of corn, but to a fall in the real value of silver. If, during the sixty-four first years of the

present century, therefore, the average money price of corn has fallen somewhat below what it had been during the greater part of the last century; we should in the same manner impute this change, not to any fall in the real value of corn, but to some rise in the real value of silver in the European market.

And lately, a weak and tottering minister, Lord Sidmouth, to please the country gentlemen, has considerably raised the bounty, at a time when the subject had been literally starving from the dearness of corn. The avaricious land owner, from selling his corn at three prices, was anxious to keep up the price; therefore he worked upon a tottering minister, who, when he brought in the bill, expressly said it was to benefit the land owner, by raising the price of corn, which is undoubtedly the operation proved by Dr. Smith, and also admitted by Mr. Malthus himself. Upon the latter's reasoning I shall hereafter make some remarks.

During this unfortunate contest with France, our superior navy commanded the seas, and from the troubles which the unhappy state of the continent had been thrown into; their manufactories being in a great measure destroyed, so that we manufactured for all the world; in consequence our manufactories thrived amazingly, and the demand of their produce was so great, that the men employed received great wages; and the provident foresight

of that description of people being so very weak, generally spending every thing they earned, so that they comparatively lived in great plenty and abundance, and in consequence consumed a great quantity of bread, and other necessaries of life. In the north, families that never tasted wheaten bread, lived altogether upon it, in consequence there was a greater demand for the importation of it, and the price gradually got up.

That the state of our manufactories has this effect upon corn, is clear; for during the American war, when they were at a very low ebb, corn (though we were feeding our army in America) sold very low, so that the farmers never had so bad a market for their produce. In the superior ranks, this will not appear so clear, as they say all must be fed. But there is a wide distinction between being full fed and poorly fed. The poor man's horse and the gentleman's horse are both fed, but the one consumes twice the quantity of food the other does. And as the labouring part form the great body of the people, therefore according to their purse will the farmer find a good or a poor market for his produce.

That very superficial college agriculturist, Mr. Malthus says, that our taxes raise the price of provisions. But was not our national debt nearly doubled during the American war, and yet the immense additional taxes at that time aided in lowering the price of food, For if a man gains

so much by his labour, the more he pays to government in taxes, the less he will be able to carry to market for his families food.

Then humane, benevolent and charitable reader, dwell upon this fact, that the labourer has only the same wages he had when his food was not half the price.* And at the very time when this poor labourer had just been relieved from direct starvation, and the markets began to descend a little from their immense price, did Mr. Malthus and our land owners get this high bounty upon exportation. I have heard different men say, that rather than undergo the pangs of actual starvation again, having suffered so much, they would really put a period to their existence.

The common language of the day now is, the farmers interest, which means the land owners interest; for farms are now principally let to the highest bidder. The old occupiers, though they and their forefathers had farmed the land for centuries; yet now the object of gain is so strong, that the best bidder gets it. That all attachment between the owner and farmer is broke. The latter was formerly attached to the soil, and would have lost his life in its defence. Though every labourer eats his poor pittance upon an average, for the last fifteen years, considerably above double the price he did before; and though all ports are shut against our receiving any

* In the manufacturing counties they are something more.

grain from other countries; and though it is now so high, yet it was with the greatest difficulty the minister could get the distillation from sugar instead of barley carried. And I see petitions from different places for its being continued; yet it probably will not. The cry of the farmer will be set up. But let me tell the land owner, that the present state of things cannot go on; that he is literally killing the goose for the golden eggs.

That England experienced a real scarcity of corn, during the year 1797, no one can doubt. I am well informed that the London dealers in wheat flour could, with the greatest difficulty, get enough to supply the bakers. The distress was so great, that the bakers would take a coach and be content if they could get half a sack at a time. They used to lend flour to each other, and the sack rose to ninety shillings. The prices in the following years soon subsided. But in the year 1800 the farmers having tasted the sweets of real scarcity, the price being so much increased, were anxious to raise it again, by giving alarms of scarcity. And that cabinet, whose great object was to raise the Bourbons on the throne of France again, took the alarm, fearful of having their foolish projects interfered with, by the people wanting bread, sent to their emissaries in the country to have returns made of the harvest (who took their information from interested farmers)

but with this intimation, to make their reports rather less produce than more. And in consequence of these imperfect statements, the returns being greatly below the real fact, the Duke of Portland published that unfortunate letter of the harvest, which has laid the foundation of the greatest real misfortune to this kingdom that it ever experienced.*

But in 1800 there was no scarcity of corn in the kingdom; for it is well known that the flour dealers in London had the greatest abundance of it: so that the bakers were not satisfied with a cart load at a time, but were only content with a waggon load. But mark the consequence of that unfortunate cabinet letter. The farmers received the authority of government that there was a scarcity, and therefore they immediately rose the price so high as seven pounds per sack; while in 1797; when there was a real scarcity, it only sold at ninety shillings per sack.

The King of Prussia also took the alarm, that English gold would drain his country of corn, and therefore with the motive of security to his subjects, and also gain to his coffers, laid an immense duty upon the exportation of it; and our foolish ministers, to confirm all, sent their agents

* That their returns were greatly less than the truth is notorious; I think it was as low as twenty-one Winchester bushels the acre, when it ought to have been as high as thirty bushels.

to buy up all the corn they could; and a premium was allowed to the importation, without specifying the quality; so that we had all the refuse of the continent poured upon us. And this great demand rose the price upon the continent to an enormous sum. Also our farmers obtaining three times the price for their grain, making amazing fortunes; but the land owner soon stepped in, and raised the rents in proportion.

In consequence of the immense influx of money to the farmer, with his extended capital, how did it operate? why, it made him break in upon his regular routine of crops; so that all his arable land, and even his grass lands, were ploughed for the growing of wheat; not reflecting that the land is only capable of such a routine of crops, in consequence it was soon exhausted; and as an able writer and observer, Mr. Thomas Davis and others remark, see the Bath papers, vol. xi. "The causes which tend to weaken the wheat plant are many, but the following are the most obvious:

"1st. Sowing wheat on land that has been so worn out by cropping, as to have lost that *tenacity* and *cohesion*, which are so necessary to a wheat crop, and which even dung, *without rest*, will not restore.

"2dly. Sowing the land in a light loose state, whereby the wheat plant roots too near the surface, and is liable to be injured by the winter's

frost, and to have its roots laid bare by the wind.

“*3dly.* Sowing wheat too late in the autumn, (which is too common,) especially in poor land and exposed situations, where the roots have not time to establish themselves before the winter comes on, and vegetation is totally at a stand.

“ Now as these causes have, in consequence of the advance in the price of wheat, occurred more frequently of late years than formerly; it is probable that the assertion ‘that the blight on wheat has increased of late years’ may be true. For,

“*1st.* It has not been uncommon to sow land with wheat every *third* year, instead of every fourth or fifth: and as the land, in the interim, has been under crops, the very nature of which is to make land light, and no fallow year having been allowed to get it close again; the crops, though abundant in straw, have not had strength enough to support them till harvest, and have been *laid by the rains*, and thereby become a prey to the blight.

“*2d.* It has been very much the practice of late years to sow wheat after turnips, and very clean crops have been produced thereby. But this system is wrong: the turnips are eaten before they are wanted, and the wheat is sown a month too late; and being necessarily *late ripe*, is often attacked by the blight.

“*3d.* It has been also a frequent practice to sow wheat after potatoes; and this system is still

worse: the land is rendered too light for wheat, and the seed time is much too late, unless it be in deep rich land, where the wheat plants will grow during the whole of the winter.

“*4th.* And even the practice of sowing wheat after clover has been carried to too great an extent on light land, especially where the land is nearly tired of clover. It encourages the slug, and the wire worm, which destroy a considerable part of the wheat plants, leaving the residue a *thin unequal crop*, which the blight seldom fails to attack, and frequently to ruin.

“ To sum up the whole:—If it can be proved, (and every man who is a farmer must have observed it) that all weak crops of wheat, and particularly all late ripe crops, are peculiarly subject to blight; it should be the great object of every farmer to sow such land, and such only, with wheat, as is fit for wheat; to get it in order early in the summer, that it may be close and firm before sowing; to sow as early as the state of the weather will permit, particularly in cold soils or exposed situations; and to sow those kinds of wheat, which are disposed to ripen early, (a circumstance much more attended to in Scotland than in England;) but above all, not to wear out his land by cropping it oftener with wheat than its nature will bear; always considering, that it is not the number of acres sown, but the number of

bushels produced, that will enrich the farmer, or supply the market.

“When I assert that weak crops are the most susceptible of blight, I do not altogether mean such crops as are weak in consequence of a want of manure, but such as grow on land which has been made so light by repeated culture, that the plants cannot get firm foothold, the great desideratum, in fact the *sine qua non* of a good wheat crop; and manure, particularly horse dung, instead of remedying this defect, only adds to the evil. In this instance, the remark which has been often made, that the highest manured crops are the most susceptible of blight, is perfectly consonant with my observation. For the same reason, these crops are apt to fall before they are ripe, and in that situation if there be any blight in the air, they are sure to be infected with it, because the sun cannot dry them, and the circulation of the sap is impeded by the bruising of the straw.

“It was well observed in one of the Agricultural Reports, ‘that land may be made so drunk with dung, that a wheat crop cannot stand upon it:’ and I will defy any man to get a good yielding crop of wheat in a highly-manured garden. He may, and probably will, get a good crop of straw.” I have only quoted a part of Mr. Davis’s very valuable paper.

Though they made the ground drunk with manure, at an immense expence, nevertheless their

crops failed; nay, these highly manured grounds were the more susceptible of blight. The ground cannot bear the same grain too often repeated, though you should make a dunghill of it. Along with this, the other crops lost their proportion of manure, it principally going to the wheat crop. Also people in trade threw their capital into agriculture; the consequence of all which was, bad crops, nature being pushed beyond her powers. These facts, and their consequences, are now universally admitted.

About 1804 the farmers seeing their error, and the price of grain falling, having got more into their former regular routine of crops; but the landowner, who had raised the farmers rents enormously, saw that they could not be paid; therefore they brought in a bill expressly on purpose to keep up the price. That being the language of the minister when he brought it into the House of Commons; the bill giving an immense bounty to the exportation, and stopping the importation when it was at a high price.* Here then know

* Then the farmers were told that the price of grain could never fall below such a price. For when the home market was glutted, there was a considerable bounty for the exportation. Confirmed in this, not dreading an accumulation of it in their hands, they kept up their high prices, there being an immediate rise upon passing the bill. The most active individuals in getting this bill passed, rank themselves in the character of patriots. But I ask if this bill could entitle them to the name; though when one of them met the Essex farmers, they ap-

this important fact, O Englishman, that it has been entirely owing to the interference of the ministry that the price of corn has been so high. Our fathers had bad crops of corn, but the price always came down again to its usual standard; and as the great Smith has clearly shewn, that government should never interfere either with corn or any other merchandize, but leave all open to the spirit, ingenuity and judgment of the traders. But our land owners have always acted a very selfish part; for when King William came over, and when every Englishman's breast beat high for his liberty, his religion and his country; when one might have supposed that all selfish motives would have been drowned amidst these high impulses; no, the land owner thought this a proper time to get his bill for the bounty upon the exportation of corn, and restrictions upon the importation of it: yet will the nation do the same? Nor need the farmer applaud him, for the same spirit that influenced the bill, will put them upon the rack rent. I am sorry to remark, that those gentlemen who are the most active agriculturists, or the enhancers of the price of grain, rank themselves amongst the patriots. But I would ask these gentlemen, what is a subtle constitutional question to a poor man, who has a starving family? He might with propriety say, it is all self-interest; for the same motive that raised the price of corn, governs all your conduct. Amidst the first constitution in the world, and also the richest country; we, who by our labours and industry, have raised it to this high state of prosperity; who have fought its battles at Trafalgar, in Egypt, Italy, Spain and Portugal, are starving systematically.

ports. The gross injustice of which bill was afterwards rescinded. But the same selfish powerful interest got it again enforced:

Indeed, formerly, there was some specious plea for the bill. The country was not in a high state of improvement; provisions were low; trade had not then reared its high commanding front to spread industry and wealth to the country. But the present state is just the reverse. Commerce has attained its utmost height; industry has been pushed to its utmost point. In short, our commerce has been the admiration, envy and wonder of the world. In consequence of this greatness, the produce of the land, from having so rich an home market, had gradually risen in its price,

At this time, I say, did our rapacious land owner get a weak and falling minister to bring in that unfortunate corn bill; so that for the last ten years the acts of the legislature have made corn three prices; and as grain is the standard, every other necessary has risen in the same proportion; so that the real and active labourers of the beehive are actually starving, while the drones of the hive are wallowing in luxury and sensuality. Look at the globe, and see what a small speck we are upon it; and yet, through commerce, we command by sea the whole world; and certainly the land owner must say, that our commerce

makes our navy; they certainly cannot say it is made by ploughmen.

The great argument of the œconomists is, that they feed us: so might they claim the intellects of a Bacon, a Locke, a Shakespear, because they fed them. But even commerce has a great share in our food; and even now, in many of our necessities, as tobacco, tea, sugar, and spices; for what a great share has the produce of other countries in our food. Let a nobleman look over his expences, and see what a deal goes to his grocer, his wine merchant, &c.: he would not like to be put upon the diet of his countries produce, butchers meat, bread, potatoes, ale and spirits from grain. But if we were confined to our island, and its produce, what would come of the most essential part of its population, its commercial part? for, according to the return of the Population Act, the agricultural makes not one fifth part. They must be sent to the poor house, but that asylum would not be long given them. And where would our rich home market be for the great surplus produce of the land, above four-fifths of it? It must fall in value below the corn of other countries, as there would be the expence of exportation. Besides, as population in consequence must rapidly decrease, where would be the heroes of Trafalgar and Maida to fight our battles, with the overgrown power of France? But when she had got to be master of the seas and com-

merce, our little insignificant speck upon the globe, with its land and land owners, would scarce be worth conquering.

Let us not imitate the Spaniards, when they expelled the commercial part of their population, viz. the Moors and the Flemings; but theirs was a nobler motive, religion; but ours, gain, sordid gain, which is defeating its end, literally killing the goose for the golden eggs. And theirs was direct expulsion, but ours direct extinction of the race. Even this great champion for it, Mr. Malthus says, that at present no man should be allowed, either by his own prudence or that of the community, to marry, without he is able to maintain a family, and if he did, he and his family should starve. He has so often changed and altered his principles since he first wrote, that it is hard to collect what he really does, or means to say. He says in his appendix, therefore it must appear to be his most digested opinion, vol. ii. p. 537, "The lowest prospect with which a man can be justified in marrying seems to be, the power, when in health, of earning such wages, as at the average price of corn will maintain the average number of living children at a marriage." Now the average number is six children, therefore instead of maintaining six, I do directly assert that his eighteen pence per day is not sufficient to maintain himself as a man ought to be maintained, who works from six o'clock in the

morning to six in the evening; and during that time, with the greatest exertion his nature is capable of, an industry of labour which no nation but the commercial nations of England and Holland are in the habits of.

Now I think this requires scarce any arithmetic to know, that if every one acts up to the spirit of Mr. Malthus's Essay, that England will soon be extinct, instead of having too extensive a population, we shall actually have none. This is as obvious as two and one make three. Good heavens! that one who is capable of counting his fingers could have erred so materially upon so important and essential a point. Nay, it has been said that ministers have been acting in conformity to his principles, in being lavish of human lives; as, according to Mr. Malthus's absurd paradoxes, the more you kill, the more you will have: so according to his favourite simile, the more calves the grazier kills, the more he will have.

He endeavours to apply these absurd calculations to France; he says, vol. i. p. 436, "The births are 955,430, the deaths 821,871, and the marriages 202,177. These numbers hardly equal Necker's estimates; and yet all the calculations in this work, both with respect to the whole population and its proportion to a square league, make the old territory of France more populous now than at the beginning of the revolution.

"In the face of these calculations, the author takes a lower multiplier than Necker for the births, observing that though Necker's proportions remained true in the towns, yet that in the country the proportion of births had increased to 1-219, 1-229, 1-22 1-2, 1-23, which he attributes to the premature marriages to avoid the military levies; and on the whole concludes with mentioning 25 as the proper multiplier. And yet if we make use of this multiplier, we shall get a population under 25 millions, instead of 28 millions.

"The part of this work relating to population is not drawn up with much knowledge of the subject. One remark is very curious. It is observed that the proportion of marriages to the population is as 1 to 110, and of births as 1 to 25, from which it is inferred that one fourth of the born live to marry. If this inference were just France would soon be depopulated."

France pushed her population to the utmost verge: marriage was made a civil contract before the magistrate: married men were exempt from the conscripts: the dissolution of the marriage was easily obtained: illegitimate children had greatly increased from the dissolute manners which the revolution had introduced. He says, p. 446, "As the proportion of illegitimate children in France has risen so extraordinarily, as from 1-47 of all births to 1-11." Besides corn,

was so cheap and labour so high; and the government being so anxious to favour population. But hear what the reports say, which was not directly drawn up by the government, immediately under Buonaparte's eye. He says, p. 443, "With respect to the population, out of 69 departments, the reports from which are given, in 16 the population is supposed to be increased; in 42 diminished; in 9 stationary; and 2 the active population is said to be diminished, but the numerical to remain the same." But Buonaparte soon suppressed this report, as shewing him and the nation these home truths of the consequence of his wars.

Is it not clear to every one that in England soldiers are scarce to be got, the parishes giving as high as 50 and 60*l.* a man; though our manufactories had been greatly stopped, letting loose a number of men who had no other way of procuring a livelihood, and their families were thrown upon the parish; so that we may now justly say that England is drained of its active population as well as France. The result of taking such a number of men for war, their families were thrown in consequence upon the parishes; and this same merciless author, with the most cruel *sang froid*, labours to take from them this asylum for their families. So that these men who so gloriously fell at Trafalgar, in Egypt, Spain and Portugal, their country in recompence are to take from their

families that miserable home, a poor-house; for the poor laws are to be abolished, and for what, to relieve the land owners, that race of men for whom he is so great an advocate. Good heavens! is this a christian country! and is Mr. Malthus a christian divine, a teacher of those heavenly precepts of benevolence, temperance and charity which our Saviour came on earth to inculcate, and which he laid down his life to enforce.

You say, Sir, the poor have no right for a maintenance; I say, Sir, they have a right, even if there was no act of parliament to enforce it. Our holy religions precepts are principally to inculcate charity; upon this principle our forefathers endowed the clergy with large emoluments, in order that they might exercise this heavenly virtue. The monasteries had large domains given them; the bishops an immense revenue; and also the dean and chapters. The clergy had the tenth of the produce. All these immense establishments were not to pamper the luxurious appetite of its members; they were supposed to follow the temperance of our beloved Saviour, and these ample means were to deal out nourishment to the indigent and distressed, giving spiritual and temporal food.

Upon the reformation by Henry the eighth, these monasteries were destroyed, and the clergy had not these ample means of charity. In consequence there was great distress among the poor.

The great Elizabeth, to obviate this distress, enacted the poor laws; an act worthy of that great and glorious princess, and her great and able ministers, Cecil and Walsingham. It is from these wise, salutary and benevolent laws that England has flourished and kept up her population; and in consequence made an acre of land of so much more value in England than in any other part of the world.

You say that the poor have no natural right to these poor laws, I say and repeat it with confidence they have a legal, a natural and religious right, which they have enjoyed upwards of five hundred years. And since that time the land has been a hundred times sold and bought, with this charitable incumbrance. Therefore the present incumbents bought the land with this humane tax. Nay, many of the great families of this kingdom seized upon at the reformation a great part of the domains of the church, which was for these charitable purposes. I confidently assert, that the poor have a just, equitable and charitable claim upon the land owner, which neither justice, honour or religion will allow it to be set aside.

Our great manufactories and artificers which have brought this kingdom to so great a pitch, and our sailors and soldiers who have so gloriously fought our battles. The one having made the land owner so rich, and the other having protected him in those riches, therefore have a natural, a

religious, a legal and just claim to be fed, when in necessity.

By direct artifice, the food in this country has got to such an enormous price, being three times the usual price; money being so much depreciated by the profuse circulation of paper money. Therefore the land owner is talking of millions that the poor rates cost him; but this is owing to his own fault, in raising the price of provisions, and driving more poor families into the poor house: add to this the paper currency. But as he is so actuated by the influence of gain, let him dwell upon this important fact; let him carry it to his pillow, and there hug it; let it sink deep into his heart; let it enter his head, and make a part of his calculation of gain, that an acre of land in England is worth ten in France, of the same quality, let him be happy and content with that gain, and not kill the goose for the golden eggs, though Mr. Malthus should advise him to do it.

But I shall inform the land owner, that by raising the price of provisions, though it may tickle his vanity in having his rent-roll so raised, yet it is a mere nominal rise, in reality the true value is depressed.

The great expence is in the government; it is it that makes the great expenditure. Only think of the enormous sum of seventy millions annually

expended; therefore, by raising the price of the necessaries of life, government's expences must be so much the more, and the land owner must have more taxes to pay. Along with this, his own expences must be much increased, as he and his family consume the necessaries of life. Add to this, the additional weight of the poor rates. All these additional expences will do more than counterbalance the increased rent. But the heaviest and most disastrous consequences are still to follow. The value of most of our manufacturing articles are in the labour; thus our great manufactories of wool, cotton and iron. A pound of cotton which costs half a crown, may be worked into a gown of the value of twenty pounds. A piece of iron may be worked into considerably greater value than its weight in gold. Wool, by labour, is equally improved by being made into cloth; therefore, when peace is established upon the continent, how can an English manufacturer enter a foreign market, against goods made upon the continent, where labour is less than half the value it is in England. A shilling will procure twice the quantity of food that it will do in England.*

Besides, worse than all this, the manufacturers are obliged to lower the wages of their labourers.

* Mr. Malthus says, that Holland lost her manufactories by the necessaries of life being too high.

so much, that the poor artist cannot get bread for his family; though he works like a horse, night and day, he sees his family starving, and disease and death seizing upon his children; and he himself is fairly worked to death, long before his natural period. This true picture of the state of our manufactories chills marriage, and prevents those whom otherwise would be born, while it kills those that are born. See what poverty does, justly and ably described by the great and able Dr. Smith; he says, vol. i. p. 107, "But poverty, though it does not prevent the generation, is extremely unfavourable to the rearing of children. The tender plant is produced, but in so cold a soil, and so severe a climate, soon withers and dies. It is not uncommon, I have been frequently told, in the Highlands of Scotland, for a mother who has borne twenty children not to have two alive. Several officers of great experience have assured me, that so far from recruiting their regiment, they have never been able to supply it with drums and fifes from all the soldiers' children that were born in it. A greater number of fine children, however, is seldom seen any where than about a barrack of soldiers. Very few of them, it seems, arrive at the age of thirteen or fourteen. In some places, one half the children born die before they are four years of age; in many places before they are seven; and in almost all places before they are nine or ten. This great mortality, how-

ever, will every where be found chiefly among the children of the common people, who cannot afford to tend them with the same care as those of better station. Though their marriages are generally more fruitful than those of people of fashion, a smaller proportion of their children arrive at maturity. In foundling hospitals, and among the children brought up by parish charities, the mortality is still greater than among those of the common people."

Also see its chilling effects upon marriage. Mr. Malthus says, vol. ii. p. 196, "In the work of Dr. Aikin, just alluded to, it appears that the register for the collegiate church at Manchester, from Christmas 1793, to Christmas 1794, stated a decrease of 168 marriages, 538 christenings, and 250 burials. And in the parish of Rochdale, in the neighbourhood, a still more melancholy reduction, in proportion to the number of people, took place. In 1792 the births were 746, the burials 646, and the marriages 339. In 1794 the births were 373, the burials 671, and the marriages 199. The causes of this sudden check to population was the commencement of the war, and the failure of commercial credit, which occurred about this time; and such a check could not have taken place in so sudden a manner, without being occasioned by the most severe distress."

But let us consider the state of the lower ranks in England; I say in England, which is universally allowed to be the greatest and richest kingdom in the world. Let us see then the happiness of its lower orders, which are the great mass of the people, being 99 out of the 100. Let us see what Mr. Malthus himself says, vol. ii. p. 410.*

An interesting author, Colonel Pinkney, see his Travels in France. The Critical Review for September says, "If credit be given to Mr. Pinkney's observations, in any thing like their full extent, those among us have formed very wrong and

* The lower classes of the people in some parts of Germany are in a better situation than those of the same class in England. In Switzerland, for the same reason, their condition, before the late troubles, was, perhaps, universally superior. And in a journey through the duchies of Holstein and Sleswick, belonging to Denmark, the houses of the lower classes of people appeared to me to be neater and better, and in general there were fewer indications of poverty and wretchedness among them, than among the same ranks in this country.

"Even in Norway, notwithstanding the disadvantage of a severe and uncertain climate, from the little that I saw in a few weeks residence in the country, and the information that I could collect from others, I am inclined to think that the poor were, on the average, better off than in England. Their houses and clothing were superior, and though they had no white bread, they had much more meat, fish, and milk, than our labourers; and I particularly remarked, that the farmers' boys were much stouter and healthier looking lads than those of the same description in England. This degree of happiness, superior to what could be expected from the soil and climate.

very fanciful conclusions who are so fond of haranguing on the misery of our neighbours under the tyrannic government of Buonaparte. The fact much more probably is, that in that extraordinary man the French nation has at last found a ruler exactly suited to its character and disposition. Our traveller is not very frequent in his philosophical or political remarks; but his book abounds in statements from which, if considered as correct, such deductions may easily be made by the reader, and this we have always held to be a much more instructive, as well as entertaining mode of writing travels than the grave and sententious method adopted by the generality of our English tourists.

“From his accounts of the peasantry in various parts of the empire which he visited, we should be inclined to believe that class of inhabitants most essentially improved in their condition by the progress of the revolution. Let us take a few extracts by way of specimen. Speaking of a pretty female companion whom he overtook on a walk near Calais, he says,

“I learned in the course of my walk that she was the daughter of a small farmer; the farm was small indeed, being about half an arpent, or acre. She had been to Calais to take some butter, and had the same journey three mornings in the week. Her father had one cow of his own, and rented two others, for cash of which he paid a louis annually.

The two latter fed by the road sides. Her father earned twenty sols a day as a labourer, and had a small pension from the government as a veteran and wounded soldier. Upon this little they seemed, according to her answers, to live very comfortably, not to say substantially. Poultry, chesnuts, milk, and dried fruit, formed their daily support. “We never buy meat,” said she, “because we can raise more poultry than we can sell.”

“I passed several cottages, and entered some. The inhabitants seemed happy, and to possess some substantial comforts. The greater part of these cottages had a walnut or chesnut tree before them, around which was a rustic seat, and which, as overshadowed by the broad branches and luxuriant foliage, composed a very pleasing image. The manner in which the sod was partially worn under most of them, explained their nightly purpose; or, if there could be any doubt, the flute and fiddle, pendant in almost every house, spoke a still more intelligible language. I entered no house so poor, and met with no inhabitant so inhospitable, as not to receive the offer, either of milk, or some sort of wine; and every one seemed to take a refusal as if they had solicited, and not obtained, an act of kindness. If the French are not the most hospitable people in the world, they have at least the art of appearing so. I speak here only of the peasantry, and from first impressions. The rent of one of these cot-

tages of two floors and two rooms on each, is thirty-five livres. They have generally a small garden, and about one hundred yards of common land, between the road and the house, on which grows the indispensable walnut or chesnut. The windows are glazed, but the glass is usually taken out in summer. The walls are generally sea-stone, but are clothed with grape-vines, or other shrubs, which curling around the casements, render them shady and picturesque. The bread is made of wheat-meal, but in some cottages consisted of thin cakes, without leaven, made of buck wheat. The common beverage is a weak wine, sweet and pleasant to the taste. In some houses it very nearly resembled the good metheglin, very common in the northern counties of England. Eggs, bacon, poultry, and vegetables, seemed in great plenty, and, as I understood, composed the dinners of the peasantry twice a week at least. I was surprized at this evident abundance in a class in which I should not have expected it. Something of it, I fear, must be imputed to the extraordinary profits of the smuggling which is carried on along the coast.

“In the foregoing passages, he is only speaking of the peasants of one particular district, that of the environs of Calais; but the reader will find, as he proceeds, that this is a tolerably faithful picture of those in the other provinces, especially Anjou, Touraine, and the Bourbonnais.”

* Good heavens! that England's ingenious, wise and active people, who have brought her to this great pre-eminence; nay, the richest, wisest, most industrious and most ingenious people upon earth, that they should be the most miserable. Lately, it has been the policy of England to keep the lower orders in allegiance and subordination; here I admit the necessity. But then let us make them happy, let a political disease be pointed out, and salutary probed to the quick, wherever it resides, whether in the lower or higher orders of the people. And this disease I say is in the high price of provisions, which have been raised by artifice to this alarming and shameful price; then let it be remedied immediately, before the disease has eat into the vitals of the state. I ring the alarm bell to Old England. It is a disease far more formidable than even Buonaparte's gigantic power.

To point out a disease, without suggesting the remedy, is not so well; therefore I will name the remedy, which is ably and judiciously shewn by Dr. Smith to be the true policy of all states, not to have any monopolies or restrictions upon any branch of commerce; to leave all open to the

* The remarks of Mr. Malthus, just quoted, in comparing the peasantry of Germany with those in England, were before the late wars; but how much lower the situation of our peasantry must be now, since the high price of provisions.

ingenuity of man, to each individual; therefore rescind all acts of parliament concerning it; in short, to have no corn laws, as the great Dr. Smith says; let the bread that the poor live upon be free from all shackles, all restraints; let its importation and exportation be open; in short, let not the rich grind the poor; that very poor who are the cause of all their riches, and who also are the guards of it. Consider at this time having so powerful an enemy in France; we ought to do every thing to nourish and preserve the people, who are naturally loyal and attached to their constitution; let its laws then guard and protect them from those hard and cruel monopolies which are actually starving them. This is as much the true policy of the land owner as it is of the state.

But what is the present behaviour of our great land owners, after having got their corn laws passed? they are as watchful as Cerberus in every thing that is to keep up the price of grain. As the present times, when corn is so immensely high; all the ports in both the continents being shut against us; and when the legislature, to relieve a little the distresses of the poor, prohibited the distillation of spirits from grain. Do these men take every opportunity to influence the legislature to get the prohibition taken off, calling out for the farmer, a cant phrase for their own pockets. This is an age for monopolies; scarce an article

of trade but what great capitalists get hold of, and raise the price according to their pleasure. I see committees of farmers, and sub-committees; I see at the wool market great proprietors, men of high rank and power; nay, even legislators, mount the rostrum, and inform the sellers that they should only sell at such and such prices.* I expect to hear of some of them presiding at Smithfield market, and inform the sellers that the cattle should only be sold at such a price; nay, that our butchers should also have their committees. Our wise and prudent forefathers were very tenacious of such combinations. Does the law authorize them? For heavens sake let this rapacity end; let the poor be able to live. I say again, kill not the goose for the golden eggs.

It was shewn that England was not able to maintain herself in corn, importing so many quarters every year. This importation of itself would naturally raise the price of provisions, as all foreign grain coming into our market would have the expence of freight, the expence of inland carriage, and the profit of the importers; therefore every land owner in England having a constant necessitous market to supply, would get a superior price for their corn. This ought to have

* There was a late instance of a man of high rank and fortune loosing a considerable sum in his attempt at a monopoly of wool. Let humanity rejoice at it.

satisfied them; but nothing less than a monopoly would satisfy their rapacity.*

* Dr. Smith, after proving in the most satisfactory manner, the impolicy and injustice of the corn laws, and even of their pernicious consequence to the land owner. And one does not know whether to admire most, the profound sagacity of his judgment, or the liberality of his sentiments; he says, vol. iii. p. 361, "The plentiful supply of the home-market was not the direct object of those statutes; but, under the pretence of encouraging agriculture, to raise the money price of corn as high as possible, and thereby to occasion, as much as possible, a constant dearth in the home-market. By the discouragement of importation, the supply of that market, even in times of great scarcity, was confined to the home-growth; and by the encouragement of exportation, when the price was so high as forty-eight shillings the quarter, that market was not, even in times of considerable scarcity, allowed to enjoy the whole of that growth. The temporary laws, prohibiting for a limited time the exportation of corn, and taking off for a limited time the duties upon its importation, expedients to which Great Britain has been obliged so frequently to have recourse, sufficiently demonstrates the impropriety of her general system. Had that system been good, she would not so frequently have been reduced to the necessity of departing from it.

"Were all nations to follow the liberal system of free exportation and free importation, the different states into which a great continent was divided, would so far resemble the different provinces of a great empire. As among the different provinces of a great empire, the freedom of the inland trade appears, both from reason and experience, not only the best palliative of a dearth, but the most effectual preventive of a famine; so would the freedom of the exportation and importation trade be among the different states into which a great continent was divided. The larger the continent, the easier the communication through all the different parts of it, both by land and by

One great cause of England's consuming such a quantity of corn, is her immense establishment

water the less would any one particular part of it ever be exposed to either of these calamities, the scarcity of any one country being more likely to be relieved by the plenty of some other."

Also that great man says, vol. iii. p. 65, "The greatest and most important branch of the commerce of every nation, it has been observed, is that which is carried on between the inhabitants of the town and those of the country. The inhabitants of the town draw from the country the rude produce, which constitutes both the materials of their work and the fund of their subsistence; and they pay for this rude produce, by sending back to the country a certain portion of it manufactured and prepared for immediate use. The trade which is carried on between these two different sets of people, consists ultimately in a certain quantity of rude produce, exchanged for a certain quantity of manufactured produce. The dearer the latter, therefore, the cheaper the former; and whatever tends in any country to raise the price of manufactured produce, tends to lower that of the rude produce of the land, and thereby to discourage agriculture. The smaller the quantity of manufactured produce, which any given quantity of rude produce, or, what comes to the same thing, which the price of any given quantity of rude produce is capable of purchasing, the smaller the exchangeable value of that given quantity of rude produce; the smaller the encouragement which either the landlord has to increase its quantity by improving, or the farmer by cultivating the land. Whatever, besides, tends to diminish in any country the number of artificers and manufacturers, tends to diminish the home-market, the most important of all markets for the rude produce of the land, and thereby still further to discourage agriculture.

"Those systems, therefore, which, preferring agriculture to all other employments, in order to promote it, impose restraints

of horses, for luxury, pleasure, commerce, &c, they are estimated, according to Mr. Curwen,

upon manufacturers and foreign trade, act contrary to the very end which they propose, and indirectly discourage that very species of industry which they mean to promote. They are so far, perhaps, more inconsistent than even the mercantile system. That system, by encouraging manufactures and foreign trade more than agriculture, turns a certain portion of the capital of the society from supporting a more advantageous, to support a less advantageous species of industry. But still it really and in the end encourages that species of industry which it means to promote. Those agricultural systems, on the contrary, really and in the end discourage their own favourite species of industry.

“ It is thus that every system which endeavours, either by extraordinary encouragements, to draw towards a particular species of industry a greater share of the capital of the society than what would naturally go to it; or, by extraordinary restraints, to force from a particular species of industry some share of the capital which would otherwise be employed in it; is really subversive of the great purpose which it means to promote. It retards, instead of accelerating the progress of the society towards real wealth and greatness; and diminishes, instead of increasing the real value of the annual produce of its land and labour.

“ All systems, either of preference or of restraint, therefore, being thus completely taken away, the obvious and simple system of natural liberty establishes itself of its own accord. Every man, as long as he does not violate the laws of justice, is left perfectly free to pursue his own interest his own way, and to bring both his industry and capital into competition with those of any other man, or order of men. The sovereign is completely discharged from a duty, in the attempting to perform which he must always be exposed to innumerable delusions, and for the proper performance of which, no human wisdom

as follows: “ The number of horses that are entered and pay the duty amounts to 1,178,000, as appears from the returns of the tax office; and if we add those exempted as belonging to the army, &c. make allowance for the occasional evasion of the tax, we shall not much err in taking the total number at two hundred thousand: nine hundred thousand and upwards, of husbandry and draught horses are entered; and making the proper allowance for exemptions, and for such as may not have been returned, we may, I conceive, fairly estimate them at one million. —Suppone then

200,000 pleasure horses require	6 acres each, or	1,200,000
30,000 cavalry	- - - 5 acres	150,000
1,000,000 husb. and draught horses	4 acres	4,000,000
200,000 colts, brood mares, &c,	3 acres	600,000
<hr/>		<hr/>
1,430,000 horses		acres 5,950,000

or knowledge could ever be sufficient; the duty of superintending the industry of private people, and of directing it towards the employments most suitable to the interest of the society. According to the system of natural liberty, the sovereign has only three duties to attend to; three duties of great importance, indeed, but plain and intelligible to common understandings: first, the duty of protecting the society from the violence and invasion of other independent societies; secondly, the duty of protecting, as far possible, every member of the society from the injustice or oppression of every other member of it, or the duty of establishing an exact administration of justice; and, thirdly, the duty of erecting and maintaining certain public works and certain public institutions, which it can never be for the interest of any individual, or small number of individuals, to erect and maintain; because the profit could never repay the

“Of the six millions of acres employed in feeding horses of various descriptions, suppose it to be divided between pasture and grain, allowing 4 millions for hay and grass, and 2 millions for oats.”

Then only think what a consumption they must make? An intelligent person whom I consulted, informed me that he thought a horse kept with the greatest œconomy, would consume the produce of three acres of ground, but a well-fed horse five acres; while a man and his wife, with six children, fed as they are in the north, principally upon potatoes only, half an acre. This then sufficiently accounts for our great importation of grain, without supposing it proceeds from an increased population. How ought the legislature act in this case? Why, it ought to lay a very heavy tax upon horses, particularly those for luxury and pleasure. Nevertheless I shall with confidence prophesy under the great dearness of the necessaries of life, our depressed manufactures, and in consequence our decreasing population, England will soon be an exporting nation of corn. Indeed, the present state directly proves it; for though all the ports for grain have been so long shut against us, both of the continent and America, and we are confined to our own produce. Nevertheless I am

expence to any individual or small number of individuals, though it may frequently do much more than repay it to a great society.”

confidently informed that the country never shewed such an appearance of plenty from the number of stacks still standing at this period of the year. This I account for in our depressed manufactories and labouring poor, their consumption being so much lessened. It was just the same during the American war; grain in consequence fell to a very low price (though we were then feeding our army in America with our own produce) from our manufactories being then much depressed.

But it may be asked, why does not grain fall now? why, from the habit the farmer has been in, in receiving high prices, from his increased rent, and from the late corn laws; knowing that when the price falls to such a point, he then will have a considerable bounty for exportation. Also the farmer has no occasion to bring his corn to market at a particular time, for to pay his rent; but he can go to a bank, where the proprietors will let him have as many of their notes as he pleases, to pay his rent; they, by this means, getting five per cent. interest, and their notes thrown into circulation. So that the farmer just keeps feeding the market scantily, so as to keep up those immense and enormous prices. This is one of the serious calamities that these country banks are the cause of; nay, many of them ruined themselves by their speculations and mono-

polies in purchasing corn. Mr. Malthus talks of scarcity; there is, nor has been no scarcity since the corn has been systematically rising; he should therefore substitute the words high prices for scarcity.

These high prices have been a great curse to England; they stimulated the farmer to alter his regular routine of crops, to force the growth of wheat at an immense expence of manure, upon the same ground, having too quick repetitions of wheat, and by that means impoverishing his other crops; the soil requiring longer intervals of rest, and also ploughing up his pastures. What was the consequence of all this? why, an impoverished grain, what the farmers called a blight. But the truth was, it was a blast from a rapacious avarice that destroyed the crops; therefore the kingdom should be told this important fact, that these high prices are the blight that has made England pay so much for foreign corn. At last the farmers had seen their mistake, and our crops became again to their usual standard. But from our wise ministers, by their order in council, having got all the foreign ports shut against our importation of grain; then the same rapacity seized our farmers, of pushing the produce of corn too much, and the same disaster took place, the crops were bad; therefore every accurate observer will see that the high price of grain, instead of

producing more corn, just acts the reverse, producing less.

Mr. Malthus, that ignorant agriculturist, talks of the producing of corn as if man could multiply it at pleasure, by expending a large capital upon it. But experience has informed him, if he has any candour, sense, or observation, that it has just operated to the contrary. I confidently say, and I challenge all the societies and agriculturists that these high prices have cost the nation many millions for foreign corn, which, if the farmers had gone on in their usual way, without pushing too much with their capitals, their own lands would have produced, without requiring foreign aid.

The manufactory of iron, which is a mineral, found in abundance in the earth, by extending your capital, you may produce at pleasure. But the produce of corn is very different; nature says, I will produce to such a point, but if you push me beyond my strength and power, you exhaust me. You may make a dunghill of my bosom, and it only counteracts itself. Wine will accelerate a man's strength, but if you give him too much, you take it away. Through all Mr. Malthus's reasoning, this idea predominates; but the real truth is this, instead of agriculture being not properly pushed for want of capital, it is too much pushed from having too much capital. For in this high commercial age, when paper forms the circulating medium; and at a time

when our manufactories were declining, and our farmers all rich, from the high prices, the same speculating spirit turned their capital to farming, in consequence the soil was too much pushed, and exhausted, which produced an impoverished grain.

The blight seems to be from this cause, that the ground has not energy enough to push the vegetable to its full maturity; for at this crisis it requires the most active powers of vegetation, when the seeds are forming; therefore from moist weather, and wanting sun, the seeds are improperly formed, being dwarfish. This the farmers are in general sensible of; but upon the orders in council being issued, avarice again seized them, they pushed their crops too much, and they in consequence were not so good.

Mr. Malthus says, vol. ii. p. 245, "The great obstacle to the melioration of land is the difficulty, the expence, and sometimes the impossibility of procuring a sufficient quantity of dressing. As this instrument of improvement, therefore, is in practice limited, whatever it may be in theory, the question will always be, how it may be most profitably employed; and in any instance where a certain quantity of dressing and labour employed to bring new land into cultivation, would have yielded a permanently greater produce if employed upon old land, both the individual and the nation are losers. Upon this principle, it is

not uncommon for farmers in some situations never to dress their poorest land, but to get from it merely a scanty crop every three or four years, and to employ the whole of their manure, which they practically feel is limited, on those parts of their farms, where it will produce a greater proportional effect." This error our farmers run into in cultivating barren lands, which in consequence favoured the blight.

But in a manufacturing nation barren lands may be cultivated, but then it must be done by a regular and slow progress, and by having a population capable of purchasing foreign grain, by manufacturing for foreign markets, as England does at present with America; she receives her corn, while she gives in return manufactured goods.

Mr. Malthus says, p. 294, "The case will be different of course, in a small territory with a great population, supported on funds not derived from their own soil. In this case there will be little or no choice of land, and a comparative superabundance of manure; and under such circumstances the poorest soils may be brought under cultivation. But for this purpose, it is not mere population that is wanted, but a population which can obtain the produce of other countries, while it is gradually improving its own; otherwise it would be immediately reduced in proportion to the limited produce of this small and barren territory; and the melioration of the land

might perhaps never take place; or if it did, it would take place very slowly indeed, and the population would always be exactly measured by this tardy rate, and could not possibly increase beyond it.

“This subject is illustrated in the cultivation of the Campine in Brabant, which, according to the Abbé Man, consisted originally of the most barren and arid sand. Many attempts were made by private individuals to bring it under cultivation, but without success; which proves that, as a farming project, and considered as a sole dependence, the cultivation of it would not answer. Some religious houses however, at last settled there, and being supported by other funds, and improving the land merely as a secondary object, they, by degrees, in the course of some centuries, brought nearly the whole under cultivation, letting it out to farmers as soon as it was sufficiently improved.”

This is directly the case with England; she is capable, from this cause, of cultivating barren soils, which otherwise would be uncultivated; and though she possesses a large territory, yet she has equally a large commerce to feed her extraordinary population, which not only affords her a means of producing a great quantity of manure, but also large capitals to turn to agriculture. Even Holland feeds considerably a proportional larger population entirely this way, having even

no arable land. Mr. Malthus says, vol. ii. p. 296, “There is no spot, however barren, which might not be made rich this way, or by the concentrated population of a manufacturing town; but this is no proof whatever that with respect to population and food, population has the precedence, because this concentrated population could not possibly exist, without the preceding existence of an adequate quantity of food in the surplus produce of some other district.”

Does not Holland directly prove that population took place of agriculture, it having the precedence? It is amazing how men can be so blinded, and have the affrontery to argue against such obvious and clear facts. England has the greatest resemblance to Holland, in being a commercial country; and I have no doubt that if she did not grow a grain of corn, she could support herself with foreign grain as well as Holland, by the profits of her trade. But then it must be done gradually, as Holland has done; and Holland experiences no famine; no, the wide world is her granary; therefore commercial countries, comparatively, never experience great distress.

Mr. Arthur Young says, that England seldom encounters a scarcity, while France often does. This is owing to her commerce having great commercial funds, that empowers the great part of her population to purchase foreign grain. But in a country purely agricultural, they have not those

extra funds, in consequence famine seizes them with all its horrors. France, to be sure, has some commercial funds, but not equal to England, therefore she suffers more. But hear this important fact, you people of England; Holland, whose existence wholly depends upon her commercial funds, is, according to her territory, the most populous, rich, powerful nation in the world, and has the least proportion of poor, for he says, vol. ii. p. 410, "Holland so famous for the management of her poor, and able to employ and support all who applied for relief."

To shew what commerce is capable of, see a just and accurate picture drawn of Holland by Mr. Pratt in his Gleanings, he says, vol. ii. p. 159, "The United Provinces display a more wonderful scene to a person of any reflection, than Rome herself in her sacred pageantry, and all the magnificence of her triumphal arches, baths, obelisks, columns, grottoes, amphitheatres, and catacombs; her majestic temples, splendid altars, and pompous processions. For if we consider the Roman and the Belgic commonwealths, we perceive the latter making greater advances towards the establishment of her opulence and grandeur in a few years, than the other was able to do in several ages. In Holland, a whole nation seems to have been born at once, and a beautiful, well-cultivated region, like the creation in the Phœnician system, rising out of the bosom of the

deep. The wisest nations of Europe stand amazed at the scene, and can find no parallel, taken for all in all, in the annals of the world. A handful of oppressed unhappy men make head against four mighty tyrants, of whom each has successively caused not only nations, but all Europe to tremble; and after obtaining glorious victories over them all, at length establish their rights and liberties, and transmit those inestimable blessings to their posterity."

Can there be a stronger picture drawn of the blessed effects of commerce, whether we reflect upon her bringing prosperity and happiness, or her implanting that heaven-born spirit of liberty, and successfully triumphing over tyranny with a handful of men whom she had animated!

Dr. Smith says, vol. ii. p. 186, "Thirdly, and lastly, commerce and manufactures gradually introduced order and good government, and with them, the liberty and security of individuals, among the inhabitants of the country, who had before lived almost in a continual state of war with their neighbours, and of servile dependency upon their superiors. This, though it has been the least observed, is by far the most important of all their effects. Mr. Hume is the only writer who, so far as I know, has hitherto taken notice of it."

Commerce, thou heaven-born spirit, sent

down from above to civilize mankind; to animate his spirit with freedom and independency; to distribute equally through all the world the arts and sciences of each country, and also their very rare and valuable products; to inspire man with that spirit of industry which is only seen in commercial countries; in short, to exalt him to his present pitch of high eminence. But if England should loose thee, it would require no great depth of prophanation to say, she would fall into her former insignificance and barbarism.

The French call us a nation of shopkeepers; yes, we glory in the name. It is from this that consists all our greatness and power; makes us keep France in awe; nay, even all the world, as Tyre had nearly conquered Alexander. I should be sorry that we should be called a nation of farmers, for then our sun of greatness would be wholly set, and we should rank with Swizerland, a secondary state, a vassal, and tributary to Buonaparte.

Mr. Malthus labours hard to justify the measure of giving bounties upon the exportation of corn, which we shall now consider. He opens with very fair and candid declarations, but we shall see whether he acts up to them. He says, in the beginning of the chapter, vol. ii. p. 237, "In discussing the policy of a bounty on the exportation of corn, it should be premised, that the private interests of the farmers and proprietors

should never enter in the question. The sole object of our consideration ought to be the permanent interest of the consumer, in the character of which is comprehended the whole nation.

"According to the general principles of political economy, it cannot be doubted, that it is for the interest of the civilized world that each nation should purchase its commodities wherever they can be had the cheapest.

"According to these principles, it is rather desirable that some obstacles should exist to the excessive accumulation of wealth in any particular country, and that rich nations should be tempted to purchase their corn of poorer nations, as by these means the wealth of the civilized world will not only be more rapidly increased, but more equally diffused."

During the early period of our history, cultivating of land was little attended to; and bread, as Dr. Smith observes, was dearer than meat: a pound of bread sold for more than a pound of meat. Therefore the prices were high, the farmers were indolent, and did not well understand the cultivation of grain, in consequence the kingdom was occasionally liable to scarcities, animal food being the principle subsistence of the people. But Mr. Malthus, who is a most unfair author, when he gives the average price of grain, gives the medium between a very scarce year and a full one, not reflecting that these scarce years proba-

bly only take place one year in ten or twenty years, therefore the average ought not to be drawn in this way. But nothing can be so clear and obvious, that as all countries are liable occasionally to bad seasons, that the plentiful years should not be forced out of the kingdom by bounties, but be allowed to be kept at home to supply the deficiency; but without any restrictions not to import, as I would have it free and open, as well as any other trade.

Mr. Malthus's insinuation, which is so contrary to Dr. Smith,* that the high price of grain in these late years, has been owing to a want of bounty; which is so very extraordinary, and so very inconsistent with his principles, which runs through all his volumes, that he labours to prove, and which is the life and soul of his essay is, that man's prolific powers are such, that they are doubling themselves in fifteen years, and their prolific power takes place most rapidly before subsistence; the one proceeds, he says, with arithmetical, and

* Formerly, when commerce was in its infancy, a dearth would be most severely felt, from two causes, both of which take place in all countries, but never operate strongly in England, never in Holland. The one is, that not being a trading or manufacturing country, the bulk of the people being agriculturists, individuals have no funds to purchase foreign corn; the other having no shipping to import it. Therefore even France, though a commercial country, in a smaller degree felt heavily scarcities, which, as Mr. Arthur Young observes, would be scarce felt in England.

the other with geometrical progress. Therefore if we have of late years been regularly decreasing in our exports, and increasing in our imports of grain; whether, Mr. Malthus, is it to be imputed to our increased population, or the want of a bounty? particularly when we consider the amazing increase of our horses; and one gentleman's horse requiring as much ground to subsist on as ten labouring families.

As to our importing so much corn latterly, I think I have most rationally accounted for; it is owing to a systematic artifice to keep up the high prices, which your volumes are designed to establish; and also these high prices, stimulated and enabled farmers to spend large sums upon forcing the soil beyond its powers, and in consequence produced blights.

But the most arrogant and ignorant presumption is, in charging Dr. Smith with boldness in saying that corn must have fallen without the bounty. The Dr. does not go upon supercilious assertions, but brings incontrovertible facts to prove it.*

* See pages 43, 44 and 45, already quoted, where Dr. Smith brings unanswerable arguments; and I shall ask Mr. Malthus, or the wisest of these tillers of acres, if it could be owing to the bounty that the price fell, when it equally fell over all Europe, and even in France, where there was no unjust bounty for the exportation, but a more just prohibition against its exportation; for certainly the people of a country has the most natural right to be fed with their countries produce, before foreigners.

Mr. Malthus, you are fond of absurd paradoxes: as a grazier, by killing the calves of his farm, he will ultimately increase their number; therefore I dare say you will easily get over this plain, clear and obvious argument of Dr. Smith's, as of no weight. You say, "as in the present state of the country, the subject (of bounties) seems to be of the highest importance; it will therefore be worth while to examine the validity of their arguments." But, reader, in this examination of Dr. Smith's arguments, he never notices the principle ones, particularly that incontrovertible fact, that the price fell in France as well as in England, where there was no bounty, but an actual prohibition to exportation. Is this candid or honourable?

Mr. Malthus says, vol, ii. p. 241, "He observes, that both in years of plenty and in years of scarcity, the bounty necessarily tends to raise the money price of corn somewhat higher than it otherwise would be in the home market.

"That it does so in years of plenty is undoubtedly true; but that it does so in years of scarcity, appears to me as undoubtedly false."

I say, Sir, your assertion appears to me as undoubtedly false; for by encouraging that corn by a bounty to be sent out of the country, in years of plenty, as Dr. Smith says, "prevents the plenty of one year from relieving the scarcity of another." The husbanding the store of a plenti-

ful year is universally done in all countries where they have not such wise heads as Mr. Malthus's; in China, Switzerland, &c.; in short, in every country. The East India Company, by this wise, obvious, and self-evident policy, of having immense granaries of rice, has hindered those shocking famines which used to take place in their dominions in the east; as the poor untaught savages have not that natural provision as well as Mr. Malthus, of making a plentiful year compensate for a scarce one.

* The great object, throughout all Mr. Malthus's volumes, is to benefit the land owner, pleading for them more absurdly than a young lawyer would commit himself to do before an ignorant

* It ought to be the leading object of the legislature and of the country, always to have a stock of old corn at the end of the harvest, equal to one third of a year's consumption; and this might be easily managed without granaries, by having stacks always one third of a year old before consumption, instead of the legislature giving bounties to send it immediately out of the kingdom. That unfortunate letter of the D. of Portland's, which made the harvest one fourth below the average crop (though from the best information it was an average one) would not then have made any alarm in the kingdom, or raised the price of corn much, or have sent such an immense wealth out of the kingdom. Let our mercenary land owner be satisfied with having ten times the rental that is paid for the same land in France, and not by every unjust artifice keep it up higher by literally starving the industrious poor; that very poor that makes his rental so high. But to make my meaning understood by all our wise acres, not to kill the goose for the golden eggs.

jury. He says it would be hard upon the farmers to save the surplus of a good year till a bad one took place; as if that identical grain that was grown that year, should be kept till a bad one. No, ignorant sophist, the old grain is first sold off before he enters upon his new stock, therefore he will only have a greater number of stacks at the years end than he usually had. But even if he does not chuse to keep it, the ports are open to exportation, without a bounty. But this is such absurd reasoning, that the farmer at these present times can have a surplus beyond our own market, when it is allowed by Mr. Malthus that we have been an importing nation for many years; and according to him, the prolific powers of man is still pushing her increasing numbers into existence; and, as he says, that the price of grain has of late years been so uncommonly high, that a labouring man ought not to marry, as he cannot maintain a family, but they must starve.*

* Nay, Mr. Malthus I am told, in the first edition of his book (for I have only seen the third) seriously proposed that those who employed the labouring poor, should not employ them, in order it is supposed to starve one half of the labouring part of mankind to death, for to make those who survived happier; or else to deter them from marrying and multiplying too fast. Good heaven! that any man, let alone a christian divine, should, from his supercilious sophistry, proceed to such an extremity! For even were his principles true, it would be the most cruel measure that ever entered the head of a human creature; but if his principles were not true, what would be the deed! humanity shudders, I must drop the curtain.

Then hear it humanity, hear it you christian reader, this divine is a strong advocate for this bounty, which he acknowledges himself is to raise the price of grain, and it has had that direct tendency; for when it was coming down, so that a poor man and his family might have lived, did it immediately rise beyond his power of purchasing, upon passing the corn bill. Well might the farmers in Essex hail the principal promoters of that bill as their friends. Rank rapacious gain is the order of the day. A country gradually increasing in riches, grain might in consequence gradually increase in price, but that price is always properly checked by importation; but the rise which has taken place has been so rapid, and so much beyond the price of other countries, that I have no doubt in asserting that it has been owing to a systematic artifice, and which is of so pernicious a tendency, that it will ruin the kingdom if not obviated.

Mr. Malthus asserts a direct mistake, to give colouring to his false arguments; he says, vol. ii. p. 242; "On the whole, therefore, we cannot reasonably expect that, upon this plan, the reserved store should in any degree be equal to that, which in a scarce year would be kept at home, in a country which was in the habit of constant exportation to a considerable amount." I believe there is scarce a farmer now living, but

who, since he became a farmer, this country has been in the habit of constant importing to a considerable amount.

Mr. Malthus says, vol. ii. p. 242, "Dr. Smith then proceeds to state very justly, that the defenders of the corn laws do not insist so much upon the price of corn in the actual state of tillage, as upon their tendency to improve this actual state, by opening a more extensive foreign market to the corn of the farmer, and securing to him a better price than he could otherwise expect for his commodity."

In the infancy of agriculture, there might be some specious plea; but Dr. Smith proves, in the most satisfactory manner, that it could not have this effect even then; for he clearly shews that even at that time tillage could not be improved by the bounty, but the reverse. But in the high state of agriculture, which the country is now in, aided by our wise agricultural societies, does it require this aid, even admitting their own foolish arguments? and at a time too, when corn upon the average was double the price; and at a time when he acknowledges himself that a labouring man cannot marry with a prospect of his family being kept from starving; also at a time when an acre of land in England was paying its owner ten times the sum that an acre of land in France of the same quality was paying its owner; at a time when population is rapidly decreasing from its

clearness; nay, at a time when, if Mr. Malthus's principles are acted upon, that no man ought to marry whose labour cannot maintain six children, and he acknowledges at present they cannot maintain two. Therefore the ultimatum of his essay is, to annihilate the people of England; at least the best and most numerous part of them, the industrious poor; and what a figure will he and the land owner cut when that is the case!

He says, vol. ii. p. 243, "In answer to this he observes, that whatever extension of the foreign market can be occasioned by the bounty, must in every particular year be altogether at the expence of the home market, as every bushel of corn which is exported by means of the bounty, and which would not have been exported without the bounty, would have remained in the home market to increase the consumption and to lower the price of that commodity."

Mr. Malthus's argument against this, is in the word market; he says, "In this observation he appears to me a little to misuse the term market. Because, by selling a commodity below its natural price, it is possible to get rid of a greater quantity of it, in any particular market, than would have gone off otherwise, it cannot justly be said that by this process such a market is proportionally extended." So by having the whole world for his market, it is not properly extended; no, the extension, according to the rapacious Mr.

Malthus, is to have a monopoly. When he says, "below a natural price," good heavens! it puts one in a passion; he ought to have said, above a natural price; for is it not? you christians, you civilized, you benevolent readers, above a natural price! when the labourer, who works by the sweat of his brow in producing that grain, should not be able to purchase enough of it for himself and his family. *I say no country can, or ought to exist,* if the labouring part who make up the great bulk of every state, by the greatest exertion of labour cannot maintain a family, such a state must soon lose its population.

He talks as if land might be made to produce any quantity; now, the truth is this, by pushing it too much lately, the purpose has been defeated, and only a blighted corn produced. Only think of many farmers forcing three annual crops of wheat upon the same ground, without ever a rest or a fallow. This is an effect of the bounty, with a vengeance.*

Mr. Malthus says, p. 247; "The most plausible argument that Dr. Smith adduces against the corn laws is, that as the money price of corn regulates that of all other home-made commodities, the advantage to the proprietor from the increased money price is merely apparent, and not

* That this is the case now with some farmers, having three succeeding crops of wheat after a crop of beans, or other green crop.

real; since what he gains in his sales, he must lose in his purchases."

Mr. Malthus admits the justness of the position; but then he says, it has its limitation. Dr. Smith excepts all foreign commodities; also wool and raw hides, but he was too much impressed with the number of cattle bred on the hills of Scotland, thinking that they were not bred on arable land; but what a small part of the consumption do they make? I ask this question, are not shoes and clothing equally advanced in price with every other necessary in life? nay, I think more so; and as to tea and sugar, they are luxuries that the poor cannot reach, but they are also immensely risen in price from their being so highly taxed; and the expence of building ships, and the great additional expence of maintaining sailors, operate upon those articles.*

* It is a just remark, that other countries, particularly America, must be the sole carriers of merchandize by sea, as the English can neither build ships nor feed sailors at the price that foreigners do. This ought to alarm us, for then what will become of our navy, not having sailors to man it? Mr. Davie, in his Letters from Paraguay says, p. 7, speaking of the Americans: "M. is rapidly acquiring an immense fortune, by sending out several small vessels laden with European goods to the East Indies, where he finds a certain and quick return. I am told by H. that he can greatly undersell the British merchants trading thither, even at their own settlements, for a special reason; he builds his own vessels, victuals them, and mans them at one third of the expence incurred by our people, every necessary article for naval architecture being contained within

In the times of excessive dearness the labouring poor, particularly women, used to drink tea without sugar, by way of cheapness; the tea operating as a strong stimulus, and by that means lulling the calls of hunger; and the men drank British spirits from the same motive; but such regimen soon exhausts nature.*

Mr. Malthus, in his superficial reasoning says, p. 251, "If Dr. Smith's theory was strictly true, and the real price of corn, or its price in the sum of all other commodities, never suffered any variation, the limits of this enterprising country." Besides, he shews in strong colours the impropriety of permitting such large emigrations from Ireland and Scotland.

It is very melancholy to see our great falling off in our commercial trade with respect to English vessels and sailors employed at present to trade with the continent. Lord Cockrane, in a late speech to his constituents says, "With respect to this trade with the continent of Europe, among all the vessels employed in this trade, there were only sixteen thousand British seamen, while there were no less than twenty-four thousand foreign seamen employed. The number of British vessels was but two thousand, while the foreign amounted to four thousand and upwards."

* From the accounts laid upon the table in the House of Commons, February 17, 1807, it appears that from 1774 to 1783, both years included, the annual average of the consumption of tea in this country was 4,313,962lb. From 1797 to 1806, this average had increased to the amazing extent of 19,981,642lb. A similar, but not equal rise, has taken place in the article of brandy. The annual average of consumption in the former period was 611,965 gallons, and in the latter it amounted to 1,580,711 gallons.

ation, it would be difficult to give a reason why we grow more corn now than we did 200 years ago."

Poor sophist! one hundred acres a long time ago did not produce one fourth of the corn that it is made to produce now, from the improved agriculture; therefore every farmer who gives a large rental for his farm, will naturally make it produce as much as he can, otherwise he must break upon it. Does it require any logic to know this, you profound sophist? But such are the vague trifling arguments of this wonderful man, with his new lights.

I have heard of the absurd arguments which were made use of in our great national assemblies, that the farmers will not grow corn without high prices; they mean high exorbitant prices, that is, starving prices. Why, what will the farmer and land owner do with their land? let it grow sterile? starve the people that way; no, then they would be starving themselves. Mr. Malthus, that ignorant sophist, says, they would turn more land to pasture; but if the people are starving for want of vegetable food, how could they purchase animal food ten times the price! Do consult Cocker's arithmetic, you ignoramus.

Mr. Malthus, on his chapter of the "different effects of the agricultural and commercial systems, begins by commending our situation in the middle of the last century; and it is recommended

by our wise board of agriculture to bring us back to the same state as we were at that period.*

* Mr. Malthus says, vol. ii. p. 221, "About the middle of the last century we were genuinely, and in the strict sense of the economists, an agricultural nation. Our commerce and manufactures were however then in a very respectable and thriving state." He also says, p. 279, "It is very justly observed by Sir James Steuart, that the population of England in the middle of the last century, when the exports of corn were considerable, was still checked for want of food." Here then in the strict sense of the economists we were an agricultural nation; yet in this most happy and desirable state of the economists, we were still checked for want of food; yes, ten times more so than we were before we begun with this unfortunate French war. Can any thing shew more contradictions and absurdities than they themselves are guilty of? For in the middle of the last century, when famine came, as the great body of the people were not in trade, but employed upon the land, therefore when the land failed, they had no funds to purchase foreign corn. But I positively and confidently aver, if the legislature will rescind their foolish corn laws, throw all open, that no famine will be felt in England. That as the trading part of the community are the great body of the people, therefore they will always have funds enough to purchase the foreign corn that may be wanted, and we having always a surplus stock, as it would not be forced out of the kingdom by bounties.

Mr. Malthus vol. ii. p. 273, objects to the general system of ploughing which takes place in France; but strongly recommends a large stock of cattle upon each farm. This is the language of our modern wise agriculturists; they not reflecting, or, in short, not knowing any thing of the matter. That France is obliged to plough, and have a very small stock of cattle, for they have no market for their butchers meat. It is only in rich commercial countries, as England, Holland and Hamburgh, which have great commercial funds that can afford to purchase

But you more than foolish wiseacres, what would then become of our revenue? instead of our raising 70 millions annually, we should not be able

much animal food. They are under an equal gross error in saying that a farmer will not grow corn without such a price. But even in England the quantity of animal food is stinted, therefore if more is produced, there will be no market for it; but, in short, our wiseacres never look at things in a full comprehensive view, but dash away, their immediate object being gain, sordid gain.

It is in this long note that his supercilious arguments are brought forward, to shew that commerce may outstrip agriculture; and in speaking of the danger he says, p. 275, "England is, undoubtedly, from her insular situation, and commanding navy, the most likely to form an exception to this rule; but in spite even of the peculiar advantages of England, it appears to me clear that if she continue yearly to increase her importations of corn, she cannot ultimately escape that decline which seems to be the natural and necessary consequence of excessive commercial wealth. I am not now speaking of the next twenty or thirty years, but of the next two or three hundred." So this wonderful sagacious profound gentleman, who is calculating upon two or three hundred years, has not real sagacity enough to see beyond his nose, with his new lights.

Nothing can be more plain, than in the present state of the kingdom, four fifths of the people live by manufactures and commerce, and they purchase the grain of the English farmer; but if his produce fail in any degree, why, they will act as the Hollanders do, purchase foreign grain. It makes no difference to them, as their funds will purchase from either; nay, a great deal cheaper from the foreign farmer, if our laws would allow them to do it.

to raise money enough to pay the interest of our national debt, let alone to provide for our navy and army, and other contingencies.

Mr. Malthus goes on with more gross errors, if possible; he says, vol. ii. p. 222, "The competition of increasing commercial wealth, operating upon a supply of corn not increasing in the same proportion, must at all times tend to raise the nominal price of labour; but when scarce years are taken into the consideration, its effect in this way must ultimately be very great. During the late scarcities the price of labour has been continually rising, and it will not readily fall again."

One would suppose this author wrote from his cell, immured in some solitary part of the university, where no human being had access to him, where his muddy brain roved at large upon a diseased imagination; even the old woman, his bed-maker, might have told him that the disease the country laboured under was not the high price of labour, but the cheapness of labour; that a hard labouring man, by the extreme sweat of his brow, could not maintain himself, let alone a family; that the land owner was getting three rents for his land, and that did not satisfy him, but he was getting the legislature to enact laws to keep up the exorbitant unexampled price of food, and that the labouring community were starving, and emigrating in thousands, leaving the once happy

England, and that population was rapidly declining.

This ignorant of all authors, speaks as if the farmer will not grow his corn if he is not allowed these high prices; and that corn, like a manufactory of bricks, may be produced to any amount. Good heavens! are our agricultural societies to be told that a farmer will, and always has done, made the most of his farm; that he has a large rental to pay, and that therefore he will not let his land be unproductive, run over with thistles; that land is only capable of a certain produce, and that by pushing that produce too much, he induces blights, which is now allowed by every candid and sensible farmer to have been lately the case, by having too much capital, and forcing the land too much out of the regular routine of crops.

He says, p. 226, "If we were to endeavour to lower the price of labour by encouraging the importation of foreign corn, we should probably aggravate the evil tenfold. Experience warrants us in saying, that the fall in the price of labour would be slow and uncertain; but the decline of our agriculture would be certain. The British grower of corn could not, in his own markets, stand the competition of the foreign grower, in average years. Arable lands of a moderate quality would hardly pay the expence of cultivation. Rich soils alone would yield a rent. Round all

our towns the appearances would be the same as usual; but in the interior of the country, much of the land would be neglected, and almost universally, where it was practicable, pasture would take place of tillage."

Good heavens! what would this cruel advocate for the rapacious land owner be at! He has brought the corn so high, that a poor labouring man can only maintain himself by a crust of bread and ditch water. What would he lower him to feed upon? grass, like Nebuchanezzar. If this Goliath, with his pockets full of new lights, had reflected the least, that an English farmer could always get more for his corn, than a foreign farmer in our market, as the latter would be at the expence of carriage; and all Mr. Malthus's laboured, absurd and ignorant volumes, are to prove, that population is outstripping food in geometrical progression; therefore the British farmer would always have a home market for his produce. Dr. Smith should have taught him that the price of labour is nominal; the true standard is corn, and I shall add, that no country can exist, or ought to exist, where an industrious hard working man cannot obtain enough of corn to maintain his family by his labour; therefore it should be the object of the legislature to bring the price of corn to that standard; policy, religion and humanity demand it, instead of

enacting laws to raise the price for to literally starve the industrious poor.

Mr. Pratt says, vol. i. p. 290, "The progress of this race was extraordinary. Originally a horde of miserable wanderers quitting one hospitable soil for another; choosing an apparently impracticable spot, and attaching themselves to it, as if proudly determined to make the barren ground, and a world under water, fruitful even to abundance. It is scarcely to be credited that these are the people, who on a trembling quagmire founded a more noble city, in despite, as it were of nature herself, than the imperial Czar. Who that has seen Amsterdam, but must give it the preference to Petersburgh? There is true sublimity in the idea of supporting one of the most magnificent cities in Europe, on rafts of timber placed upon an enormous bog: Matter of fact is compelled to borrow strength from imagination to have faith in such a miracle, wrought by the toil, industry, and perseverance of human beings! And indeed, reason seems to struggle against her own conviction, as she sanctions every word of the following apostrophe: "How wonderful!" says the author of it, "that in a country without a stone or a pebble, there should be stone edifices the most magnificent! Without forests, or an oak tree (two little woods excepted) that the Dutch navy should be the second in the world! that without arable land they should supply the half of Europe

with corn, and with a tract of country scarcely larger than an English county, they should raise men and money to make themselves of importance in the eyes of the first power of Christendom!"

"How often, my friend, when I have seen the truth of these observations, have I called to mind a most beautiful remark of the excellent Dr. Johnson, on the united effects of resolution, industry, and perseverance."

It is this industry and perseverance in trade and commerce, that has brought England and Holland to such a high state of pre-eminence; for even a wiseacre must see this, that agriculture could have nothing to do with it, as Holland has no arable land.

I have shewn what Holland was capable of doing from capital, therefore, as Dr. Smith observes, that a shilling laid out in forcing corn upon bad land, where it might be purchased cheaper abroad, is highly impolitic, as impoverishing the nations capital. Besides, you yourself, Mr. Malthus, say, p. 294, "The great obstacle to the melioration of land is the difficulty, the expence, and sometimes the impossibility of procuring a sufficient quantity of dressing. As this instrument of improvement, therefore, is in practice limited, whatever it may be in theory, the question will always be, how it may be most profitably employed; and in any instance where a certain quantity of dressing and labour employed

to bring a new land into cultivation, would have yielded a permanently greater produce if employed upon old land, both the individual and the nation are losers. Upon this principle, it is not uncommon for farmers in some situations never to dress their poorest land, but to get from it merely a scanty crop every three or four years, and to employ the whole of their manure, which they practically feel is limited, on those parts of their farms, where it will produce a greater proportional effect."

But his volumes contradict each other in every page; he is so blind and dashing an author, having no regular well digested plan, that his right hand knows nothing what his left hand does.

Mr. Malthus himself says, p. 344, "The object of those who really wish to better the condition of the lower classes of society, must be to raise the relative proportion between the price of labour and the price of provisions, so as to enable the labourer to command a larger share of the necessaries and comforts of life."

When our pretended patriotic agriculturists got the corn bill passed, they insinuated that labour was so dear, that the bill was necessary, having got very partial returns of the price of labour. But how does the fact turn out? why, the labourer is literally starving, with his crust of bread and ditch water, and the land owner

is getting three rents. Let us put an analogous case: if the manufacturer wanted to raise the price of his goods, by having a monopoly, to exclude foreign goods, and that the lower ranks were quite naked from the want of clothing, owing to the high prices, the manufacturer receiving two prices from what they were paying for the articles upon the continent; and that the population of the country was suffering, the people dying from being starved; and to make the analogy perfect, that the houses which produced the manufactured goods could not be increased (similar to the land that produces food in England, which cannot be increased:) what would our land owner say to this? would they let the manufacturer get such a bill stole through the house? therefore follow the golden rule, do as you would be done by.

Besides, the reports of these patriotic agriculturists were unjust, for they said that the country was loosing so much capital out of the kingdom, as the corn they imported came to. Now, I think, it requires no great depth to know, though it might not penetrate their candour, that the labour and expence in producing this corn is not taken into the account; and that the land which would have been employed in its produce, is employed to some other valuable purpose. But this was never brought into the account in their reports.

In a commercial country, capital is every thing.

therefore, as Dr. Smith justly observes, that two shillings laid out in forcing corn, where one shilling would have produced the same quantity of foreign grain, there is a shilling lost to the nation; and you, Mr. Malthus observe, that the prudent farmer endeavours to till his productive ground, and not impoverish it by wasting his manure upon tilling the barren soil; therefore in whatever way we view this enormous price of grain, it is big with the greatest calamities to the state, and is an outrage against policy, humanity and religion.

But what can be so clear and obvious, and it is impossible to mistake, that the land owner is getting three times the rent that he used to get twenty years ago for his land; nevertheless the land is higher taxed and higher loaded with poor rates, yet the farmer pays all these additional burthens, and nevertheless gives the owner three rents. Then in the name of common sense and reason, how can Mr. Malthus say that labour is increased? for if that was the case, he would not be able to pay even his old rent, twenty years ago, if he had the addition of labour and his taxes to pay. But I will put the case in its proper light; that the land owner, by raising the price of corn so high, so as to receive so much additional rent, supposing it only to be double to what it was, has actually laid a tax upon the consumer near one hundred millions a year, and this coming upon the

back of governments taxes, so that a poor man with his eighteen pence per day can only get from the land owner nine-pence worth of corn. This I assert is the truth, and not like Mr. Malthus's incorrect statements and assertions. I defy the agriculturists to contradict it. One would almost wish with Sir William Petty, that a part of this islands acres were buried in the sea.

I must here quote the beautiful, just and expressive lines of Dr. Goldsmith's ;

" Ill fares the land, to hast'ning ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay :
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade ;
A breath can make them, as a breath has made :
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroy'd, can never be supply'd."

But, Mr. Malthus, I will commit my judgment, and I think more justly than you have done yours, that England in her present system will soon be an exporting nation of corn, from impoverishing and starving her active population; and in consequence if she does not see her folly she will tumble headlong from her present high state of prosperity.

It has been the astonishment of the rational and equitable part of mankind, the immense price of provisions which has taken place so suddenly, particularly when we reflect that in the present state of the kingdom, we should have expected (if things were left to themselves) that there ought to have been a decrease of price, instead

of an increase ; for certainly the bloody and sanguinary wars we have been engaged in for these last eighteen years, must have greatly affected our population ; for as Sir Francis d'Ivernois observes, that " those have yet to learn the first principles of political arithmetic, who imagine that it is in the field of battle and the hospitals, that an account can be taken of the lives which a revolution or a war has cost. The number of men it has killed is of much less importance than the number of children which it has prevented, and will still prevent, from coming into the world. This is the deepest wound which the population of France has received."—" Supposing," he says, " that, of the whole number of men destroyed, only two millions had been united to as many females ; according to the calculation of Buffon, these two millions of couples ought to bring into the world twelve millions of children, in order to supply, at the age of thirty-nine, a number equal to that of their parents. This is a point of view in which the consequences of such a destruction of men becomes almost incalculable ; because they have much more effect with regard to the twelve millions of children, which they prevent from coming into existence, than with regard to the the actual loss of the two millions and a half of men, for whom France mourns. It is not till a future period that she will be able to estimate this dreadful breach."

* But even a more considerable effect than those bloody wars have been our late dearth of provisions, which have operated so strongly with the great mass of the people, that their late necessi-

* From a very recent census taken in France, it appears that there are four millions more of females than males in France; and that this enumeration must have been accurate, as it was taken for the purpose of taxation. This immense loss of males must have been from war, from their numerous conscripts; and they consist of the young men, who must have been the fathers of families. That it could not have been from common mortality of decease, for women are more liable to mortality from that cause than men, from child bearing. Then to every rational man, how absurd must appear Mr. Malthus's arguments and reasoning, that France has increased in population from her foreign and intestine wars! But this is like every other of his absurd paradoxes; nay, he himself has shewn, (see p. 60, 61 and 62,) the gross errors of their calculations. All Europe has greatly suffered in its population from these wars, though not to the same extent as France, therefore I think I am rationally authorized to assert, that it will be a long time, if ever, before Europe will regain its population, particularly when we reflect upon the relaxed, corrupt and dissolute morals which have so universally gained ground. That even in America, in her maritime towns, Mr. Malthus himself allows that they do not increase in population; and therefore it cannot be from want of subsistence, for it is those towns from which the American corn is shipped for other countries; but they have got there the dissolute morals of Europe; as all large communities decrease in population from luxury and relaxed morals; therefore I am borne out in this rational proposition, that as population is so amazingly decreased, and as from the improved agriculture, corn is increased, it must in consequence be cheaper, as more will be produced, and the number of the consumers decreased.

ties have been bordering upon famine, and also the decline of our manufactures; so that these great causes must have strongly operated upon our population.

And also when we reflect upon the many inclosures of commons which have lately passed the legislature, that one would have supposed that all these great circumstances must have operated to lower the price of provisions; add to this, our numerous agricultural societies. But I am afraid instead of their operating to the benefit of the country, their influence has been acting directly contrary.

Mr. Pitt, when he first instituted the board of agriculture, his object was to divert our great land owners from looking too tenaciously into his politics (the re-establishing the Bourbon family upon the throne of France:) and I am told he used to hold their labours in great derision. Their first great effort was the fattening of animals, and they had arrived at so great a perfection, that no Englishmen could eat them, being all fat and tallow. Their next great achievement has been making provisions so dear, that no Englishman can subsist upon them; therefore it would be well if the members had some other less dangerous amusement to exercise their great talents upon.

Mr. Pitt, that statesman who had the helm in the most critical period that ever history produced;

who had the destiny of Europe in his power. His proud and haughty spirit mounted the war-horse, and his passions became interested; his proud arrogant and high spirit levelled itself with Buona-parte, the struggle was which should conquer, that Europe was lost in the contest of his pride. Fox, who had considerably more penetration, whose great mind grasped future consequences; and along with that great talent, possessed a mild benign spirit, whose philanthropy felt and sympathized with the feelings of mankind, and had no passions beyond their good and amelioration, saw and painted in strong colours the disasters of his rivals politics; but his peaceable spirit was lost amidst the phrenzy with which the other had intoxicated the people.*

And to this unfortunate war politics of Mr. Pitt he added others of great national misfortune; he restrained the bank from paying in specie, though he was fully warned by Mr. Fox of the ultimate misfortune it would lead the kingdom into, by having so much paper currency; and his next equally unfortunate measure the Duke of Port-

* It was from that proud and haughty spirit of Mr. Pitt's, that made him adopt that cruel and scourging system with regard to Ireland, which will be an eternal blot upon his administration. At length Mr. Fox's benign spirit prevailed, and Mr. Pitt sent over that great and good character, Lord Cornwallis, whose mild and benevolent government soon restored tranquillity to that distracted country.

land's letter upon the harvest of 1800; also he supported that equally pernicious measure the corn bill, so that I should suppose our children will look upon him as the most pernicious minister that ever directed this kingdom. I believe most rational and sensible men are now viewing his politics in this light. Thank God I have nothing to lay to my charge; I always with my feeble voice opposed these destructive and unfortunate measures, and happy those Englishmen who can say the same, though their voice was as impotent as mine, for their country has nothing to lay to their charge, which must be a great comfort to every honest man and true Briton, that they were not accessory to their countries misfortunes.

France has no wealth comparatively; that is, she is not a manufacturing country, formed of people who labour for other nations, and which receive their wealth, and in consequence have money to purchase animal food. And it is well known that without there is a market for animal food, the farmer cannot cultivate his land to advantage; for, as Mr. Young observes, there should be a regular routine of crops, a mucilage one and a dry one. But those countries whose consumption is altogether grain; they must be confined to that crop which must soon exhaust the ground; and the only remedy in this case, are repeated fallows.

120

But without a great stock of cattle no farmer can cultivate his land to advantage; not only to breed manure, but also to eat off his mucilage crops, turnips, clover, &c. therefore instead of commerce outstripping agriculture, no country can be properly cultivated without commerce, not only to consume its produce, particularly of animal food, but likewise affording capital to improve wealth. But capital has its limits; for if the ground is pushed too much beyond its powers or strength, it will only produce an impoverished grain, which has been the case lately.

Mr. Malthus, and many agricultural writers, talk as if ground might be pushed to any point; but the late failures, or blights, have directly shewn them their error. The ground must have ease, and that is best done by alternately a mucilage crop, and it eat off the ground. And to prove incontestibly that our late failures have been owing to pushing nature beyond her power, and not to the seasons, or Sir Joseph Banks's plants: that amidst all these failures, fresh land always produced good grain. But if it had been owing to the seasons, or insects, or plants, this fresh land would also have miscarried.* There-

* Whenever any vegetable has lost its energy, its circulation not being performed with activity, but sluggishly and deceasedly, animalcali, or a fresh plant will form upon it; and it was upon the upper part of the stalk or straw where these deceased spots appear, the circulation not having energy to move

121

fore, beyond a doubt, and I challenge all the agriculturists to prove the contrary, our late bad harvests have been owing to the immense price of corn, pushing the farmer to alter his regular routine of crops, ploughing up every thing, the ground having no rest; and the great price he got for his corn enabling him by forced manures to push his land too much, so that capital did harm, avarice defeated itself. The same ground having constant dry crops, principally wheat, without any ease, but receiving an abundant proportion of manure, at the expence of the other grounds, so that his regular systematic plan was broke in upon, and blights were the consequence. Good heavens! let me inform our tillers of acres that nature can only produce to a certain point, and beyond that, nothing but disease and blight will take place. And also let me inculcate into our land owner, that his acres are producing him ten rents to what they do upon the continent; (France for instance,) and let him be satisfied, and not force the legislature by the corn laws to starve the people.

with vital life enough, and to feed the young forming grain or embryo, therefore an imperfect embryo or grain is formed; for it is at this crisis that the plant requires her full powers in forming the seed for future plants. It is the same with all vegetables, even fruit trees, when they do not thrive and bring forth fruit, they are covered with animalcali, but this is not the cause but the consequence of the vegetables not thriving.

122

Mr. Malthus talks of so much land being employed in grazing; but there is far less land employed in grazing than formerly; indeed, no ground should be exclusively employed in grazing; for the improved husbandry of turnips, and clover with grass seeds, should be universally followed; and all lands should be ploughed, and the turnip crop, and clover with grass seeds, will yield him considerable more produce than the same land will yield in natural grass. But then the farmer must have a commercial country like England to consume his produce, that is, cattle to eat his turnips and clover, which they have not in France. And the more commercial the better the land will be cultivated; for in the north of England they cannot follow that proper and regular routine of crops which they pursue in the south, not having a population rich enough to eat their animal food; therefore they are obliged, like France (but not to that extent) to push their dry crops too much. And I would ask Mr. Coke of Norfolk, that great land owner, who is so zealous an advocate for the corn bill, what would the county of Norfolk be, if it was not for the great consumption of animal food? Supposing we were a nation of agriculturists, where would be his market either for his barley or his butchers' meat fed by his turnip crops? A great part of his lands, formed of so poor and thin a soil, would scarce be worth cultivating: the same through-

123

out the county. The poor starving labourers of the country, the great mass of its population, could not afford to drink malt-liquor or spirits, the produce of the barley; and also what would become of the immense revenue which those articles pay to government? I say look to it, and not kill the goose for the golden eggs.

The little confined idea of the economists, that as man lives by the necessaries of life, therefore it should be the sole object of the policy of the state to increase the production of those necessaries, to the sacrifice of trade. But reflect upon the present state of Great Britain, mistress of the sea by her commanding navy, with her great, powerful and rich colonies, her great trade and manufactories. Then let us take a view of her if she was solely confined to agriculture. Mr. Malthus says, vol. ii. p. 213, "According to the returns lately made of the population of England and Wales, it appears that the number of persons employed in agriculture is considerably less than a fifth part of the whole." Then what must become of the rest of her population, suppose one twentieth (which is considerably a greater number than would be required) is employed to work at trades for those who are engaged in agriculture? Then I again inquire, what is to come of the remainder, are they immediately to be hungered to death, or are they to be gradually starved, to linger out a miserable existence?

124

And after those lives are *killed off*, according to Mr. Windham's unfeeling language, where will be the market for the agriculture produce? * It must be a foreign one, and the produce must sink below the price which it is upon the continent, from the expence of freight. See the picture which is now justly drawn of France, p. 69. But France is a commercial country, therefore our produce and land would be still lower. But if we lose our trade and manufactures, France and other nations will take them up, and in consequence reap the same benefit from them as we have done, and their land will in consequence be as highly cultivated as ours is at present, by having a population that can consume animal food, from having a large population of manufacturers paying for it by the money they receive from other nations for their manufactured goods, and ours will in consequence as certainly decline.

But fortunately for England she is an island, and therefore requires a powerful navy to protect

* Mr. Malthus says, vol. ii. p. 275, speaking of our commerce and manufactures, "I look upon them as the most distinguishing characteristics of civilization, the most obvious and striking marks of the improvement of society, and calculated to enlarge our enjoyments, and add to the sum of human happiness. No great surplus produce of agriculture could exist without them, and if it did exist, it would be comparatively of little value."

125

her, and this navy requires seamen; but how shall we make them? A soldier may be made in a room, but a sailor requires the sea, constant practice upon that element; and therefore a country which has no foreign trade and colonies, those nurseries for seamen, can never be a maritime one. Besides, where will be our population, when it is reduced to be not much above one fifth, either to form soldiers or seamen, and where will be the funds to support them? Our navy is built principally with foreign articles; what is there to purchase them? will our agriculturists send their corn and cattle to Russia for the purchase? the articles there will be of very small value.

It requires no great sagacity to predict; nay, even our wiseacres are equal to it, that England, which now stands so highly pre-eminent, being the wonder and envy of the world, will fall from that high eminence to a poor half starved mass of agriculturists, that Buonaparte might think us scarce worth conquering. It is mortifying at a time when we alone have withstood the gigantic power of France, when we have been the life and soul of every confederacy against her with our money and navy; nay, made exertions beyond what any one would have thought possible, particularly by those who knew not the immense power and influence of commerce, that we should at this time produce a set of contracted blind

writers, to disparage that commerce, and revive that foolish idea of the economists.

A Mr. Spencer, who has taken this field, talks of a coach being built at the expence of the land owner, by expending so much of his produce; true, he may carry him into his cellar and his kitchen, he may shew him his stately palaces, his furniture, his library, his gallery of paintings, many of these are foreign produce, and trade brings him these by the high price of his landed produce. But if Mr. Spencer's absurd system was to take place, he would have nothing but a cart instead of a coach to loll in. Such absurd pernicious writers! it makes one lose all patience to contend with; the misfortune is, that according to the proverb, one weak man makes many, a harmless one I should quietly pass by, but a dangerous one requires reproof. This language may be thought harsh, but the pernicious consequence of such reasoning deserves it; nay, it has been supposed that our present imbecile ministers act upon their gross absurdities.

France, from not being a commercial nation to any extent, therefore her comparatively trifling national debt was too much for her, she has twice been a bankrupt. But this is not the case with England or Holland. Look at our immense national debt, considerably above eight hundred millions; and I think even the confined and contracted intellects of Mr. Spencer must see that we

can only bear up against it by the greatest energy and spirit of our commerce. We have now the commerce and are the manufacturers for all the world, therefore we can meet the full expenditure of the times. But when peace is established upon the continent, and they attend again to their manufactures and commerce, then will the pressure of our immense expences be most felt; and we by protracting the war, are still adding to our debt, and forcing them from necessity to manufacture for themselves. War, that frantic mad spirit of Mr. Pitt's, is still pushing the nation to its continuance; that no experience of its disaster can teach us discretion. Peace, thou benign spirit of christianity! I wish all the world were Quakers, in that tenet of their religion, not to go to war.

Our agriculturists in attending to their great object in raising the price of provisions, never reflect upon the present state of this kingdom in respect to its finances, its immense colossal debt and its immense taxation. I should ask this question, what would their impotent agriculture system do for our revenue?* To shew what commerce

* France, from not being a commercial nation, but what our foolish economists call an agricultural one, could not support the least national debt, but has been twice in a state of bankruptcy. Then I would ask those foolish men, who would bring this country again into an agriculture one, what would they do with our immense national debt. The public credit of

and agriculture will do in this respect, let us take the two countries the most remarkable, this country, including the stocks, paper currency, India bonds, &c. is above one thousand and forty millions; yet France had a far more extended landed country than England, and yet the smallest national debt overwhelmed her.

I observe in the Globe some observations which says, "the following statement of the factitious wealth of the United Kingdom, taken from the second edition of Sir Philip Francis's pamphlet, is so important, that we think it ought to be laid before the public, with his observations on it:—

1. National funded debt of Great Britain	£.784,552,142
2. Unfunded ditto	49,684,948
3. Notes issued by the Bank of England	21,406,980
4. Notes of private bankers	84,000,000
5. India bonds in circulation	4,869,992

IRELAND.

6. Funded debt, in January 1810	81,510,856
7. Unfunded ditto, exclusive of the capital of sundry annuities for lives, and for terms which I cannot ascertain	684,809
8. Notes issued by the Irish Bank, on the 1st February, 1809	3,072,516
9. Notes issued by private bankers, computed on the principle of Ricardo's calculation	12,000,000
	<hr/>
	£.1,041,732,193

Total—One thousand and forty-two millions!

"In this account the only disputable article is the amount of notes, issued by private bankers, taken on a general computation, which it is impossible to ascertain.

"This stupendous edifice of credit is at once an object of terror and astonishment. At a distance sufficient for safety,

Holland for commerce, and Poland for agriculture. The one a trading nation for Europe, and the other a granary for Europe. Mr. Pratt says, vol. ii. p. 252, "As to the first, it is certain there is not a country in the world more heavily charged with impost than that of the Dutch, especially in the province of Holland. Bread, wine, beer, flesh, fowl, fruits, vegetables, fire, and in short almost every necessary of life, are all onerated, and with a rigour as if they were so many luxu-

the most formidable phenomenon may be viewed with admiration or indifference; but not so, when the danger approximates, or the sense of it is real. A deep and uniform impression on a constant mind, or even on a timid imagination, cannot be wholly against reason. This pile of paper is too near us to be seen through a false medium, or to be contemplated without fear. I am not gifted with faculties to compare it to any thing but a wonderful house of cards, of which the materials are light enough to be blown away or fall to pieces at any moment, but heavy enough to crush the kingdom in their fall."

England at present is in a high state of commerce; but this state depends upon contingencies, not like the solid foundation of France, upon a great population and territory. Our commerce is founded upon public credit, and this is by no means a permanent foundation; a breath may injure it.

To be sure we have great colonial possessions, but these depend upon the protection from a superior navy. England has lost a considerable permanent wealth since the war; she has lost thirty millions of her specie. The currency is now therefore paper, I owe you and you owe me, which is but a sandy foundation. It behoves the legislature to bring back again that specie as soon as possible. Policy imperiously demands it.

130

ries. These taxes amount to a third of the value of the commodity, to be paid by those who sell, and consequently by those who buy, as the seller raises the price of each article in proportion. If, amongst the cavils which are made against Old England, we are to reckon those which proceed from taxation, it may afford the murmurers some consolation to understand that their near neighbours are burthened yet more severely than themselves, and that it would be difficult to mention a single article which has escaped—salt, soap, tobacco (one of their absolute necessaries) tea, coffee, chocolate, masters, servants, carts, coaches, horses, asses, house and land, all go to the maintenance of the Republic, on a principle, literally, of state necessity. The tax on houses augments or diminishes, according to their situation, their magnificence, and the date of their erection.

“ In any great emergence, their High Mightinesses levy the hundredth or the two hundredth part on the whole property of the inhabitants, given on the oath of each individual. The duty on all stamps is, in itself, a very great revenue, and so strictly guarded, that neither favour nor finesse can find a loop-hole to creep out; and all contracts, public or private, not made upon stamped paper, are not only void, but the offenders punished with all the rigours of the law; which rigours, by the bye, are frequently put in force.

131

“ The duties on Holland, as the most opulent province, constitute the half of what is produced to government by the whole of the Republic; and after Holland, the most burthened is Friezland, then Zeland. We have been told that, during the war with England, in 1663, they raised double the ordinary revenue, which is allowed to be near two millions sterling; and it has been said that, on the occasion of the last general war, which began in 1702 and ended in 1713, they raised near five millions sterling every year; which the financiers of the country assert is the utmost sum of which the states are capable. The proportion between this Republic and England is calculated at five to seven; that is, supposing the subject equally burthened.

“ But they have favoured their great source of trade as much as possible, raising rather by excises than customs; for fear, says Carter, of driving so unstable a traveller into other countries. This indulgence shewn to what may properly be called their staple commodity (commerce) is according to a maxim of two of their most illustrious republicans: ‘ In Hollandia et Zelandia, etiam nuptiis tributum impositum; sed ne mori quidem ibi licet impune,’ says Bynhershoeck.

“ Some articles, such as salt, is taxed whether consumed or not. Every sale of moveables, comprehending grain, cattle, and all produce of land,

132

pays the 80th penny; horses the 12th; immoveables the 40th.

“A very ingenious writer, by way also of consoling the English reader, has detailed, and with great accuracy, some of the taxes I have not hitherto noticed.

“For instance: the land tax is two florins sixteen stivres per acre; the dykes two florins three stivers; and rent about 20s. per acre.

“Houses pay as far as 40*l.* sterling.

“One of their most singular imposts is what they call a collateral tax, which is a levy on inheritance out of the direct line, laid in the province where the property, not the person, of the deceased, was lodged. This is supposed to bring, in the course of a few generations, all private property into the coffers of the public.

“There is a tax of 2*l.* per cent. on every man's income, stated on oath. Wine pays an excise of 3*l.* per hogshead. Small-beer 50 per cent. Another of 2 per cent. on the revenue of all offices, excepting those in the army. This is called Acmt Geldt; that on income, Famille Geldt.

“Every man appointed to an office must buy stocks to a certain amount, and tear the bonds; which renders offices a kind of annuity, yielding to the purchaser about 12 or 14*l.* per cent. This tax is named Acmt Obligaties, or recognitions.

133

“All manufactures used in the country pay exorbitant charges, to spare those levied by the several admiralties: and the Dutch East India Company pays as a compensation for its charter about 36,000*l.* sterling annually: but in addition, each share of 6000 florins pays 480 florins annually, whether there is a dividend or not.

“The revenues, therefore, if we include what is paid to the several towns and corporations, may be estimated at about 24 millions of florins, levied on a population of about 800,000 souls: so that on an average each person contributes about thirty florins, or two guineas and a half English, when exchange is most in our favour. An immense sum, if we consider place and people; yet the Republic not only subsists, and moves, but flourishes—not, however, without heavy murmuring,* as we shall see presently. The losses, we are told, sustained by their East India Company since the year 1780, in consequence of the rupture with England, amounted to about seventy millions of florins, equal to about six millions one hundred and twenty-five pound sterling, reckoning the florin at its usual rate.” And those taxes were before its heavy imposts from its late misfor-

* “Its murmurings appeared to arise from the want of a revolution. They have got a revolution; but do their murmurs cease? Inveterately fixed in general habits and opinions, in politics they are capricious and changeable.”

134

tunes by the French revolution. But what would the fine country of Poland, with its immense exportation of corn, do in point of revenue, a mere bagatelle to Holland? it could not raise in proportion to its population one fiftieth part of the revenue. Let our economists and agriculturists attend to these important facts, and let us no longer hear of their absurd system. England has flourished and must flourish entirely upon the commercial system. Upon the agriculture system she would fall away and waste, as snow in a summers day.

Mr. Pratt has drawn a just and accurate character of a commercial country, which I shall quote, vol. ii. p 228, "Some sentiments on this subject are so apposite to this cause and this effect on general principles, that I cannot but apply them in this place, so far as my memory accommodates me either with them or the language in which they were given to the British House of Parliament in the course of the last session. But you should previously understand that what the member offered as descriptive of the British empire, I consider as equally influencing *all* the trading parts of Europe, and in a more especial manner the United Provinces.

"When we thus see the revenue and the trade of every country increasing, it is natural to inquire into the causes. Of these the first is undoubtedly the industry and energy of a country.

135

But there must be secondary causes to give to this its effect, said one who is not in the habit, as many honourable members are, of sacrificing truth to declamation. The increase of skill in artisans and manufactures, the great improvements in the application of machinery, and the various ways by which labour is saved, subdivided, and expedited by ingenuity, have done much in all countries: the facility of credit arising from confidence in the public faith, gives great advantage to manufactures at *home*, and, by enabling the merchant to extend his credit *abroad*, gives no less advantage in the foreign market, and thus operates in a double ratio.

"This is certainly first the sign and then the cause of national prosperity, which is greatly extended by the commercial enterprise and judicious speculation arising from an unrestrained intercourse between nations. But the principle source of this prosperity, and which indeed suggests the only possible way of accounting for its sudden and immense magnitude, is to be found in the astonishing effects resulting from the accumulation of capital; effects which were never fully understood till a philosopher of our own country, the celebrated author of the 'Wealth of Nations,' with a depth and clearness of investigation fitted to enlighten and direct the internal policy of any state, discovered and pointed them out. This accumulation operates with all the effect of com-

136

pound interest, every addition to it being the immediate cause of another, and its force increasing in an accelerated ratio through its progress.

“ And these combining causes are most indisputably productive of those astonishing effects, which pour, not only through our own country but every other in the trading world, the graces, the riches of each other in greater abundance at this very hour, than at any former period of at least modern, and perhaps of antient times.

“ Of what *farther* is it susceptible, it is impossible to say; because the perfection of national commerce, that bound which it may reach but may not pass, cannot easily be ascertained; but we may fairly ask, if such are the effects of such causes *already*, what, in the progress of industry, genius, and emulation, may not be expected from them in future? In prosperity, *no* limit can be set to national vigour; and in the hour of difficulty, distress, or danger, as such vigour is the only mitigation of national evil, it will be exerted in proportion. Far therefore from having reached a point at which it is likely to stop, the national prosperity of a country, flowing out of its commerce, admits yet of increase; and though the causes must be permanent, the effects may be progressive; for while human skill in any branch of commodity is *capable* of improvement, it is impossible to say to what a pitch of wealth and pro-

137

sperity any trading nation may arrive by its own energy of advancing.

“ Holland, it is true, has had at different periods of her history very heavy drawbacks, as well from within as from without; from the enemy in her own bowels, as from a public invader. Often have the fruits of her genius and industry been swept away by rebellion and war; often has she been drenched in her own blood: but with all these depressions, her efforts resisted these calamities, and repaired them so well, that at this very hour she may stand perhaps foremost amongst nations, as an example of human industry producing human prosperity.

“ The description of Alexandria by an ancient author has been applied, and justly, to this Republic, particularly its capital. ‘ Rich and opulent provinces that abound with every thing, and where nobody can be idle. The very lame and blind have their exercises and useful occupations, and even those who have the gout in their hands are not suffered to be useless.’ This is so true of Amsterdam, that in almost every corner of it amazing examples of industry are to be seen, even in those whose age, sickness, and bodily infirmities, would obtain a dispensation from work any where else. Those who think, therefore, that the Dutch have more of matter than spirit in their composition, may undeceive themselves. Other

cities of Europe have had the models of most of their useful contrivances, and machines of various sorts, from the towns of this Republic. Even those who arrogate all wit and all art to themselves, have been obliged to borrow from hence several of their most ingenious utensils: and upon the whole, Voltaire's character of the States is well merited. 'La Hollande,' says he, 'merite d'autant plus d'attention, que c'est un etat d'une espèce toute nouvelle, devenu puissant sans posseder presque de terrain, riche, et n'ayant pas de son fonds de quoi nourrir la vingtième partie de ses habitans, et considerable en Europe par ses travaux au bout de l'Asie.'" What would that very great man have said of Poland? The leading causes of Holland's greatness are commercial and manufacturing industry and capital.

Mr. Malthus says, p. 473, "On an average of the five years ending in 1800, the proportion of births to marriages is 347 to 100. In 1760 it was 362 to 100." He also says in the same page, "On the other hand, if the marriages were rather more prolific formerly than at present, owing to their being contracted at an earlier age, the effect would be a greater proportion of births compared with the marriages;" and that the marriages were earlier formerly he clearly shews in many parts of his Essay. And he says that "in the years 1710, 1720, and 1730, it appears from the returns (of

the Population Act) that the deaths exceeded the births." He also says, speaking from the same authority, "with regard to the three following periods, ending with 1780, in which thirty years it would seem, by the same mode of calculation, that an increase of a million and a half had taken place." What a considerable alteration from these returns took place in this century! In the thirty years of the first part of it, the deaths exceeded the births; but in the last thirty years, ending in 1780, he says we had gained a million and a half; though in this last period the German war, and the more bloody one of America, were included. This clearly shews how erroneous the Population Act is, for the deaths abroad, which would in consequence take place from these bloody wars, and also from our then extended commerce, are not accounted for. He also says, p. 476, "I do not think that we can depend upon any estimates of past population, founded on a calculation from the births till after the year 1780, when every following year is given, and a just average of the births may be obtained. As a further confirmation of this remark I will just observe, that in the final summary of the abstracts from the registers of England and Wales, it appears that in the year 1790 the total number of births was 248,774, in the year 1795, 247,218, and in 1800, 247,147."

Then as he acknowledges our marriages are fewer, and not so prolific, from being later. And

140

from 1790 to 1800 our scarcities had not begun to operate; for though we had a bad harvest in 1796, yet it was only one year, and the sack of flour was never higher than ninety shillings, and it soon fell again. But after 1800 the systematic rise took place, from the Duke of Portland's mistaken and unfortunate letter, so that Mr. Malthus is obliged to say, p. 470, "The effects of the late scarcities are strongly marked in the returns of the Population Act by a decrease of births and an increase of burials, and should such seasons frequently recur, they would soon destroy the great excess of births which has been observed during the last twenty years." Besides, from the year 1790, to 1795, when we had no scarcity, and when we were in peace; the unfortunate war having only just begun, at the end of this period, therefore could not be felt, we were decreasing in population; in 1790 there were 248,774, in 1795 there was only 247,218.* And these calculations of the births are just, for he says, "I do

* But since 1800 the decrease of births has been alarming, and the mortality still more so. Just to mention two diseases, the hydrocephalus, which so seldom took place formerly, now is so frequent, that a noted writer says its mortality is equal to the small pox, and fevers are more malignant now than formerly; a late one, in the town of Sheffield, was so mortal, that it was called the Walcheren fever; but I am told it was the typhus, aggravated by poverty and distress. But, indeed, that is the case with all diseases. Poverty and distress debilitates the constitution, and makes it liable to cold and infection, and when disease

141

not think that we can depend upon any estimates of past population, founded on a calculation from the births till after the year 1780." And he says after the period 1800, the scarcity is so forcibly operating against population. Then how, candid reader, can he say, p. 470, "we now suppose that the proportion of births to deaths is above 13 to 10?" I should think from his own statement he should have reversed it, and made the deaths 13 to 10 births.

In speaking of Scotland, Mr. Malthus says, p. 485, "From a general view of the statistical accounts the result seems clearly to be, that the condition of the lower classes of people in Scotland has been considerably improved of late years. The price of provisions has risen; but almost invariably the price of labour has risen in a greater proportion; and it is remarked in most parishes, that more butcher's meat is consumed among the common people than formerly; that they are both better lodged and better clothed; and that their habits with respect to cleanliness are decidedly improved.

"A part of this improvement is probably to be attributed to the increase of the preventive check. In some parishes a habit of later marriages is noticed, and in many places, where it is not men-
catches it, it has no strength and energy to fight with, its powers being only half alive; see p. 67, the mortal effects which Dr. Smith gives of poverty.

tioned, it may be fairly inferred, from the proportions of births and marriages, and other circumstances. The writer of the account of the parish of Elgin, in enumerating the general causes of depopulation in Scotland, speaks of the discouragement to marriage from the union of farms, and the consequent emigration of the flower of their young men of every class and description, very few of whom ever return. Another cause that he mentions is the discouragement to marriage from luxury; at least, he observes, till people are advanced in years, and then a puny race of children are produced. 'Hence, how many men of every description remain single, and how many young women of every rank are never married, who in the beginning of this century, or even so late as 1745, would have been the parents of a numerous and healthy progeny.'

"In those parts of the country where the population has been rather diminished by the introduction of grazing, or an improved system of husbandry which requires fewer hands, this effect has chiefly taken place; and I have little doubt, that in estimating the decrease of the population, since the end of the last, or the beginning of the present century, by the proportion of births at the different periods, they have fallen into the error which has been particularly noticed with regard to Switzerland, and have in consequence made the difference greater than it really is."

Then I would ask any rational person how can Mr. Malthus say that Scotland increased at the ratio of four births to three burials? He says, p. 484, "with respect to the marriages, it will be still more difficult to form a conjecture. They are registered so irregularly that no returns of them are given in the Population Abstract. I should naturally have thought from the Statistical Account, that the tendency to marriage in Scotland was upon the whole greater than in England; but if it be true that the births and deaths bear the same proportion to each other, and to the whole population, in both countries the proportion of marriages cannot be very different. It should be remarked, however, that supposing the operation of the preventive check to be exactly the same in both countries, and the climates to be equally salubrious, a greater degree of want and poverty would take place in Scotland, before the same mortality was produced as in England, owing to the smaller proportion of towns and manufactories in the former country than in the latter."

Then Mr. Malthus, I would ask even you, if you claim the least character to reason or consistency, can you say that this island is increasing in population as "4 births to three burials?" and I would also ask, how could this puny race of children resist mortality so much more than when marriages were formed earlier?

That I have not misrepresented Mr. Malthus's opinions, that deaths aid population, I shall give a long quotation, beginning at chap. 5th, p. 358, "It is an evident truth, that whatever may be the rate of increase in the means of subsistence, the increase of population must be limited by it, at least after the food has once been divided into the smallest shares that will support life. All the children born beyond what would be required to keep up the population to this level, must necessarily perish, unless room be made for them by the deaths of grown persons. It has appeared, indeed, clearly in the course of this work, that in all old states the marriages and births depend principally upon the deaths, and that there is no encouragement to early unions so powerful as a great mortality. To act consistently, therefore, we should facilitate, instead of foolishly and vainly endeavouring to impede the operations of nature in producing this mortality; and if we dread the too frequent visitation of the horrid form of famine, we should sedulously encourage the other forms of destruction which we compel nature to use. Instead of recommending cleanliness to the poor, we should encourage contrary habits. In our towns, we should make the streets narrower, crowd more people into the houses, and court the return of the plague. In the country, we should build our villages near stagnant pools, and particularly encourage settle-

ments in all marshy and unwholesome situations. But above all, we should reprobate specific remedies for ravaging diseases, and those benevolent, but much mistaken men, who have thought they were doing a service to mankind by projecting schemes for the total extirpation of particular disorders. If by these and similar means, the annual mortality were increased from 1 in 36 or 40, to 1 in 18 or 20; we might probably every one of us marry at the age of puberty, and yet few be absolutely starved."*

* Only just to make a few comments upon these quotations. Mr. Malthus allows that the late dearthness of provisions is operating strongly upon population, "by a decrease of births and an increase of burials, and must," he says, "soon destroy the great excess of births which has been observed during the last twenty years." But unfortunately for England, there was no excess of births; for I have shewn at this very time they were diminishing, from his own quotation from the registers, when he says this excess took place. But the writer of the account of the parish of Elgin gives the cause why our registers deceive us in our estimates of the population, he says, "the discouragement to marriage from the union of farms, and the consequent emigration of the flower of their young men of every class and description, very few of whom ever return. Hence, how many men of every description remain single, and how many young women of every rank are never married, who in the beginning of this century, or even as late as 1745, would have been the parents of a numerous and healthy progeny." Formerly there were no emigrations, therefore all born died in their country, which made the deaths even at this very period he speaks of, as Mr. Malthus says, "from the return of the Population Act

146

I assert, so far from his pages proving this monstrous opinion, I say they prove a spirit the reverse, though he should think his chapter on Switzerland justifies him. In opposition to such gross absurdities, I will give a quotation from him, of a

that the deaths exceeded the births; therefore the reason is clear and evident why the births now exceed the deaths, is that the last are not registered, from the immense numbers of them which die abroad.

Mr. Malthus's gross and absurd arguments, that deaths aid population, are supposing this was an island shut up from all intercourse with any other part of the world. Upon this idea, how could Holland have existed, for she grows no corn? even all countries require assistance from one another, as their crops fluctuate. And also supposing that this island was cultivated to its utmost point, and population equally pushed; but under the present European habits, customs and manners, population will decrease instead of increase.

It has been the wonder of all philosophers the immense hords which formerly inhabited Europe, and at last overwhelmed Rome; but this immense population was from the simple and rural manners of the people, which are now taking place in the interior of America, and which are now so fast increasing their numbers; but in their maritime towns, similar to Europe, they can scarce keep up their numbers: there never was an author so immersed in absurdities as Mr. Malthus.

Mr. Malthus's observations on Scotland were taken from statistical accounts, and before provisions rose so very high, he says "but almost invariably the price of labour has risen in a greater proportion than provisions." But since 1800 the reverse has taken place, labour has fallen, particularly manufacturing, and the price of provisions has risen to an alarming height; therefore if she was suffering in her population then, what must she do now?

147

striking and obvious effect, generally admitted by all historians, till this little philosopher, with his new lights, made his appearance: he opens his chap. ii. p. 278, by saying, "It has been observed, that many countries at the period of their greatest degree of populousness have lived in the greatest plenty, and have been able to export corn; but at other periods, when their population was very low, have lived in continual poverty and want, and have been obliged to import corn. Egypt, Palestine, Rome, Sicily, and Spain, are cited as particular exemplifications of this fact; and it has been inferred, that an increase of population in any state, not cultivated to the utmost, will tend rather to augment than diminish the relative plenty of the whole society; and that, as Lord Kaimes observes, a country cannot easily become too populous for agriculture; because agriculture has the signal property of producing food in proportion to the number of consumers.

"The general facts from which these inferences are drawn, there is no reason to doubt." Then it appears that population was the cause of a great surplus subsistence, instead of a surplus subsistence being the cause of population; for as population decreased, subsistence decreased, which must be the case till the world is cultivated like a garden. But I say that is so far from being the case, that the world does not produce one hun-

dredth part of the subsistence it is capable of; then why profanely charge God with vice and misery, to keep down population, against his express command to increase and multiply? No, God says, "increase and multiply, and replenish the earth," knowing that the earth is only to be replenished, that is cultivated, by a large population; and so far from that law being fully executed, the earth is not replenished a hundredth part it is capable of; therefore it is impious to charge God with being the author of vice and misery, in order to keep down population. I appeal to every rational christian if this is not the truth!

Colonel Pinkney, in his Travels in France, gives a very different picture of the peasantry than he would draw if he was to travel through England. See p. 60, 70, 71 and 42.

But let us examine the present state of the peasantry in England: a labourer has eighteen pence per day, and how does he maintain himself upon this small pittance? Why, upon an average he has a mile and a half to walk before he arrives at the place of his labour: when breakfast time comes, he draws out of his pocket his crust of bread, which he eats, and drinks after it a quantity of ditch water. The same is repeated for his dinner; and at six o'clock in the evening he retires to his solitary home. If he marries to sooth his dismal and unfortunate life, he immediately

applies to the parish for relief.* I would ask if the slaves in our West India islands are not in a better station than him? Good Heavens! what a picture is this for an Englishman, in this land, overflowing with riches, luxury and corruption! Mr. Arthur Young, in his Travels through France, before the revolution, says that the peasantry are starving while the higher orders are spending five hundred louis d'ors in a night. How similar a situation is England now thrown into; the higher orders, from having their land rents raised three fold, are spending it as the French higher orders were doing, in gross sensual luxury, while the lower orders are starving, as the French peasantry were doing formerly. But how different a picture did he then draw of Old England; he says, "When you are engaged in this political tour, finish it with seeing England, and I will shew you

* There is a laudable and high spirit of independency which is innate in the breast of every Englishman, and he will suffer a great deal before he will apply to the parish; but if the applications become general, the stigma attending a pauper will loose its influence, and he will resort to it without any compunction; and when that is gone, he will fly to a poor house, from the mere impulse of indolence; and what is man when he has lost that great impulse industry! that industry which Englishmen have more than any other nation in the world; and along with it will go that ingenuity which he likewise has above all other men in the world, and which has brought England to her unrivalled greatness. Nay, our manufacturers are equally starving as well as the agricultural labourers; for they, upon an average, only get twelve shillings per week.

150

a set of peasants well clothed, well nourished, tolerably drunken from superfluity, well lodged, and at their ease." But now, how melancholy is the change!

I, in the voice of policy, charity, and benevolence ask what has produced it? That population has not increased, I have satisfactorily proved; for is it possible it can have increased during so bloody a war, when our troops have to contend with so powerful an enemy as France? nay, we are at war with all the world, and along with this the mortality our brave troops experienced in the West Indies from the yellow fever,* and also more lately, the equally destructive Walcheren fever; and also how we have suffered in Spain, from our temerity, being obliged to make such rapid retreats. Let us in our disquisitions take

* Mr. Malthus says that our registers are correct since 1780, and he gives the births from them up to the year 1800, which shew that they are decreasing, and also since that period most rapidly; he says, p. 470, "The effects of the late scarcities are strongly marked in the returns of the Population Act by a decrease of births and an increase of burials, and should such seasons frequently recur, they would soon destroy the great excess of births which has been observed during the last twenty years." And if our births are decreasing, our burials upon our registers must have increased in still greater proportion than is mentioned by them; for add to these bloody, ill-conducted, and unfortunate wars, our immense extended trade, which carries our seamen to all the world, all of whose deaths are not registered.

151

reason and common sense along with us; this is all I want to carry conviction. The seasons have not been unfavourable for our producing corn since 1800,* the time from whence sprung our regular scarcities, or more properly high prices. No, it has been clearly proved (see a sensible paper published by the Bath Society, wrote by Mr. Davis, already quoted; he shews that our impoverished grain has been lately from pushing its produce too much, forcing nature beyond her powers, though the ground is glutted with manure, which I believe is now generally admitted.† Good Heavens! what a change is this for Great Britain! no wonder her sons are emigrating by thousands, while the rapacious land owners

* Nay, even Mr. Malthus himself says, vol. ii. p. 407, "The nature of her soil and climate is such, that those almost universal failures in the crops of grain, which are known in some countries, never occur in England. Her insular situation and extended commerce are peculiarly favourable for importation."

† Also what added to this indiscriminate ploughing system was, the rapacity of our land owners, for the rents having had such a rapid rise, they thought they would still continue to advance; and in their golden dreams of rapacity they would not let their farms by leases for a term of years, but only from year to year, in consequence the farmers ploughed up every thing, making no provision for future years, not knowing how long they might continue upon the farm; in consequence all their regular routine of husbandry was broken in upon, and the ground was impoverished: by this conduct the most fertile grounds might be made perfectly barren.

are lulled into a sordid apathy by a set of ignorant and cruel writers. But let our legislators look to it before the deace is irremediable, and Old England falls for ever.

Mr. Malthus says, p. 214, "Before the late revolution in Holland the high price of the necessaries of life had destroyed many of its manufactories." Then I would ask him if their necessaries of life were half the price which ours are at present? It certainly ought to be the chief object in every manufacturing country to keep down the price of the necessaries of life as much as possible, instead of yielding to the rapaciousness of a set of land owners, to raise them as high as possible; and aided by high taxes, and a deluge of paper currency, which is now fatally operating so as to make the exchange so much against us. That this is the operation of paper currency is so clearly proved by Mr. Whately and Dr. Smith, that it is unnecessary for me to say any thing about it. They clearly shew that it must operate in this way; indeed, they bring the example of America, and other countries, where it had the direct same operation, and those that will not be convinced by their arguments, are incapable of conviction. Also our country banks have a most pernicious effect in advancing money to farmers to pay their rents, and by that means they can keep up their stock, just feeding the market at their own prices. Formerly, farmers used to be

under the necessity of bringing their produce regularly to market. But now, by the aid of country banks, they can get what money they choose, and by that means prices are kept up. Each farmer, if he has not credit himself, has only to bring a friend to pass his word to the bank, and he gets the paper money he wants. The bank by this means gets its notes thrown into circulation. This alone is of such pernicious consequence, that paper currency ought to be checked.

The cant phrase is that commerce has outstripped agriculture; but see what Colonel Pinkney says of France, the land is only "about one tenth of what such land would cost in England." He also says, speaking of the turnip and clover crops, "The French farmer cannot persevere in them, for he can find no cattle to eat them, and no purchasers for his cattle." This will soon be the case with England if our commerce and population fail, we shall be in the identical same state as France is at present, and she will just reverse the picture more than she has done at present. The times are awful, nor will Providence assist us, but must turn from us, because of our rapacity and corruption.

* Colonel Pinkney has said that the French farmer does not cultivate his ground to advantage, being not so laborious as in many other countries. But that is partly owing to his not having trade to stimulate and call forth those physical exertions

Mr. Malthus appears to be a most presumptuous and ignorant author, contradicting the most obvious and clear facts; he says, vol. ii. p. 10, Dr. Price very justly says (Observ. on Revers. Pay. vol. i. p. 269, 4th edit.) "that the general effect of an increase, while it is going on in a country, is to render the proportion of persons marrying annually, to the annual deaths *greater*, and to the annual births *less* than the true proportion marrying out of any given number born. This proportion generally lies between the other two proportions, but always nearest the first."—"In these observations I entirely agree with him, but in a note to this passage he appears to me to fall into an error. He says, that if the prolificness of marriages be increased (the *probabilities of life and the encouragement to marriage* remaining the same) both the annual births and burials would increase in proportion to the annual weddings. That the proportion of annual births would increase is cer-

which are seen both in England and Holland. It was the same in the north of England and Scotland till the manufactures were established there; and they brought money and a good market for the farmers produce, and infused that spirit of labour and industry; so that they now vie with the farmers of the south. In manufacturing countries, the children are immediately put to work, being habituated to labour; they make the best soldiers, as exemplified in this war, for by their mixing in society so soon, they acquire that spirit, activity and adroitness, their minds and bodies being so early called into action, receive that acuteness, ardour and spirit.

tainly true, and I here acknowledge my error in differing from Dr. Price on this point in my last edition; but I still think that the proportion of burials to weddings would not necessarily increase under the circumstances here supposed.

"The proportion of the burials to the weddings would be rather decreased than increased. From not attending to the circumstance that the average age of marriage may often be considerably earlier than the mean age of death, the general conclusion also which Dr. Price draws in this note does not appear to be strictly correct."

Can any thing be so plain, clear and obvious, that if more are born, more must die? But then he begins with wild calculations, confounding his puerile brain with them. He just did the same with Switzerland. see p. 22, 23 and 24 of this pamphlet. Though the most learned of the Swiss were very sensible of the decrease of their population, as indeed the decrease of their births directly proved it. In the first period he multiplies by 26, but at the last period by 36; so by the magic of his imaginary numbers, all the common sense, facts and observations of the Swiss are immediately to vanish, and the ridiculous absurd multipliers of Mr. Malthus, viz. 26 and 36 are to be applied to the same people at different periods. But in France their multiplier is only 25, and is always the same at all periods.

The poor wages that the manufacturers can obtain for their labour (which I am told is only upon an average of 12s. per week, though they work fourteen hours a day to obtain that.) About twelve months ago a great disturbance in Lancashire took place, the men demanding more wages, as they could not subsist upon their present ones; and the masters, on the other hand, said that they could not afford any more, according to the price their goods were selling for; and I will inform them, that when the manufactories of the continent get forward, they will not even get their present prices, they will be undersold by the foreign manufacturers. The truth is, the disease does not lie with the master, he cannot afford larger wages; but the disease lies with the dearness of provisions, and that dearness is owing to a systematic artifice; therefore both masters and men ought to petition the legislature to repeal the corn laws, for if the legislature does not do every thing to reduce the price of corn, England will fall for ever.

After Mr. Malthus's making every effort to raise the price of provisions, he endeavours by all the arts he is master of, to hinder people from marrying. Good Heavens! is this a christian country, and is Mr. Malthus a christian divine, that an Englishman's situation is to be such that he ought not to marry! O Britons! the first, the most industrious, ingenious and warlike race of mankind;

a servile mean writer for the rich, endeavours to make your race extinct for fear you should incumber them. What endears a man to his country, and loses his life in its defence, but his wife and family? what bears him up under the pressure of want but his wife and family? what is his consolation amidst his misfortunes but his wife and family?

Dr. Currie says "in appreciating the happiness and virtue of a community, there is perhaps no single criterion on which so much dependence may be placed as the state of the intercourse between the sexes. Where this displays ardour of attachment, accompanied by purity of conduct, the character and the influence of women rise, our imperfect nature mounts in the scale of moral excellence; and from the source of this single affection, a stream of felicity descends, which branches into a thousand rivulets that enrich and adorn the field of life. Where the attachment between the sexes sinks into an appetite, the heritage of our species is comparatively poor, and man approaches to the condition of the brutes that perish."

And even Mr. Malthus feels for the negro in our islands, though he has none for his countrymen. He says, vol. ii p. 557, "But with the negroes the case is totally different. The unequal number of the sexes shuts out at once the majority of them from all chance of domestic happiness."

They have no hope of this kind to sweeten their toils, and animate their exertions; but are necessarily condemned either to unceasing privation or to the most vicious excesses; and thus shut out from every cheering prospect, we cannot be surprised that they are in general ready to welcome that death which so many meet with in the prime of life." Indeed, the negro with that privilege of marrying, is more to be envied than an Englishman without it. For the negro slave in our islands is encouraged to marry, and he has nothing to fear from want, either for himself or family, his master feeds them. So in this mighty feast which nature has prepared, Mr. Malthus says his poor countrymen should not be admitted; there is no cover for them; no, be starved, and your race obliterated, for you are not to be allowed either to eat or marry. Reader, what are thy feelings?

He also says, vol. ii. p. 264, "On account of the tendency of population to increase in proportion to the means of subsistence, it has been supposed by some, that there would always be a sufficient demand at home for any quantity of corn which could be grown. But this is an error. It is undoubtedly true, that if the farmers could gradually increase their growth of corn to any extent, and could sell it sufficiently cheap, that a population would arise at home to demand the whole of it. But in this case, the great increase of demand arises solely from the cheapness, and

must therefore be totally of a different nature from such a demand as, in the actual circumstances of the country, would encourage an increased supply. If the makers of superfine broad cloth would sell their commodity for a shilling a yard instead of a guinea, it cannot be doubted that the demand would increase more than ten fold; but the certainty of such an increase of demand, in such a case, would have no tendency whatever, in the actual circumstances of any known country, to encourage the manufacture of broad cloths." So by referring his own principles to him of population increasing in proportion to subsistence, he deserts his ground; that his laboured volumes were to enforce as it would interfere with his more favourite object, the enhancing the value of corn; therefore he says that corn is directly similar to the superfine broad cloths, in consequence the industrious poor are neither to eat of the one nor to wear the other; but that the corn is to be put upon the same footing in point of dearness as the broad cloth, which every one knows is beyond their purchase, being too good for the industrious Englishmen, though they may call themselves either manufacturers or the heroes of Trafalgar or of Egypt; nay, he not only wants to relieve the rich from the poor laws, but he finds fault with them for their charities to the starving poor during their extreme great distress. He is certainly as little conversant with the christian virtues of cha

...rity and benevolence, as he is with population and commerce.

Buonaparte, that great politician, seeing that commerce, ships and colonies make a nation great and powerful; Poland, the granary of Europe, what a poor figure it makes in Europe, and what a great figure England and Holland make with their ships, commerce and colonies; therefore Buonaparte after laying the continent of Europe prostrate at his feet, sees that he wants the most essentials to power, viz. ships, commerce and colonies; that a little island, a speck upon the globe, which possesses them, is mightier than his gigantic power and territories; therefore as a great politician, his soul is panting after them, but our little puerile politicians, though if they have the least sense and observation, must have seen what England has done with them in resisting Buonaparte's immense power; yet are they sending out their absurd volumes, and renewing that old, absurd and obsolete theory of the economists, making agriculture every thing. I think there never was an instance of such great absurdity; but one needs not be surprised at any absurdity that the folly of mankind is capable of.

There seems to be a dormant apathy with respect to our situation, having so powerful and so implacable an enemy as Buonaparte. It is certainly incumbent upon the nation to look to the first talents in the kingdom to direct us in this aw-

ful crisis. But the corrupt influence of the ministers seem to have the same power as if no danger threatened us. The great and powerful families who have so much at stake, and to whom any immediate gratuity can or ought to weigh so lightly, when the very existence of the kingdom is depending. But even those of the lowest rank, what Englishman could bear this glorious kingdom to become a province of France, or could bear to have his constitution destroyed, and ruled by a foreign absolute individual? No, I hope every Briton would rather die upon the sod, like his native game cock, than that should take place. But every rational man must say there is danger, without we are directed by the wisest councils; and it is not certainly the present weak ministers, the very outskirts of Mr. Pitt's administration, whose councils and war principles have brought us to this unfortunate situation. But we must look to the disciples of the great Fox, that true friend to his country, whose penetration and sagacity anticipated our misfortunes. But unfortunately for this kingdom, there seems that the same sordid and selfish apathy has taken possession of the people of England, as I have I hope fully proved to have taken place with respect to the land owner. The ministry has not only greater influence, or more powers of corruption than formerly, but the people have a greater disposition

162

to be corrupted, luxury being so predominant and general.

If the land owner would take a cool and correct view of his situation, he ought to be the first to take every step to lower the price of provisions, in order to keep up population, but also our trade and manufactures; for upon their flourishing depend the existence of the kingdom. His property is fixed in the kingdom, therefore he must rise or fall with it; and this property of his is legally mortgaged for the national debt, as strongly and sacredly as bonds can make it betwixt man and man. And only reflect upon this debt, its immense colossal weight, equal, if not superior to the whole value of the land in the kingdom. The number of proprietors of that debt is considerably above the number of proprietors of the land; I should suppose five to one; for the land belongs principally to large proprietors, but the stocks to every one, even those of the lowest rank. If a servant saves a little money, he places it in the nations security; also the tradesman and farmer; likewise the navy and army are very general proprietors, so that the great physical strength of the kingdom lies in the stock holders. France, with a small and comparatively trifling debt, nothing compared to ours, being a mere bagatelle, and an arbitrary government, was in a state of bankruptcy without making much commotion. But our debt is

163

of a very different and extensive nature, sealed with more sacred bonds—the bonds of a free people, and of the first honour, integrity and liberality; therefore, the land owners interest should be to take every step to make provisions as low as possible; for as the two great masters of our policy, Dr. Smith and Sir J. Stewart, both equally have proved to us “the intimate connection between flourishing manufactures and the low rate of the necessaries of life;” indeed, it is self evident. And I would ask the most rapacious and most prejudiced of our land owners; nay, I would ask the Board of Agriculture, and its profound members, Lord Sheffield, Mr. Western, Mr. Coke, &c. if they can suppose we can manufacture with the continent, when their necessaries are not half the price that ours are; nay, it appears from the most recent information from France, that bread is below one third of the price that it is in England.* If a school-boy was not sensible of the gross absurdity of our being able to contend with them in manufactures, when they become settled, I would whip him. Ame-

* It appears that their sanguinary wars by diminishing their population, has greatly lessened their consumers. Our wars would have just operated in the same way, if it had not been artfully counteracted by the mistaken policy of our rapacious landowners. They saw that individuals of the commercial part of the kingdom had made great fortunes, and therefore they were determined to squeeze part of their wealth out of them; thus avarice often defeats itself.

rica is selling her wheat at three shillings and sixpence per bushel; but the land owner really loses nothing by the low price of provisions, for as he lives by the necessaries of life, therefore the high or low price is indifferent to him. The price is merely nominal; grain is the true standard; nay, by their low price he will gain, as he will be able to dispose of more, by having a quicker market.

Buonaparte, instead of giving bounties for exportation, stops its exportation, when the price is very low indeed.* I have drawn a case from analogy, if the manufacturers wanted to bring in a bill to stop importation of manufactured goods, see p. 111; but if they not only did that, but demanded a bounty for the importation of their own manufactured goods, it would make their demands still more exorbitant and cruel. The legislature seeing the impolicy of the corn bill, I should hope would voluntarily repeal it; but if

* Instead of enacting laws to keep up the high prices of provisions, the legislature ought to enact laws to keep them down. The French in their famine, some years ago, enacted the law of maximum, and it had a very good effect; their corn never reached any thing like the price that even our false alarm of scarcity did. But if that should not accord with the spirit of our laws, there might be a law that every farmer should have always one third of his old stock at the time he reaped his harvest; and that it might not bear hard upon him, he should not be compelled to pay his full rent when due, but keep back the third part for his stock of grain which he was forced to have in reserve, paying four months after it became due.

that should not be done, I should think it the duty of the subject to petition against it, but with that respectful language which the legislature has a right to require from the people.

Population is one of the most interesting subjects that a nation can attend to, to know whether it is increasing or decreasing. It behoves a government to ascertain it accurately. There are only two ways of doing this, either by enumeration or an exact register of births. Enumeration is the most difficult, it requiring to be done exactly. The way it ought to be done, would be to have it taken on a particular day and hour through the whole island, and by persons who would do it exactly, having a small recompense for their trouble; and the births to be regularly returned to government every year. As the community of this island are so constantly travelling, therefore by taking the population at the same time, the travellers would also be numbered where they were then residing; and this enumeration might be made every five years, so that government would have exact data to fix their judgment upon.

Mr. Percival drew a very flattering picture of our commerce; but as to our internal commerce I differ from him. All our manufactories are very far from flourishing; to be sure, there was a large quantity of cloth made in Yorkshire the last year, but that was principally from the demand which

166

took place from clothing the local militia, and the women having introduced the fashion of wearing cloth cloaks. Also I am told there were considerable orders for Spain and Portugal; and what an immense navy and army we have to cloath; but these are accidental, and cannot be looked upon as permanent trade; but that all our other manufactures are upon the wane, the great distress among them sufficiently prove.

That our necessaries of life being so very much above those in other countries, must place our manufacturing country in a most perilous situation; for if our manufactures leave us, the capital and men who were engaged in them will certainly be tempted to go to those countries, where the price of grain will favour them. They have been regularly pursuing the low price of provisions; thus from the south to the north of England, then Scotland, and after that to Wales, and by having population to follow them, they have made those countries as dear in point of necessaries as the south; therefore it is certainly to be apprehended they may pursue the same progress out of the kingdom. Our situation is most critical, therefore it is incumbent upon the legislature to attend to it immediately; policy imperiously demands it.

In Mr. Malthus's appendix there is a most curious illustration that he makes use of, and which is to silence all his opponents, see vol. ii. p. 508. As to what arguments they made use of, I am a

167

total stranger to, not having read any of them; but I can with confidence say, that his simile is a gross and absurd one. That man in society is to be compared to the breeding of calves, lazy, indolent calves, there is no labour, no ingenuity to be employed in their tilling the ground, but they are only to eat and procreate, being all drones; and in this society of beasts and calves, there is no distinction of ranks, they are all to feed and fatten alike; no active labourers for another set who are to wallow in the rich pastures, many destroying and consuming what would maintain hundreds of the labourers. Mr. Malthus, from the reward for his essays, has become one of these higher ranks. Property is sacred, and must be held inviolable; but all I contend for is, that the rich man should not oppress the poor man.

There is only another remark, and then I shall have done with you, Mr. Malthus. The great navigator, Capt. Cooke, whose extensive knowledge, observation and penetration I should think should awe you into silence, was so struck with the world being so thinly inhabited, that he asks this natural question, "from what cause man is so thinly scattered upon the face of the earth?"

I have never been in trade, nor am any way connected with it; but my motive for being its strenuous advocate is, from the purest genuine philanthropy and patriotism, seeing that the existence of this kingdom depends upon its welfare;

168

therefore, Mr. Malthus, I am a more disinterested writer than you; I have no benefice or living in view to stimulate my pen, and I hope every reader will view with an impartial and candid eye my book, and their criticisms will be directed by the same pure, genuine philanthropy and patriotism, equally impartial, candid and liberal; and weigh coolly my arguments; for certainly there cannot be a more important subject, and which requires greater deliberation. The food, population and commerce; nay, the very existence of the kingdom depending upon it. I may be thought harsh by some in my strictures; but every one viewing things in the light I have done, must, I should suppose, think my animadversions fair and allowable.

From a late able and distinguished speech of Lord Grey's, upon the state of the nation (he makes our national expenditure 85 millions) which breathes nothing but moderation, liberality and and manly sense. With every sentiment there expressed I cordially agree with him, and I think every Englishman who is impartial, and who sincerely loves his country, must do the same.*

* The interested individuals seem to be anxious to raise the cry of scarcity again; but the present crop will be a full average one, particularly the wheat. There is an old adage in this country, "a drought never brought a dearth;" besides, both America and the continent are full of grain.

ERRATA.—P. 27, "grass roots," READ cut grass, P. 40, "overwhelming," READ may overwhelm. P. 147, "a servile-mean writer," READ a servile writer. P. 113, "one hundred millions," READ twenty millions, P. 149, "slaves," READ freed slaves. There are also some typographical errors.

FINIS.