

0544

99-6



THE
 LETTERS
 OF
 ANTI-RESTRICTIONIST
 ON
 THE CORN LAWS.

These Letters are published from a full persuasion that the principles laid down are those alone which can raise us from our present difficulties and maintain us a great and powerful nation. The subject is beyond a party question, and, from its importance, should commend itself to every man's reason rather than to his passions or prejudices.

The Restriction equal to a Tax of	£27,500,000.
Families employed in Agriculture	978,655.
Yearly Number of Poor relieved, <i>without</i> <i>reckoning Children</i> , about.....	950,000.

PER QUARTER.	
	On Wheat. Barley, &c. Oats.
Tithe, &c. amounts to a Charge of ..	2 5 .. 1 2 .. 0 10
And Poor-Rate	1 10 .. 0 11 .. 0 9

LONDON:
 PRINTED FOR J. M. RICHARDSON, 23, CORNHILL.

1826.

THE
LETTERS,

&c. &c.

No. 1.

(*In The Times of August 10th, 1826.*)

SIR,

HAVING observed, in some most respectable publications, the distress of our manufacturers attributed to the supply of manufactured productions exceeding the demand, the position appears to me fraught with so much evil to the country, that I address you, with the view of leading to a more correct consideration of the subject. That supply exceeds demand, under the present restriction-laws, may very possibly be the case, and indeed demand might be much further reduced by narrowing, through prohibition, the import of all articles which contribute to the subsistence of this great and essentially manufacturing country;

MERCHANT, PRINTER, INGRAM-COURT, FENCHURCH-STREET.

such as sugar, cocoa, and innumerable other articles. But let the following quotations from Mr. Jacobs's Report on Poland and Prussia show that supply only exceeds demand, or in other words, that the manufacturers cannot get bread for their productions, only because we will not receive it from those who would gladly send it us in exchange for them.

"One farm, of about 4000 acres, let on lease for £180, about 10*d.* per acre, only twelve miles from Warsaw, and with an excellent road to within one mile of it.

"Two thousand three hundred acres, two-sevenths of it water-meadow, on the banks of the Vistula, and with a castle or capital mansion on it, let for £95 per annum," about 9*d.* per acre, including the residence; and so, generally, land is to be had from 7*d.* to 10*d.* per acre: but all is in misery, because they cannot dispose of their agricultural produce,—that very bread which our starving population would with gratitude consume.

"Examples have recently been set by some of the first families of establishing manufactories, with a view of raising a race of consumers on their own domains, among whom a vent may be created for the production of the soil."

And again,—“Of late years the attention of government, of private nobles, and of the richer Jews, has been drawn to manufacturing. The very low rate of all mere manual labour, the

extensive market of the vast Russian dominions being opened to the Poles, and the cheapness of raw products, have contributed to the establishment of numerous, though not large undertakings." Such is the case in Poland.

The cause, therefore, of the present distress may, in a degree, be obviated, though not perhaps immediately; and although you say “the opening new markets would only afford a *temporary* relief, because the production of manufactures will again exceed the demand,” yet, with all Eastern Europe, Asia, and America before us, may we not put off to a more distant day the limits assignable to our manufacturing industry?

If it were the mere question of giving food to 300,000 or 400,000 artisans, the extent of the evils to be apprehended would *comparatively* be trifling; but our very existence as a nation depends on an immediate abolition of our restriction of food.

Those dependent on agriculture in Great Britain may be about 5,000,000; those in manufacture and commerce, about 10,000,000. We are therefore essentially a manufacturing and commercial people.

The existence of a manufacturing nation depends on an ability to afford manufactured productions at a lower rate than they can be afforded by any other nation, because people

will purchase where they can obtain the articles they require at the lowest rate.

If the continental nations can both supply themselves and others at a cheaper rate than we can supply them, it is evident that our commerce must decrease.

If our commerce, or the demand for our manufactures decrease, numbers of people must be thrown out of employment, and of the means of gaining their subsistence.

The disadvantages under which we should then labour are not subject to any limits, but, by degrees, must become more serious and destructive.

Where manufactures are once advantageously established, they naturally give birth to an increasing accumulation of capital, which again re-acts upon itself by a wider diffusion of its produce, and an increased ability to supply.

Such is the case at present with the continent, where the necessaries of life are so much cheaper; it is found that capital can be advantageously vested in manufactures, and they are depriving us, by degrees, of the various markets we have hitherto enjoyed.

The idea of *continuing* to support a large population by charitable subscriptions is ridiculous.

The number of persons thrown out of employment eventually come upon the poor-rates

for subsistence; thus not only ceasing to supply themselves, but reducing to poverty a large additional number.

The subsistence of those out of employment must fall on the returns of capital yet engaged, or, in other words, on the profits of the still existing establishments.

Such an additional charge must either be met with by an increase of price in the commodities produced, which would add to our inability to compete with the foreigner, or would so reduce the returns to capital, as to occasion its being transferred to other countries.

Progressively, therefore, an immense manufacturing population must come upon the land for subsistence. This very demand must reduce the profits on agriculture, and occasion land to be thrown out of cultivation, and eventually bring about general ruin.

Such, sir, I think it will be generally admitted, must be the natural upshot of our restrictions on the import of food. How far the supporting the present rents by such a system may be conducive to the interests of the landlords, I leave to them to consider.

The system is already at work in producing its effects; the distresses of the manufacturers are already affecting the other classes of the community. Builders, carpenters, butchers, bakers, and numerous others in the manufac-

turing districts, no longer obtain a livelihood: even landlords cannot obtain their rents. Our shipping, from the same cause, will be supplanted, as far as the laws admit, by that of other states; as an instance, I refer you to the last report from Prussia.

Our taxes must be levied upon a decreased means of meeting them; in short, the first step of a declining state involves in it an accumulation of evils.*

Ere it is too late, it behoves all well-wishers to their country to contribute their aid in bringing about a system of law which shall admit, without any restriction whatever, the free admission of corn and other chief articles of subsistence: there may seem some tautology in this expression; but on so momentous an occasion, I mean that we should not even levy a protecting duty (as it is miscalled) to the amount of the tithe and poor-rate: let these and any other taxes be levied on produce, not cut at the very root of production.

I am yours, &c.

ANTI-RESTRICTIONIST.

* Since the publication of this letter in *The Times*, of the 10th August, this position is beginning to develop itself.

No. 2.

(*In The Times of August 22d, 1826.*)

SIR,

HAVING made evident in my former letter how necessary it is to our very existence as a nation, that we keep the lead in manufacturing industry, and that if we do not so, the greater part of our manufacturing population must, by degrees, be thrown upon the land for its subsistence, I am led, by the daily symptoms of our power departing from us, to address you again on this most important subject.

I wish, in my present letter, to show how unreal and unsubstantial are the advantages which it is supposed our country derives from the present system of monopoly.

It may be calculated that the annual consumption of Great Britain is about, as follows:—15,000,000 quarters of wheat—12,000,000 quarters of barley, 26,000,000 quarters of oats, 2,000,000 quarters of rye, peas, beans.

Taking, from the best authorities, the average of the difference between the prices, existing in this country, on the various description of grain, and the prices which importation would establish, ten shillings may be calculated as the

difference on the aggregate, making £27,500,000 raised on the country, beyond the actual necessary cost.

The returns to capital and labour, vested in agriculture, are to be divided in about the following proportions—Two-ninths as rent to the landlord, two-ninths as labourers' wages, five-ninths as returns to the tenant for his capital and outgoings.

It is well known that the farmer, on an average, reaps only the benefit of a common return for his capital and employment.

The labourers throughout the country are on wages which are just sufficient for their existence. The landlords, therefore, are the only party who benefit to the amount of their two-ninths, or about £6,000,000. Their income, according to the last returns of the income tax, is about £45,000,000, upon which £6,000,000 is about $13\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. but as the price of every article is more or less increased, in consequence of the high price of provisions, it may be doubted whether the difference to them on their expenditure would not be nearer 20 per cent. than 13, and that, therefore, they are positively losers.

But even supposing them to gain the whole £6,000,000, is it not the most destructive system of taxation, to raise £27,000,000 to obtain £6,000,000?

In proof of the exceeding injury it is to the country, it is to be remembered, that the remaining £21,000,000, as no one benefits by it, is to be placed to the account of unprofitable labour.

To explain this, it is necessary to advert to the progress of cultivation:

Let it be supposed, that the labour of twenty men, on a first quality of land, can raise sufficient food for one hundred persons,—on a second quality for 80—on a third, for 60—on a fourth, for 40,—on a fifth, for 20—is it not evident that if, by the exchange of manufactures, we can obtain for the labour of twenty manufacturers the food which is raised on the second and third quality of land in Poland, we shall obtain enough for eighty or sixty persons? whereas, if we employ those twenty on a fifth quality of land in our own country, we can only get sufficient for twenty.

The progress of such result is that which now presents itself to this country; the increase of population has rendered necessary the resort to inferior soils, which afford little, if any, advantage.

The progressive difficulty of raising the means of subsistence affects, in an equal degree, those employed in manufactures.

When the necessaries of life are easily raised in abundance, and with comparatively little

labour, the agriculturist can afford a large portion in exchange for the manufactures he may require: but, as it becomes more difficult to raise agricultural produce, and a smaller return is obtained to the same quantity of labour, the less he can afford in exchange for manufactures.

If from the richness of soil, the labour of twenty men can raise sufficient food for one hundred, it is evident that four-fifths of the produce of their labour may be spent or exchanged for a large proportion of necessaries, or comforts; whereas, if they can only raise food for twenty, in consequence of the decreasing goodness of the soil, to obtain any part of the produce of the labour of others, as clothes or any other article of necessity, they must part with a portion of their food. Labour cannot for any considerable time together be richly repaid in one occupation and badly in another, because people would cease from the less profitable employment to enter the more profitable: independent, therefore, of the argument of the smaller portion of food, which the agriculturist would retain for himself, or could afford to spare, it is clear that all trades or occupations must suffer alike.—If we judge, therefore, either from the amount of the tax caused by the monopoly, or from the natural result attending our restricting ourselves to our own

soils, for the first necessaries of life, the state of the agricultural labourer or the manufacturer is no longer a problem,—misery unavoidable attends unprofitable labour, or the cultivation of poor soils.

We can only produce subsistence to a certain extent, and by that extent must our population be limited: when we arrive at a state at which population becomes stationary or is decreasing it must be the result of misery and the concomitant of decline. The squalid wretchedness and diseases, which are the invariable attendants on poverty, are the natural checks to increase of, and the natural agents in diminishing, a population. I refer you to the manufacturing districts for the example. I do not say, that our present distresses arise solely from the corn monopoly, but that they are highly aggravated by it: by its immediate abandonment, and admitting even now what the continent can spare us, a demand for our manufactures would be created, and our distress be much mitigated, if not quite done away.

The present harvest presents rather under an average supply of wheat, though excellent in quality, and only about half a crop of barley and oats.—We shall, therefore, now have to experience all the disadvantages of coming on countries unprepared to supply us, and whose agriculture has been ruined by our own

wretched policy. We might, at any rate, by immediate measures provide against the recurrence of so great an evil.

It may be worth while to add a few words on the general principle of our having recourse to less thickly-populated countries for part of our supply.

If we take advantage of their productive soils, through the medium of exchange for our manufactures, whether they be Poles or Egyptians who till the ground, is it not essentially the same thing as if the land were in our own country? It enables an increasing population to be abundantly supplied; in that abundance consists the prosperity of individuals, and of individuals the state is made up.

The proposition, that our procuring corn from Poland or Egypt being in effect the same thing, as if the land were in our own country, may appear extravagant; in making it, I consider the entire nation, and not any particular class of persons; and I would ask, in what essentially consists the difference between one occupation and another, whose ultimate effect is the production of food.

As well might the manufacturers, as a body, claim the right of clothing the landlords, and then charge them a price which would keep them half naked, as the landlord be permitted to half starve a nation of manufacturers. It

is not by the industry, or from any peculiar merits of the landlord that his rents are increased, but from a cause with which he has no connexion—namely, the uncontrollable increase of population; therefore, a cause from which he can have no right to derive any additional advantage.

I am Sir,

&c. &c.

ANTI-RESTRICTIONIST.

No. 3.

(In *The Times* of 13th September, 1826.)

SIR,

IN the prosecution of my subject, I come next to consider the objections which are commonly made against the free importation of grain; they may be classed as follows:—

1. Our liability to be deprived of the requisite supply by war, or by any arbitrary regulations of the government of the countries supplying us.
2. That our land would be thrown out of cultivation.
3. That our agricultural labourers would be thrown out of employment.
4. That the taxes or charges on our agriculture do not allow of a competition with that of foreign countries.

With regard to the first objection, it may be argued that states, like individuals, are generally influenced by their interest, and it is hardly to be imagined that two countries, who are aware of their dependence on each other for benefit, and whose friendly intercourse is attended with great mutual advantage, would either go to war on slight ground or continue at variance for any length of time. The causes of

jealousy and variance amongst powers are prohibition and restriction;—commerce begets liberality and forbearance. If our importations remained small, say even as far as two millions of quarters of grain of all kinds, and were the produce of one country, as Poland, they would not constitute one twenty-seventh part of the consumption of Great Britain, about twelve days' supply. Our being deprived of such a supply would not be productive of famine—as our importations became larger we should draw them from various sources, as Prussia, the Russian provinces on the Black Sea, Egypt, America, and other countries; and then the quantity we should receive from any one country with which we might go to war would bear even a less proportion to our consumption than that above-mentioned, and, consequently, the privation of it would be attended with less inconvenience.

If the interest of the countries from which we might import be considered, it is to be remembered that grain cannot be kept for any length of time without very considerable deterioration and expense, and that, as England would be the only country which could take off any great quantity, it could not find a market elsewhere. The disadvantage, therefore, on our part, would be trifling, whilst a continuation of interdicted intercourse, on the part of another country, would lead to a total loss

of its surplus agricultural produce, and to considerable distress among its population. Much more might be said on this head; but, perhaps, the foregoing will suffice to show that any fears of deprivation by war are altogether groundless.

On the second head, that of throwing our land out of cultivation.—If a difference of ten shillings per quarter were caused by free importation, that land only which pays a rent of ten shillings and under, and *which is under tillage*, would be affected; in fact, the least profitable description of land that has come under the plough, and on which, as is expressed very generally, the raising of grain, especially of wheat, ought never to have been attempted. Instead, however, of these poorer lands becoming valueless, it is most probable that they would become more valuable under a free trade in grain; the impulse given to manufactures would occasion, *as it has heretofore done*, a very considerably increased demand for meat, and give full, and, what is more important, a profitable, occupation to any land that might be thrown out of tillage. It will be conceded by all parties that the supply of meat is altogether dependent on the demand; where much is required, which includes the ability to pay for it, much will be reared; where little is required, from an inability to pay for it, little will be reared. Extensive and advantageous

production is riches—the contrary is poverty: but, independent of any direct means of national wealth from this source, the advantage to agriculture, generally, from increased stock, requires some detailed consideration.

The following may be stated as the expense attending the preparation for wheat of an acre of land of the *best quality*, only twenty miles from London, and with a canal running through the estate:—

Ploughing and harrowing..	£1	0	0
Seed	1	4	0
Manuring.....	3	0	0

the latter constituting three-fifths of the expense, the land capable of producing thirty bushels of wheat per acre. But this is viewing the question in the most favourable light for opponents; for the manuring of land costs, often, as high as £10 and £12 per acre.

I repeat, that an immense accession of national riches, from these sources, may fairly be presumed upon; but the rearing and fattening of flocks and herds must emanate from the demands of an increasing and *prosperous* population; not from a population who are deprived of the means of maintaining themselves, through a system which renders their industry of no avail.

It may, perhaps, be remarked, with advantage, here, that the increase of riches to the landlord, instead of being risked, is secured,

by their delaying their accession until it be simultaneous with the increase of riches and prosperity to the other classes of the state; the demands of an increasing and prosperous population will ever be acting on the means of subsistence, or productions of the land, and giving them by degrees a greater value; and every step in this progress must be accompanied with an accession of rent. This progress is, however, to greater and greater difficulty, not to greater facility, and, therefore, must be made, as far as it can be, in common with other countries; for, if we precede them in the disadvantageous course, it is evident that we leave them the ability to manufacture more cheaply than ourselves, and, therefore, to undersell us. It is the attempt, on the part of the landlords, by unnatural means, to force a premature prosperity for themselves that the great evil to the nation is produced: their prosperity, in the one case, proceeds from the prosperity of the commercial part of the nation, and is accompanied with a general accession of riches: in the other, it is obtained by the privation and disadvantage of the other classes, and must end in the ruin of all.

No. 4.

SIR,

IN continuation of the subject of my letter of yesterday, I proceed to the remaining objections against the importation of grain, namely;

That of our depriving a certain portion of our agricultural labourers of their employment: and of the inability, in consequence of tithes and rates, of our agriculture to compete with that of foreign countries.

The first head has to be considered as it regards the nation, the landlords, and the labourers.

As a national question, if the employment of the labourers depend upon a continuation of the restrictive system,—I have already shown that it is attended with a tax upon the country of about £30,000,000 a year, and that it is such a check upon our foreign commerce as must be attended with its final ruin.

As it regards the landlords, I have shown, in a former letter, that their participation in the extra amount levied upon the country is about £6,000,000, in return for which, besides the extra prices charged to them in their expenditure

generally, I observe that a sum of £4,602,252 was levied upon lands, as poor-rates, in 1823; besides their proportion of £1,853,859 levied upon dwelling houses and manorial profits. That the present employment of our population, therefore, is highly to the disadvantage of the landlords is a fact reducible to figures. It may be contended that a large proportion of the amount required for poor rates is levied for the manufacturing poor. Conceding the point to any extent, the opening of our trade, so that the produce of the manufacturers may find a market, would immediately give full employment, and relieve the country of the burthen; but if the greater part be levied for the agricultural poor, it does away every argument in support of their present employment. I am not here alluding to the distress of the last year, which has evidently over-speculation for its cause, but to that state of distress which is permanent, and which as regularly attaches a charge of some millions as the year itself revolves; neither do I attribute the common state of distress of the agricultural and other labourers to the existing Corn Laws, as it is easily to be traced to their own imprudence and ignorance, and can only be counteracted by education and a knowledge of their true interests; but I state the case as a matter of fact, that, instead of being dependent on their own exertions for their maintenance, they are a continual

burthen on the landlord and others, to the amount above stated.

As the question regards the labourers themselves, it may be shortly stated that, in the year 1821, there appeared to be in Great Britain 978,656 families employed in agriculture; the yearly number relieved, according to returns, must have been about 950,000, *without reckoning children*; and the total sum levied and expended for relief, including law expenses, &c. may be taken at £7,000,000; adding to these facts, that the state of the agricultural labourer is one of abjectness and privation, I would ask the supporters of the present system to point out either its moral beauty, or to show how the individual welfare of the labourer is promoted on the high price of corn. Finally, on this head, it remains to be proved whether any number would really be deprived of employment. Cheaper subsistence is coupled with additional means of giving employment; and general prosperity and advantageous occupation of capital, with an increased demand for labourers; there is every reason, therefore, to believe that from whatever cause the present condition of the agricultural labourer has arisen, a free trade would be the means of raising him from it, by giving full employment; and by placing the means of subsistence in advance of the existing population, would restore the country

to a wholesome and prosperous state, when it would depend upon the wisdom of government to prevent the return to so degraded a condition, by altering the poor laws and making every man, in every rank of life, dependent upon his own prudence and energies.

No. 5.

SIR,

THE last objection against the free importation of grain, on which I proposed to address you, was the *inability of our agriculture to compete with that of foreign countries, in consequence of the tithes and charges attending our cultivation.*

It is necessary to examine, first, whether any charge does now attach to our cultivation from the tithe and poor-rate, and, next, in what degree it exists.

It may be expedient to preface what I may have to say by entering upon the theory of rent, as it is closely connected with the subject of my present letter.

We will suppose, then, that the cultivation of an acre of land will cost £5: that a first quality of land will yield five quarters of wheat. It is necessary that the price in the market be £1 per quarter, which will pay the expense of cultivation, but afford no rent.

As society advances, and population increases, a demand takes place for more wheat, which naturally raises the price, we will suppose to £1:5s. per quarter. This rise admits

of the cultivation of a second quality of land, which will produce only four quarters of wheat: and in this case, as there cannot exist two prices in the market for the same commodity at the same time, the five quarters raised on the first quality of land will equally fetch 25s. per quarter, and thus produce £1 beyond the expense of cultivation: this additional value is naturally laid hold of by the proprietor; and thus rent is established.

As population again increases, and creates fresh demands, a further rise takes place, say to 33s. 4d. which admits of a third quality of land being brought into tillage, and which will produce only three quarters of wheat. In this case, the value of the five quarters, the produce of the first quality of land, will be £8:6:8, affording a rent of £3:6:8; and the second quality, which produces four quarters, will give £1:13:4 rent: and thus, as population advances, rents are increased, there being always one description of land, that last cultivated, which pays no rent, however nominally it may do so by being mixed up and averaged with other superior lands. The application of additional capital and labour to land already in cultivation to procure a diminished return is equivalent to the cultivating of a poorer soil; for instance, if £5 additional be expended on a first quality of land to obtain three quarters of wheat additional, it is

the same as cultivating the third quality of land.

The price of wheat, as well as that of every other commodity, depends upon the quantity in the market, compared with the demand; and the quantity of grain raised and brought to market must depend, in the aggregate, on the price it can obtain, as that price must, to allow of cultivation being carried on, cover all attendant expenses. Suppose, on a fifth quality of land, which would produce two quarters of wheat, the expenses are,

Rent	£ 0	5	0
Tithe.....	0	3	0
Poor-rate	0	2	0
Other expenses, interest of farmer's capital, &c.	5	10	0
	<hr/>		
Together....	£6	0	0

If the two quarters will sell for only £5:15s. instead of £6, it is evident that the land must be thrown out of tillage; or if it be not, it must be in consequence of the tithe and poor-rate being thrown on, and paid by the landlord, through the medium of a reduction of rent; and in this case any inferior quality of land cultivated which produced less grain, and which only repaid the expense of cultivation, without affording rent, must evidently be thrown out of tillage.

In exemplifying my position, I mean not to state the various sums as positive, but only to use them as general terms: any alteration in the division of the sums, which others may deem more correct, will always leave the principle of my argument untouched.

It may be objected by some that in letting a farm no distinctions are made between the quality of one acre and another; and that a farm of 300 acres may let, say for £300; the farmer, however, in taking it, knows well what land is worth 30s. what 10s. what 5s. and what is worth no rent, and thus averages it: and, again, on the quality of land, the term fourth or tenth will equally well serve my purpose of illustration as those I have adopted.

Now as every quarter of wheat raised on a farm on the fourth, third, second, and first qualities of land must undergo the same reduction in price, as there cannot exist two prices for the same article at the same time, so the whole of the tithe and poor-rate is thrown on the landlord.

In order to throw the tithe and poor-rate on the landlord, it is not necessary that a *positive* retrocession or diminution in his rents take place; his being deprived of progression, or of an increase of rent, which would have taken place from increased demand, has the same effect in principle.

If our supply were restricted to that land

only in England which *all* paid tithe and poor-rate, and the demand for the consumption of England were fourteen millions of quarters of wheat; and that to raise these fourteen millions it were necessary to include in our cultivation the sixth quality of land, whose produce would pay all the attendant expenses of tithe poor-rate, and of cultivation itself, (but afforded no rent,) together estimated at the £5:15 as above, it is certain that all those charges would be paid by the consumer; but if the portion of wheat raised on the sixth quality of land, say, for sake of illustration, 300,000 quarters, can be supplied from any other source for £5:10s. the effect must be to throw the sixth quality of land out of tillage, and to cast the tithe and poor-rate of the fifth and every superior quality of land on the landlord, as before exemplified.

The question, then, as regards the landlords, is to what extent the quantity of wheat which is brought into England from any other country, whose lands are exempt from tithe and poor-rate, or is produced on our own tithe-free or church-lands, (over and above what would be so imported or produced, if they were subject to tithe,) has had the effect I have mentioned above, of either diminishing our cultivation or impeding its progression; for, in whatever proportion this is the case, the landlords to that extent have no longer to contend

against the disadvantages of *future* privation on these accounts. It remains to be ascertained to what extent the extra portion of wheat, which the existence of the tithe causes to be raised in Scotland, and on our own tithe-free and church lands, and supplied to our markets, prevents the tithe and poor-rate from being thrown upon the consumer by means of a rise of price.

The question is one, to determine which requires that evidence and practical acquaintance with facts, which it is hardly within the sphere of an individual with no advantage of power, &c. to obtain:—it is more within the ability and province of government, and its decision is of so much importance as to be worthy any labour of investigation.

In order to show how little grounds for complaint the landlords really have for any small disadvantage to them, that may now attend a measure fraught with the most important consequences to the country,—that of allowing of importation, I will here introduce a comparative table of rent, and, I hope, the knowledge of the benefit of nearly £100 per cent. which accrued to them, without exertion or risk on their part, between 1790 and 1814, will forever silence the demand for a protecting duty, which shall have the effect of giving them any addition to their income, through a tax which bears peculiarly heavy on the poorest classes

of the state, and altogether fetters our manufacturing industry.

Comparative Statement of Rent and Expense attending the Cultivation of 100 Acres of Land.

	1790.	1803.	1814.
Rent*	£ 88	£ 121	£ 161
Tithe	20,14	26,8	38,17
Rates	17	31	38,19
Wear & tear 15	22	31	
Labour	85	118	161
Seed	46	49	99
Manure	48	68	37†
Team	67	80	134

Nothing can more clearly demonstrate the principle, explained in a former letter, of the progressive increase of rent to the landlord, and also the progressive difficulty and expense of raising subsistence, than the above table.

As regards the amount of protecting-duty which should be levied upon importations, the only object to be had in view is to prevent any part of the capital vested in agriculture being turned into less lucrative employment, in consequence of any charge or rate being laid upon

* In the practice of the Court of Chancery, rents are calculated to be the same as in 1814 or 1815.

† The article of manure is under-rated in the last column; were it fully stated, the aggregate of 1813 would have exceeded £800.

the produce of our cultivation beyond the amount laid upon the agriculture of any other country whence we may draw our supplies; for example:—

If land of the fourth quality abroad produces corn which, when charged with the expenses of transport, comes as dear to us as corn grown on our sixth quality of land, it is evidently more for our advantage to cultivate our fifth quality, than to import the produce of land No. 4 from abroad. Now, if the amount of tithe, &c. added to the cost of cultivating our fourth quality of land, raise the price to what the cultivation of our sixth quality would cost, it is evident, that, if we permitted corn to be imported without a countervailing duty, we should pay the foreigner an amount equal to the cost of cultivating our sixth quality, before our fifth quality was in cultivation, and, therefore, capital would be more disadvantageously applied, by being laid out in importation, than if it were employed in our own cultivation: the disadvantage in its employment is the same as paying a dearer price for our corn, and, to obviate it, a countervailing duty to the extent of the charge on our own cultivation must be laid.

England, therefore, is in the anomalous situation of its consumption being partially exempt from tithe, through the effect of the produce of tithe-free land, and yet of not being

able to import from foreign countries, without levying the whole of tithe, or a sum equal to it, upon its importations. I submit, if it should prove, on investigation, that the tithe and poor-rate fall chiefly on the landlords, whether it would not be politic in them, and highly beneficial to the country, if they were to make over the fee simple in land to the clergy and to the lay impropiator; the landlord would thereby reap a great advantage in exemption from tithe, on all future increase, to the value of his property, (which increase I have shown to be progressively certain;) and as the clergy and lay impropiator would then only hold the situation of landlords, the cultivation of our country would be relieved from a tax, which sits like an incubus on our national prosperity.

ANTI-RESTRICTIONIST.

The doing away with the tithe would immediately cause a great addition to our cultivation, and this addition would reduce the poor-rates, by creating profitable employment for labourers. The clergy would, also, be provided for in a far superior and more independent way than at present.

No. 6.

SIR,

IN conclusion of the subject of my last letter, it remains to consider to what amount tithe, poor-rate, &c. act as a charge upon our cultivation, even if no part of them fall on rent.

It appears that the poor-rate levied on lands, in 1823, was £4,602,252. This charge belongs exclusively to England and Wales, and therefore falls upon their cultivation only. As the total produce of grain for Great Britain is estimated at 55,000,000 quarters, which, at the common average of price, would be equal to £100,000,000, and the total of the agricultural produce is computed at rather more than £200,000,000, so, if the half of the £4,600,000, say £2,300,000, be considered as falling on grain, and the other half on cattle and other produce, it, perhaps, will not be far from the truth.

Allowing, for England and Wales, the following quantities as their produce, and that

they bear the proportion and prices affixed to them, say

Of the £2,300,000	
Quarters of Wheat.	Per Quarter.
12,000,000 at 64s. or $\frac{8}{15} = \frac{96}{196} =$	£1,126,500 = 1s. 10d.
Oats.	
20,000,000 at 24s. or $\frac{3}{15} = \frac{60}{196} =$	£704,100 = 9d.
Barley, &c.	
10,000,000 at 32s. or $\frac{4}{15} = \frac{40}{196} =$	£469,400 = 11d.

It appears that 1s. 10d.—9d.—and 11d. are the charges which respectively fall on the wheat, oats, and barley, in consequence of poor-rate.

The tithe, for England, Wales, and Ireland,	
may be about.....	£ 6,000,000
Church, high and bye way, militia, &c. rates	<u>1,600,000</u>
Together....	<u>£ 7,600,000</u>

Taking the one-half, or £3,800,000, as falling upon grain, and calculating the production as only equal to that of Great Britain, the quantities may be taken and computed, in their respective proportions and prices, as follows :—

Of the £3,800,000.	
Quarters of Wheat.	per Quarter.
15,000,000 at 64s. or $\frac{8}{15} = \frac{120}{254} =$	£1,795,200 = 2s. 5d.
Oats.	
26,000,000 at 24s. or $\frac{3}{15} = \frac{78}{254} =$	£1,166,880 = 10d.
Barley, &c.	
14,000,000 at 32s. or $\frac{4}{15} = \frac{56}{254} =$	£837,760 = 1s. 2d.

I have thought it best thus to give the detail of the calculations, to show the grounds of the computation. Any error I may be under in the amount of tithe and poor-rate will scarcely affect the result of the calculation. The tithe, I expect, I have over-calculated.

It appears, then, from the above statements,
that

	On Wheat. s. d.	On Oats. s. d.	On Barley. s. d.
The poor-rate is a charge of	1 10	0 9	0 11
And the tithe and other rates	2 5	0 10	1 2
Together	<u>4 3</u>	<u>1 7</u>	<u>2 1</u>

These sums, respectively, therefore, constitute the amount which would be requisite, as countervailing duties, allowing even that no part of them is, at present, a deduction from rent.

In concluding these letters, I cannot forbear pressing the important point of immediate decision and action on the part of government.

Independent of the evil which attends uncertainty, and the allowing the seed time to pass over, the present moment is peculiarly fitted for opening the trade, as the late convulsions have injured or destroyed many foreign establishments, as well as those of our own country. By an immediate change in our system, which may enable us to supply America and other countries, their capital would flow to other channels of employment than in producing the manufactures with which we could, more advantageously, supply them.

THE END.