



Adams 172.7

172 7

THE

ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES

OF THE

WEALTH OF NATIONS,

ILLUSTRATED;

IN OPPOSITION TO SOME FALSE DOCTRINES

OF

DR. ADAM SMITH, AND OTHERS.

_____ Aratro,
Dignus Honos. VIRGIL:

To labour diligently, and be content, is a sweet life.
ECCLESIAST.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR T. BECKET, PALL-MALL.

1797.

THE
ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES
OF THE
WEALTH OF NATIONS,
ILLUSTRATED, &c.

THE causes of the wealth of nations are various, nay even infinite; for it is out of the power of any man, or of any number of men to enumerate every minute circumstance that may serve to promote the prosperity of a state. He that employs his time in collecting linen rags for the use of the paper maker, contributes to the wealth of his country. He that in making planks substituted the saw for the hatchet, and he that substituted carts and waggons for sledges and pack-horses, were great benefactors to mankind, and in this view were entitled to as much praise and as much recompence as the most successful general. In short, every person in society, who prefers honest industry to idleness, promotes in some degree the wealth of the nation.

The prudent statesman, sensible that it would be a presumptuous and vain attempt to trace out the million of small causes that contribute to the wealth of nations, applies his attention chiefly to the prin-

principal and most essential causes; and assiduously endeavours to render these causes as efficient as possible:

The principal and most essential cause of the prosperity of a state is the ingenuity and labour of its inhabitants exercised upon the fertility of its soil. All other causes of the prosperity of a state; united, are not equivalent to this; and it alone affords that revenue upon which a state is to subsist and accumulate wealth. This truth, Mr. Locke contented himself with slightly touching upon; and since his time Vanderlint; and some other English political writers, have bestowed some notice upon it: But of late years it has been very systematically, though not correctly, illustrated by many celebrated French writers, who on that account are distinguished by the name of Political Economists. Dr. Adam Smith in his work, entitled an Enquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations, has in my opinion given, (except in one point) a fair and accurate view of the great outlines of that system, according to the French writers, with the purpose of objecting to some material parts of it: As I mean in my present discourse to establish that system, and to correct the errors of the French Economists, and of Dr. Adam Smith; it becomes necessary for me to lay before my readers, its leading doctrines according to the French writers, which I shall endeavour to do, with as much brevity as is consistent with distinctness.

According to the French Economists, the different orders of people who contribute in any respect to-

wards

towards the annual revenue of a country are, first, the proprietors of land; secondly, the cultivators, whom they honour with the peculiar appellation of the productive class; and thirdly, artificers, manufacturers, and merchants, whom they degrade, by the humiliating appellation of the barren or unproductive class.

The proprietors contribute to the annual revenue, by what they may occasionally lay out upon the improvement of the land, by which the cultivators are enabled with the same capital to raise a greater produce. The cultivators or farmers, who form the second class, contribute to the annual produce, first by their stock, and secondly by their annual labour and expenditure; for without stock, and without daily labour and expence, the farm would not produce. The farm ought to produce to the farmer a reasonable profit upon both those capitals, and over and above a surplus produce, which goes to the landlord under the name of rent; and on account of both these profits, this class is distinguished by the appellation of the productive class. Till the landlord receives a reasonable profit upon the primary expences, and the farmer likewise a reasonable profit upon his stock and expence, neither the church nor the king can take any thing without occasioning a diminution of the produce of succeeding years.

The original and the annual expences laid out in cultivating the soil, are considered as the only productive expences. All other expences are in their estimation barren or unproductive; conse-

quently artificers, manufacturers, and merchants, the third order of men, whose labour only replaces the revenue which they consume, are called barren or unproductive. The expence laid out in employing and maintaining them does no more than continue the existence of its own value, and is therefore unproductive. The wealth of society can never in the smallest degree be augmented by artificers, manufacturers, or merchants, otherwise than by their saving and accumulating part of what is intended for their daily subsistence; consequently it is by privation or parsimony alone, that they can add any thing to the general stock. Cultivators, on the contrary, may live up to the whole of their income, and yet at the same time greatly enrich the state; for their industry affords a surplus produce called rent. Nations therefore that like France and England consist in a great measure of proprietors and cultivators, can be enriched by industry and enjoyment. But nations which, like Holland and Hamburg, are composed chiefly of merchants, manufacturers, and artificers, can grow rich only through parsimony and privation.

The unproductive class however is greatly useful to the classes of proprietors and cultivators, for by means of the industry of that class the latter can purchase manufactures, either foreign or domestic, with a much smaller quantity of their own labour, than if they were to slacken in their attention to cultivation, and to attempt either to manufacture or to import them themselves. The industry of merchants, artificers, and manufacturers, though in
its

its own nature altogether unproductive, yet contributes in this manner indirectly to increase the produce of the land. It will always be the interest of the cultivators and proprietors to encourage the industry of the unproductive class, because from that encouragement, competition will arise, and consequently more industry will be procured with less recompence; that is, things will become cheaper. It will likewise always be the interest of the unproductive class to encourage cultivators, because the greater the produce which they draw from the ground, the greater will be the employment of that class. The establishment of perfect justice, of perfect liberty, and of a perfect equilibrium, is the very simple secret, which most effectually secures the highest degree of prosperity to all the three classes.

Should a nation of proprietors and cultivators have in the beginning neither artificers, manufacturers, nor merchants, within its own territory, yet it would be sound policy in that nation to admit foreign manufactures free of all duties whatever, because it would thereby purchase them with a less quantity of its own produce, and consequently would have a greater surplus produce, which in progress of time, when its lands were all brought into cultivation, would serve as a capital for the employment of artificers and manufacturers at home. These manufacturers though at first probably unskilful, yet by having it in their power to sell their manufactures cheaper than foreigners could, who brought them from a great distance, would in time be able not only to supply their own nation, without

any foreign importation, but to carry their own manufactured goods abroad at a cheaper rate than a mere mercantile nation could afford them. But till its lands be all cultivated, it gains more by employing its capital in the cultivation of its lands, than in promoting manufacturing industry; for the former gives a real increase, or renewal of revenue, which the last does not.

This system has truth and nature for its foundation; but the French writers not having gone quite to the foundation, have consequently not given such an explanation of it as is altogether just and accurate. Had the French writers traced the Economical system to its foundation, they could not have deemed Receivers of land rents, as mere Receivers of rents, a productive class in society. What made them stop short in their investigations, I shall not pretend to say; but they have in some degree compensated for their error by intimating that the Church and King are to be served out of those rents. Dr. Smith, however, not perceiving the error of the French writers; but on the contrary, suffering it (seemingly as an engraftment from them) to pervade the whole of his own enquiry, directs his refutation to the sound part of the Economical system.

Let us now examine in what manner he combats this system. His introductory remark is as follows. ‘ The capital error of this system seems to lie in its representing the class of Artificers, Manufacturers, and Merchants, as altogether barren and unproductive. The following observations may serve to shew the impropriety of this observation.’

Now

Now what Dr. Smith apprehends to be the capital error of this system, I hope to be able most satisfactorily to prove to be no error, but a well-founded truth of great political importance. The Economists we have seen affirm, that no part of the revenue of society arises from manufactures; and as the discussing the validity of Dr. Smith's observations affords me an opportunity not only of establishing this truth, but at the same time of shewing that the revenue of society arises solely from the industry of the inhabitants, bestowed upon the fertility of the soil, I shall therefore proceed to the consideration of the Doctor's observations. The first observation is in the following words:—' First, this class (meaning the class of manufacturers) it is acknowledged reproduces, annually, the value of its own annual consumption, and continues at least the existence of the stock or capital which maintains and employs it. But upon this account alone the denomination of barren or unproductive, should seem to be very improperly applied to it: We should not call a marriage barren or unproductive, though it produced only a son and a daughter, to replace the father and mother, and though it did not increase the number of the human species; but only continued it as before. Farmers and country labourers, indeed, over and above the stock which maintains and employs them, reproduce annually a neat produce, a free rent to the landlord. As a marriage which affords three children is certainly more productive than one which affords only two, so the labour of farmers and country labourers is
 ' certainly

‘ certainly more productive than that of merchants, artificers, and manufacturers. The superior produce of the one class, however, does not render the other barren or unproductive.’

The whole of this observation of Dr. Smith is nothing but an evasive quibble about the accurate meaning of the word *barren*; and the comparison he has introduced of a marriage, shews most appositely the fallacy of his conclusion, and establishes the great propriety and justness of the sense given by the Economists to the word *barren*, that is, *not yielding any increase*. The mother of two children certainly could not be called barren; but a marriage that produced only two children may with the utmost propriety be called barren. If for every child that was born, an adult person died, would a desert country ever become populous? Were this to be the case in Botany Bay, and were no new inhabitants to be imported thither, would New Holland ever become a peopled country? Were I to sow 20 bushels of wheat in a field, and at harvest it should only produce 20 bushels, might it not, with the greatest propriety, be called a barren field? I suspect it would be deemed so by every one, and be deserted accordingly. If this field has produced 20 bushels, some vegetation has appeared in it, *but no increase*; for 20 bushels were thrown into it. Therefore a class of men whose labour (though it produces something) produces no more than what was bestowed, in order to effect that labour, may with the greatest propriety be called an *unproductive class*. It would be wasting my readers time, to bestow more words

upon this first observation. I shall proceed to the second.

‘ Secondly, it seems upon this account altogether
 ‘ improper to consider artificers, manufacturers, and
 ‘ merchants, in the same light as menial servants.
 ‘ The labour of menial servants does not continue
 ‘ the existence of the fund which maintains and
 ‘ employs them. Their maintenance and employ-
 ‘ ment are altogether at the expence of their masters,
 ‘ and the work which they perform is not of a na-
 ‘ ture to repay that expence. That work consists
 ‘ in services which perish generally in the very in-
 ‘ stant of their performance, and does not fix or re-
 ‘ alize itself in any vendible commodity which can
 ‘ replace the value of their wages or maintenance.
 ‘ The labour, on the contrary, of artificers, manu-
 ‘ facturers, and merchants, naturally does fix and
 ‘ realize itself in some such vendible commodity.
 ‘ It is upon this account that, in the chapter in
 ‘ which I treat of productive and unproductive la-
 ‘ bour, I have classed artificers, manufacturers, and
 ‘ merchants, among the productive labourers, and
 ‘ menial servants among the barren or unproductive.’

I must begin with remarking, that Dr. Smith, in putting the labour of menial servants upon the same footing with the labour of artificers and manufacturers, has actually misstated the doctrine of the Economists; and in this point only, as I have before noticed. The Economists make a distinction between the labour that yields an equivalent for expence, and the labour that yields no equivalent. This last is the labour of menial servants, and

the

the first that of artificers and manufacturers ; but still they both are with the greatest propriety termed unproductive ; though the one be much more so than the other. I shall explain the difference in a few words. It will be allowed, that a field which returns only the seed sown into it, is a barren field. But some ground, such as the sea beach, may possess no vegetative power at all, and may not even return the seed sown into it, consequently would be much more barren than the other. The labour of menial servants is aptly compared to this very sterile ground. But will the greater sterility of one spot entitle ground to be called productive, that actually returns only the seed, but gives no increase ? This difference is only a greater or less degree of a *minus* ; but will never give a *plus*. The Economists most readily allow that the labour of artificers and manufacturers fixes itself ; which the labour of menial servants does not. But from thence does it follow, with any shadow of logick, that the former yields the smallest increase, and consequently can be called productive. Upon this false induction, however, Dr. Smith says, ‘ It is upon this account that, in the chapter in which I treat of productive and unproductive labour, I have classed artificers, manufacturers, and merchants, among the productive labourers, and menial servants among the barren and unproductive.’ Has he done so on this account ? Then, I say, having no other account, he has actually by these words declared a very large portion of his own treatise fallacious ; for the error of deeming that productive which is thus plainly proved

proved to be unproductive, pervades much more than one chapter of his work.

In his third observation Dr. Smith pushes the point a little further, and attempts to shew that the labour of artificers and manufacturers does not only give an equivalent for the consumption it occasions, but even yields an increase. ‘ Thirdly,’ he says, ‘ it seems upon every supposition improper to say, that the labour of artificers, manufacturers, and merchants, does not increase the real revenue of the society. Though we should suppose, for example, as it seems to be supposed in this system, that the value of the daily, monthly; and yearly consumption of this class was exactly equal to that of its daily, monthly, and yearly production; yet it would not from thence follow that its labour added nothing to the real revenue, to the real value of the annual produce of the land and labour of the society. An artificer, for example, who in the first six months after harvest, executes ten pounds worth of work, though he should, in the same time, consume ten pounds worth of corn and other necessaries, yet really adds the value of ten pounds to the annual produce of the land and labour of the society. While he has been consuming a half yearly revenue of ten pounds worth of corn and other necessaries, he has produced an equal value of work, capable of purchasing either to himself, or to some other person, an equal half yearly revenue. The value therefore of what has been consumed and produced, during these six months; is equal not to ten; but to twenty pounds.

‘ It

' It is possible, indeed, that no more than ten
 ' pounds worth of this value, may ever have existed
 ' at any one moment of time. But if the ten
 ' pounds worth of corn and other necessaries, which
 ' were consumed by the artificer, had been con-
 ' sumed by a soldier, or by a menial servant, the
 ' value of that part of the annual produce which
 ' existed at the end of six months, would have
 ' been ten pounds less than it actually is, in conse-
 ' quence of the labour of the artificer. Though
 ' the value of what the artificer produces therefore,
 ' should not, at any one moment of time, be sup-
 ' posed greater than the value he consumes, yet at
 ' every moment of time the actually existing value
 ' of goods in the market is, in consequence of what
 ' he produces, greater than it otherwise would be.'

' When the patrons of this system assert that the
 ' consumption of artificers, manufacturers, and
 ' merchants, is equal to the value of what they pro-
 ' duce, they probably mean no more than that
 ' their revenue, or the fund destined for their con-
 ' sumption is equal to it. But if they had ex-
 ' pressed themselves more accurately, and only as-
 ' serted that the revenue of this class was equal to
 ' the value of what they produced, it might readily
 ' have occurred to the reader, that what would na-
 ' turally have been saved out of this revenue, must
 ' necessarily increase more or less the real wealth of
 ' the society. In order therefore to make out some-
 ' thing like an argument, it was necessary that they
 ' should express themselves as they have done; and
 ' this argument, even supposing things actually
 ' were

‘ were as it seems to presume them to be, turns out
 to be a very inconclusive one.’

I choose to give Dr. Smith’s arguments without any abridgment, though they would lose nothing in being expressed in fewer words. His verbosity and ambiguity clearly shew how a man of ability, when overlooking fundamental principles, may speculate upon the surface of things, without ever getting at the kernel. In this third observation we have what, in mercantile accounts, is called a second entry, that is, the same articles stated twice in the same account, which must necessarily occasion a false aggregate, or false conclusion. ‘ While an artificer,’ he says, ‘ has been consuming a half yearly revenue of ten pounds worth of corn, and other necessaries, he has produced an equal value of work capable of purchasing either to himself, or to some other person, an equal half yearly revenue. The value therefore of what has been consumed and produced, during these six months, is equal not to ten, but to twenty pounds.’ Were this true, artificers and manufacturers would certainly be a productive class. But in stating the case with precision, which the Doctor has not done, it will appear that this *hocus pocus* manner of turning ten into twenty, is like legerdemain tricks in general, a mere deception. The artificer, he means to say, who produces a piece of manufacture, after half a year’s work, may sell it for as much as will maintain him a second half year; consequently, though he has consumed only what fed him six months, he may get, by his manufacture, what will feed him
 twelve

twelve months. It has totally escaped Dr. Smith; that the artificer had no right to sell his manufacture, as it was previously mortgaged to pay for his first six months provisions; for it cannot be presumed that his first six months provisions were given to him gratis. He that furnished those provisions to him must be reimbursed; and how is he to be reimbursed? By the piece of manufacture. Consequently the ten pounds still remain ten pounds. I will state a case analogous, and similar to that mentioned by Dr. Smith; which will render his false conclusion still clearer to my reader. Suppose a farmer has a desire for a good clock; and meeting with a skilful clock-maker; just come out of prison, without a farthing in his pocket; agrees with him on the following terms, namely, to furnish him with provisions, materials and tools, till he finish the clock, and to have the clock in return. Would not the clock-maker be deemed a dishonest person, or a fool, if he attempted to dispose of the clock to any other person but the farmer who furnished him with provisions.

It is, I think; unnecessary to enlarge further in the refutation of the third observation. I shall only remark, that the second argument, that the artificer by his labour must create an increase of value; because the menial servant does not, is equally inconclusive as the first, and has already been answered.

I proceed to his fourth observation, which is in the following words: ‘ Fourthly, farmers and country labourers can no more augment, without parsimony, the real revenue, the annual produce of the land

‘ land and labour of their society, than artificers,
 ‘ manufacturers, and merchants. The annual pro-
 ‘ duce of the land and labour of any society can
 ‘ be augmented only in two ways ; either, first, by
 ‘ some improvement in the productive powers of
 ‘ the useful labour actually maintained within it ;
 ‘ or, secondly, by some increase in the quantity of
 ‘ that labour.’

‘ The improvement in the productive powers of
 ‘ useful labour depends, first, upon the improve-
 ‘ ment in the ability of the workman ; and, se-
 ‘ condly, upon that of the machinery with which
 ‘ he works. But the labour of artificers and ma-
 ‘ nufacturers, as it is capable of being more subdivi-
 ‘ ded, and the labour of each workman reduced
 ‘ to a greater simplicity of operation, than that of
 ‘ farmers and country labourers, so it is likewise
 ‘ capable of both these sorts of improvement in a
 ‘ much higher degree. In this respect, therefore,
 ‘ the class of cultivators can have no sort of advan-
 ‘ tage over that of artificers and manufacturers.’

‘ The increase in the quantity of useful labour
 ‘ actually employed within any society, must depend
 ‘ altogether upon the increase of the capital which
 ‘ employs it ; and the increase of that capital again
 ‘ must be exactly equal to the amount of the sa-
 ‘ vings from the revenue ; either of the particular
 ‘ persons who manage and direct the employment of
 ‘ that capital, or of some other persons who lend it
 ‘ to them. If merchants, artificers, and manufac-
 ‘ turers are, as this system seems to suppose, natu-
 ‘ rally more inclined to parsimony and saving than

‘ proprietors and cultivators, they are so far, more
 ‘ likely to augment the quantity of useful labour
 ‘ employed within their society, and, consequently,
 ‘ to increase its real revenue, the annual produce of
 ‘ its land and labour.’

Here we have another misconception of the doctrine of the Economists. The *augmentation* of revenue is not, but indirectly, the object of the Economists, though that would be a consequence of their system. Their object is the *production* and *reproduction* of a revenue, which, they affirm, solely arises from the ingenuity and labour of man exercised upon the fertility of the soil. The people of Great Britain, for example, are such great spenders, that they actually waste and consume to the amount of more than eighty millions sterling annually, and the British farmers are so kind to them as annually to *reproduce* the value of the millions spent. Were the farmers to neglect their annual labour, and no supplies were to come from abroad, there would not be a living soul in Great Britain in fifteen or sixteen months after. A hard frost of three or four weeks continuance, we see, fills the streets of London with the poor gardeners begging for a subsistence, as their revenue is then cut off. From this we may draw a conclusion what would be the national misery on the supposition of a twelve-months frost. The cattle of the farmers would soon be slaughtered or perish. Every horse would die. The landlords receiving no rents would dismiss all their domestics, who finding none to employ them, must starve or quit the kingdom. The farmers

mers

masters and landlords having no income could not pay taxes; would also cease being customers to the shop-keepers, and could not give employment to carpenters, masons, painters, sculptors, gilders, shoemakers, taylor, &c. all of whom would gradually cease being buyers, and thus the misery would descend from the first ranks to the last, till the means of subsistence ceased to all. The supposition of a twelvemonths frost, I acknowledge, seems rather an improbable supposition. But history gives us what may be reckoned nearly equivalent to it, and records also the consequence, namely, extreme misery. We are told that in Judea no rain fell for above three years, and that the people, in consequence of it, were perishing with famine. Mr. Thunberg, a late Swedish traveller, informs us likewise, that in one of the Cape de Verd Islands, it had not rained for three years, and that it was impossible to describe the misery of the inhabitants. It is not worth while to unravel the inconclusive obscurities of the rest of this observation, which is brought in as subsidiary to the first misconception, as they stand and fall together.

Dr. Smith's fifth and last observation is in the following words: ' Though the revenue of the inhabitants of every country was supposed to consist altogether, as this system seems to suppose, in the quantity of subsistence which their industry could procure to them; yet even upon this supposition, the revenue of a trading and manufacturing country must, other things being equal, always be much greater than that of one without

' trade and manufactures. By means of trade and
 ' manufactures, a greater quantity of subsistence
 ' can be annually imported into a particular coun-
 ' try than what its own lands, in the actual state
 ' of their cultivation, could afford. The inhabi-
 ' tants of a town, though they frequently possess
 ' no lands of their own, yet draw to themselves by
 ' their industry such a quantity of the rude produce
 ' of the lands of other people, as supplies them not
 ' only with the materials of their work, but with
 ' the fund of their subsistence. What a town al-
 ' ways is with regard to the country and its neigh-
 ' bourhood, one independent state or country may
 ' frequently be with regard to other independent
 ' states or countries. It is thus that Holland draws
 ' a great part of its subsistence from other countries;
 ' live cattle from Holstein and Jutland, and corn
 ' from almost all the different countries of Europe.
 ' A small quantity of manufactured produce pur-
 ' chases a great quantity of rude produce. A tra-
 ' ding and manufacturing country, therefore, natu-
 ' rally purchases with a small part of its manufactured
 ' produce a great part of the rude produce of other
 ' countries; while, on the contrary, a country with-
 ' out trade and manufactures is generally obliged to
 ' purchase at the expence of a great part of its
 ' rude produce, a very small part of the manufac-
 ' tured produce of other countries. The one ex-
 ' ports what can subsist and accommodate but a
 ' very few, and imports the subsistence and accom-
 ' modulation of a great number. The other exports
 ' the accommodation and subsistence of a great
 ' number,

‘ number, and imports that of a very few only.
 ‘ The inhabitants of the one must always enjoy a
 ‘ much greater quantity of subsistence than what
 ‘ their own lands, in the actual state of their culti-
 ‘ vation, could afford. The inhabitants of the
 ‘ other must always enjoy a much smaller quantity.’

The same misconception and inconclusiveness run through this observation as through the preceding. Were the nature of men the same as that of forest horses, who require neither clothing nor houses, artificers and manufacturers would have no place among them, and cultivators of the ground would be alone required. But as the nature of man differs from that of forest horses, artificers and manufacturers are altogether necessary to him; and who can doubt but that it is better for any society which has brought its lands to a high degree of cultivation, to have those artificers and manufacturers residing within its own territory than without that territory. A nascent state has just as much need of manufactures as an adult state; but while it can with little labour draw a great revenue from its lands, and while foreign commerce exists among men, it will draw those manufactures to itself from the distance of a thousand miles at a cheaper rate than if they were to be made at home. In an adult state lands not yielding such a surplus of revenue after the expence of cultivation is deducted, the profit from handicrafts and the allurements of society attract in a greater degree the attention of men; and consequently artificers increase, and villages commence, which by degrees swell into towns.

A nation then may be said to become more robust, when it abounds with manufacturers as well as cultivators; for manufacturers are in fact a military corps de reserve, and, if I may be allowed the expression, a granary of soldiers. This enables an adult state to be powerful in defending itself; but a nascent state having no such corps de reserve is feeble in self defence, without foreign aid; but to counterbalance this, it, like man in an infant state, grows faster, is not so quarrelsome, and husband his strength. While the artificers and manufacturers continue their peaceable employments they are fed by the cultivators, and while they are soldiers they are likewise fed by the cultivators; in the former case they return clothing, and the supply of the other necessary wants of man; and in the latter they return defence; but in either case their labour is only an equivalent for their feeding, and no increase of revenue.

If the produce of their labour is to be exported, and their feeding imported, the former, Dr. Smith alleges, may more than purchase the latter, consequently may yield a revenue. Dr. Smith has here broke bounds, and, contrary to his own plan, has stepped out of the agricultural system into the commercial system. But when the question is about the production of a revenue, it is altogether illogical to substitute for that the transfer of a revenue, which all commercial dealings are merely resolvable into. Whatever be the advantage accruing from exports and imports, that advantage is not an increase of revenue, but a transfer of revenue from

A to B. Should a Jew sell a crown-piece for ten shillings, or a Queen Anne's farthing for a guinea, he would augment his own income, no doubt, but he would not thereby augment the quantity of the precious metals; and the nature of the traffic would be the same, whether his virtuoso customer resided in the same street with himself, or in France, or in China. What does the word *commerce* imply, but *commutatio mercium*, an interchange of revenues already created, which most frequently is for the mutual benefit of both dealers, though sometimes more beneficial to the one than the other; but still what the one gains the other loses, and their traffic really produces no increase.

But setting aside the great impropriety of thus changing the state of the question, the Economist is ready to meet Dr. Smith upon his new ground. If we are to take into consideration the profits from foreign commerce, it will be generally acknowledged, that when any two nations interchange their superfluity, or merchandize with each other, that nation which produces its superfluity with the least expence, will, other things being equal, draw the greatest profit from the sale of that superfluity. Now in a nation possessing a fertile territory, the production of corn, including in that word the other necessary articles of subsistence, is less expensive than the fabrication of manufactures, consequently the exportation of corn is of all other exportations the most profitable to such a nation.

The comparison of the profit arising from cultivation with the profit arising from fabrication, is of

so great importance, and so little attended to by those whose minds are wholly intent upon manufactures and foreign commerce, that it merits a particular illustration.

Suppose a gentleman has four favourite servants, a man and his wife, with their two sons, all capable of labour, and places them in one of his old mansions, with an allowance of ten pounds a year to each for subsistence, 'tis plain they would be an annual charge of 40 pounds to that gentleman. But suppose those same four persons to get possession of 50 acres of good soil, which they wish to cultivate, but having no capital are obliged to borrow every thing. The same friendly gentleman, instead of *giving* them this year 40*l.* *lends* them 40*l.* and also *lends* them 90 bushels of seed, a plough, harrows, sickles, &c. and the use of two horses. Of the fifty acres they sow thirty, and being exceedingly industrious, from having the full assurance that all they shall earn will be their own, they in harvest reap 630 bushels, or seven grains for one. Now computing those bushels at 630 crowns, or 157 pounds 10 shillings, and allowing the profits arising from the twenty acres in grass to pay for the implements, and the hire and keep of the horses, they are thus by their crop enabled to acquit all their debts. They reimburse the 40 pounds for their subsistence, and the value of the seed, amounting to 22*l.* 10*s.* and allow five per cent interest for the loan, making in all 65*l.* 12*s.* which leaves them a reserve, or neat profit of 91*l.* 18*s.* In this new situation, therefore, instead of being a charge to the gentleman, they are a charge to nobody, have by
their

their own labour subsisted themselves, and realized 91l. 18s.

They are now in the second year not under the necessity of borrowing; but have a capital of their own fully sufficient for the same enterprize; therefore supposing the same increase in their arable fields as before, they will in this second year have raised a second income of 157l. 10s. to which (as their farm was this year stocked at their own expence) twenty pounds at least must be added for the twenty acres in meadow and pasture, making in all 177l. 10s. Deducting from this the expence of the third year's enterprize, or about 62 pounds, and supposing their farm to be as productive, as in the two preceding years, they will at their third harvest have realized a second 177l. 10s. to which must be added the reserved capital of their second year, or 112l. 10s. making in all 290 pounds.

Should the corn the cultivators have produced each year, which amounted to the marketable value of 157l. 10s. be sold abroad, the nation by their industry will be a gainer of 91l. 18s. annually. Should it be consumed at home, four persons will have thereby subsisted themselves at nobody's expence, and added to the national capital 91l. 18s. annually.

My reader will doubtless have observed, that I have omitted mentioning the payment of any rent for the fifty acres. This is a designed omission, (for in the above stated case no payment of any rent is required) as the fifty acres are supposed to be given by the Supreme Benefactor, who expects no rent
for

for them, but thankfulness and obedience to his laws. In fact these fifty acres represent the seventy-three millions of acres possessed by the inhabitants of Great Britain, who pay no rent to any one for the territory they occupy; and my cultivators, if there had not been room for them in Great Britain, might have sat down in Kentucky, where they might have had not fifty acres, but one hundred acres, without paying for them any rent whatever. But of the nature of rent I shall treat by and by.

Let us now examine the profits accruing to the nation from the exportation of manufactures. It has already been shewn that no man, as a manufacturer, however he may gain himself, adds any thing to the national revenue, if his commodity is sold and consumed at home; for the buyer precisely loses not only what the manufacturer gains, but the amount of the wages, and of the price of the raw materials besides. There is an interchange between the seller and the buyer, but no increase. Mr. Edwards, in his judicious and elegant history of the West Indies, states, that annually 22,000,000 pounds weight of cotton is imported into Great Britain, and manufactured into a value of seven millions and a half sterling, by the full employment of 600,000 people. Suppose this statement accurate, then deduct one million for the prime cost of the cotton, and the labouring manufacturers will be found to earn 10l. 16s. each, which is not the half of a ploughman's earnings. From the statistical account of Scotland, vol. vii. published by the very respectable President of the Board of Agriculture,

culture, it appears that in 1784 the manufactures of the town of Paisley amounted to the value of 579,185*l.* and gave employment to 26,484 persons. If from the value of the manufactured commodities, we deduct one-fifth for the price of the raw materials, we shall have the sum of 463,350*l.* which divided among the above mentioned manufacturers, makes the wages of each amount to 17*l.* 10*s.* From Mr. Durnford's History of the Town of Tiverton, in Devonshire, it appears that the total value of the manufactures fabricated there, deducting the price of the raw material, and divided among all the manufacturers, allows to each hardly 10*l.* a year.

The first reflection that arises from these statements is the smallness of the earnings of the manufacturers, which are not much more than those of a common foot soldier. The second reflection is that there appears to be no surplus; for small as the earnings are, yet the aggregate of them all makes up the full value of the fabrications. To supply the want of a surplus, I shall suppose that the master employer takes a profit of 50 per cent upon what he expends in wages, or sixpence in the shilling on each manufacturer's pay; and allowing the average income of each manufacturer to be 16*l.* a year, that would make the master's annual gains upon each four manufacturers 32 pounds; and if the manufacture is sold abroad, these 32 pounds would be the national profit from four artificers. Even in this light the exportation of the labour of four cultivators appears to be 38 per cent more profitable to
the

the nation than the exportation of the labour of four artificers.

This conclusion however is doing but half justice to the cultivator; for upon a more narrow and accurate inspection it will be found, that the 32 pounds which the master employer is enabled to draw from abroad by the sale of his manufacture, is not owing solely to the four manufacturers, but in part to the cultivators, who fed those manufacturers. Had there been no subsistence provided, there would have been no work done; and the value of the work done, we have seen above, does no more than compensate for the value of the subsistence. Therefore to send abroad such a value in manufactures as should yield a profit of 32 pounds to the exporter, requires not the labour of four men only, but of six men, allowing the surplus produce of two cultivators sufficient to feed four manufacturers. Now if six men are necessary to the procuring a profit of 32 pounds by the exportation of manufactures, and four men can procure a profit of 31 pounds by the exportation of corn, the national profit from the exportation of the latter exceeds that from the exportation of the former nearly in the proportion of 4 to 1. Mr. Jefferson of Virginia therefore speaks the language of an enlightened politician when he says, ' 'Tis for the interest of the American States, that for a long time to come their manufacturers should reside in Europe.'

The preceding reflections, I think, suffice to shew the falshens of Dr. Smith's position, that the exportation of manufactures may create a revenue

to a state in preference to the exportation of rude produce. His reasoning in the rest of this observation, if obscure sophistry deserves the name of reasoning, is equally inconclusive with what has been refuted. What has *great quantity* and *small quantity* to do in the comparison of one value with another value. A small bundle of lace will purchase many sackfuls of corn; but the question is, if food be wanted, or even if gold be wanted, whether the manufacturers of that lace would not have drawn more profit to themselves and to their country, if they had employed themselves as cultivators, than as manufacturers; and that question having already been resolved, shews the *nomeaning* of the words *great quantity* and *small quantity*.

Dr. Smith further says, ‘ The inhabitants of a town, though they frequently possess no lands of their own, yet draw to themselves by their industry such a quantity of the rude produce of the lands of other people as supplies them not only with the materials of their work, but with the fund of their subsistence.’ The very terms of this sentence disprove what Dr. Smith wishes to prove by it. The inhabitants of a town, he says, *draw* to themselves the *rude produce* of other people. By thus drawing it is evident they do not *create* a revenue, but *transfer* the revenue created by others. Who ever doubted that in traffic one may gain and another may lose? But where the inquiry is not concerning the source of the wealth of individuals, but of the Wealth of Nations, it is rather illogical to substitute the one for the other. Dr.

Smith

Smith not adverting to this paralogism goes on, ‘ It is thus,’ he says, ‘ that Holland draws a great part of its subsistence from other countries; live cattle from Holstein and Jutland, and corn from almost all the different states of Europe.’ Now before any thing can be inferred from this, in favour of his supposition, Dr. Smith ought to have proved, that Denmark and Poland are losers in supplying Holland with beef and corn in return for manufactures. But from what is above written the presumption is, that the gain is on the side of Denmark and Poland, and that these kingdoms, while any lands remain in them uncultivated, may adopt the language of Mr. Jefferson, and say, ‘ It is for the interest of Denmark and Poland, that for a long time to come their manufacturers should reside in Holland.’

That the pecuniary wealth of Holland exceeds that of any other European nation has been noticed by many writers; but he must not have perused history with much attention who attributes that wealth to the manufactures carried on by the Hollanders. The enquiring Economist will find three much more copious sources of that wealth than manufactures; and two of them that are actually sources of the natural and real revenue, to which wise nations will ever give the preference, namely, territorial improvement and fishing. When the Economist says that the chief source of the wealth of nations consists in the labour of man exercised upon the fertility of the soil, he by no means excludes the fertility of the seas, as the ocean, when ploughed

ploughed by fishermen, yields an increase frequently as abundant as the land when ploughed by husbandmen. By this natural source of wealth the Dutch were formerly, and still are great gainers. The famous De Witt reckoned that one-fourth of his countrymen were maintained by fishing; and the distinguished engineer, Thomas Digges, in Queen Elizabeth's reign, who spent a considerable time in Holland, says, 'Fishinge onelye being none of the leaste foundations of all their proude townes, built in our age.' (See his plan for improving Dover Haven, written about the year 1582, and printed in the *Archæologia*, vol. II.) Now if the Dutch territory hardly suffices to maintain one-half of its inhabitants, and one-fourth of them draw their subsistence from fishing, this is nearly the same thing as if their land territory were enlarged one-half, and to be productive of a revenue.

Another source of Dutch revenue is likewise equivalent to an enlargement of land territory; I mean the monopoly of the spices of the East. Were Great Britain to possess a monopoly of the growth of potatoes, and finding a great demand for them in other countries, should sell them at five shillings a pound, instead of a penny a pound, 'tis plain that one acre of potatoes in that case would, in point of mercantile profit, be equal to 60 acres. But such for these two hundred years past has nearly been the case in respect to Dutch traffic in nutmegs, cloves, mace, cinnamon, which are at the tables of the luxurious, what gin is at the meals of the indigent. Were the expence of the production or purchase of those spices in the East, and the
European

European market prices of them to be compared together, they would be found to differ as widely as the pound of potatoes produced at the expence of one penny, and sold for five shillings, differ from each other; and all that difference is so much gain to the monopolizing Dutch, and renders every acre of nutmegs nearly equivalent to 60 acres of corn. Were this monopoly to be permanent, it would be a permanent advantage to the Dutch, an advantage which my readers will perceive is in respect to production a natural revenue, but in respect to mercantile value, only a revenue transferred, distinct however from that arising from manufactures.

The third great source of the opulence of the Dutch, of which likewise they long possessed a kind of monopoly, and which in its nature is distinct from manufactures, is the carrying trade. Their ships were so many floating warehouses and retail shops, appearing in every quarter of the globe, buying cheap in one nation, and selling dear in another, and carrying the wealth thus acquired by transfers of revenue home to their narrow hive at the mouths of the Rhine. Of these three sources of Dutch income; the first, namely, the fishing, is a real new production; the second, arising from the sale of spices, is in part a new production, and in part only a transfer of revenue; and the third is wholly a transfer of a revenue already created, but no new production. Out of these three revenues the parsimony of the Dutch has formed a fourth revenue, which however is no new production, but a revenue drawn to themselves from the revenue of their
 their

their less thrifty neighbours. Thus the whole of the present land-tax of Kent and Suffex, and perhaps of Effex, belongs to the Dutch, and goes to maintain Dutchmen in Holland, in consequence of sums lent by them to the Government of Great Britain. The Dutch having long persevered in this money lending system, which they superadded to their other sources of income, it is not at all surprising that, in length of time, they should have accumulated much pecuniary wealth, the precariousness of which however will not impose upon the real political Economist. During the last century the Dutch made such a rapid progress towards opulence, that their artificial system was regarded by political writers of that age, of no small discernment, as far preferable for securing the prosperity of nations, to the possession of an extensive and well cultivated territory. Among those who were dazzled and misled by the prosperity of the Dutch were Sir William Temple and Sir William Petty, the latter of whom not perceiving upon what a weak and insecure foundation that prosperity rested, went so far as to wish it to be a model for England, saying that England would be more rich and more powerful, if Scotland, Ireland, and Wales were sunk in the sea, provided their inhabitants were first transferred within the bounds of England. Such are the wild and dangerous conclusions that sensible men are led into, when the true and fundamental principle of the wealth of nations is not attended to by them, and when in their plans of policy they substitute

the unstable and tranſient revenue ariſing from commerce, for the permanent and ſecure revenue ariſing from the cultivation of territory.

How widely different are the maxims of the American States from thoſe of Sir William Petty! Were the Americans to adopt his commercial ſyſtem of getting rich, they might all find room in the peninſula bounded by the Delaware and the Cheſapeak, which, with very little labour, might be made a complete iſland; and there, bounded by the ſea, they might direct their views to commerce and navigation, and by living penuriously might acquire, in progreſs of time, a monied capital. They have however wiſely choſen to accumulate men rather than to accumulate ducats: and by giving their chief attention to the moſt valuable of all capitals, an extenſive territory, and by the improvement of that capital, they have acquired more power and more wealth in four years than the Dutch acquired in an hundred years. The increaſe of population in the American States from the year 1790 to 1794, is found by a late cenſus to be 1,321,364 perſons, who eſtimated in a pecuniary light, at the price only of negroes, is an augmentation of national capital of near 100 millions ſterling.

If the ſources of opulence of the Dutch above enumerated (which, as we have ſeen, are not dependent upon manufactures, and which fascinated the politicians of the laſt century) are inferior, in point of abundance, to the ſource ariſing from the cultivation of an extenſive, a fertile, and connected territory, they are no leſs inferior in point of ſtability. Their fiſhing trade does not now produce

one-half of what it formerly produced, because the Swedes, the Britons, the French, the Americans have all interfered in that branch of industry. Their East India monopoly of spices is on the point of being terminated, because the climates in the West will soon furnish those spices; and their carrying trade has also declined from the same cause that has occasioned the decline of their fishing trade. Now supposing, what is but too likely, that these three sources of the opulence of the Dutch should still suffer a greater wane, and likewise that their neighbours, to whom they at present stand in the light of absentees, should be wise enough to pay them back the money borrowed from them, they would soon have the sad experience that poverty and tenantless houses would overspread their whole country, notwithstanding their greatest skill and greatest industry in manufactures.

Are then manufactures of no value to a nation? Very far otherwise. What would man in his present state be, were he to be without houses, without clothes, and without furniture. These and a great variety of other kinds of manufactures, are, according to the present condition of men, justly termed necessaries of life; and consequently manufacturers are most deservedly to be deemed a *necessary class* in society. That however does not make them a *productive class*, that is, a class which renews the revenue of society, or gives any augmentation or increase to that revenue. The manufacturer because he produces something of value, has been most erroneously supposed to augment the

mafs of national opulence, to double or triple the value of what is put into his hands, and confequently to increafe in the fame proportion the income of fociety. Hardly is there any political or commercial writer who has not in fome degree adopted this error ; and among thofe who have been formerly thus mifled, I muft include myfelf. But clofe and frequent meditation on the fubject has given me the cleareft conviction that no augmentation of the revenue of fociety arifes from the labour of a manufacturer, except in the cafe of its being fold abroad. In that cafe indeed the profit of the exporter becomes the profit of the nation where he lives. That nation however would, as has been before proved, be a greater gainer, were the labour of the cultivator to be exported rather than the labour of the manufacturer. The manufacturer, almoft in all cafes, produces fomething of value to fociety ; but he produces that value only by the extinction of another value, previously provided for him by the cultivator. The merit of the manufacturer is, that he gives a fixed and permanent value to the more perifhable riches procured by the cultivator, or rather beftowed by nature on the labour of the cultivator ; but he does not augment that primary and fole fource of riches. Thus the beef and bread furnifhed by the cultivator to certain mafons and carpenters have given us Weftminfter Bridge. The beef and bread are gone, but the bridge we have in exchange. Thus the onions produced by the cultivators in Egypt, and expended by fome manufacturers there, have given us one of the great pyramids.

mids. Thus the linen manufacturer, at the expence of the subsistence of his workmen, furnished by the cultivator, will turn the flax, furnished also by the cultivator, into a commodity which is transmitted by careful housewives from one generation to another. Thus the leaves of one mulberry-tree will, through the intervention of some silk-worms, yield perhaps a guinea's-worth of silk ; but the increase, or revenue, does not originate from the silk-worms, but from the mulberry-tree ; that is, from the cultivator, assisted by the bounty of nature. The silk-worm, in this view, is the exact type of all manufacturers whatever. Having his subsistence furnished to him, he gives in return a permanent commodity, equal in value to that subsistence.

But do not we see many manufacturers get rich ? Yes, certainly : and this very circumstance of their acquiring a capital, has led political and commercial writers into the false conclusion, that manufacturers created a capital. In a professed enquiry into the nature and causes of the Wealth of Nations, one would have expected to have found this error clearly refuted ; but so far otherwise, Dr. Smith has interwoven it into the whole of his performance, which renders that performance worse than useless as a political treatise, a mere castle of cards, erected without a foundation, and affording no habitation for the politician. If a manufacturer gets rich, or, in Dr. Smith's phrase, acquires a great capital by the profits of a manufacture, the resolution of such manufacture into its constituent parts, will prove to every person open to conviction, that no manufac-

ture when sold at home, increases the income of a nation, however it may add greatly to the conveniences of that nation. Whatever value is put upon any manufacture, it is resolvable into three other values; namely, the value of the raw material of which it is made, the value of the wages expended in its fabrication, and thirdly, the value or profit which the manufacturer superadds to the other two values, as a recompence to himself. Now none of these three values comprehends in it any increase of general revenue, consequently the three together cannot form any increase of general revenue. They only occasion a commutation or transfer of the revenue previously provided by the cultivator, by giving a permanency to that revenue under a new form. Nay, in some cases (which, indeed, rarely happen) they do not even do that; for we have instances wherein the labour of the manufacturer is quite unprofitable both to himself and to society. Thus the editor of the posthumous edition of Lord Bolingbroke's works, would have much better have been doing nothing, than employing himself in that publication, by which he lost several hundred pounds, because the work did not sell. Thus the maker of a time-piece which nobody will buy, because it is inaccurate, has actually produced nothing of value, though he may have employed several years in the construction of it. Thus the calico printer, who unluckily has used a pattern that suits nobody's taste, finds by the result, that his labour has added no value to the calico. Such cases, indeed are very rare; but they plainly prove, that a manu-

manufacturer only enriches himself by being a seller, and that when he ceases to be a seller, his profits are immediately at a stand, because they are not natural profits, but artificial. The cultivator, on the other hand (supposing a little domestic thrift), may exist, and thrive, and multiply, without selling any thing: consequently, a nation of cultivators may be a most prosperous nation without much exterior traffic.

In the same manner as an individual manufacturer gets rich, so a manufacturing district gets rich. It abounds in sellers, who draw profits to themselves from the revenues of those to whom they sell their manufactures. Were the populous manufacturing cities of Great Britain not to be great sellers (I mean within the limits of Great Britain), they would soon dwindle down to the size of moderate villages; but as by means of their riders and correspondents they disperse their fabrics through every corner of the island, they consequently concentrate profits from every corner of the island to their own district. But all these profits, whatever their amount may be, are precisely so much deducted out of the profits of the buyers of those manufactures, consequently no national income, or augmentation of national revenue. Let it be farther observed, that one half of the nation do not supply their own wants. Now it is the great praise of manufacturers, that they supply their own wants; they return a full equivalent for their own subsistence, which is a most material point in their favour, and constitutes them one of the essential classes of society. The

returning this equivalent for their subsistence, though it does not increase any revenue, yet, by rendering the revenue permanent, while half the nation are dissipating theirs without any return, must consequently fix ease and opulence in a manufacturing quarter in a greater degree than in a quarter where neither cultivation nor manual industry is much attended to. Suppose twenty-four poor females were to have their subsistence furnished to them; and twelve of those females, imitating the practice in Guernsey, should after dinner assemble alternately in each other's houses with their knitting-needles, and spend the evenings in conversation and knitting of stockings; while the twelve other females after dinner sit down to cards, and spend the evenings in play. These last, it is plain, would ever remain in indigence; but the former would in process of time have something to sell. Nevertheless, the value of what they offered to market would only be a retribution of the value of their subsistence, which by their industry they had fixed, while the card-players had dissipated theirs without any return. These twelve industrious females represent the whole class of manufacturers, who by yielding a return of a permanent nature, equal in value to the subsistence they consume, give, by this transformation, a certain stability to what was before of a more perishable nature. Thus a cart-load of manufactured cloth may be equivalent to five cart-loads of corn, because it has cost five cart-loads of corn to pay for the wool and for the wages of the workmen. An additional value it cannot produce,

without

without drawing that additional value from some other revenue before created, and therefore yields no increase. But still it is a circumstance extremely in favour of manufacturers, that they do not, like half the nation, eat their bread for nothing, or for an old song; but give in return what all nations both civilized and uncivilized have ever deemed necessary not only to their well being, but to their very being; consequently manufacturers have a most just right to be called an essential class in society, next after the cultivators. Add to the above, that working manufacturers in towns and villages being accustomed to consider the value of time, are often led to employ their spare hours in cultivating a potatoe spot, or a small garden, which is a labour that yields an increase; and in the populous towns the rich manufacturers, instead of a large establishment of servants, hounds, and horses, dispose of their surplus wealth in building and ornamenting villas, or improving of farms, which places them in the productive class of cultivators, and consequently adds to the wealth of their district. Lastly, though manufacturers, by their labour, do not increase the revenue or income of a state, yet the demand for their subsistence encourages the farmers in their neighbourhood to produce that subsistence, consequently the lands in such situations are generally better cultivated than they would otherwise be; and this better cultivation, adds both to the wealth of the district, and the wealth of the nation. All these considerations united serve to explain how wealth and opulence may be concentrated

tered in a manufacturing district, and how master manufacturers may acquire great capitals, though, at the same time, manufacturers themselves do neither originate nor increase the income of a nation.

As manufacturers, however, in general, prevent that part of the national income which goes to their subsistence from being dissipated, but return it in some vendible fabrick, that may be either used or sold, it will be a great object with every wise statesman to give every encouragement to increase the number of manufacturers, at the expence of such other classes in society as are by no means essential classes. A nation cannot give too much into manufactures, provided it draws its manufacturers from the supernumeraries in other classes, whose subsistence is in reality a tax upon society. Every one acknowledges that the indigent poor at present on the parish rolls in Great Britain, who may perhaps exceed 400,000 in number, and who contribute nothing to their own subsistence, are a tax and burthen upon society; and in so far as they are really helpless, their subsistence is a most necessary and a most humane tax. But were one-fourth of their number, or 100,000 of them, to be found capable of manual labour, the establishing such regulations as would transfer that fourth into the class of manufacturers, would probably save a million annually to the nation. The manufacturing class in Great Britain might also be profitably reinforced from the supernumerary and useless individuals in many other classes of society. Were the many supernumerary thousands that could be spared from
among

among retailing shop-keepers, from among ale-house-keepers, inn-keepers, apothecaries, attornies, menial servants, &c. &c. who are now a much heavier tax upon society than the parochial poor, to be transferred into the class of manufacturers, we should soon find manufactures more abundant, and at much cheaper prices; that is, the prosperity of the nation would be thereby greatly increased, because probably half a million of people, who at present are subsisted by the community, without returning to it any equivalent, would in that case return the full value of their subsistence.

A nation, however, would be extremely blind to its own interests, who should augment the class of manufacturers at the expence of the class of cultivators. That would be, in a manner, to neglect the working of a rich gold mine, for the sake of working a silver mine, that did no more than pay the wages of the workmen. The labour of the manufacturer, we have seen, is profitable in so far as it returns the value of his subsistence; but the labour of the cultivator not only returns the value of his own subsistence, but, when skilfully applied, and aided by the bounty of nature, yields a surplus sufficient to feed four or five other persons; consequently the more numerous the class of skilful cultivators is in any nation, and the greater the fertility of its soil, the greater will be the resources of that nation. It is the mass of surplusses occasioned by the whole of the cultivators, that forms the revenue of every other class in society. It is that which sets the carpenter and mason to work; it is that which

pays

pays the foldier and failor ; it is that which enriches the fhop-keeper ; it is that which pays the fees of the lawyer and phyfician. In fhort, the only fource of every payment in a ftate is the produce of its lands and its feas, exclusive of the fmall income it may acquire by foreign commerce, fmall in comparifon of the immenfty of the other, and often impolitically procured at the expence of that other. What clafs in fociety fo much claims the encouragement and fupport of a wife legiflature as that clafs, which alone originates and increafes the wealth of fociety, by furnifhing a furplus much beyond its own fubfiftence. Thirty hay-makers will in five or fix days make an hundred pounds worth of hay ; a value exceeding their own fubfiftence five or fix fold. Twenty negroes in Carolina will produce as much rice as will purchafe the labour of an hundred manufacturers in Great Britain. The patriarch Ifaac, we are told, fowed and reaped an hundred fold, which, allowing even one-half for expence, leaves a neat profit of 5000 per cent. The cultivators of rice in China, it is faid, often reap an hundred fold, and have two crops in one year ; which, fuppoſing the fame degree of expence as before, will give a neat profit of 10,000 per cent. But were the profit of the cultivator, as in lefs fertile climates, to amount only to 400 per cent, or even to 100 per cent, or even but to 50 per cent, it has this advantage over the profits of every other clafs in fociety *that it is all increafe*, not being formed by the diminution of the revenue of any other clafs. Nature yields the profit to him, and
through

through him, to the whole community, who have nothing else to subsist upon, excepting perhaps, as above-mentioned, some small gains from foreign commerce; which commerce, however, would soon cease to exist, if it were not for the support of the cultivator.

Since, then, the class of cultivators is that alone which originates and increases the revenue of a state, a wise nation will zealously pursue every measure that may tend to increase the numbers in that class, not only from the many unessential classes in society, but even from the class of manufacturers itself. Instead of making manufactures the attractive principle of cultivation, such a nation will follow the much more natural and more profitable system of making cultivation the attractive principle of manufactures. While there is in any corner of its territory lands unimproved, it will advance its prosperity much more rapidly, and establish it much more solidly, by directing the industry of its inhabitants, not to manufactures, but to the cultivation of those lands. The labour of the manufacturer we have seen is sterile or unfruitful in comparison of that of the cultivator. This last, by originating subsistence, originates and supports population; and by originating more than his own subsistence, creates annually a new fund for purchasing all the conveniencies that it is in the power of the manufacturer to produce, whether that manufacturer resides in his own parish or ten thousand miles off, provided the communication, or mutual intercourse between them, be unobstructed.

From

From not investigating in what the Wealth of Nations consists, and where it originates, the want of manufactures has been by many writers alleged as an apology for neglected and deficient agriculture. The great cry has been, even among legislators themselves, let us have but manufactures, and then we shall have well-cultivated lands. The false principle of Dr. Smith, that manufactures produce a revenue, has given support to this very misleading and pernicious doctrine—a doctrine, indeed, of much older date than that of Dr. Smith's Enquiry. It is, however, with great pleasure I observe, that several of the authors of the statistical account of Scotland, particularly the Rev. Mr. Oliver, in the judicious account of his parish of Corstorphine, view the subject in a very different light. Like faithful pastors, as well as skilful politicians, they plainly shew, by many judicious arguments, that from motives of religion and morality, as well as from motives of worldly advantage, the cultivation of the territory ought to have the preference to the establishment of manufactures, more especially as manufactures are at present established in many parts of Great Britain. Agriculture, I hope, will soon be viewed by the whole British nation, and by the whole Irish nation, in the same light as it is viewed by those reverend writers; and that it should be so viewed, is the great purpose of my present discourse.

If no national revenue proceeds from manufactures, and if all national revenue proceeds from agriculture, which truths I presume the preceding pages have made very manifest, it may then, I

think, be expected, that the land owners in both islands, zealously concurring with their respective legislatures, will without delay adopt such measures as may spread cultivation over every mountain and over every valley in Great Britain and Ireland. While a field admitting cultivation can be found for every idler, let no idler be without a field. Houses of industry are good things; but fields of industry are much better; and were Great Britain and Ireland to be wholly overspread with such fields, the annual revenue of these islands would thereby soon acquire a real augmentation of twenty millions sterling. I say a real augmentation, and not a nominal. A nominal augmentation only serves to heighten prices, to the prejudice of foreign commerce; but a real augmentation would actually lower them, and increase both the numbers and the ease of the people.

Great Britain and Ireland have the means of this augmentation within themselves. It may be effected without treaties of commerce; without any acquisition of new territory, and without any increase of the balance of trade. But it cannot be effected unless the possessors of land give every encouragement to those who are willing to undergo the fatigue of cultivating them. From the false notion that manufactures are a source of wealth, land owners are extremely ready to give perpetual leases to manufacturers. But what an overflow of wealth would they not procure to themselves, and to the nation, would they but shew an equal readiness to give perpetual leases to cultivators, from whose labours

labours it has been shewn, and not from the labours of manufacturers, the Wealth of Nations originates.

Let cultivators have the same security given to them that is lavished upon manufacturers, and thousands and ten thousands would quickly appear as ready to contract an alliance with their native soil, as the vine is to contract an alliance with the lofty poplar. We should then hear of hundreds of thousands of new marriages between farmers and their farms, no matter whether of great or of small extent, for what is great to the capacity and means of one farmer, may be small to the capacity and means of another. The giving security to the labourer would give activity to the spade and the plough, on every waste and on every heath in Great Britain. Innumerable buildings would be raised by new cultivators, not only along our rivers, our canals, and public roads; but in sequestered places, now inhabited by moor fowl and wild deer. And intermixed with the buildings of those new cultivators, would be the houses of new manufacturers; so that a traveller journeying from south to north, or from east to west, would find every where over the whole island, a neat habitation within a mile, or within half a mile of another.

A decided preference to cultivation, by no means implies a neglect of manufactures. On the contrary, like natural genius assisted by erudition, *conjurant amice*; they in most cases mutually promote each others prosperity; and would more especially do so, if manufacturers, instead of being impolitically crowded together in great towns, were every
where

where intermixed with the cultivators. By this system the unprofitable waste of expence in transporting goods forwards and backwards would be avoided. Manufacturers would every where be near to their subsistence; and cultivators would no where be obliged to go far from their habitations for the common fabrics they wanted to purchase. Above all a virtuous simplicity of manners would be preserved among the people; and while industry and content would be every where diffused, the land would overflow literally with milk and honey, and the population, the wealth and power of the state resting on their natural foundation, would gradually rise to the utmost degree of prosperity that the island was susceptible of. Such would be the happy consequences of adopting the system of the Economists, in considering the produce of the soil as the source of all revenue, and giving the preference to that branch of industry, which has for its object the augmentation of that produce.

Having, I think, clearly proved that the revenue of a state arises solely from the produce of its lands, and that Dr. Smith's arguments in support of the productiveness of manufactures are altogether illusive, I shall now proceed to consider the fundamental error of the French Economists in ranking the proprietors of lands as a productive class in society; and shall explain the principle founded in nature, which when acted upon, renders the proprietors of land, not indeed a productive class, but an *essential class*, and the most honourable class in society.

In so far as a proprietor of land cultivates his own possession, or a part of his own possession, he certainly ranks among cultivators, and consequently is one in the productive class in society. But when he does not actually interfere with the cultivation of his land, and merely lets it out to be cultivated by others for a certain rent, (which in Europe is the case with ninety-nine proprietors in an hundred) it is evident he from that moment ceases to be of the productive class, and becomes one in the many unproductive classes of the community.

Every class of men in a state, except the class of cultivators, is properly an unproductive class. But among the indefinite number of unproductive classes some are essential to the being of a state, while others are wholly unessential, though they may be convenient for its well being. What is essential to the being of a thing, is that without which the thing itself could not exist. Thus it is essential to gold to be incorruptible, to be yellow, to be very weighty, very malleable, &c. but it is not essential to gold to be round or square. To a globe or circle it is essential to be round. To a musket it seems essential to have a barrel, a lock, a stock, and a ramrod; but it is not essential to it to have inlaid work or gold or silver ornaments. Thus in examining the classes in civil society that are essential to its very existence, we shall find that they may be all reduced to the four following; first of all the productive class of cultivators; secondly, the class of manufacturers; thirdly, the class of defenders; and fourthly, the

the class of instructors; for every civil society must be fed, must be clothed, defended, and instructed.

On the supposition of the Abbé de St. Pierre of *une paix perpetuelle*, or a perpetual peace, the class of defenders would cease to be an essential class in society; and in a state that chose to be as illiterate as the Romans were before they became acquainted with Grecian literature, or as the Grecians themselves were till long after the Trojan war, the class of instructors would also cease to be an essential class. But as the corrupt nature of man renders defence absolutely necessary; and as his mental improvement ought no less to be an object with him than his corporeal conveniences and enjoyments, the classes of defenders and instructors are as justly entitled to be deemed essential as the classes of cultivators and manufacturers, and I have therefore mentioned them as such, though the class of cultivators be the only productive class.

The proprietors of land as mere receivers of land rents are not an essential class in society, any more than engravers, statuaries, &c. It is by the constitutional appropriation of the rents of land to the defence of the state, that the receivers of those rents become an essential class in society. By separating the rents of lands from the constitutional purpose of the defence of the state, the receivers of those rents instead of being an essential class, render themselves one of the most unessential and most burdensome classes in society. This fundamental maxim is applicable to all states; but I shall consider it chiefly in regard to Great Britain. In Great Britain the

rents of the lands may be stated at twenty-five millions, making a burden upon agriculture amounting to one third, and in some cases to near one half of all that the island produces, which, as has been shewn, is our only revenue.

The cultivation of the ground is absolutely necessary for the subsistence of man, but the payment of a rent is not absolutely necessary for the cultivation of the ground. The farmer could cultivate it as well without paying a tax of fifty per cent, or thirty per cent for leave to cultivate it; and we have the experience before our eyes, that young states thrive exceedingly, by being exempt from that unnecessary tax. What has drawn so many settlers from Europe over to the late British Colonies in America, but the happy circumstance of having lands without paying any rent, and formerly with the impolitic indulgence of paying hardly any public burdens. The circumstance of paying no rent has been the attracting loadstone to thousands and ten thousands to the American shores. Now can it be said that the lands of America yield the less, because the cultivators of them are also the possessors? Certainly not. On the contrary, the cultivators of the lands in America being at the same time the possessors of those lands, are thereby exempted from a tax of 33 per cent, which the cultivators in Great Britain and Ireland are subject to, which circumstance has been the very animating soul of the agriculture of the Americans, enabling them, in the commerce of grain, to undersell their mother country in foreign markets. Nay, it has even

even served them as a bounty of thirty-three per cent, to pour their corn in upon us, which was the same thing in point of policy on our side, as if a duty of thirty-three per cent had been imposed upon Newcastle coals, and American coals had been admitted duty free.

If the practical example of the late British American Colonies proves to a demonstration, that states may not only exist, but flourish with the greatest prosperity, without paying any rents for the lands that yield them their subsistence, the plain conclusion is, that land rents abstractedly considered are unnecessary burdens, and that land renters in that sense are not an essential class in society.

How then will a wise government, acting in conformity to the principles of nature, render the receivers of land rents an essential class in society? The political Economist answers by assigning them an appropriate occupation; for it is contrary to all reason, and to all policy, to allow mere idlers in a state, or to suffer those who receive one third, or even but one fourth of the whole income of the kingdom, to do nothing for it in return. We are by the law of our nature condemned to earn our bread by the sweat of our brow; but no law can justly exist, by which one man shall earn his bread by the sweat of another man's brow, without rendering for it some equivalent.

The sum of twenty-five millions sterling, making between one third, and one fourth of the whole income of Great Britain, being paid by the cultivators to the proprietors of land, and being, as appears, an

actual burden upon the community, reason and sound policy point it out as the natural fund for the defence of the community. When thus applied by the legislature, the possessors of those rents instantly become not only an essential class in society; but an honourable class likewise; for honour will ever be freely allowed to those, whose profession it is to be ready to risk their lives in the defence of the community.

A case of danger to this kingdom, can hardly be supposed, that would require the military exertions of every fourth person in it, that is, that would absorb the fourth part of its yearly income, or in other words, the whole of the land rents. A part of those rents therefore may, without the risk of any deficiency in point of defence, be appropriated to the annual maintenance of the fourth essential class in society, namely, the essential and honourable class of instructors.

A full fourth, or, perhaps, near a third of the annual national income being thus applied, or applicable to the support of the defenders and instructors, the people ought to be exempted from every species of taxation for the purposes of defence and instruction, that is, government ought to draw the whole of the national supplies in all cases, from the rents of lands, as those rents afford an ample fund for every supposed case of emergency.

Such is the natural consequence of the principles of the political Economists, in respect to countries where the cultivators pay rents for the lands they cultivate; and in those countries where the cultivators

tors pay no rents for the lands they occupy, but are the masters of their own surpluses, the defence of their lands, in case of an attack from an enemy, must come out of those surpluses, or what is worse, must come out of the capital possession itself, upon the principle that half a loaf is better than no bread.

Those whose minds have been preoccupied with the expediency and rectitude of the present most chaotic system of taxation, and with the notion of the vast income arising to the state from manufactures, have expressed great surprize and astonishment at the conclusion of the Economists, that the public supplies ought to be drawn wholly and directly from the rents of lands, or from the surplus produce of lands, that is, that there should be no tax but a land tax. To the superficial it has been matter of drollery; to the serious a stumbling block; and to the half-knowing an inexplicable riddle. In France, Germany, and Holland, it has had a great variety of opposers, as well as of approvers. The witty Voltaire attacked it in one of his most flimsy productions, *L'homme a Quarante Ecus*. The serious Necker expresses his doubts of it; and argues upon its impracticability; but his arguments are such as most clearly prove, that the subject had not been justly conceived by him.

In Britain, Dr. Adam Smith views it askance, and cautiously shoves off the discussion of its merits, in the following evasive words. ‘ Without entering, he says, into the disagreeable discussion of the metaphysical arguments, by which the Economists

‘ support their very ingenious theory, it will sufficiently appear from the following review what are the taxes that fall finally on the rent of land, and what are those that fall finally upon some other fund.’ The perusal and re-perusal of that very long and desultory review, to which he refers, has not to me discovered that difference of funds, from whence taxes originate, which he was to make so evident. The Economists found their system of policy and finance upon the three principles of *number, weight, and measure*; and if we are to reckon with Dr. Smith, *number, weight, and measure*, to be metaphysics, I should be glad to know what we are to consider as physics.

Though Dr. Smith thus glides over in a most cursorily manner, a subject of enquiry of the greatest importance to the Wealth of Nations; yet another British political writer, Mr. Arthur Young, thinks it deserving of a very particular discussion. Mr. Young declares himself a warm antagonist to the idea of the Economists, of drawing the whole of the public supplies from the rents of lands, or from the surplus produce of land, and endeavours to combat it by fair reasoning; but reasoning that is not substantial. Great Britain and Ireland are much indebted to him, for the persevering and patriotic zeal with which he has illustrated and enforced many truths, important to their prosperity. He every where appears to me a candid searcher after truth, disclaiming any hypothesis, though inadvertently adopted by himself, that has not truth for its basis. Therefore in giving a full refutation to his very

very erroneous doctrines on this point, and others connected with it, and dependent upon it, I doubt not but he will think me entitled to his warmest thanks. My appeal shall be from Mr. Young ill informed, to Mr. Young better informed, and I flatter myself that I shall have him among the first and most zealous of my proselytes.

Having in the preceding pages explained the fundamental principle of the Economists, namely, that a state possessing a large territory has no other revenue than that arising from the produce of its lands, (exclusive of some small income from foreign commerce) and as one third of that produce is in Great Britain given by those who raise it, to a class of men, who if they were not to defend the state, would in a political sense have nothing to do, the defence of the state therefore naturally and politically devolves upon that class of men, as every other class of men in a state has its respective employment. From the fundamental principle above mentioned and above explained, it follows, that since there ought to be no other tax for the defence of the state than a land tax, that tax ought to be most carefully collected, in a just proportion according to the exigencies of the state, and that it is highly criminal in any receiver of land rents, to withhold from Government his due proportion of those rents.

A crowd of new ideas, in regard to finance, will immediately succeed in the minds of those who are fully convinced of the truth of the preceding principle, and its corollary; and their eyes will be opened to the insignificance of almost all that Hume,

Montesquieu, Neckar, Dr. Smith, and many others have said upon the subject. The wild deviation from the true principle of taxation, which is now, and for near two hundred years has been, the practice of every European state, has served as an unsurmountable barrier to the acumen and spirit of enquiry of those writers. They have shewn themselves as little acquainted with the nature of public supply and national defence, as we were with New Holland before the discoveries of Captain Cook. Among the few nothings mentioned by Montesquieu on the subject of taxation, he most decidedly, but absurdly says, the *natural* tax of moderate governments is the duty laid on merchandize, which is really paid by the consumer. Wonderful! we have not however one word from him, why such a tax is more natural than a tax upon dogs, or upon hackney coaches. The complaints of the excess of taxes in France, had made an impression upon him; and he makes the following remark upon that subject in general, which greatly supports the system of the Economists, and might have opened to him the right tract, if his mind had not been completely hood-winked as to that point. ‘ It was the excess
‘ of taxes, he says, that occasioned the prodigious
‘ facility, with which the Mahomedans carried on
‘ their conquests. Instead of a continual series of
‘ extortions devised by the subtle avarice of the
‘ Greek Emperors, the people were subjected to a
‘ *single tribute*, which was paid and collected with
‘ ease. Thus they were far happier in obeying a
‘ barbarous nation, than a corrupt government, in
‘ which,

‘ which they suffered every inconvenience of lost liberty, with all the horrors of present slavery.’ This *single tribute*, paid with ease by the Greeks to the conquering Turks, was probably the produce of the soil at prime cost, that is, unenhanced by nominal money, by excises, &c. The plain understandings of the Turks pointed out to them that the produce of the soil was the natural source of income, and that it was true policy to apply to that source directly, and to use every means to make it more abundant. And that system they seem, through succeeding ages, to have persevered in; for the elegant Busbequius, the Imperial ambassador, in his letters from Turkey, written near two hundred years ago, mentions with admiration the great fertility and well-cultivated fields of Asia Minor; and we have it also upon good authority, that not half a century ago the bushel of wheat was sold at Smyrna for less than seventeen-pence*.

Mr. Young, in his treatise entitled *Political Arithmetic*, opposes with much zeal the idea of a single tribute, or, in other words, a land-tax, adequate to the defence of the state in every emergency; but his arguments, when examined upon the principles of the Economists, will be found to be mere delusions, though of a very dangerous tendency to the public welfare, while they remain unrefuted. It would be a very tedious business to expose all the errors in that performance, which are thick scattered in the midst of many useful truths;

* Vide Tracts on the Corn Trade, p. 33.

and it would likewise be an unnecessary task, as the refutation of the essential errors will lead to the detection of the others, and take from the whole the power of further misleading.

It is an idea of Mr. Young, and of many others besides him, that near one-half of the income of the nation arises from manufactures; and upon this idea he says, page 239, ‘ The income of our soil
 ‘ is very considerable, but does not make much
 ‘ above half the total income of the state. The
 ‘ profits and labour in commerce, manufactures, and
 ‘ arts, are of a vast amount, consequently to ex-
 ‘ empt them all from taxation, and throw the
 ‘ whole burden on land, would be unequal and op-
 ‘ pressive in the highest degree.’ This reasoning would be just, were any revenue in reality to arise to the state from manufactures made and sold at home; but as I have above shewn in my remarks on Dr. Smith’s fifth observation, that manufactures, though greatly beneficial to the community, really produce no revenue, that is, no actual augmentation or renovation of wealth, it consequently follows, that no public supply can be drawn from them. There is not, therefore, the smallest necessity for further enlarging on this point, as what is before said is a sufficient explanation of it.

I shall proceed to consider another fundamental error of Mr. Young, which pervades the whole of his performance. He has, like Dr. Adam Smith, never once considered the political nature of rent paid by a cultivator for leave to cultivate the ground,

ground. With him the rent of land is something sacred, indefeasibly appropriated to the landlords, who have a right to increase it as much as possible, and to dispose of it as they please. It is no burden upon the cultivators, that is, upon the community at large; for the cultivators, he says, in this country, feel very little the burden of taxation, which he attempts to prove by several cursory observations on the excises, customs, window-lights, poor rates, and other taxes, totally overlooking the payment of rent, that is, the payment of six shillings and eight pence in the pound, or even but five shillings in the pound, by the farmer, of all his earnings and profits. Sentiments somewhat similar I remember to have read several years ago, apologising for the conduct of some land owners in the Highlands of Scotland, who stating that they had a right to do as they pleased with their own, upon that principle raised their rents exorbitantly, and thereby compelled their tenants to emigrate to America. The tenants practically replied to this false principle of their unfeeling landlords, by shewing them that they had a right to inhabit where they pleased. Now, according to the principle of the Economists, every man in a state ought to have some occupation; and the rents of lands being a surplus income falling into the lap of the land owners, without their contributing to the production of that surplus, and tending to enhance the price of things one-third or one-fourth, reason requires that the land owners should do something for the community in return for the privilege of having this surplus secured

to them by the community. The words of Cicero to this purpose are very apposite, ‘ Major hereditas
 ‘ venit unicuique vestrum in iisdem bonis a jure &
 ‘ a legibus, quam ab iis, a quibus illa ipsa bona
 ‘ relicta sunt;’ that is, You are not so much indebted to your rich father or rich grand-father for the great landed income you possess, as to the laws and government which protect you in the possession of that income. Government having thus a natural claim upon those whom it protects in the enjoyment of great incomes, to the production of which they contribute no labour of their own, has a right to ask for a part of this surplus for the defence of the state, as being the only disposable revenue in the state. For the cultivator, it is evident, cannot both fight and at the same time provide subsistence for the community; the fisherman when fishing cannot be fighting; the manufacturer, if any thing be taken from his wages, must either starve or raise his wages, which last tends to load commodities with an artificial value. The state, however, must be defended; and thus, by placing the defence upon the surplus revenue, every landlord in the kingdom becomes politically as much a tenant to the state, as any of his farmers is a tenant to him.

Another very capital error which Mr. Young endeavours to establish is, that an equal land tax raised in proportion to the value of the rents, would be a most pernicious system. His short argument in support of this error is, that the improver would thereby be taxed according to his improvements. Now if we examine this herculean

argu-

argument, printed by him in capital letters, we shall find that it is wholly unsubstantial, and that Mr. Young himself will assist us in refuting his own false doctrine. In the first place, his conclusion does not follow from his premises; for a real four shillings in the pound, though not now paid, may be demanded from lands that have received no improvement for these hundred years. But waving this oversight, the Economist affirms, that the argument of Mr. Young against a valuation of the land tax according to the real amount of the rents, is the strongest argument in favour of such a valuation. When does a creditor most naturally look for the payment of a debt, but when his debtor is in cash? When ought government so properly to ask more of a landlord, as when that landlord asks more of his tenant? Does not a landlord who raises his rent upon a new lease, tax the improver according to his improvement? Does he not, in effect, argue to the following purpose with his farmer—Your farm twenty years ago was worth only 50*l.* a year, but in consequence of your good management it is now worth 70*l.* a year; therefore I shall require that rent from you during the present lease. Every one will readily acknowledge that within this half-century the rents of lands are risen very considerably over the whole island. What can this rise be owing to but to real improvement, or the presumption of future improvement. If upon the presumption of future improvement, which I am afraid is too often the case, then the improver is not taxed in proportion to the improvement he

has

has made; which is just and equitable, because the property is really become more valuable; but according to an improvement *in futuro*, which may never take place at all, consequently he may be forced to pay a new taxation without any new fund to support that taxation. But hear what may be concluded from Mr. Young himself. From his information, the rents in Norfolk are now four times higher than they were forty years ago, and the tenants in that county are in a very thriving state. It may be presumed, that this fourfold rise of rent in Norfolk is founded upon improvement of some kind or other; for to found it upon no improvement would not be just and equitable. If, then, improvement has enabled the land owners in Norfolk to quadruple their rents within the space of forty years, and at the same time to enrich their tenants, it plainly follows, that to tax the improver in proportion to his improvements, has not been a pernicious system in the county of Norfolk, and therefore would not be a pernicious system if extended to the whole kingdom. Government, it must ever be kept in mind, in requiring a land tax in proportion to the real value of the rents, is only the secondary taxer; for the land owner precedes in raising his rent according to the improvements made by his tenant; if, therefore, the land owner, who is the primary taxer, has acted equitably and judiciously in demanding a higher rent, in consequence of a real improvement of the soil, government cannot act wrong in demanding the usual proportion upon that new rent.—That is to say, *An equal land*

land tax, raised in proportion to the real value of the rents, is a just and truly politic system.

A fourth erroneous doctrine, fondly embraced by Mr. Young, is the importance of high price to the prosperity of agriculture, and even to the prosperity of the nation. But this doctrine, inculcated by him in a variety of places, he leaves unsupported by any solid argument. It is, indeed, an excellent doctrine for those who could possess an exclusive monopoly of selling, and were never to be buyers; but as no class of men in a community, nor indeed any nation upon earth, can possess such a monopoly; and as all buyers run naturally to the cheap market, it is the height of political imprudence in a nation wishing to extend its foreign commerce, to give an artificial rise to prices by a needless augmentation of their pecuniary value. Will a bushel of wheat feed more people when sold for ten shillings than when sold for half-a-crown? Will a pound of gunpowder send a ball farther if sold for five shillings instead of one shilling? Similar questions may be extended to the whole circle of commerce, both internal and external, which would plainly prove that high price is not favourable to the extension either of manufacture or of agriculture.

Already it is affirmed that high price has deprived us of one branch of manufacture, the printing of English books for foreign sale, such books being now printed in France for the American market; and if high price be in like manner annexed to the productions of the plough, we shall thereby affur-

edly be deprived of the profitable trade of the exportation of corn.

Were we to have no connection at all with foreign nations, high price or low price in all our internal dealings, supposing those prices fixed and stable, would not affect our national prosperity, as the price of the subsistence of the labourer would still regulate all other prices. In the one case, high price would permanently meet high price, as in the other, low price would permanently meet low price. But while that class in society, from whom the revenue originates, are from year to year pushing the nominal value of that revenue higher and higher, the balance between sellers and buyers is kept in perpetual uncertainty, and the peaceful order of society is thereby greatly disturbed. Those whose yearly salaries were adequate to their yearly wants, find that they have only a full supply for nine months; and those whose weekly wages were adequate to seven days supply, find that they have only a full subsistence for four days, and to make them hold out, they must go upon short allowance during the whole week. As this augmentation of the nominal value of the produce of land consequently augments the nominal value of every thing else, the result is, that the landed gentleman is not thereby enriched, nor are sellers in general enriched by it, since what they gain as sellers, they precisely expend in quality of buyers. Thus George Faulkener having occasion to expend but little, probably gained as much by his Dublin Journal when sold for

for a farthing, as many of those who in London now sell their newspaper for eighteen farthings; and he furnished for his farthing as many advertisements and as much news as they do for their eighteen farthings.

Another instance of the unavailing power of high price to make rich, may be gathered from what was lately declared in the House of Commons by Mr. Whitbread. Mr. Young, in his Political Arithmetic, gave it as a sign of national prosperity, that the land rents of Norfolk had within forty years increased four-fold, not distinguishing what was nominal and what was real in that increase, and now by Mr. Whitbread we are informed, that the Norfolk Barley, though not of a very good kind, is so extravagantly dear, that brewers can hardly afford to purchase it; that barley in general is so high priced, that they have been obliged to brew porter of an inferior quality, and are doubtful whether they shall be able to continue the trade.

The trade, however, might be continued without loss to the brewer, were the price of porter and other malt liquor to be doubled, were salaries and wages to be doubled, and the price of home manufactures to be doubled. But in what respect would the nation be a gainer by these new nominal values, taking into view either its connection with foreign states, or considering it independantly of any relation to those states. In the former case it would infallibly oblige our foreign customers to leave off trading with us; and in the latter, supposing us not to be in need of foreign trade, it would only

make us pay with shillings what we now pay with sixpences.

There are few people, I believe, that would not confess that this duplication of prices, instead of being beneficial to the nation, would not be extremely prejudicial to it. Nevertheless, from the prevalence of a false principle in regard to taxation and the national utility of high price, we are most improvidently hastening towards it, by raising year after year, without necessity, the prices of the necessaries of life, and, as a corrective to that malady, forming plans for raising proportionally the rate of wages and the hire of labourers. True policy would rather recommend to keep wages and the hire of labourers steadily at their present rate, or at the rates at which they were forty years ago, and at the same time to use such means as to bring the necessary articles of living to correspond to those rates. If such had been our policy, national abundance with us would have been greater and more general, and volumes of laborious and patriotic disquisitions about meliorating the present state of labourers would have been rendered altogether unnecessary.

In a well-governed state, the price of labour may remain nearly unalterable for many centuries; and in the East Indies, before European modes of taxation were there introduced, the prices of things, it may be presumed, had remained nearly stationary for 2000 years. What more can the successive generations of men require, during their temporary life here, than to have fulness of bread; and, sup-

posing

posing the population of one age equal to that of another, the fertility and cultivation of the ground the same, and the medium of circulation not augmented or diminished, each succeeding race of men may have that fulness of bread in the same degree as the preceding, and at the same price.

Were the permanent augmentation of the quantity of gold and silver to be alleged as a reason for the rise in the prices of things, it will on that ground perhaps be found, that prices ought to be very little higher now than they were an hundred years ago; for supposing the quantity of specie to be doubled in this island since the revolution, which may justly be doubted, that ought not to double the prices; for if population in that time be increased, suppose in the proportion of two to three, fifteen millions of coin would not now be a greater abundance of money than ten millions were at the revolution; consequently, if the quantity of circulating money was at the revolution ten millions, the nation ought now to possess considerably more than thirty millions in specie, to occasion the prices of things to be twice as high as they were then; for, since the revolution, the great improvements in the cultivation of the lands of the kingdom would otherwise have lowered prices, instead of raising them.

Though the real augmentation of the quantity of gold and silver affords no ground for the rise of prices, yet the most extravagant augmentation of the expletive medium of circulation called paper-money (often the representative of nothing) has

contributed to overspread the land with high price in every direction, all ranks being now reciprocally complainers or complained of. As the great augmentation of this imaginary wealth has been a principal cause of introducing this epidemical malady into the kingdom, the true remedy for the illness will be found in removing that cause of it; namely, in suppressing this inefficient wealth, and studying without delay to augment the substantial wealth of the country by means of the plough. To the disgrace of our policy, it may lately have been said of us, *Nummis Chartaceis locuples eget panis Britannorum gens*; Britons, though wanting bread, abound in paper riches. The legislature that will sedulously endeavour to increase the physical wealth of the country, by encouraging the cultivation of its lands, may, without hesitation, say to every one of the coiners of imaginary money, *Tolle tuas precor imagines et cum tota farragine migra*; take yourself and your imaginary riches out of the country: it is substantial riches that are wanted; and this our lands will furnish us abundantly and cheaply, if you will but withdraw your interference. So far, however, from withdrawing their interference, they have lately most insidiously preached up the necessity of augmenting the present medium of circulation, and a newly-established bank in Norfolk-street upon that principle offers its services to the public. If a spirit of re-action do not occupy the country gentlemen, there is no knowing how far the mischief may lead. They, however, have a good precedent and example in the gentlemen

men of Brecknockshire; who, four or five years ago, in a county meeting, came to the resolution of not accepting in payments any notes of country banks. This example ought to be followed by every land owner in Great Britain; and the moment that peace returns, the land proprietors throughout the kingdom ought to declare to their tenants, that, except when the rent is to be paid in kind, they will not receive in payment of it any thing but gold and silver.

But it is not only necessary to abolish, or nearly to abolish*, this artificial wealth, which, by heightening all prices, tends actually to impoverish the state, and consequently to weaken government, it is also necessary, without delay, to augment the substantial wealth of the nation, and thereby to bring the prices of necessaries to correspond to the existing rate of wages. At present, and for many years back, the attention to augment the nominal wealth of the nation, seems to have greatly exceeded the attention to augment the substantial and physical wealth of the nation. A little, at a high price, has most impolitically been preferred to much at a low price. Now the very object of true policy is, to have the substantial and physical wealth permanently abundant, because, in proportion as that wealth is abundant or scanty, so will be the natural strength or weakness of a state.

The abundance of physical wealth, and the rate

* I say nearly to abolish; for there is, I think, a possibility of instituting country banks so as not to be prejudicial to the nation.

or market value of that wealth, ought ever to be considered distinctly. If the land proprietor, from whom this wealth originates, and the statesman will consider these two things separately, they will both readily acknowledge that the former ought to be the first object of pursuit, as much as abundance of water ought to be a first object of pursuit to the proprietor of a water-mill. This physical wealth, whatever be its rate, is the power that regulates the whole of the industry of society. It cannot effect more by being rated high, nor will it effect less by being rated low; but if its quantity be increased, the power thence arising will be proportionally increased.

A garrison, supplied with 20,000 sacks of flour, may be expected to hold out a siege twice as long as if it were supplied with only 10,000 sacks of flour; but it would be justly deemed a most absurd and extravagant idea to think of strengthening the garrison, not by supplying it with 20,000 sacks of flour, but by doubling the price of the 10,000 sacks. If it be wise and prudent to strengthen a garrison, not by increasing the price of the supply which it possesses, but by increasing the quantity of that supply, it will be no less wise and prudent to strengthen a nation in the same manner; that is, not by increasing the price of the substantial wealth, which it produces, but by increasing the quantity of that wealth*.

There

* Presuming that it will not be unacceptable to my learned readers, I shall here remark, that Longinus, not being an
Econo-

There is not, at present, a complaint more general among all classes of men than that there is hardly any living, because all things are become so extravagantly dear. There is, however, a possibility that all things might become extremely plentiful, and consequently extremely cheap, and the system of the Economists leads to that. A common complaint, even among the rich, is, that the keeping of a horse is at present extremely expensive, oats and fodder are become so immoderately dear. Now the fact is, that the keep of a horse is in reality not dearer at present than it was 500 years ago; nay, perhaps is even cheaper; for 500 years ago it might have required the produce of three acres, but, from the improvements in agriculture, the produce of two acres may perhaps now suffice. In like manner, the maintenance of a regiment of soldiers is probably not more in reality

Economist, has, in sect. 29 of his Essay on the Sublime, misunderstood Plato, and censured him improperly. After having praised the rhetorical figure of circumlocution, and observed that in the use of it Plato was *divus*, or very eminent, he says he was accused by some of using it sometimes very improperly, as in the following expression, In a state, no gold wealth or silver wealth ought to be admitted. The mockers, who thought the word wealth might have sufficed, alleged, that he might just as well, in prohibiting cattle to be purchased, have said, *No sheep wealth, and no oxen wealth.* Plato's circumlocution, however, is here most apposite and emphatic. He placed the riches of a state in something else than gold and silver; and though he banished them from his common-wealth, he by no means excluded the physical wealth flowing from agriculture; and therefore he particularly distinguishes the kind of wealth which he would have to be excluded.

now than it was 150 years ago, but the parliamentary estimates, and exceedings of estimates, prove that the pecuniary expence of present days is far beyond what it was 150 years ago; that government accomplishes not so much with 20 millions as it formerly did with 5 millions, and that it is now actually experiencing the impotence of pecuniary wealth.

Other political writers, besides Mr. Young, have been deluded by the notion of the great importance of high price. The following false computation of Davenant has been repeated, with eulogiums, by subsequent writers. ‘In the year 1600,’ says Davenant, ‘the whole rental of England did not exceed 6 millions, and the price of land was 12 years purchase; in 1688 the rental was 14 millions, and the price of land 18 years purchase, so that within this period, the land rose from 72, to 252 millions.’ A modern author, by the same way of computing, reckoned the value of the lands of England a few years ago at 700 millions, that is, according to him, the lands of England are near ten times as valuable now as they were in the end of Queen Elizabeth’s reign. This the Economist affirms to be a most gross miscalculation, similar to that of doubling the price of the supply of a garrison, instead of doubling the supply; for, in the time of Elizabeth, England fed and clothed 4 millions of people; and at the present day can hardly feed and clothe 8 millions of people; consequently the real rise of value of its lands is barely double. But, if instead of multiplying money, and thereby needlessly raising prices, we had been studious for these 200 years past to have

multiplied substantial and physical wealth by an unremitting encouragement of agriculture, the lands of England at this moment might perhaps have been near four times as valuable as in the time of Elizabeth, that is, they might now be feeding and clothing 15 or 16 millions of inhabitants.

Mr. Young's ill-grounded fondness for high price leads him to undervalue or decry low price or cheapness, without, however, explaining by any kind of illustration, the prejudice that low price would bring upon a community. He makes assertion supply the place of argument, and says, p. 82, ' Cheapness of provisions is such an encourager of idleness; that no manufactures can stand under it.' Now, so far from this assertion being consistent with fact, cheapness of provisions is the very thing that enterprising master manufacturers above all things wish for. It is the load-stone that draws manufactures to itself. It has drawn the woollen manufactures even away from the woollen counties into the North; it has removed the gauze manufacture from London to Paisley; and the blanket manufacture from London to Dundee. What cheapness of provisions is in some places, cheapness of coals is to Bristol, Newcastle, Birmingham, and Carron. Were coals to be as dear in those places, as in some parts of the kingdom, can it be doubted but their glass works and iron works would quickly decline. Were a manufacturer of Birmingham to be asked whether he would wish coals and provisions to be dear there, he would probably answer by the following question: Sir, would you wish to ruin our town?

The

The same that cheapness or low price effects within the island, it effects throughout the whole commercial world. What turned the channel of the sugar trade from the British to the French Colonists, but because these last sold for 50 livres, what the British Colonists asked 50 shillings for. What else but cheapness brings rice and sugar to Britain from the East Indies, by a voyage of near 10,000 miles? What has brought American wheat, produced 300 miles from the sea, to Europe, but its cheapness? What but cheapness brings Russian iron to Britain, loaded with an inland carriage of 1000 miles? With these, and twenty other examples of the same kind before our eyes, shall we expect to invite foreign customers by high prices? We wish greatly to extend our foreign commerce, and at the same time we have many commercial rivals. Now internal high price has actually the effect of a bounty bestowed by us on those foreign rivals against ourselves. By our high prices we thus in effect say to the Swedes, We shall promote the sale of your herrings in foreign markets, in preference to our own, by keeping our own herrings 3 shillings a barrel dearer than yours.

In all things, a medium is best; therefore I doubt not but the following observation, made 100 years ago by the judicious Mr. Cary, of Bristol, will meet with approbation. ‘The price of wheat,’ he says, ‘arises from the price of land; and the price of labour from the price of provisions; you cannot fall wages unless you fall product; but no good in running it down too low.’ Supposing that at present we have raised a barrier against many foreign customers,

customers, by our high prices, which they find 5 or 6 per cent higher than those of our commercial rivals, it would be no detriment to the nation to remove that obstacle, not only by lowering our prices that 5 or 6 per cent, which would bring them to a par with those of our commercial rivals, but to lower them likewise 5 or 6 per cent even below that par. This would still be consistent with Mr. Cary's rule, and would give to foreigners a most decided preference to the British market. Mr. Young sees nothing but national perdition in lowering of prices; but from his own reasoning on the subject of the price of wheat it may be concluded, that previous to the late scarcity, that price was in effect one third lower than in the end of the last century. And since the invention of spinning mills, the price of cotton goods is fallen 50 per cent. As neither of these circumstances has brought any inconvenience upon the public, it may be presumed that the extension of the same system to other articles would not be accompanied with any detriment to the community. The encouragement of agriculture, and the inducement to reproduction, is not high price, but great consumption, which arises from general industry; for with high price, there may be little consumption and great want.

Those who measure the value of things by high price, are but too much inclined to run in search of that high price, in preference to the promoting of physical abundance, which is the very prop of society. Because in Covent-Garden-market green figs are about 40 times dearer than they are at Na-
ples,

pies, would it be just from thence to conclude, that London is 40 times richer in that article than Naples. Those who make high price the standard of national opulence, naturally drop into such an erroneous conclusion, and, by their way of reckoning, an acre of garden-ground in the north parts of Scotland is twice as valuable as in the neighbourhood of London ; for by the statistical state of Scotland, it appears, that in the north some garden-ground is rented at the rate of 8*l.* per acre. This rent, however, is more likely to be the standard of the oppression of that part of the country, than of its prosperity ; for it may well be presumed that an acre of garden-ground in the vicinity of London, rented at no more than 4*l.* would yield a greater quantity of produce than could be procured from an acre of garden-ground in the north. A great part of the enormity of this oppressive rent would be done away, if, according to the natural system of taxation for government supply, one fifth, or one sixth of it, were appropriated to the defence of the state, as those that are now heavily taxed by that high rent, would then be relieved from other taxes.

I shall conclude this point, at present, with the following remark. Mr. Young says, p. 245, That high price enables landlords to raise their rents, and thereby to reimburse themselves for their taxes. But it may be asked of Mr. Young, why should landlords be reimbursed their taxes, any more than their tenants are reimbursed the 33 per cent, or the 25 per cent, which they pay to them for leave to cultivate the ground. The indemnification of every man
for

for the taxes paid by him, is internal peace and external defence. Can any man reasonably expect to enjoy those two great blessings for nothing?

Another of Mr. Young's erroneous doctrines, or rather ignorant positions, which I shall now proceed to examine, is the following; that taxes on consumption ought to have the preference to other taxes, for this most superficial reason (alleged also, as we have seen before, by Montesquieu), 'That they are paid by the consumers.' There he and Montesquieu rest, having satisfied themselves, that they have explained the nature of taxes on consumption. The consumers pay them. Neither he nor Montesquieu condescend to inform their readers what it is that enables the consumer to be a consumer, though upon that very point rests the distinct explanation of the whole of the expenditure of the kingdom. What should we think of a guide to the castle of truth, who should say to the enquiring traveller, this road leads directly to it through that dark and pathless wood. When you enter the wood, you must find your way to the castle in the best manner you can. Exactly such guides are Montesquieu and Mr. Young. They cease giving information precisely where it is most wanted. Who doubts, that taxes upon consumption are in the first instance paid by the consumer; but does that lead to any final political result in regard to the real fund for such taxes? Not in the smallest degree. When a school-boy purchases a folding knife, or a cricket bat, he is certainly the consumer in the first instance. The Economist, however, not only asks who furnished him with money

ney to be a consumer ; but who furnished the money to the person who supplied the school-boy, and who furnished the money to that third person, and who to the fourth, the fifth, the sixth person, &c. and by such a reiterated investigation, he will in the end trace the money to the sale of some of the agricultural produce of the earth. And he defies Mr. Young, or any other person, to draw the money disbursed by the school-boy from any other fund, besides that fund (the mines of the precious metals alone excepted), a fund which was not in existence last year, that will perhaps be wholly consumed this year, but will be reproduced next year, by the fertility of the soil, in conjunction with the labours of the cultivator. In like manner, it will be found, that the money disbursed by the blacksmith, the mason, the carpenter, and every other artisan, as consumers, may be traced to the same fund ; and if in consequence of taxes on consumption, that money is twice as much as it otherwise would have been, that twice as much will occasion the original fund to be rated double in commercial value ; but will not increase the fund.

Were a modern financier to say to a carpenter, your wages of two shillings a day allows you to be a consumer ; I mean, therefore, by laying taxes on consumption, to draw four-pence or six-pence a day from you, the carpenter might very justly reply, You will in that be much deceived ; for when I find articles of consumption taxed, I and all my fellow workmen will insist upon half-a-crown a day as wages ; and that new demand will be most reasonable, for when we

had

had two shillings a day, we had not, at the end of the year, one shilling of surplus, neither shall we have more, out of our half crown. The whole body of artificers throughout the kingdom is represented by that carpenter, as are all others who give their labour for wages; for those wages in a populous country actually measure themselves by the daily or annual subsistence of the receivers, without any regard to the pecuniary value of that subsistence.

Were Mr. Young upon his idea, that there is no need of enquiring what enables the consumers to become consumers, to propose to the French loyalists, now refugees in England, to become greater consumers, in order that government might be more benefited by them, they might, perhaps, reply in the following manner. Alas, Sir, it is not in our power to be greater consumers; the blood-thirsty tyrants at Paris have treated us as Hercules treated the giant Antæus; they have removed us from our Parent Earth; and instead of being consumers, we are ready to perish. Let us but touch again our Mother Earth, and we shall revive, and become consumers. There is no other means but that.

In order to avoid needlessly enlarging my present discourse, I shall omit taking notice of several of Mr. Young's smaller errors, the mere offspring of his false principles in essential points, and I shall conclude my remarks upon his Political Arithmetic with exposing the futility of what he deems the unsurmountable objection to the *single tribute* or single tax proposed by the Eco-

nomists. Like Mr. Necker, he falls into the blind
 mistake of making the general amount of the pre-
 sent taxes the standard or measure of the sum total
 to be required by government, if all the taxes were
 to be consolidated into a single land tax. . . . Because
 the taxes at present raised by Government, added to
 the annual loans, required during a war, exceed the
 amount of the land rents of Great Britain, he con-
 cludes, the single tribute proposed by the Econo-
 mists would absorb the whole of those rents, and not
 leave one farthing of income to the land proprie-
 tors, nay, would even occasion an annual deficit to
 government. Mr. Necker is more moderate in his
 computation; and upon a comparison of the income
 of the land rents of France with the amount of its
 taxes, concludes, that the single tribute would run
 away with only 17 shillings in the pound of the rents.
 But neither of these authors advert to circumstances
 which totally overturn their conclusions. The single
 tribute of the Economists arising from the surplus
 produce of the soil has nothing at all to do with the
 amount of modern taxes, become cumbersome by
 artificial price, accumulated upon artificial price, in
 consequence of a Public Debt of near 400
 millions, which, according to the system of the
 Economists, would not at this moment have had any
 existence. The question with Mr. Necker and Mr.
 Young ought to have been, Will four shillings in
 the pound of the rents of land suffice for the de-
 fence of the state in all presumable emergencies;
 and for Great Britain, at least, the following com-
 putation, I think, will shew, that the answer may
be

be in the affirmative, and will prove not only the great moderation, but the great efficacy of this tax. The rent of the land owners I shall state at only 1-4th of the general produce; and four shillings in the pound of that rent demanded by Government, is one 1-5th of it. Now 1-5th of 1-4th is equal to one 1-20th; that is, a land tax of four shillings in the pound would be equivalent to one shilling in the pound of the whole national income. In Great Britain are reckoned 72 millions of acres, and upwards. Now, of those 72 millions of acres, suppose 16 millions to be of little or no value, and that 16 millions more are required for horses, this will leave 40 millions for the sustenance of man. Of those 40 millions of productive acres, one twentieth, or two millions of acres are demanded by government for defence. This government share, therefore, allowing eight acres for the sustenance of one man, would enable Great Britain to maintain 250,000 men. But it may be said that a war establishment would require more than 250,000 men. I allow it. But would not a peace establishment require much fewer; therefore joining the two together, and taking the average, that average would be found not to exceed a land tax of four shillings in the pound; nay, would probably not exceed three shillings in the pound.

The following computation, I think, will prove, that if since the revolution a true assessment of the land tax had taken place, and a real four shillings in the pound had been raised on the rents of land in Great Britain, we should, previous to the commencement of the present war, have been entirely free from

any national debt. From Sir John Sinclair's valuable History of the Publick Revenue, part 2d. page 63, it appears that the national debt, on the 31st of December, 1701, was 16,394,702 pounds, that is about eleven years after the system of borrowing began. But supposing the land tax, from its first establishment, to have been not a nominal but a real four shillings in the pound, and consequently to have amounted to one million a year more than it actually produced, this new national debt would thereby have been diminished eleven millions, and would have been, in December, 1701, only 5,394,702l. The war of the succession, in Queen Anne's time, occasioned a further augmentation of the publick debt, which is stated in the above mentioned history at 54,145,363l. on the 31st of December, 1714, but from this must be deducted, first, the preceding eleven millions, and secondly, thirteen millions more, which the land tax, at a real four shillings, would have produced from 1701 to 1714. These deductions, then, would have left the publick debt, at Queen Anne's death, at no more than 30,145,363l. Soon after the death of King George I. that is, in 1727, the national debt, by the same historian, is stated at 52,092,235l. but from the preceding observations, from this sum of 52,092,235l. the 24 millions before paid off are to be deducted, and likewise a million per annum, for 14 years, furnished by the land tax at a real four shillings in the pound, consequently in December, 1727, the amount of the national debt would have been only 14,092,235l. Twelve years afterwards, when the Spanish war broke

out

out in 1739, the national debt is stated at 46,954,623*l.* but the reductions in the preceding periods would have taken from this debt 38 millions, and reduced it to 8,954,623*l.* while in the same period, the annual million arising from the land tax at a real four shillings would have given a supply of 12 millions, which would have extinguished the whole debt, and left above the sum of 3 millions as a surplus in the Exchequer. By the same computation, the national debt in December, 1790, which is stated at 247,833,236*l.* would have been really only 170,719,685*l.* This, it may be said, is far short of a complete extinction of the national debt in 1790. But the following considerations will serve to prove, that on this point the means would have been adequate to the end. Mr. Briscoe, who exactly 100 years ago published several judicious remarks upon the new funds, proves by arithmetical tables, that for the loans of 1,000,000*l.* in 1692, and 1,200,000*l.* in 1693, Government actually bound itself to pay back 32 millions. Now, if the land tax had produced one million more each of those years, those two loans would not have taken place, and 32 millions of the national debt would have been thus prevented. Again, I have taken the land tax at a real four shillings, as producing only one million more than it now produces; but for these last fifty years it might justly have been taken as producing annually two additional millions; consequently, these additional fifty millions, joined to the annual savings upon the interest operating at compound interest, which I have not reckoned upon, would have done

much more than liquidate the above 170,719,685*l.* of national debt.

Should the heavy expences of a war oblige government in future to have recourse to a loan, that loan, like those in King William's time, would be inconsiderable, and whatever debt was contracted during the war, it is plain from the preceding reasoning ought in time of peace to be liquidated by the land tax, by keeping that tax at such a rate above the peace establishment, as might afford a considerable annual reimbursement, till the whole new debt were paid off. This the land owners would find the cheapest expedient for themselves; for by avoiding the repetition of taxes on consumption, they would avoid the artificial price, thereby added to commodities, a heavier burden upon them than a direct land tax.

Having thus established, by reasoning which appears to me conclusive, the fundamental principle, That the primary and essential source of the Wealth of a Nation is the produce of its soil procured by the labour of the husbandman; and having also illustrated the consequence arising from that principle, That the supply for the defence of the state ought naturally to be drawn from the surplus of that produce, as being the only disposable revenue in the community, I shall now, for the further satisfaction of my readers, proceed to confirm what I have said relative to the national supply by an appeal to facts.

The system of the Economists, as appears from the preceding pages, tends to sweep away the whole of the taxes enumerated in Kearsley's Tax Tables, to
abolish

abolish all Excises, all Stamps, in short, to extinguish all taxes but the Land Tax and the Customs, nay, even if possible not to spare the Customs. To this, some who make modern usages the measure of possibilities, will be apt to object as a new and unheard of theory, which no practice could ever realize. No; the Economist replies, so far from being a new theory, it is only a revival of the system of ancient days, with all the improvements that modern times render that system susceptible of. The French writers who have treated of this subject, have not done justice to it, in considering it as the new discovery of modern times. It is no more a new discovery than the discovery of Copernicus, in regard to the planetary system, which was known to the Pythagoreans two thousand years before. The doctrine of the Economists may now have been explained more fully than heretofore; yet imperfectly as it might have been formerly understood, it was, nevertheless, the rule of practice not only of this nation, but of many other civilized nations of Europe and Asia.

The system of the Economists, I have said, leads to sweep away the whole of the taxes enumerated in Kearley's Tax Tables, and to abolish the Excises and Stamps. Now, I would ask my readers, if any of those taxes were known to Queen Elizabeth. Did either the Excises or Stamps then exist; and yet that Queen during her long reign shewed no small vigour both in defence and offence. Let the military efforts, exerted by Queen Elizabeth, at the head of 4 millions of subjects, with Scotland and Ireland so far from aiding her, hanging as heavy bur-

depends upon her, and without any West Indian or East Indian resources, be compared with the military efforts of Great Britain and Ireland during the present war, enjoying both West Indian and East Indian resources, and a population exceeding 13 millions of people, and it will be hard to decide, whether the former were any way inferior to the latter, in proportion to their respective funds, and the duration of the efforts. The foreign enemy of Queen Elizabeth was among the most formidable powers in Europe ; but so far were the people of England then from being panic struck with the Grand Armada, they encountered it with an undaunted spirit at sea, and prepared with an equal spirit to encounter it at land. The English nobility and gentry came forward both with their purses and persons, on the principle, that their own safety and the safety of the state were inseparable *. So far was her revenue from

* I cannot here omit taking notice of the nobleness of spirit of Lord Romney, who in the House of Lords, on the 27th of last March, proposed, instead of a Public Loan, to support government by a general subscription, to which he offered to contribute 5000*l*. In Ireland, likewise, we lately have instances of an equal public spirit. On the debate on a loan for this year in the House of Commons of that kingdom, Mr. Bagwell said, that rather than agree to a loan, he would give for the support of government the fourth of what he was worth, as long as the state should need it. Mr. Brown, another member likewise opposing the loan, said, that he would not lend, but give to government a sum without debenture, without treasury bill, or any other security. These gentlemen, whether from the knowledge of the true principle of supply, or from a momentary and very laudable zeal, have precisely hit the right nail on the head. There needs nothing more to prevent all future public loans, but that

from being exhausted by her perpetual struggles for forty years, that her treasury frequently overflowed, and she even declined accepting subsidies that were offered to her by Parliament. Upon enquiring into the chief sources of that revenue, we find that they consisted in the monied value of the produce of the soil, paid either by the direct tenants of the Crown, or by the land owners, in Parliamentary subsidies or feudal services. No Excises, no Stamps, nor any of the taxes enumerated by Kearsley, made part of that revenue. The possibility of defending the kingdom in great emergencies, by means of a land tax, without any of those taxes, and without burdensome loans, must therefore be admitted.

The Saxons, it appears from the History of England, by their *trinoda necessitas*, or three-fold obligation, laid the charge of defending the state on the possessors of land. It was a fundamental law among them, that all the lands of the kingdom, even those that were held by ecclesiastics and women were subject to three public duties, the building and repairing of forts and castles, the building and repairing of bridges, and the military expedition, which three duties, or *trinoda necessitas nulli unquam relaxari potest*, can be forgiven to no man.

From the constitution established by William the Conqueror, which in its fundamentals remained unaltered till the 12th year of Charles the Second's reign, that every proprietor of land in Great Britain and Ireland should adopt the spirit of Lord Romney, of Mr. Bagwell, and of Mr. Brown, and act accordingly. When the land proprietors shall connect themselves more with government, and government shall disconnect itself more from the money lenders, the athletic vigour of the nation will increase, and all apprehension of a financial convulsion will vanish.

the

the defence of the kingdom was placed wholly upon the revenue of land, exclusive of the trifling supply which the Customs yielded. But was England then in a state of weakness, because it had no Excises, no Stamps, nor any of that variety of taxes mentioned in Kearley's Tables. Far otherwise. The constitutional defence of England was then very great, and its King one of the richest and most powerful Monarchs in Europe. A contemporary author mentions, that the daily receipt of his Exchequer exceeded 1000l. sterling of that age, or above 3000l. of the present money*. Another author, ancestor of the present Earl Fortescue, and contemporary with Edward the Fourth, speaking of the revenues of that King after he had made a resumption of the Crown lands that had been fraudulently alienated, says, 'The King our sovereyng Lord had by tymes sithing he reigned upon us live-loode in Lordshippis lands, tenements, and rents, nere hand to the value of the fifth part of his realm, above the possessions of the chirche.' What, then, should hinder Great Britain from being rich and powerful, were it now to abolish all the present chaos of taxes, and revert to the same source of supply, which formerly sufficed for all its exigencies, and which probably in those times, from the unimproved state of the lands, was a source not half so abundant as it would now prove. By the constitution of England established at the conquest, which remained its constitution, till it was most impolitically overturned in the 12th year of

* See the Hist. of the Pub. Rev. of the Brit. Empire, vol. I. p. 44, 45.

Charles the 2d. by the act for the abolition of tenures, every possessor of lands was bound to give a regulated part of his income for the defence of the state; and if he neglected to give that regulated part, he in consequence forfeited his lands. Baron Gilbert, in his treatise on the Exchequer, says, in conformity to many authorities, ‘Whoever held lands by Knights service, and failed coming to attend the King in arms, according to the array that was made on every expedition, or failed to render his quota of men according to his tenure, his lands were originally liable to be seized into the King’s hands for not doing his duty.’ The possession of land, and the duty were inseparably connected together; and notwithstanding the duty, which sometimes exceeded four shillings and five shillings in the pound, the grant of the land was called *Beneficium*, or a Kindness.

It is then most evident that this single tribute or single land-tax did not appear an absurd thing either to the Anglo-saxon monarchs, or to those who immediately succeeded them, since they placed the whole of the defence of the kingdom upon it. The feudal system, which confirmed that mode of taxation, was in its very nature a system of union, calling upon all land possessors, wherever situated within the dominions of the Sovereign, to assist him in defending the state in proportion to the landed property they possessed. Thus Henry the 2d, when he obtained possession of Ireland, firmly and irrevocably united that island to England by the fiefs and benefices which he there established, *holding of the Crown*
of

of England *. That is to say, he conferred the same rights and the same privileges upon his new subjects in Ireland as those of England possessed, and precisely the same burdens, likewise, upon the land owners of both countries. The taxes placed by the feudal system upon the produce of land were precisely the same in both islands, and the tenants in capite, whose lands lay in Ireland, were bound by their tenures to give their fixed supplies to the Crown of England. In point of taxation, there was not one law for the land possessors in England, and another for those of Ireland, but both paid proportionably upon the same scale †. This

* The grants of lands in Ireland by the successors of Henry II. were held by the same tenure. The Butlers received the county of Ormond from Edward III. *as a fief of the Crown of England*. Fitz Eustace received the Barony of Castle-martin, in the county of Kildare, from Edward IV. *as a fief of the Crown of England*. Donald M'Arty More, in 1565, accepted of his lands from Queen Elizabeth, to hold them *as a fief of England*. Queen Elizabeth also gave to Sur le Boy, four estates in the county of Antrim, with the castle of Dunluce, as a fief of the Kings of England, &c. &c. See Sir John Davis.

† The subject of the American dispute always appeared to me to be most completely misunderstood by both parties in Great Britain, as well as by the revolters in America, from the true principle of government supply being misunderstood or gone into oblivion. Had that principle been known and attended to by those who drew up the Colony Charters, a permanent connection might have been formed between the mother country and the colonies, profitable yet unvexatious to both. About the commencement of the dispute, it was recommended to Lord North, as a means of restoring quiet and contentment, and as a permanent bond of union between the mother country and the colonies, to grant to the latter an entire liberty of foreign commerce, and an assurance of perpetual exemption of all taxation from the mother country, on condition that they should triple their

This solves the hitherto unolvable riddle of the Irish peers sitting in the parliaments of England. As those peers held their fiefs of the crown of England, they took their seats in the parliament of England as possessors of those fiefs; and to have talked of a peer of one country being a commoner in the other, would then have been deemed the most absurd of all political solecisms. The king of the Irish ever since the time of Henry II. is he who wears the crown of England; and so sensible were the Irish of this fundamental truth, that they even established it when they were espousing the cause of an impostor; for Lambert Simnel, when he met with little countenance elsewhere, went to Dublin, where he was, with much solemnity, crowned king, not of Ireland, but of England. The Irish were then sensible of their relation to England, which still remains unaltered, and is steadfastly supported by those who understand the constitution of both countries.

But it was not in England and Ireland alone that the system of the Economists, in regard to taxation, was anciently established. In Scotland, when the Queen Regent, in 1555, proposed to raise a tax

their quit rents for the general defence of the empire. Henry the Second, if America had been settled in his time, would probably have colonized it, as he connected Ireland with England. But the legal ignorance of the constitutional nature of tenures that prevailed throughout the last century, added to the selfish spirit of mercantile monopoly, led government into the absurdity of establishing the colonies by fockage tenures, and limiting their foreign trade.

upon property in general, the gentry with much spirit obliged her to drop the design, saying, that as for ages past the defence of the country had lain upon them, there was no occasion for any alteration. Did not the same system in former times prevail in France, in Germany, in Italy, and indeed over all Europe. Does not China at this moment adopt it! Has it not existed for ages in the empire of the Mogul. Do not at this day two-thirds of the revenue of Bengal arise from a tax upon the produce of the soil? Was any other tax known in that province, when it came under the power of Great Britain? And did not the first introduction of the tax upon salt occasion much murmuring and much distress among the inhabitants, when according to the principles of the Economists, and the established mode of that country, the whole of the supplies ought to have been drawn from the zemindars, the receivers of rents, though not the proprietors of lands, the sovereign being the only proprietor. Even among ourselves, about the period of the Revolution, a direct land-tax formed one-half of the taxes of England, though now making so small a proportion of the general amount of those taxes. And in Scotland, at the time of the Union, about one-third of its public revenue consisted in a land-tax.

The preceding historical observations I think most clearly evince that the system of the Economists, in regard to taxation, is no new impracticable theory. It is at this moment practised in countries of great extent, and in England, both before and after the Conquest, it was the system by which the
national

national supplies were regulated. The principle of that system has formerly in England been supported with great strictness; for it has been the repeated decision of lawyers, that should the king grant a tenure in the express words, *absque aliquid inde reddendo*; yet the law would imply a military duty; and in the Abbot of St. Bartholomew's case, in the 14th of Henry VI. upon a grant made in the words, *tenendum si frankement come le Roy est en son corone*, it was decreed, that the patentee was not exempt from military service.

This service was commonly termed, *servitium consuetum et debitum*, the accustomed and bounden service, or duty incumbent upon those who were the possessors of land. How this *bounden duty* came not to *bind*, during the four or five succeeding centuries, is a subject worthy of being amply discussed by some philosophical historian, as it has never yet been treated of with such attention as it deserves*. How came William the Conqueror, who

* Sir John Dalrymple, not many years ago, published an Essay on Feudal Property, in which his claim of having treated the subject like a scholar and a gentleman will be most readily admitted. But ought he not likewise to have treated it as a politician? His researches seem confined to the investigation of the ever changing rights of the feudal tenants, who, aided by the subtlety of lawyers, were continually endeavouring to evade their obligations to the crown, and, at the same time, to rivet their oppressive claims upon their inferior vassals, many of which claims they retain to this very hour. In the consideration of feudal property, the first point to have been investigated was, what property belonged inalienably to the crown, next, the nature of the property belonging to the sub-

ject,

who had about five millions a year, and Edward IV. who had near four millions a year, to be succeeded by a King James and a King Charles, who had not much above half a million a year, though there was no constitutional alteration in the financial system from the first of these monarchs to the last, and the monied value of commodities was risen three fold.

The first cause of this depredation of royal revenue appears to have been the supine negligence of some of our kings, who not considering that by the constitution they really were but life possessors, gave away with both hands what they had no right to give away. What by Domelday Book was *terra regis*, or kings land to Edward the Confessor, became kings land to William the Conqueror, who is said to have possessed in royal domain 1,200 manors, which successively became the right of the kings who reigned after him. But of those 1,200 manors, Charles I. probably did not possess 100, all the others having been alienated by the impolicy of his predecessors. A second cause of the depredation of royal revenue was the school-boy notion of

jest, and for what cause, or for what expected services it was bestowed. If Sir John had taken but half the pains to elucidate the *Duties* of the feudal tenants that he has taken in treating of their *Rights*, he would have rendered his ingenious essay much more valuable. What he uniformly deems progress was in reality a degradation of the constitution then subsisting. The feudal system was a Public Edifice whose pins and mortises were daily weakening, and from whose roof some tiles were every year most knavishly stolen, to cover castles of private despotism.

estimating

estimating wealth not by its physical use, but by its present value in money, and upon that notion agreeing to a permanent commutation of revenue in kind for revenue in present money to remain unalterable; in consequence of which the king of Great Britain now receives for some lands one penny, in lieu of what sells in the market at present for five shillings. A third cause was the unwatchfulness of those who ought to have guarded the king's revenue, and thereby suffering the most fraudulent entries to be made by the feudal tenants. A fourth cause, and the last I shall mention, was the unremitting endeavours of the feudal tenants to smuggle and conceal the number and value of their fees, so that in less than 300 years after the Conquest, the number of them was diminished above one-half; and in Charles the First's time they hardly amounted to one-fourth of what they had been in the time of William the Conqueror, and these often rated at less than one-tenth of their real income. Mr. Phillips, in his very curious treatise, entitled, *Tenenda non Tollenda*, written in 1660, against the abolition of the feudal tenures, and abounding with legal knowledge, gives the following instance of two of those smuggled estates: 'An estate,' he says, 'in the reign of Charles I. above 1000l. per annum, hath been found (by the Escheators) to be but of the yearly value of twenty marks. Another estate, consisting of very few manors and as few copyholders, but most in farms and demesnes, upon an improved and almost racked rent, worth 6000l. per annum, found at no greater yearly value than

‘ 183l. 11s. which is less than the 30th part.’ Had the records of the Exchequer, for successive reigns, been faithfully kept, and were they still preserved unimpaired, who knows but among the land smugglers of the reign of Charles I. might be found John Hampden, and others of the violent oppositionists of those times, so clamorous for a redress of grievances, the chief of which they themselves occasioned by unconstitutionally withholding their *debita servitia*, or bounden services from government. What should we think of the tenants of a Duke of Bedford, who should combine to pay him only one-tenth or one-thirtieth of what was stipulated in their leases, or should burn their leases, and deny to pay him any thing. But such tenants to the crown of England, and to the crown of Scotland, were the majority of the land proprietors of Great Britain in the reign of Charles the First. They had not only stripped the crown of almost all the royal domains, but had shaken off their obligations to defend the state, by which they had rendered themselves from an *essential class*, one of the most *un-essential classes* of society.

These unconstitutional and dishonest practices of the land proprietors, leaving King Charles the First with hardly any revenue, that ill advised monarch not having the political prudence and fortitude to withstand such fraudulent violations of the constitution, had recourse to illegal means of supply, which were the source of many calamities to the nation. But no one acquainted with the English history will affirm that the calamities that then overwhelmed

whelmed the nation had no other source besides the king's illegal conduct. The constitution was not more violated by Charles, than by the acts and proceedings of those who with much bitterness were contending for *rights*, without saying one word about *duties*. Would not Charles the First, when he granted the Petition of Rights, have been supported by the constitution, if he had addressed the parliament to the following purpose: ' It gives me great pleasure to have established the rights of my people, but I must represent to you that the crown also has its rights, and I expect this parliament to confirm those rights. The Doomsday Book shews us that my predecessor, William the First, had in royal domain twelve hundred manors; now as there is by law no prescription against the crown, it must be allowed that all those manors belong to me. Besides, as many frauds have been committed by changing military tenures for other holdings, and by great undervaluations of estates upon the deaths of tenants in capite, I desire the parliament may appoint a committee to enquire into the defrauders of the public revenue, and to form a bill, to which I will give my assent, for preventing such frauds in future, that the defence of the nation may be put upon its old constitutional footing.' In such an address the king certainly would not have talked unconstitutionally; but his despotic and tyrannic temper, and his overweening notion of the uncontrollable supremacy of the kingly office, and perhaps a desire of copying after the example of his brother-in-law in

France, who had been taxing his subjects for twenty-two years, without the authority of the states of his kingdom, led Charles to pursue other measures. The king's faults however by no means rendered the land smugglers faultless.

The mutual dislikes proceeding to animosities, both parties had recourse to arms, without either of them being able clearly to define upon what grounds they were fighting. But had the principles of the Economists been then understood by king and people, those bloody contentions needed not to have taken place; for by those principles not only the nature and source of the public supply would have been manifest to the whole nation, but the best mode of collecting it likewise; and all the alteration necessary for obtaining a free constitution would have been to have made the grants annual, according to the discretion of parliament, and the actual circumstances of the time, and the executive power accountable for the expenditure.

The issue of the fatal contest was the murder of the king, by a sentence in direct violation of law; and a succession of his chief murderer a few years afterwards to the despotic rule of the nation. Under the iron rod of this despot the supplies for national defence were collected without rule or measure by military compulsion; and, by various extortions, more money was raised by him in one year than had been raised by the murdered sovereign in three years.

Upon the restoration of Charles II. when it was supposed the ancient laws were restored with him,
and

and likewise the ancient mode of supply, it might have been expected that the parliament, from the experience of past troubles, would have adopted such means as might prevent land smuggling in future; and while it renewed the obligation of the land possessors to furnish their debita servitia, or bounden services, in some better mode than by feudal tenures, would at the same time have laid the executive power under some obligation to apply those debita servitia to the defence and honour of the nation. Parliament however adopted a measure altogether different, and not more contrary to the spirit of the constitution than to the dictates of sound policy. By the most absurd and unconstitutional act for the abolition of tenures, it wholly exempted the land possessors from all direct supplies whatever; and in commutation for what ought by the former constitution, as well as by the dictates of just policy, to have been drawn directly from the produce of land, it annexed hereditarily to the crown an excise duty on beer and ale, amounting not to one-twentieth of what by the old constitution was required from the owners of land. This was a no less violent than impolitic innovation*. By dissolv-

* Among the many unconstitutional and oppressive expedients of supply adopted by the long parliament, the excise had been introduced by them, in imitation of the practice of Holland, which in this point had attracted the curiosity of many in England in the time of James I. who is said to have sent over a person thither to enquire into the manner and management of it. About that time it was by the English styled *Heathen Greek*, and was most generally reprobated by them.

ing the *nexus adictiffimus*, or bond of most strict obligation, it threw the land owners into the class of mere idlers, a class ever to be avoided by a well constituted society; and it introduced a new mode of taxation, rather prejudicial, in many cases, to the nation at large, and no less burdensome to numbers of individuals, than the feudal services had been to the feudal tenants. I may likewise add, as it has since proved, no less intricate and perplexing in the modes of raising it, than the incidents of the feudal tenures ever had been. As a supplement to this first excise duty, the parliament granted an assessment upon the lands in the different counties; but instead of imposing it in a just proportion to the fund to be taxed, (which is the fundamental principle of all equitable taxation) it was rated negligently and inaccurately, in consequence of which some must have been too much charged, while others were too much eased.

At the era of the Revolution the parliament nobly reverted to the system of nature, in regard to public supplies, and established a land-tax sufficient not only for the peace establishment, but as has been proved in pages 84 and 85, for the exigencies of an expensive war likewise; had the tax been levied in exact proportion to the value of the rents upon which it was imposed. The Economists affirm that the produce of the land is the only fund for national supplies. The parliament at the Revolution made a great step towards this important truth, when by establishing a land-tax at four shillings in the pound, they declared the produce of land to be
the

the chief fund for taxation. Est quoddam prodire tenus*. Why they omitted the principle of imposing that tax in a just proportion to the respective rents, it may be now impossible to determine; but that such a principle should at this moment be neglected in the establishment of a land-tax, is a great reproach to these enlightened times, and a great injustice to the majority of the land proprietors of the kingdom. A deviation from this principle in other matters, with the pretence of adhering to it, would be deemed no less ridiculous than unjust. In this respect the modern acts for the land-tax may be considered as political bulls of no small magnitude. They established disproportion almost in the same paragraphs, where they enact that just proportion shall be observed; as if a landed gentleman should say to his tenants, I mean that you should pay me your rents in a just proportion to the size of your farms, that is, I require a certain quantity of wheat from each of your wheat fields, whether the field be large or small, and a certain quantity of apples from each of your orchards, whether the orchard be large or small, or whether the crop be scanty or plentiful. It would be readily allowed that this gentleman was not very accurate in his notions of proportion. But nearly similar is the spirit of the present acts for raising a land-tax in Great

* From what is here remarked, as well as from what is above written, it most evidently appears, that Mr. Pitt, and those who voted with him, in the affair of the Legacy Bill, acted more in conformity to the Revolution principles of taxation than those who opposed that bill.

Britain. From some they require only four-pence, and from some four shillings, by the same rule of proportion; nay, from some not even four-pence; for I can declare, upon good information, that a gentleman possessing an estate of 5,000l. a year, in one of the northern counties of England, pays in land-tax, at four shillings in the pound, only 75l. The undervaluation from a real four shillings in the pound on this single estate, if it had been brought to account in the Exchequer, since the Revolution, with the compound interest thence arising, would have liquidated upwards of one million of the national debt. We may thence discover the radical cause why the nation is at present so much involved, for if the deficiency upon a single estate of 5,000l. a year, would have sufficed to have paid off one million of the national debt; it would not be a strained conclusion to affirm, without any farther computation, that the sum total of the undervaluations of the land-tax upon the estates of the whole kingdom, would have paid off the whole national debt.

As the number of landed gentleman that are aggrieved by the present very disproportionate assessment of the land-tax far exceeds the number of those that are thereby unjustly favoured, it is most reasonable that this unfair advantage of the minority should give way to that of the majority. This majority therefore have a right to press for an equal valuation of the land-tax without delay, that the minority, who are now exempt, may bear an equal share of the public burdens with themselves. The
equal

equal valuation of the assessment, and the rate of the assessment, are two very different things, and ought ever to be kept distinct. The latter depends upon the discretion of parliament, but the former is founded on a stronger authority than that of parliament, the immutable law of right and wrong, to which law parliament ought ever studiously to conform.

Leaving the rate of the assessment, as it ought to be, indeterminate, unless by an annual law of parliament, I shall here confine myself to the means of obtaining its equal valuation. For this purpose there is no need of a new Doomsday Book, or any intricate mode of investigation. As the knowledge of the value of the fund is the sine qua non for obtaining a proportionate rate, and as the leases to tenants, whether annual or for a term of years, discover that fund, let all leases of whatever kind be registered in the respective counties where the lands are situated; and let the assessments be made for such county according to those registers. Whenever a lease is renewed, let the value of such new lease be faithfully specified and registered within one month after its date, and published three times in the newspaper of the county town, or in the London Gazette; and let the particular new assessment be made thereupon, by which easy and honest expedient, the income to government would rise or fall in exact proportion as the income of the land proprietors rose or fell; or rather as the income of the whole nation rose or fell; for it is to be presumed that the rents of lands will only rise or decline as this last rises or declines.

The registration above proposed would effect the same thing in politics, that logarithms have effected in mathematics. The now intricate and perplexing financial questions would thereby be rendered easy of solution. The assessment of the poor-rates supposes such a notoriety in every parish in England; and the same notoriety is implied by the laws enjoining the payment of tythes; for that law could never have been put in effect with exactitude, were not every clergyman to be fully acquainted with the whole of the produce of his own parish. When England was divided into knights fees, and the owners of them were bound in return to defend the kingdom, the notoriety of those fees was implied in the very institution; and the corruption of that institution proceeded from the neglect of notoriety, or the difficulty of obtaining it. The art of printing was then unknown, nay even the art of writing was almost unknown; there were no newspapers, no turnpike roads, no regular postage of letters, consequently, though notoriety was the principle of the institution, deeds of darkness easily escaped detection, and defrauders annually increased, even with the connivance of the escheators, who were sometimes only two for all England. The modern improvements in civil life, that have been just mentioned, would not only preclude in these times any fraudulent evasions of the land-tax, but would render the levying of it a matter of the greatest ease and correctness. Every county would have its receiver general residing in the county town, corresponding with the exchequer, and making his re-

mittances

mittances thither; and the financial machine would be kept at less expence, would move with more accuracy, and would seldom require repairs and amendments, when thus composed only of a few wheels, than as it is at present, clumsily formed of an hundred wheels.

Having given an outline of the mode for establishing an equal valuation of the land-tax, I shall proceed to consider a superficial objection often made against such a proportionate valuation, which objection has served as a stumbling block to many who sincerely wish to see such a proportionate valuation take place. Many landed estates, it has been said, have been purchased in counties where the valuation of the land-tax is extremely low, upon the presumption that no alteration of that tax would take place, and now to impose a higher rate upon such estates would be an injustice to their possessors. But is it not an injustice in those possessors, who enjoy an equal protection of government with their neighbours, not to contribute to the support of government in an equal proportion with their neighbours. The *salus populi*, or the obligation of defence, is in its nature paramount to every other obligation. We have seen above, that in the feudal times a grant of land made with the express condition of no services, *tenendum si frankement come le roi est en son corone*, was nevertheless judged in law not to be exempt from military service; and the Saxons said of their *trinoda necessitas*, or threefold obligation, *nulli unquam relaxari potest*, it can be forgiven to no man. Among the Romans likewise,

in

in the flourishing times of their republic, a free man who fraudulently avoided being enrolled in the legions, when called upon by the consul, was made a slave, and his property was confiscated to the state. Many purchases of landed estates were doubtless made in England between the Restoration and the Revolution; but when the assessment of the land-tax, soon after the Revolution, was raised from 600,000*l.* which it had been at the Restoration, to two millions, we do not find that those new purchasers were exempted in the new valuation. It is the protection of Government that renders any man's estate valuable to him; and if in consequence of this protection, an estate bought at twenty-five years purchase should (without any improvement) become saleable for thirty-five years purchase, government is certainly entitled to a retribution for such a benefit. The rise in value here specified amounts to upwards of one-fourth; but should an estate now paying only four-pence in the pound, be required to pay a full four shillings in the pound, that would not be quite one-fifth of augmentation, consequently the benefit bestowed by government would exceed the retribution to government, which (exclusive of any rise in marketable value of an estate) would be entitled to four shillings in the pound from it, if the other estates of the kingdom were rated at four shillings. But when government by drawing the supplies from the direct source shall become independant of the monied men, whose shackles it has worn these hundred years past, the rate of interest will sink to such a degree

as will raise the marketable value of land in a greater proportion than I have above mentioned. To the objectors among the new purchasers of estates at undervaluations, administration might then say, we will reimburse you the full money you paid for your estates, and will resell them, burdened with four shillings in the pound, confident that the exchequer will be a gainer by such commutations. If the exchequer, as I think may be demonstrated, would be a gainer by the commutations of such estates, it would then be the interest of the present possessors of those estates to avoid such commutations. This is considering the subject in the light of the objectors, as a mere money transaction, in which light it appears that should government maintain the nation in prosperity, the imposition of four shillings in the pound, would really take nothing out of their pockets. But the necessity of defence, or in other words, of supplies for defence, places the subject in another light, in which though the objectors have not chosen to consider it, the constitution must. A person who buys an estate does not only lay out his money in the purchase of land, but actually enlists himself as a defender of the state. We have seen above that government has actually been carried on, and consequently may be carried on, without any of those taxes, that are called taxes on consumption. Now should the British government revert to that natural system, abolish all taxes on consumption, and draw the public supplies from the direct source of supply, the produce of land, a land proprietor in such circumstances,

stances, fitting exempt from a land-tax, would assist government no more than one of his own grooms. Upon what principle then could such a land proprietor expect the protection of government.

I shall conclude, at present, with one reflection more on this point. Were all our taxes on consumption suppressed, and the whole of the public supplies, as in former times, to be raised from land, the land proprietors would, nevertheless, still remain the most opulent class in society, as possessors of the only assured surplus revenue in the community. Merchants and manufacturers, by many years assiduous attention, may become rich; but they may likewise, by many mischances, become bankrupts. Those who live upon stipends and salaries, are presumed to have only a daily subsistence, correspondent to their respective ranks. In the present state of things, by the rise of prices and the fixedness of salaries, many of them have not even that daily subsistence; and by the extinction of taxes on consumption, they might be enabled to live in ease, but not in affluence. The great body of manual labourers give their whole capital daily to the public, without any reserve of interest; consequently, when infirmity or old age overtakes them, instead of having made accumulations, they are often in a state of destitution; and be the prices of things, or the rate of wages what they may, this will ever be the case with the great majority of them. Mental labourers,

nations are often rendered rich, generally receive themselves but a scanty retribution. *Laudantur & Algent.* The British history furnishes many examples of the great opulence of our nobility and gentry, when no public taxes existed in this island but what were paid by themselves; which taxes, in the estimation of the payers, were not even deemed taxes, but stiled by them *servitium liberum*, that is, the service of a freeman. If such was the case in former times, when the marketable value of estates was low, in consequence of the rate of interest being ten per cent and upwards, it is reasonable to expect, that upon a return to that system, the landed gentlemen would be more distinguished for their opulence, from the marketable value of their estates being high, in consequence of the low rate of interest. Land, selling at thirty-six years purchase, is a capital three times more valuable than when sold at twelve years purchase.

Having in the preceding part of this discourse shewn that manufactures made and sold at home, though they may enrich individuals, do not give any augmentation of national revenue, I shall here make a few observations in respect to the profit that accrues to the nation from that idol of modern times, foreign commerce. If our imports are of equal value to our exports, the national gain will be nothing; it will only be as if a crown-piece were exchanged for five shillings, or five shillings for a crown. In this state of an equal balance between us and our foreign customers, though the nation
may

may be no gainer, yet our own merchants, and those of foreign countries who sell our merchandizes may be great gainers, by putting 30, or 40, or 50 per cent upon the retail of the merchandize imported by them, and sold to their fellow-subjects. Thus the East-India company may gain annually 800,000*l.* upon the sale of their teas, though the nation may thereby not gain a single farthing. This private gain, and others of the like kind, are too often mistakenly deemed national gains, though in some certain cases (as in the case of tea some years ago) the nation is actually a loser by them. The real national gain, therefore, cannot be estimated from the most accurate statements of the inspector general of the customs, nor from the magnitude of the exports, if the magnitude of the imports keeps pace with it. To settle this balance clearly, very many circumstances are necessary to be taken into the account; and till those circumstances be minutely understood, the decisions in regard to the profit from foreign commercial dealings must be very inaccurate. Should this profit, in respect of Great Britain, amount annually to five or six millions, though it may be doubted whether it rises so high, that profit, in comparison of the other part of the national revenue arising from agriculture, would not be so considerable as to justify the great importance annexed to it in the minds of the multitude, and far less to justify government in engaging in war in compliance with the avaricious spirit of those who wish to extend their gains by unlawful
and

and unjust means*. From the continual cry in the mouths of some, *We are a commercial nation*, one would be inclined to think, that they believed the chief source of the riches and prosperity of Great Britain was her foreign trade; that without foreign trade poverty and distress would overspread the land, nothing but misery would be known, and Great Britain would lose her preponderance among the nations of the earth; therefore, every interest should give way to the interest of foreign trade. Whoever rightly understands the principles of the Economists, will see no necessity for such gloomy forebodings, even on the supposition of no foreign trade. The Economists, however, are far from saying, Perish our commerce; or from wishing to adopt the system of the antient Egyptians, who prohibited foreign trade; or applying to Great Bri-

* What we translate *Good-will towards men* (Luke 11 and 14) may, perhaps, be as justly rendered *Good-will among men*. This Christian good-will among men has but too often been interrupted by a selfish spirit among dealers, of monopolizing foreign markets to themselves, at the hazard of prejudice to the national welfare. The frequent captures of English ships by the Spanish guarda costa's greatly irritated the British nation, and occasioned the war with Spain in 1739. But it may be doubted whether both nations were not betrayed into hostilities by the avarice and artifice of our South Sea Company. From a person that resided seven years at Carthagena and other places in Spanish America, before the breaking-out of that war, I have been told that the Spanish guarda costa's, that would otherwise have remained inactive, were privately excited by our S. S. Company to make seizure of English ships, who, as interlopers, sold goods to the Spanish colonists cheaper than the Company sold them.

tain the late Bishop Berkeley's maxim in regard to Ireland, and saying, Great Britain might be happy and prosperous, though it were to be surrounded by a wall of brass 40 cubits high.

The Economists see not only national profit in foreign commerce rightly conducted, but a great augmentation of the conveniencies and enjoyments of human life. They, nevertheless, consider foreign commerce as an object of very little regard as to revenue, in comparison with that arising from the cultivation of territory; and deem a state possessing an ample territory to be exceedingly misled and ill-advised, that bestows more of its attention upon commerce than upon agriculture, since this last is a much more ample and more substantial support of national opulence and power than the former.

Many false principles of writers on commerce might here be quoted, but I shall mention only one. Great Britain, says one of those writers seventy years ago, could no more expect to get rich without the balance of trade in her favour, than a family could get rich, the master of which had no other occupation than winning the money of his wife and children at play. In this writer's idea, then, which has served as a misleading doctrine to thousands, Great Britain could not increase in opulence and prosperity without acquiring something from her neighbours more than she gives them. Were this doctrine true in regard to Great Britain, it would likewise be true in regard to other nations that have foreign traffic; and they should all direct their views to acquire something from their neighbours

more than they give them. As it is impossible they should all succeed in this, the consequence of commercial dealings between different nations would then be, according to that false system, that while some of them were thereby enriched, others of them must thereby be impoverished. By that system, all the commercial nations of the earth are considered as so many gamesters, each endeavouring to make itself rich by making its neighbours poor; and what can be expected from this but continual jealousies, dislikes, and animosities, rendering nations unfriendly, and but too frequently hostile to each other. The Economists, on the other hand, whose leading principle is *Good-will among men*, affirm, that all the nations of the earth may traffic together with mutual advantage, without acquiring from each other more than they give to each other; and that Great Britain may daily advance in wealth and prosperity, without gaining one farthing by her foreign trade, however extensive that may be, provided she gives her attention to acquire every year additional wealth from her territory and her seas.

Do manufactures afford no revenue, and does foreign commerce yield but a small income—and do we possess what furnishes the natural income of a state, an extensive and fertile territory not much more than half cultivated, are we not then called upon by true policy to increase the wealth and power of the state by rendering this territory more productive. It is to this new Potosi, this mine of riches, that the Economists wish to direct the attention of British patriots, and British agriculturists.

Here permanent wealth may be acquired without the sword, without the envy or molestation of our neighbours, accompanied with the increase of people, the lessening of taxes to individuals, but the augmentation of them to the state, and with the diminution of the number of poor, not by death, but by transferring them into the class of those living in easy and comfortable circumstances.

As the produce of the territory of a state is the natural support of its government, it becomes, therefore, the duty of government to establish such regulations as may contribute to render that territory as productive as possible. The dominium utile of the lands is secured to the possessors by government; but the dominium regale, inherent in government, is paramount to the other, and gives to government a right of inspection and direction over the whole. No land proprietor, in civil society, is entitled to say he may do with his estate what he pleases; because, should he, from obstinacy or negligence, omit to render his lands productive, the state is thereby so far endamaged, and consequently has a right to take such measures as may prevent that damage. This renders evident the great importance and necessity of the bill for the division and improvement of the commons and waste lands of Great Britain. By passing that bill (the fruits of the assiduous labours of the Board of Agriculture) into a law, the legislature will directly enlarge its own revenues, as well as those of individuals, and will thereby as much increase the power and opulence

opulence of the nation, as if a fertile island half as large as Ireland were united to its territory.

But it is not only neglected lands, but the neglected cultivators of those lands, that call for the interposition and protection of government. The legislature, by taking upon itself the noble occupation of exempting from thralldom the poor and industrious country labourers, would, in fact, be only looking more particularly after its own interests, for the latter must suffer in proportion as the former are oppressed. The nation is very much obliged to Sir John Sinclair, who, by his assiduous and patriotic labours, has been instrumental in bringing to the knowledge of the public the grievances and oppressions suffered by many of those cultivators in the northern parts of the island. There is hardly one of the many judicious and humane writers of the statistical account of Scotland, whose parish is in the northern and mountainous parts, who does not enumerate among the disadvantages that agriculture there labours under, the high rents, and the want of security to the farmers in the possession of their farms.

In regard to high rents it may be observed, that, according to the system of the Economists, government ought always to feel an immediate benefit from them, or from any rise of rent whatever. In that case, the malady and the remedy would go together, and the people at large would more willingly pay double for their bread and their butchers-meat, when they perceived the income of government was thereby proportionably increased, and

consequently the less would be demanded from them through the means of other taxes. But when they find the prices of their bread and butchers-meat raised upon them without any alleviation in other taxes, the moderate naturally conclude that there is misgovernment somewhere, and the factious that government is to blame; when, in fact, it is government that is injured, as well as the community at large. A landed proprietor, who raises the rents of his farms without any actual improvement of them, what else does he do but assume the unconstitutional power of taxing his fellow-subjects without consent of Parliament, and his farmers are his tax-gatherers. When these ask ten-pence for a pound of butter which they formerly sold for five-pence, or demand six-pence for a pound of cheese which they before sold for a groat, and sell their corn and cattle proportionably dearer, what apology can they give for these new taxations but that they are compelled to impose them, because their landlord has asked so much more of them.

The rise of rents from a real improvement of the soil, and augmentation of its produce, is to be viewed in a quite different light. This rise of rents is a principal object of the Economists. It enlarges the powers of the main wheel, that moves every other wheel in society, and is itself set in motion by nature and the industry of man. As the motion of that wheel is progressive or retrograde, so, proportionally, is the prosperity of the state progressive or retrograde. A rise of rents after this manner ought as much to be encouraged by government,

vernment, as the other manner of raising rents ought to be condemned. How common is it to find those two very different meanings of the word improvement confounded together, not only by superficial reasoners, but by men who might be expected never to lose sight of the distinction between them. A man who has raised his estate, without any improvement of the soil, from 500l. a year to 1000l. makes no difficulty of saying he has improved his estate. But has he thereby improved the estate of the nation? By no means. He has only taxed the manufacturers and labourers in his neighbourhood, and rendered living more hard to them, till they overtake him by raising their prices and wages upon him, which restores all of them to the relative situation they were in before; when, should a new rise of rents in the former manner take place, the strife between them is recommenced without any benefit accruing from thence to the nation.

The increase of produce, and not the increase of the price of produce, is what a wise agricultural nation will chiefly aim at; and when this becomes the principal object of the land owners of Great Britain, the increase of their incomes will then be a certain proof of the flourishing state of the nation. The more they raise their rents after this manner, the more the people will have occasion to rejoice, as easiness of living and general abundance will be the consequence.

The nation, in general, being greatly interested that the rents of lands should be raised after this

manner, the legislature is therefore bound to pursue such measures as may remove every obstruction that prevents its taking place. And as one of the chief obstructions to the increase of national produce, upon which the public prosperity so much depends, is the want of leases, that is, the want of security to the cultivator in his farm, the legislature, therefore, possesses the right of enforcing the granting of leases throughout the whole kingdom.

It was well observed by a member of the last parliament, who has wide estates in that part of the island where the grievance of the want of leases is most severely felt, that agriculture ought to be under regulation as well as commerce. And certainly nothing can be a more disgraceful and absurd policy in an agricultural nation, than that great numbers of owners of land should from negligence, mistaken avarice, or a lust of domination, be suffered so to let their land as to prevent the general yearly revenue of the state from augmenting twenty or thirty millions, more especially when by letting their lands upon leases those very owners of land would probably soon greatly augment their present incomes. The mosaical law forbid the ox that treaded out the corn to be muzzled; but in some parts of Great Britain the cultivators themselves are muzzled; their labour, though yielding sustenance to others, not yielding sustenance to themselves and families. This impolicy and inhumanity having long prevailed, has compelled many of them to become cultivators in America, from whence perhaps they have lately been instru-

mental

mental in relieving our wants, thereby draining the money out of the kingdom, when by a different policy they might have been adding both to its wealth and its strength.

But the cultivators in that part of the island, it is alleged, are lazy and indolent. To this it may be answered, that they are lazy and indolent for the same reason that slaves are lazy and indolent, from their daily experience that all their sweat and all their labour go only to fill another man's pocket, and turn to no account to themselves. Such a consequence damps their exertions; and since they have no prospect but of continuing poor, many of them prefer, *molles in gramine somnos*, soft flumbers on the grass, to active industry that would yield them no profit. But that they are not, in general, naturally indolent, but of a character the very reverse, appears from the following circumstance, recorded by several of the statistical writers, that great numbers of them annually undertake temporary emigrations from home of 100 or 200 miles in order to get employment. Can any thing give a greater proof of the love of industry of these poor labourers, and of some great misgovernment and oppression existing at home on the part of their landlords? If those landlords would but reflect upon those emigrations, they would perceive that the disgrace of them recoils wholly upon themselves. Were hundreds of country labourers annually to quit Kent and go into Devonshire for employment, or if country labourers were to make short emigrations from Connecticut to Virginia to get work,

would

would it not be concluded that the cultivation of land met with some particular discouragement from the land owners of Kent and Connecticut. For a farm, under proper management and skilfully cultivated, ought to give employment to labourers the whole year round. Land owners, therefore, who are instrumental in the temporary emigration of their country labourers, are, in fact, contributing in so far to the diminution of their own incomes. But when they compel them by ungenerous treatment to a perpetual emigration to a foreign country, they contract a high degree of culpability in respect to the community at large. The slothful man apologizes for his indolence by saying, there is a lion in the way; but were many of the farmers in those parts to be reproached with the miserable cultivation of their fields, they would have a most solid excuse in saying there is a landlord in the way. They might justly plead, we have no property in our farms; we are in continual dread of being dispossessed; were we to attempt improvements, some avaricious neighbour, who offered a small rise of rent, would be preferred to us. These are discouragements which sink us, and are strong inducements to us to quit our native country. But we do not love to forsake our relations and friends, if we could get land to cultivate upon terms that would afford us a prospect of enjoying the fruits of our industry. As the state, by our oppression, is a very great sufferer as well as ourselves, government is therefore, for its own sake as well as ours, bound to establish a law founded on the principles of justice,

tice, by which we may be secured, that the more we improve our farms, where we were born, and which we love to occupy, the more we shall enrich ourselves. Give us but such security, and the improvements of our farms, and the embellishment of the country will in a short time prove that we are neither lazy nor unintelligent. We will then willingly participate our gains with our landlords, which will put it in their power to contribute much more largely to the defence of the state, while we ourselves, by bettering our circumstances, will be enabled to rear up new families, and to become greater customers to the manufacturers and merchants.

As the procuring the greatest quantity of produce from its lands will ever be a principal object with every wise government, and as that greatest quantity of produce cannot be procured from the lands of Great Britain, while the farmers are discouraged from improvements by want of leases, a grievance, not confined to one corner of the island alone, but pervading almost every county in the kingdom, it becomes, therefore, the duty of the legislature to impose a penalty upon those who thus obstruct the prosperity of the nation by not granting leases to their farmers; and that penalty would very properly be an additional land-tax, of six-pence in the pound, upon all lands not cultivated, under a lease of at least twenty years duration.

Should such a penalty have the happy effect of abolishing the great political evil, which now inflicts barrenness upon our lands, it may be presumed the

the land owners would immediately from the change feel a benefit in their rents of two millions sterling annually, reckoning the cultivated acres in Great Britain at only 40 millions, and supposing a rise of rent of one shilling per acre, upon a general introduction of leases. And if the land owners would be thereby benefited two millions, the national benefit thence resulting, may consequently be computed at four times that sum. In point merely of profit, can the revenues of a Bengal, naturally precarious, be compared to such an easy and permanent acquisition within the circuit of our own seas. An expedient somewhat similar to what is above proposed was adopted by an ancestor of the present King of Sardinia, who wishing to introduce a most material agricultural improvement in his dominions in Italy, imposed a particular tax upon the lands in Piedmont; but exempted from the tax all those landlords who planted upon their estates a certain number of mulberry trees. To this judicious law Piedmont is at present indebted for its annual rich revenue from the production of silk; for the landlords, in order to exempt themselves from the additional land tax, made haste to plant the stipulated number of mulberry trees, by which, besides greatly benefiting their country, they quickly added very considerably to their own rents.

The great difficulty of forming a proper lease, where the advantages arising from improvements may be shared proportionately between the tenant and the landlord, has probably been one of the chief causes why leases have been so neglected. This difficulty, however,
being

being now happily removed by the great ingenuity of the late Lord Kaims, who has given a general form of a lease, suited to all possible cases, published by Dr. Anderson in his Agricultural Report for the county of Aberdeen, and which I have added in an Appendix to my present discourse, it may therefore be expected that landlords will at length advert to the annual losses they sustain by not granting leases to their farmers, and will perceive the advantages that would accrue to themselves and the nation by cultivating their estates by farmers excited to industry by equitable leases.

As men by their nature are intended to be cultivators of the ground, the more equally, therefore, they are distributed over its surface, the greater, in all likelihood, will be their prosperity. On this account the Economists exceedingly condemn the aggregating or crowding of men, without necessity, by twenty thousands, and thirty thousands, in towns and cities, and urge it as an indispensable duty of government to take such measures as may spread population in an equal degree over the whole territory it superintends, in order that men may never be far separated from the source from whence, as has been demonstrated, the chief of his subsistence and of his wealth is to originate.

There is no territory on the globe where this principle may with more propriety be reduced to practice than in this happy island of Great Britain; and it is a circumstance worth noting, that our ancestors two thousand years ago, seem to have acted upon this principle from a conviction of its propriety and suitability

ableness to the territory which they occupied. Julius Cæsar, in his wars on the neighbouring continent of Gaul, was employed for six or seven years, not only in fighting many battles, but besieging many populous cities, so strongly fortified by art as to seem to bid defiance to any assailant. But in Great Britain, at the same time, from his own account of it, neither walled town nor walled city seems to have existed, though in comparative populousness it appears not to have been deficient; for the infinite number of men, *hominum infinita multitudo*, which he met with in Britain, was particularly noticed by him. Indeed, this *hominum infinita multitudo*, or infinite number of men, is more likely to be met with in a country inhabited, without towns and cities, than in a country abounding with them; for, as in cities and towns, in general, more die than are born, their multiplicity must, therefore, rather retard population than forward it.

The dread of hostility, and the hopes of security against blood-thirsty and vagrant plunderers, were probably the motives that first drove men into walled towns, and while these motives were continually operating among the small sovereignties into which the continent was then divided, a spirit of good neighbourhood and mutual kindness seems to have prevailed among the small sovereignties into which Britain was at that time divided, and happily rendered walled towns to them unnecessary. A sense of general security against a foreign invader seems to have inspired the Britons with a sense of individual security, and with the natural concomitant of that, a
predominant

predominant passion for rural habitation ; and this passion so consonant to nature, has descended through successive generations to Britons of modern times, even in spite of the false policy of late years, which has given too much countenance to the augmentation of towns, from a notion that manufactures could not be properly carried on elsewhere. On the Continent, on the other hand, the natural passion for rural habitation has through successive ages continued to be in a great measure stifled from the want of security that has always prevailed ; and one meets there not only with walled cities and walled towns, but even with walled villages.

Great Britain is now happily One and Indivisible, consequently its inhabitants, who when they lived in different sovereignties did not find cities and towns necessary, are at present much less under any necessity of crowding into cities and towns, from motives of defence and security. Bands of ravagers are here unknown ; and individual plunderers would probably be less frequent, were they to exchange the wants and distresses of a town life for the easily acquired competence, which honest industry would procure by cultivating the ground.

If cities and towns in the inland parts of Great Britain are not required for defence, a little consideration will serve to shew that they are not in general required for manufactures. We observe manufactures of great extent and great ingenuity at this day carried on in villages. What, then, is to hinder all manufactures of the same kind from being carried on the same manner, and in many cases, even in detached

tached hamlets. Amid all the variety of curious manufactures now carried on in Birmingham, there is hardly any one kind, that is not as completely manufactured by Mr. Bolton, in his great manufactory, at Soho, within two miles of that town, many of whose workmen, when their day's work is finished, retiring to detached hamlets on the adjoining common. If village workmen at Soho furnish the most curious hardware, we find village workmen, likewise, from the hamlets round Tunbridge Wells, furnishing the elegant cabinet work so much admired under the name of Tunbridge Ware. It is village workmen who fabricate the great variety of iron work at the very extensive manufactory at Carron. Of the great numbers of mills for spinning cotton now existing in Great Britain, many have by preference been erected in villages. In the nicest part of the linen branch, namely, damask weaving, not a few of the most skilful manufacturers are to be found in villages. Without specifying more particulars, these may suffice to shew that the great mass of manufactures may be executed by workmen not resident in towns; and from hence it follows, that it would be a true policy in Great Britain to check the augmentation of inland towns, since neither defence nor manufactures require such towns.

It is taking but a half view of things, to say, that towns give employment to the farmers; for if all those who are now workers in towns were to become workers in the country; and in general there is no natural impediment to such a transition, they would not be less consumers of the produce of the soil than at present;

present ; and the same may be said of idlers in towns, were they to prefer a residence in the country. The probability rather is, that in such a state of population, both the produce of the soil would be greater, and the consumption greater ; for in towns the situation of many journeymen labourers is such as prevents them from marrying, and leads them to spend many of their non-working hours in skittle-grounds or in ale houses ; whereas, if those journeymen were to be settled in the country, with a garden adjoining to their house, more of them would be induced to marry, and would find delight in their hours of relaxation, in cultivating their garden, or instructing their children. Agriculture, the fountain of our wealth, would thus get a recruit of two hundred thousand new cultivators, who were they to bestow but one hour a day in field labour, would thereby more benefit the nation, than by six hours employed by them in manufactures. Were even great numbers of them to quit manufactures altogether, and to employ themselves in agriculture, the greater still would be the advantage to the nation ; for the present overabundance of manufactures on one hand, and over great scarcity of products on the other, plainly shews that too many labourers are employed in the manufacturing line, and too few labourers in the agricultural line. For example, were all the cutlers in Great Britain to be idle for a couple of years, the stock in the shops gives reason to presume, that the buyers of scissars, knives, razors, &c. would during that time experience no deficiency of supply ; and the same may be concluded in regard to some

other articles of manufacture, which the makers are frequently pressing upon the buyers at a twelve-months credit, or an eighteen months credit, a plain proof that the market is overstocked with such commodities, since the sellers of them are fain to give a premium of 6 or 7 per cent to have them taken off their hands.

How different is the state of the products of agriculture, particularly of the important article of corn! The annual supply of that article, in its greatest abundance, for these 50 years past, has never yielded a surplus of three months subsistence above the annual consumption. Nay, within these two years, the annual consumption in the article of grain has experienced a deficiency of supply of three months; so that if corn had not been brought from abroad, the whole nation must have been put for twelve months upon a short allowance of bread, with a daily diminution of one fourth of the usual quantity. The evident consequence of this seems to be, that the people of Great Britain for a long time past have gone too much into manufactures, which when sold at home produce no national income; and have bestowed too little attention upon agriculture, which in some cases has yielded the vast increase of 10,500 per cent and of which some of the products are as capable of being stored and preserved for years, as some articles of manufacture are.

The commons that require to be divided, and the waste lands that would admit of further improvement, are computed to amount in Great Britain to 22 millions of acres, which is more than one fourth

fourth of the whole territory. These to be properly cultivated would give employment to 200,000 new families, and subsistence to twice that number; and how can they be expected to be properly cultivated unless inhabitants reside upon them. But besides these commons and waste lands, the lands at present under cultivation would require many thousands of new cultivators, in order to advance them to their highest degree of improvement.

To accomplish this highest degree of improvement of our soil, the Economists affirm, that inland towns are so far from being necessary, that they even obstruct it, and that the wealth and opulence of the nation would be very quickly advanced, were the hands that those towns have withdrawn from agriculture to be distributed as cultivators over the whole island, wherever there was occasion for the spade or the plow.

The proportionate distribution of the people over the surface of the territory, while it greatly increased the real and substantial revenue or wealth of the kingdom, would neither prejudice manufacturing industry, nor general morals. We have seen above, that in this island most extensive branches of manufacture are carried on in villages; and as by this distribution of the cultivators, subsistence would be rendered more abundant, and consequently cheaper, manufacturers would thereby naturally be drawn to intermix themselves with them in every corner of the kingdom.

In regard to general morals it by no means follows, that if in the inland counties of Great Britain

there were no towns besides the county town, that either rusticity or immorality would prevail. In a Christian country every parish church is a centre of civilization. Christianity, in regard to its practical duties, is only the perfection of humanity; and whoever will attend his church, and assiduously practice the precepts there recommended, will neither be deficient in good morals nor in good manners. He may not have the deceitful varnish of the late Lord Chesterfield's whited sepulchre, but he will have the polish of the mind, which will infallibly give him a civil demeanour.

The proportionate distribution of the people over the territory would likewise be the means of preventing innumerable expences that now detract considerably from the nation's prosperity, I mean the carriage of subsistence from the place where it is produced to the place where it is consumed, and of raw materials from their place of production to the place where they are manufactured; and of manufactures from the places where they are fabricated to the places where they are vended. In consequence of the present impolitic system of people's clustering without necessity into large cities, or even into particular counties (for Lancashire, we are told, contains more people than it can nourish), cattle reared in one place are driven 300 or 400 miles to be slaughtered in another place; wool that grows in a southern county is carried 200 miles to be manufactured in a northern county; and when manufactured is carried many hundred miles in order to be sold. These and similar instances that might be produced, give employment

ployment to a great number of waggons upon our public roads, and this transport business passes with many for a lucrative commerce, when it is in fact a diminution of the national profit, nearly to the amount of what it costs. If woollen manufactures, by being fabricated where the wool is produced, were to be exempted from this charge of double transport, they might be bought at lower prices both by domestic and foreign purchasers, which would promote the national prosperity. If Lancashire contains more people than it can nourish, we ought to conclude from thence, either that the cultivation of that county is not brought to its highest degree of improvement, or that the county is too populous, in which last case, it would be a national advantage, if the supernumerary inhabitants were to remove to some other part of the island, where there is a deficiency of population, and a superfluity of subsistence. The cattle that are now driven at a considerable expence 300 or 400 miles to be slaughtered, might more profitably to the nation be consumed near the spots where they are reared, were those spots to have their proportionate share of cultivators and manufacturers.

Although large cities and large towns in the inland parts of Great Britain may justly be considered as detracting from the nations prosperity, they would however have a direct contrary effect when situated upon the coasts of the island. As much as villages and detached hamlets ought to be preferred in the interior of the island, so much ought walled cities

and walled towns to be encouraged upon its coasts, and at the mouths of its navigable rivers. There, and there only, walled cities and walled towns ought to be as numerous as possible, on many accounts, but principally for the three following reasons.

First, numerous walled towns upon its coasts would be the means of promoting and extending foreign commerce, which though no great source of income, compared with agriculture, yet when conducted with prudence, may add something to the enjoyments as well as to the riches of the inhabitants.

Secondly, numerous walled towns upon the coasts would contribute greatly to the increase of the fishery, that golden mine to those who prosecute it with skill and industry. The British seas are an undivided common, remarkable for its great fertility, and they who cultivate this common, namely, fishermen, ought naturally to have their habitations on the edge of it. As it would be absurd to expect a constant resident in a large town to be a farmer, so it would be equally absurd to expect the inhabitant remote from the coast to be a fisherman. How many thousands in this island follow a marine life hardly for any other reason but because they have been born and bred within sight of the sea. Were the number of those in Great Britain born and bred within sight of the sea, to be then twenty times as great as it is at present, it might be expected that those following a marine life would also be twenty times as numerous. In proportion to the harvest, so should be the reapers. Since the British seas can furnish twenty times the wealth or subsistence

fistence that is at present extracted from them, it will therefore be a prudent policy in the government of Britain to adopt such means as may augment the number of those following a marine life twenty fold. And what policy could so much augment the number of those who follow a marine life, as to induce a million more of inhabitants to reside on the sea coasts, by giving every encouragement to multiply maritime cities. The Pensionary De Witt, in his Political Maxims, p. 35, computes the number of the people in the United Provinces at 2,400,000, and of these he reckons 450,000 *earn their living by the fisheries at sea, and setting them out with ships, rigging, casks, salt, and other materials or instruments, and the traffic that depends thereon.* In another place he says, *more than the one half of the trade of Holland would decay, in case the trade of fish were destroyed.* In a population of 2,400,000 souls, 450,000 make near a fifth part, and in that proportion the number of people in Great Britain depending for a subsistence upon the fishing business, and what relates to it ought to amount to near two millions, were the views of government, and the views of individuals, turned as earnestly to that great object in Britain as they are in Holland, and that they are not so turned, is no small reproach to the policy of this island; for what has maintained this fifth part of the inhabitants of Holland, has been drawn from seas properly belonging to Great Britain; or from seas situated more conveniently for British fishermen, than for Dutch fishermen; and capable of main-

taining ten times more people than who now draw their subsistence from them. Had Britain even but a small sea frontier to improve, the neglect of improving it, though not of great consequence, would still be a blameable policy. But Great Britain, including Ireland, (which I mean to be included in all that is said, or shall be said in this discourse) has the advantage of a sea frontier of upwards of 3000 miles, and of seas washing that frontier, affording subsistence for millions of men, were those millions to be induced by political regulations to cultivate them. Should a rich proprietor possess an immense plain of great fertility to the extent of 30,000 or 40,000 acres, where the herbage, as in some places of Hungary, rises to the height of five or six feet, and should he nevertheless keep neither bullock nor horse upon it, nor any live stock whatever, it would be concluded by the sensible and judicious, that such proprietor had not his eyes open to his own interest. But must not the same thing be concluded of the people of Great Britain and Ireland, who continue to give so little attention to the watery plain with which they are surrounded, though an hundred times more to be valued on account of the wealth it would afford, than such a plain as is above mentioned.

The first and most natural step to the improvement of this watery plain is by encouragements to bring multitudes of men to live within view of it; for it is hardly possible for multitudes of men to live constantly within view of it, without a great part
of

of them forming such a connection with it, as may procure them, if not opulence, at least a subsistence. Were the proposition of founding either a second Birmingham or a second Liverpool to be deliberated upon, true policy would decidedly declare in favour of the new Liverpool, because all the arts, trades, and manufactures carried on in Birmingham, or in any inland town whatever, might just as conveniently be carried on in the new maritime city, with the addition of the trades that seafaring business creates.

But instead of one new Liverpool, the sea frontier of Great Britain and Ireland would admit of twenty new Liverpools, which so far from diminishing the national population, would contribute greatly to augment it. How many vacant and desert spots are there at present on the shores of these islands, where such new maritime cities might conveniently be founded, were Government to make it an object of its attention to mark out such spots, and give encouragement to new settlers to inhabit them. The situations for such new maritime cities ought not to be hastily chosen, nor fixed upon entirely upon the report of military engineers. Civil engineers ought also to be consulted, and the reports of both to be compared and weighed. The great abundance of fish ought to be a leading motive for fixing the situation of many of the new maritime cities in their vicinity, and such is that abundance in our north-western seas, that a city of 8,000 or 10,000 inhabitants might be supported by
fishing,

fishing, and the commerce depending upon it, on many of the now half inhabited islands on the west coast of Scotland*.

Building in these new maritime cities might probably soon become a profitable speculation, as government, it may be hoped, will ere long have a happy opportunity of colonizing them with 150,000 or 200,000 men, who by changing their swords and cutlasses for plows and fishing nets, may add to the wealth of the country, and at the same time may continue to add to its strength.

The public encouragements to these new settlers may be various. Were the tax upon bricks, used in their buildings, to be remitted to them, the general amount of that tax would probably thereby not be diminished. The same might be said of the general amount of the house-tax, and of the win-

* In the northern counties and islands of Scotland are reckoned 4,528,000, and the population in 1795 was computed to be 137,754 souls, which is near 38 acres to each individual, or about 20 souls to a square mile. In the kingdom of Naples the general population is reckoned to give 203 souls to a square mile, supported by the fertility of the territory. The land in the north part of Scotland is greatly inferior to that of the kingdom of Naples in point of fertility; but this inferiority is fully compensated by the superior fertility of the seas in furnishing subsistence to man; therefore the improvement of the fisheries by the establishment of large maritime towns may render the lands in those parts of the island capable of supporting a population equal to that of the kingdom of Naples, that is, would increase the number of their inhabitants to near a million and an half, and the value of the lands in a proportionable degree.

dow-tax,

dow-tax, were the new settlers to be exempted from those taxes for ten years. Premiums might likewise be bestowed on those who built or navigated boats or vessels of a certain tonnage, or spun twine to a certain quantity.

These indulgencies, without being at all burdensome to government, or sensibly diminishing the general sum total of the taxes, would be most alluring inducements to draw inhabitants to the new settlements, who by directing their industry without delay to fishing, and the seafaring business dependant upon it, would as assuredly acquire an income as if they were to become farmers in any county of Great Britain. They ought for the first years to receive every prudential support, which, in the succession of time, they would most amply repay to the nation. Though an orchard does not yield any fruit sufficient to defray the expence of forming it, till several years after it is planted, yet that does not deter the prudent husbandman from incurring that expence. In like manner though these new settlements should for some years yield little return in point of taxes, yet the prudent statesman will not refuse to them his fostering care, knowing that, with proper management, their natural advantages will enable them not only to subsist, but to acquire opulence, and consequently to be large contributors to the public supply. There was a time when the immense capitals possessed by the wealthy inhabitants of Liverpool, Newcastle, Glasgow, &c. did not exist; but in the same manner as these capitals have been created, so might capitals be formed in

the new maritime cities, since they would be equally favoured by the ocean as Liverpool, Newcastle, or Glasgow. How have the capitals of our great West Indian planters been formed but by producing with great labour, and sending to market an article of very general consumption? But fish is a commodity not of more limited consumption than sugar, with this superior advantage, that besides the foreign sale, it actually makes great part of the subsistence of those who produce it and send it to market. As the market for both is daily increasing, colonizing on our own coasts may be found to be as true policy as colonizing in the West Indies.

A third principal reason for multiplying cities and towns upon our coasts is, that they would in such situations add much more essentially both to the defensive and offensive strength of the nation. I have said that Great Britain and Ireland have the advantage of a sea frontier upwards of 3,000 miles in extent; but while this frontier shall remain but thinly occupied by inhabitants, it will be more consonant to truth to say, Great Britain and Ireland have the disadvantage of a sea frontier upwards of 3,000 miles in extent, because from this very extent a foreign invader may assail them in a greater number of points. But were a foreign invader to know, that he could no where land within 100 miles of the seat of government of either island, without having a populous and regularly fortified city to attack, or without having within 20 miles of him two such cities on the coast, that could each send out a military force of 10,000 men, we may be almost

most sure, that a fleet could hardly be wanted for the defence of such a coast, or at least it may be affirmed, that a coast so peopled and so fortified, would be twice as formidable to a foreign enemy, as if left unpeopled and unfortified to the protection of a fleet alone.

Independent then of the extension of foreign commerce, and of the extension of the fishery, the cheap defence of the kingdom calls loudly for the multiplication of maritime cities of great populousness and great strength. It is hardly in the nature of things that such cities should be filled with idlers; and the example of Holland shews us that where manufacturing and commercial industry prevails, one great and populous city does not prevent another great and populous city from thriving within twenty miles of it, nay sometimes within ten miles. In this view it may be affirmed, that two new Liverpools might arise on the coast of Essex, between Harwich and South End, at the mouth of the Thames, and twice as many on the coasts of Kent and Suffex. These, when strongly fortified, would be most powerful outguards to the metropolis; and it may be presumed that in the policy of having such outguards originated the privileges conferred upon the cinque ports, which in former ages, during the weak state of the naval force of Europe, well acquitted themselves by their services to the public. But instead of having only cinque ports, or five sea ports, true policy in these modern times demands that Great Britain and Ireland should have an hundred sea ports, or maritime

cities, flourishing in populousness, and so fortified as to bid defiance to a sudden attack of an invading enemy. In the new maritime cities, founded on the coasts of Essex, Kent, and Suffex, might be carried on to greater national advantage many branches of manufacture and seafaring business, now most unnecessarily established in London and its vicinity. As neither corn nor coals are staples of the port of London, it is a heedless policy to suffer distilleries, iron founderies, fire engines, and other works and undertakings that require a great consumption of fuel to be concentrated in the capital; as though they could prosper no where but on the banks of the Thames. All these, instead of being crowded into London, should studiously be removed from it, and might be carried on as profitably for the proprietors, if not more profitably, on the shores of Essex, Kent, and Suffex. Thither likewise a great part of the ship building business, that may now be said to encumber the river Thames, might with national advantage be transferred. And with national advantage likewise the overgrown metropolis with its neighbourhood could spare thousands and ten thousands for the peopling of these new cities, which might also attract great numbers of inhabitants with large capitals from the opposite continent, were the impolitic restrictions against foreigners to be removed, and succeeded by invitations. Men of mercantile enterprise are often of more consequence to the aggrandisement and prosperity of a commercial city, than even a good situation or a good harbour. What then might be expected

pected were these three circumstances to be united; and to all appearance it remains only with our legislature to unite them. Nature has already given us the two former, and were our legislature to invite foreigners to settle in those cities, by the offer of naturalization, thousands of them would probably prefer the security and quiet to be obtained on the shores of Great Britain, to the insecurity and oppression to which they are but too often exposed on the continent.

But without enlarging further, my readers may easily figure to themselves, from the preceding illustrations, what would be the natural and happy consequence of the establishment of the system of the Economists, in respect to Great Britain and Ireland. The lands of both islands would be cultivated under leases upon the model of that of Lord Kaimes, by which the farmers would be excited to increase the national produce in the full security of augmenting their own incomes. Manufacturers, without expecting any income from them, would be cherished on account of the multiplied conveniences arising from them. Taxes upon consumption would in general be abolished; and the supply for national defence would, as formerly, be drawn directly from the national income by a single tax upon the surplus of that income, possessed by the land proprietors. What alone sustains the whole of the people would be allowed to suffice for sustaining the defenders of the people, who, when defenders, do not cease to make part of that whole. The real resources of the nation would be understood by the
ge-

generality of the people to consist in the productions of the soil, and not in stamped paper, which would animate their zeal to favour the increase of those productions. Abundance would be attended with its natural consequence cheapness, and cheapness would greatly extend the circle of our foreign commerce. Gold and silver would become the general medium of circulation, and few families be without some reserve of them, either in coin or in plate. The hamlets and villages would be so multiplied in the interior parts, that in every county a traveller would never lose sight of one habitation before he might see another, each the seat of industry, and many of them the nurseries of numerous and healthy children; and the sea frontier would be every where spiked, or, in the French idiom, *bristled* with large and populous cities, abounding with fishermen, sailors, and artists of every kind, and so fortified with rampart and ditch, as to bid defiance to the sudden attack of a foreign invader.

A P P E N D I X.

A GENERAL PLAN OF A LEASE

BY

LORD KAIMS,

WITH

SOME REMARKS UPON IT BY DR. ANDERSON,

IN HIS

AGRICULTURAL REPORT FOR THE COUNTY OF ABERDEEN.

I AM extremely happy to have it in my power on this occasion to lay before the public at large, through means of the Honourable Board, to whom this report is addressed, a plan of a lease which is perfectly adapted to secure alike the interest of the tenant, and the legitimate rights of the landlord; by which the rights of humanity can never be violated, and which can apply to all possible cases, so that neither of the parties can ever acquire an undue advantage over the other in any situation of things. To effect all these things appeared to me, for a great many years, to exceed the powers of human ingenuity to devise. It has been done; and the public are obliged to the late Lord Kaims for this excellent device.

K

His

His lordship proposed that the lease should extend to an indefinite number of years consisting of fixed periods, at the end of each of which a rise of rent should take place, with permission for the tenant, at the period of each of these rises of rent, to give up his farm, if he shall see proper, and granting a similar power to the landlord, upon proper terms, to resume his land if he shall think fit. The particulars of this contract, and the grounds on which they rest, are as under:

He assumes it as a postulatam that a landlord and tenant are capable of forming a tolerably just estimate of the value of land in question for a short period of years, such as it is customary to grant leases for in Scotland: say 21 years. And having agreed upon these terms, which for the present we shall call 100*l.* rent, the tenant expresses a wish to have his lease extended to a longer period. To this the proprietor objects, on this ground, that it is not possible to form a precise estimate of what the value of the ground may be at the end of that period. He has already seen that ground, for the last 21 years, has increased much more in value than any person at the beginning of that period could easily have conceived it would have done, and therefore he cannot think of giving it off just now for a longer period, as a similar rise in value may be expected to take place in future. This reasoning appears to be well founded, and therefore to give the landlord a reasonable gratification, he proposes that it should be stipulated that if the tenant should agree to give a certain rise of rent, at the end of that pe-
riod,

riod, suppose 20l. the landlord should consent that the lease should run on for another period of 21 years; unless in the cases to be after mentioned.

But as it may happen that this 20l. now stipulated to be paid at so distant a period, may be more than the farmer will find he is able to pay, an option shall be given to him to resign his lease, if he should find that is the case, by giving the landlord legal notice, one year at least, before the expiration of the lease; but if that notice be omitted thus to be given, it shall be understood that the tenant is bound to hold the lease for the second 21 years, at the rent specified in the contract. And if the landlord does not give the tenant warning within one month after the period, it shall be understood that he too is bound to accept of the stipulated additional rent for the 21 years that are to succeed.

It may however also happen that the sum specified in the lease may be a rent considerably below the then present value of the farm; or the proprietor may have very strong reasons for wishing to resume the possession of that land, or to obtain an adequate rent for it: a power therefore should be given to him, in either case, to resume the lands, if he should so incline. But as a great part of that present value may be owing to the exertions of the farmer, who has laid out money upon the farm, in hopes to enjoy it for a second period of 21 years, it would be unjust to deprive him of this benefit, without giving him a valuable consideration for that improved value. On this account it should be stipulated, that in case the proprietor at this time

refuse the farm, he shall become bound to pay to the tenant ten years purchase of the additional rent he had agreed to pay; which in the example above stated would be 200l.

But the land may be worth still more than the 20l. of rise mentioned in the lease, and the tenant may be content to pay more, say 10l. rather than remove, and he makes offer accordingly to do so. In that case the landlord should be bound either to accept that additional offer, or to pay *ten* years purchase for that also; and so on for every other offer the tenant shall make, before he agrees to move from the farm.

In this way the landlord is always certain that he can never be precluded from obtaining the full value for his land, whatever circumstances may arise. And if the tenant shall prove disagreeable, so that he would wish rather to put another in his place upon the same terms, it never can be any hardship upon the landlord to pay the stipulated sum; because it would be the same thing to him as if he bought a new estate at ten years purchase, free of taxes: a thing he can never expect to do. It is indeed true that it would be more advantageous for him to allow the present tenant to continue; and therefore this alternative will be always, unless in very extraordinary cases, accepted of, as it ever ought to be; and thus the tenant's mind is impressed with a conviction that he will continue in his possession: a conviction that ought ever to prevail, because it stimulates to industry in the highest degree. And as the tenant is thus certain that, at the very worst, his family must be entitled to draw

draw a reasonable remuneration for the exertions of his industry, he can never find the smallest tendency to slacken his endeavours in any way.

By stipulating in the original lease in the same manner, that at the end of the second 21 years, the lease shall be continued for 21 years more, and so on at the end of the third, and fourth, and any farther numbers of periods of 21 years, on agreeing to pay a specified rise of rent; reserving to each party the same privileges as above described, the lease might be continued to perpetuity, without either party ever being in danger of having an undue advantage over the other. The tenant will always be certain of having a preference given him over every other person, and will of course go on with unceasing exertions to better his land, which will of necessity tend to augment the income of the proprietor much more than could have happened under any other system of management.

Such are the outlines of that plan of a lease his Lordship has proposed. By this plan the tenant's hands are not tied up by restrictive clauses dictated by ignorance, under the pretext of securing the interest of the landlord. His interest is secured in a much more effectual manner, while the tenant is left at full liberty to avail himself of his knowledge, his skill, and his industry. Instead of ceasing to begin any arduous undertaking, as he ever must do where he has no lease, or of beginning to improve for a few years only at the commencement of his lease, but stopping in a short while in the midst of his career, and then running it down

to the same exhausted state as it was at its commencement, he continues to push forward without ever stopping, and advances even with an accelerated progress for an endless period of years. No person but an experienced farmer can conceive the difference that would be between the productiveness of the same land under this management, at the end of an hundred years, from what it would have been if let even for detached periods of 21 years each. In unimproved waste lands, the difference would approach to infinity. In lands which were originally very rich, the difference would be less considerable; but in all cases where cultivation could take place the difference would be very great. It is worth remarking here also, that if this arrangement were adopted, a new order of men in civil society would be created, different from any that at present exists. They would be inferior in point of rank to that class of men who are called *gentlemen*; and superior in point of wealth and energy, not only to the present order of *farmers*, but even to that class of men who are called *yeomen*. The peculiar political advantage attached to this order of society would be, that while their exertions would always insure affluence, that affluence never would become such as to permit them, by imitating the life of the higher orders, to neglect their own proper concerns; for the moment they did so, their exertions in business would become slackened, in consequence of which they could not afford such a rent as others around them would be willing to give, and so they must quit their lease.

Here

Here we are led to perceive the most essential difference between thus granting what may almost be called a perpetual lease, and every other *long* lease that ever yet has been tried; for in all other long leases, if the rent stipulated at first shall prove to be at last inadequate, and the holder of the lease be reduced to poverty, by dissipation or otherwise, he may neither himself be able to cultivate the ground properly, nor can another be permitted to do so; and by this means the proprietor may not only be for a long period of years deprived of an adequate value for his land, but that land also being locked up from improvement, may be doomed long to remain in a degree of comparative sterility. Nothing of that kind could here happen.

It differs also very much from that sort of tenure which is called yeomanry, in which the small capital, if properly applied, would have been just sufficient to give scope for agricultural exertions, but by being locked up on the original purchase of the land, it deprives the possessor of the only funds he had in his power to apply for improving his land. Instead of active exertions, and chearful affluence through life, he is thus stinted in every exertion, and is doomed to a perpetual hard struggle against the harrassments of poverty.

In short, were I either a proprietor or a tenant, I should either let or take land upon these terms, in preference to any other I have ever heard of. Several little clauses have been overlooked by his Lordship, which it would be necessary to advert to. Some provision ought to be made respecting trees on
a lease

a lease of this kind, as it is probable the tenant might find it convenient to plant, which by the common law of Scotland he cannot do at present with a view to profit. Perhaps the wood, if any was on the farm at the time of his entry, ought to be valued, and he should be bound to leave at least an equal value upon it, or pay the balance. Whatever timber trees he himself had planted, he should be at liberty to cut at pleasure, for the use of the farm, unless it were such individual trees as the landlord, from situation or other causes, should think proper to mark for reservation. He should also have permission to sell such trees as he inclined, unless as above reserved, or during the last six years of any of the 21 years of the lease. But in case of his removal, the proprietor shall either permit him the whole of the trees that was over the value of the stock at his entry, or take the whole, or such part as he chose to reserve, at an appreciated value. In case of his removal also the tenant should be bound not to outlabour the ground, during the last six years of the lease, or to crop it improperly, or to carry off any straw or dung: otherwise to pay the damages that should thus accrue to the landlord, at the estimate of two honest men, to be mutually chosen; and to leave the houses in a habitable condition, and the fences in good repair. There seems to be no other clause necessary in such a lease



