BOOK II.

CHAPTER I.

Vain Remedies for the supposed Increase of Pauperism—Sir John Sinclair respecting Farms—The spade instead of the plough—cow-keeping—cultivation of bogs in Ireland—fishing, &c.

I SHALL begin the imaginary remedies, which are as much more numerous than the causes of pauperism, as the *materia medica* exceeds the list of diseases. The remedies are equally fantastic in their object and their means. For a long time the misery felt or imagined was supposed to proceed from want of produce: hence the rage for cultivating commons, and the schemes for laying the earth under the heaviest contributions.

Sir John Sinclair has largely contributed to schemes and proposals for the culture of the land. One of the latest by him is to grant by loan ten millions from the sinking-fund to the agriculturists. Sir John has also written largely on farms of every scantling: he seems to think there should be farms for all denominations, as there are spectacles for all ages: he is a great friend to bounties on exportation, and even to coasting bounties[1]. The topic of large farms I shall hereafter resume. If the friends of large farms have

[1] Month. Rev. vol. v. p. 230.

transgressed, the advocates of small farms have erred egregiously[1]; but their error, far from sinning by inhumanity, rather fails by a misdirected sympathy with the laborious. This part of the subject I shall also resume hereafter: yet I must, before I dismiss it even for the present, make a few observations on the ultra-anti-machine doctrine of spade cultivation as preferable to the plough.

The spade is part of Mr. Owen's plan; and in this he would be consistent if he agreed with Hereuschwand that the spade produces less than the plough in respect to the expense of labour: for he expressly stated that his objection to machinery was its greater cheapness and facility in manufacturing,—particularly to the steam-engine, which Adam Smith computed, after paying the first cost, its repair, &c. was nine-tenths more profitable than horses. This being the case, it follows that in Mr. Owen's philosophy horses are preferable to that great machine of power, and of course that the spade, or human labour[2], is pre-

[1] Mr. Lechmere refers our distress to large farms. Annual Register, 1796, p. 47. Waltham on the Poor Laws, p. 8. Month. Mag. May 1819. p. 8: Nov. 1820, p. 304.

[2] Mr. Owen seems latterly to have discarded the plough entirely; at least in his exposé in the Dublin Morning Post, Dec. 5, 1822, the spade is only mentioned. He says the spade cultivation will enable Ireland to support sixty-four millions of people, and this without taking into the account the produce of its mines and fisheries. Here again is another turn. As to the productiveness of the spade, Sir C. Burrell said that he was incredulous;—he inquired, in consequence, from the tenant: the report was double the truth; instead of sixty bushels the acre, it was only thirty bushels. Morn. Chron. Dec. 16, 1819.

ferable to horse-work, which at less cost is more productive. That human labour is less effectual than the plough, I conclude is his opinion; for he says, in talking of his villages, that an ordinary man and woman can cultivate seven statute acres after they have been brought into a proper state of pulverization. Why land pulverized is land laboured. But what will the man and woman labour of ordinary land?—and why should women be forced to this severe toil, for which they are absolutely incapable, except for a short period of their lives, and then but occasionally? —and how does this concur with Mr. Owen's project of all living in abundance, yet daily working only a few hours? The horse and ox are living machines; and notwithstanding their keeping, which is greater than the board and clothing of men, they are generally, as machines, cheaper in cultivating the land.

There are exceptions. The spade is superior to the plough in the rudest state, when the labourer is destitute of capital to purchase even an ass. The spade also must be used in grounds interrupted with rocks. But what is the progress?—the rocks are taken away, and the cow and the ass (as I have witnessed in provinces of France from my first to my last acquaintance with that country) are succeeded by horses; and in time the women, who universally laboured the earth, and are now frequently occupied in agriculture, will be relieved from that operose duty to which Mr. Owen would, as an improvement, subject the females of Great Britain. Gardens are, of course, better cultivated by the spade. Old Lysons was justified, in respect to the Battersea gardens, in

exclaiming, "O the incredible profit of digging the ground[1]!" I have also known fields in the north of Ireland profitably dug: but then the linen trade was so depressed and unprofitable, that the loom sometimes scarcely returned the cost of the yarn. But are not these pitiful exceptions? And yet Mr. Ricardo and Mr. Brougham indirectly countenanced the spade speculation, by expressing an ignorance of the subject, and voting for the investigation of Mr. Owen's plan by a committee of the House of Commons. Let Mr. Playfair and Mr. Chambers insist that the spade should supersede the plough: Let Mr. Willis[2] propose that commissioners and sub-commissioners be appointed; that money be raised, land taken and worked with the spade: Let Mr. Bayley propose a court of guardians: and Mr. Heathfield[3] recommend that gradations of paupers "be formed, particularly with a view to instruction and occupation in the use of the spade." Is the spade a new instrument? is it little used? We must conclude in the affirmative, or else all classes of the community are ignorant of their interest. The spade—the spade, *την σκαφην σκαφην λεγοντες*. I know but of one instance of the spade being substituted for the plough: I speak of the inhabitants of Berber. Yet Burckhardt, who relates the fact, speaks most unfavourably of the tillage of that people:

---

[1] Month. Rev. vol. xi. p. 385. Environs of London, published in 1792.

[2] Month. Magazine, 1820, p. 21; 1821, p. 227.

[3] On Liquidating the National Debt, p. 75.

"Nor law they know, nor manners; nor the care
Of labouring oxen, nor the shining share."

The next remedy proposed is cow-keeping. It is said that the rich by inclosing commons deprived many of keeping cows, who previously enjoyed that advantage[1]. To make proper what was common is a great improvement. Yet I have no doubt but in effecting this change, the rich, as is their custom, seized the lion's share; and thus many poor men lost their cows on the inclosure of commons. Whether regard for the poor (which is returning, as Mr. Malthus's heartless and headless doctrines are condemned,) operated on a late occasion, I cannot say; but at a meeting at Chigwell, called in respect to the propriety of inclosing Epping Forest, the proposal was generally discountenanced.

To assist the poor by providing them with cows, was partially intended by Mr. Pitt's bill[2] on the poor; which strange bill contained provisions for setting apart portions of wastes, with consent of the lords of manors, for schools of industry. Mr. Arthur Young was a strenuous advocate for the cow-keeping plan: he who would not allow a weaver a potatoe-garden, proposed farms and cows for day-labourers. Mr. Myers considers that each poor man should have a cow: which is actually the condition in Bjorko[3]; "there is a cow for every mouth." The Society for Bettering the Condition of the Poor, in their gene-

[1] Annual Register, 1816. p. 463.
[2] See Sir F. Eden, vol. iii. p. 318.
[3] Clarke's Scandinavia, p. 526.

rosity, affirm that each poor man should singly possess two or three cows. Should we attain this situation, the English might adopt the epithet *Trimilchi*, which, according to Bede[1], our Saxon ancestors possessed; and the country be called *Galaxeon*, from a district in Bœotia[2] which by the bounty of the gods flowed with milk.

Some economists have far transcended the foregoing puny improvements, and for this purpose various estimates have been submitted to the public. The whole area of England and Wales has been calculated to contain 34, 35, 36, and 37, millions of acres. Mr. Brown estimates the acres producing grain in Great Britain at eight millions, each acre producing three quarters. Mr. Spence estimated the waste lands of Great Britain at 20 millions of acres: and Mr. Banfell, from the agricultural returns, concluded that one-third of the surface capable of cultivation was untouched. So much land being capable of cultivation, it was concluded that it should be forthwith submitted to tillage. For this purpose, it was proposed that a *Board* of men of property, with a treasury in each county, should purchase all the waste land, and subject it to cultivation.

Ireland was connected in these rare speculations of extending the dominion of Ceres. Indeed, Plato never contemplated the cultivation of the earth to such extent, when he advised that the most barren land should be employed for sepulture. Mr. Edgeworth

[1] De Ratione Temporis, c. xix. L. Dict. vol. ii. p. 726.
[2] Plutarch. Moralia, p. 625.

estimated the peat soil in Ireland at three millions of acres:—the Commissioners for bogs state the amount at 2,830,000 acres. In 1820 a Report was made by a Committee of the Dublin Society, the residuary legatee of the wisdom and purity of the Irish Parliament. This committee disclaim theory, and affirm that their opinions are founded on the *unquestionable testimony of noblemen and gentlemen,* who are lauded for the information they gave:—It is this; "that every description of bog is capable of being reclaimed and converted into profitable land, which would adequately, nay liberally, remunerate the outlay of the capital necessary to accomplish that object," &c. Then, with the happiest self-satisfaction, they add; "Your committee congratulate the society and the country at large on this satisfactory result of their labours"—asserting that the two hundred millions expended by Great Britain on foreign grain could have been furnished by Ireland, had her bogs been judiciously improved[1]. Wonderful! But who shall be the cultivators of this mighty space?—Probably the descendants of the firl-bolgs, men of the caves who were children of Nimrod. These shall turn the peat bogs into arable, and raise up wheat for the British empire.

"What's 'come of thy men, thou Gordin so gay?
They're in the bogs of Dunkirtie mowing of hay."

[1] This may alarm Mr. Ricardo, who attributed the low price of corn principally to the great importations from Ireland. April 10, 1821. And yet the export of grain from Ireland to England in fifteen years amounted only to 12,304,000 quarters of grain.

This Commission and Report are a compound of blundering and jobbing. The commission was got up by one who has been praised for his regard to the tillage of Ireland, yet whose capacity was confined to place-making and prodigality[1]. The expense of bringing one acre of bog into cultivation would purchase an acre of tolerable land. Besides, bog reclaimed requires frequent repair; and moreover, bog or moss or peat—call it as they may—has not basis or staple to produce a single grain of tolerable wheat.

Having used all endeavours to make the land productive, many have extended the design to the sea. Who has not heard of the improvement of the fisheries as a means of relieving the poor? This is an old project revived. In James the First's reign the herring-fishery was expected mainly to relieve the *poor.* So in Charles the Second's it was insisted that the fishing-trade would completely set *the poor to work*; and it was proposed in 1673 to establish fisheries, in order to set the poor to work[2]. All these speculations were derived from the practice of Holland, whose fisheries about this period furnished food to half a million of people[3]. But Holland and

[1] The bounty on land carriage fostered by him was proposed as an encouragement to agriculture. Lord Macartney gave his opinion, that it was intended by it to diminish the revenue of the Crown and weaken the Government, and thus increase the consequence of Parliament. Works, vol. ii. p. 138.

[2] Harleian Miscellany, vol. viii. p. 60. See also another project, Ibid. vol. vii. p. 341.

[3] De Witt's True Interest of Holland, part i. c. 9.

England were very different, and in none more than in the governments of the two countries. Yet Sir W. Temple[1], a name dear to philosophy and freedom, was so beguiled with the produce of fishing, among the thrifty busy republicans of the United Provinces, that he proposed the fishing trade to Ireland—the abject and tormented slave of Great Britain—in order to serve Ireland, a country of which he observes; "The largeness and plenty of food and scarcity of people, all things necessary to life are so cheap, that an industrious man by two days' labour may gain enough to feed him the rest of the week[2]," &c. Yet in Ireland where he also says, beef is a drug[3], he suggests that four companies should be instituted, to improve the fishing-trade. The same fishing scheme is every lustrum revived among the ameliorating projects for Ireland. Whether Mr. Shultes extends his views to Ireland, I do not recollect; but he is very sanguine in its effects in Great Britain, not less than that it will *extinguish the poor rates:* and as an assurance of his sagacity, he insists it should *be undertaken in the name of Government*[4]. Mr. Frazer, however, has taken Ireland, in respect to the fishing scheme, under his immediate protection; and he proposes both to improve its fisheries, and cultivate its bogs; which, he says, would make Ireland "the envy of the world." Poor Ireland! whose prospective opulence is confined to the schemes of projectors!

[1] Works, vol. ii. p. 217.
[2] Ibid. vol. i. p. 61.
[3] vol. i. p. 114 and 119.
[4] page 78.

CHAPTER II.

Remedies, to increase the price of grain—to exclude the entry of foreign grain—increased prices—increased expenditure—to make roads—to build churches.

HITHERTO the whole scope of reasoning and speculation was to increase produce, and ensure abundance. But now, as the evil is inverted, and the desideratum of course is, to limit the excess of all things, the plethora being universal,—the first of the stinting projects is to obstruct and finally prohibit the commerce of corn inwards.—Though various impertinent and contradictory practices were not unknown in this country, the more general object, here and elsewhere, was to secure plenty at home by preventing a diminution of the existing stock by exportation. Then export was allowed at certain prices; and to this was added a bounty on export. Mr. Malthus[1] admires this policy. Adam Smith, with his usual sagacity, condemned it. Indeed the only tolerable reason assigned for feeding strangers more cheaply by our corn than our own people, is given by the Marquess de Casaux—that the bounty was some indemnity to agriculturists, in respect to the monopolies granted to tradesmen and merchants. This was a consistency in error—multiplying evils instead of ending them.

[1] Principles of Population, vol. ii. p. 160.

Some begin the extreme pauperism of England, as they express themselves[1], with the year 1773, when the corn laws were repealed, and a duty of sixpence the quarter only was laid on the importation of foreign corn. It may be said, except for a few short intervals, the trade in corn was free from 1773 to 1814. Then, instead of a bounty on exported corn, its import was controlled. The difficulty increased with the reduction of the circulating medium, till on the return to cash payments the original sum of 80*s.* actually amounted to 96*s.*, such being the difference of the currency of the two periods. By the law of last session the import price was further enhanced. Yet still certain legislators and colloquists[2] propose that duties should be laid on all agricultural produce, in order that English proprietors may be relieved from all competition from foreign growers. What landlords and farmers can desire beyond a monopoly of the market, is unimaginable; for 80*s.* the quarter, in the state of the currency and of the world, amounts to a famine price: if this does not satisfy them, they design to starve the people, in order in their wisdom and humanity to uphold rents, tithes, and taxes. Happy expedients, truly, for relieving the general distress! It was said that 1720 was a year of projects; but surely the present deserves that title: and it may be remarked, that there was in 1720 a *scire facias* issued[3], which dissipated these delusions. This

[1] Morning Chronicle, Nov. 23, 1819.
[2] Mr. Pinsent's Conversations on Political Economy, &c.
[3] Anderson's Commerce, vol. iii. p. 343.

was a quick remedy. But what process can cure the existing infatuation? for the evil complained of is the superabundance of all things! and *ruinously low prices*, to use the expression of the Agricultural Committee in 1821. Formerly the lament was the high price of provisions. To countervail which, the empirics of that day (one of whom is styled the author of the "Dignity of Human Nature!") advised a *Provision Society*, another patronized a *Board of Plenty*[2]. But now the reunion of Boards and Societies recommend, and have effected through our wise parliament of king, lords and commons, a starving statute.

In aid of the new code, intended to raise the price of the prime necessary of life to double its present price in Britain, and treble its price in France, it is further proposed that much of the public money should be expended in public works; for Mr. Baring[3], Mr. Ricardo[4], and Mr. Malthus[5], insist on the unbounded wealth and the immense increase of capital during the war. This may be so; and yet, without noticing the expense during the first period of hostilities, the extraordinary war expenditure for the last twenty-three years amounted annually to about forty-seven millions; and in the concluding four years of the war the money raised (including the sinking-fund) reached the enormous amount of 486,065,000*l.* Yet neither the monied gentlemen, Messrs. Baring and

[1] Month. Rev. O. S. vol. xxxv. p. 147.
[2] Ibid. vol. xxxvi. p. 488.
[3] Speech, Morning Chronicle, May 9, 1820.
[4] Political Economy, &c. second edit. p. 170.
[5] Principles of Political Economy, p. 421.

Ricardo, nor the professor of political economy, Mr. Malthus, are agreed in the mode of this prodigious enrichment during a war which exhausted the yearly rental of the land in its maintenance—Mr. Baring referring this miracle to what he calls a monopoly of the trade of the world—Mr. Ricardo to private saving[1], and Mr. Malthus[2] to high profits, economy, and industry. They are still more at variance in respect to the causes of the present distress; Mr. Baring attributing the derangement to a return to cash payments—a measure advocated by Mr. Ricardo, and which he says could not have depreciated prices more than the difference between paper and gold, which was not more than two per cent.[3]; though he has since admitted the fall to be ten per cent. The fact is, that the war altered, dispersed, revolutionized property: the monied interest has become actually or indirectly the landed interest; as at Rome, the debts incurred by incessant hostility transferred the acres to the money-changers:—in truth, the land-

[1] Speech in March 1821.

[2] "It is the only cause which seems capable of accounting for the prodigious accumulation among individuals, which must have taken place in this country during the last war, and which left us with a greatly increased capital, notwithstanding the vast annual destruction of stock for so long a period." p. 202. The *only* cause, according to the context, is triple; namely, "high profits, economy, and industry."

[3] Lord Dacre said at the Hertford meeting, that Mr. Ricardo had told him in the House, that the depreciation in value of landed property after the return to cash payments never could vary more than the relative price of gold had varied, that is, two per cent.

lord is the tenant of the fund-holder, whose agents are the tax-gatherer and the Lords of the Treasury. But more of this hereafter.

Some, pursuing the opinion of the productiveness of the war, consider the immediate cause of the distress the reduction of taxation. Mr. Gray, in a work entitled the "Happiness of States," also admires the productiveness of the war; and he estimates the national debt a copious source of wealth[1], and productive of nearly fifteen per cent. of the whole national income. On such premises he laments consecutively the halt to the expenditure of Government, reputing it the primary source of all our woe.

Hence this judicious person advises a large expenditure. In this spirit Sir John Sinclair proposed the embankment of Lancaster sands, and to lay out three millions on a great road to Scotland. Mr. Frazer advises that a parliamentary grant be made for repairing roads and forming new lines, building bridges, and enlarging harbours in England, Ireland, &c. on a large scale. Mr. Burns[2], on the contrary, considers the increase and extension of public works as the great cause of deteriorating the morals of the people.

But the sublimest project of this kind was the recommendation of building churches: and what adds to the peculiarity of the proposal is, that it originated with the Edinburgh Review, which indeed sometimes repays the liberal hints in the Quarterly Review by flash articles in favour of Church and State. It is

[1] page 659. [2] Hist. Disq. &c. p. 241.

said, indeed, that the author of the article composed astronomical sermons. Probably. Yet it is certain that in the February Number of 1818[1], that journal strenuously recommends the erection of churches as a remedy for pauperism. How a million of the national revenue expended in building churches could relieve paupers, is only conceivable on the Laureate's principles of political economy.

The business from its concoction (to use a conceited term) to its completion is most curious. When Mr. Vansittart was asked by Mr. Gipps respecting his intention on church building, he declined making any proposal to parliament on this point, "on account of the existing state of our finances." Yet in the subsequent year, when the country was more grievously distressed, he proposed to parliament the expenditure of a million for this very purpose.

Supposing that the benefit to be derived from additional churches did not regard the occupation of labourers in their erection, but as adding to the accommodation of the people religiously disposed;—still it is to be ascertained whether more places of worship be wanted for those of the Protestant faith. That they are not wanted, we might conclude from their not being built. Zeal never wanted supplies. Greeks and Armenians in Turkey[2], dissenters in England, can always command a house of assembly, though

[1] page 277.

[2] They frequently build churches with precipitate activity, lest the permission of the Porte should be withdrawn. Van Egmont's Travels, vol. i. p. 205.

they are considerably poorer than the members of the Establishment. Then why should not the opulent members of the favoured creed raise receptacles for themselves from their own funds? They are not wanted, or Protestants want zeal. How does this appear? There were fourteen churches built by private subscription in Liverpool: besides, proprietary chapels are numerous. St. Pancras had only one church, but it possessed three chapels, and these were well attended. Why? Because it is the interest of the proprietors that preachers of ability minister in them. But this, which is good for religion, is bad for the Establishment.

On what grounds, then, is it asserted that the churches are not commensurate to the people? A comparative calculation, indeed, was made of the population of the number of persons which the churches could contain, and thence it was concluded the people want accommodation. But the majority of the people do not go to church. Many even of the Protestant religion are repelled, in consequence of law processes and bickerings about tithes, from associating in public devotion in the parish church. Many abstain from church on account of the negligent ministration of the service. What must be the consequence, when to about eleven thousand churches the resident incumbents are only 4421! that is, nearly two-thirds of the beneficed clergy receive their salaries without affording a pretext of executing their duty to their parishioners; and of those who do officiate, many seem to consider their business a tedious formality, as Lord Redesdale declared in the House of

Lords, much to the discomfiture of His Grace of Canterbury.

Suppose, however, that every minister of the established religion did feel at all times, as they professed, the call of the Holy Ghost; that they were all resident—all conscientious in discharging their spiritual functions,—How few of the people are of the Protestant persuasion actually and heartily! and this secession daily increases, and must increase. If to the eighty churches of London, eighty were added, and these were reserved entirely for the people[1], instead of an inconsiderable space in them, the separation from the Established Church would continue; for, constituted as the monarchy is, these churches would be used not for God's but man's service[2]. What the celebrated Dr. Skelton said of Primate Robinson, "Aye, he builds fine churches, but he cares not who he puts into them," is equally applicable to church-building in our happy constitution of Church and State. Some think that to build churches

[1] It is proposed to build 85 churches, which it is calculated will afford sittings to 144,190 persons; one-third of these to be free seats, or appropriated to the use of the poor: each seat, according to the sum to be expended, will cost about seven pounds eight shillings.

[2] This is in the language of Bubb Doddington Lord Melcombe, "offering boroughs for nothing, when they are a commodity so particularly marketable," meaning getting a place for them. He told the Duke of Newcastle, that in elections those that would take money he would pay, and those that would not take money he (the Duke) must pay. He adds, I recommended two parsons of Bridgewater and Weymouth, *Boroughs* and *Franklin*, who were of course advanced in the Church.

must magically arrest the fall of a declining domination; as in the darker ages of Christianity their erection was supposed to sanctify their prostitute founders. Churches and religion have no necessary connection: it is questionable if churches existed when Domesday Book was composed; at least no churches are mentioned in any of the districts detailed in that survey. Christianity had no temples for centuries, and itinerancy and field-preaching have more than once triumphed over mighty establishments. Churches do not teach. Dubois[1] says, "There is not perhaps in the whole world a land in which buildings destined for religious uses are so numerous as in India," &c. How are the Indians benefited by their multiplicity? Or, to come nearer to our own affairs, How were the people of Aquila[2] improved or relieved by their one hundred and eleven churches? or Madrid, which has more churches and religious foundations than any city of its size in Europe[3] except Rome? or Rome, which is called the city of churches? Churches will not reduce the poor rates, or diminish paupers, by their moral influence, if this be the object of their erection; and as they are raised by taxation and multiply the clergy, they tend to aggravate the distress of the people. The Edinburgh Reviewer, however, seriously recommended the building of churches as a remedy against the increase of

[1] page 393. [2] Scipione Mazzella, p. 254.

[3] With this limitation, Lampedusa has the prerogative. Van Egmont says, the island contained one inhabitant, who had raised an altar and read mass before a statue of the Virgin Mary.—Travels, vol. i. p. 63.

paupers, and the call was heard to the amount of one million: and the Quarterly Review[1] in a late Number adds, "that a plain and intelligible policy will require many repetitions of the grant." Yet in 1547[2] many churches were pulled down in York, expressly in order to relieve the poor. Such, however, is the triumph of the alliance of Church and State,—to enrich the Church and tax the poor are to relieve the people. The sarcasm of Protarchus[3] is stronger now than ever,—"Happy are the stones which rear the altar, because they are honoured, while those of the same sort are trodden on."

CHAPTER III.

Mr. Malthus's remedy—his eulogium on the idle consumers—their services necessary to society, according to his newest doctrine.

NOW, though to expend the public funds on works not necessary, be a preposterous course to relieve

[1] Quar. Rev. No. liv. p. 310. The Reviewer then makes a long quotation from Mr. Southey in praise of the expenditure and prosperity during the war, and the benefit of taking through taxation the money of the people and expending it for them by Government. The Reviewer superadds, that the Government exhibits a culpable facility in yielding to the popular claim for *every kind* of retrenchment.

[2] "The superfluous churches shall be pulled down, towards the reparation and enlargement of the other churches, or of the bridges of the said city, and the relief of the poor." Anderson's Commerce, vol. ii. p. 107.

[3] Aristot. de Nat. Auscult. lib. ii. c. vi. p. 336.

distress occasioned principally by waste and taxation, yet has Mr. Malthus improved on this project; and if he formerly obtained an ovation for proving that England suffered from excess of people and want of food, he carries off, without competition, the greater triumph by demonstrating that all our embarrassments proceed from superfluous subsistence. This, obviously, contradicts his reiterated dogma in his Essay on Population. Mr. Malthus started a philosopher, avowedly, in consequence of reading a crotchet in a celebrated writer. In the first and second editions of his work, he allowed no check to population but vice and misery. He then began to fear that this doctrine was not sufficiently respectful to the Author of all. On this surmise,—for he does not seem to have improved from a philosophical spirit;—he superadded moral restraint. His words are, "The chief reason why I allowed myself to suppose the universal prevalence of this was, that I might endeavour to remove any imputation on the goodness of the Deity." How any man,—I do not speak of one who had written volume after volume on population,—but how any ordinary thinker could exclude moral restraint from the procreation of human beings, is marvellous. I have mentioned in my "Population of Nations" various facts[1], including whole nations, which illustrate the extent and intensity of the feeling.

[1] I subjoin a few others. In Sumatra, when a woman is found with child before marriage, her father is fined forty dollars. Marsden.—The Tartars of Dagesten do not permit any one to marry who has not planted an hundred fruit-trees. Hist. Gen. des Tartares, p. 313.—In Tuscany marriage is confined to the

And I ask, What rules public opinion and stops universal intercourse, when passion prompts, but a regard to consequences? Yet Mr. Malthus has been reputed a profound investigator of causes, and a comprehensive and an original thinker. His pretensions to originality rest on his proofs, that without food men will not breed[1]; a position surely not first recognised in the 19th century. It has been assumed by various writers, ancient and modern, from Plato to Herrenschwand[2] and David Young[3] of Perth. He

eldest; *L'aîné de la famille se marie*, &c. Sirmonde, Agriculture Toscane, p. 101.—A wife so young or so old as not to have her courses, is supposed by the Mahometan code to excite greater desire, "as the husband can indulge his carnal appetite with such a wife without any apprehension of her producing children, the support of whom might fall upon him," &c. Hedaya, vol. i. p. 206. The aila probably regarded that consequence, ibid. p. 206 et seq. Children are suckled for two years, ibid. p. 189 et seq. So respecting the Montenegrins, who do not cohabit with their wives while they suckle their children. Ann. Regist. 1788, p. 15.

[1] "The importance of the great law of nature, under which the want of food is every where found to be the grand obstacle to the multiplication of the species, was first duly appreciated by Mr. Malthus." David Buchanan Enc. Britannica, "Emigration." Mr. Ricardo also glorified the Essay on Population, in his Essay, p. 549. He has every reason, since Mr. Malthus's Principles of Political Economy, to correct that opinion.

[2] Month. Rev. vol. lxxvi. p. 97.

[3] "Now as the population of a country can only increase in the proportion of the means of subsistence," &c. in Month. Rev. vol. lxxxi. p. 22, Old Series. A late writer is more an inventor than Mr. Malthus, who says, "The growth of population is in manner regulated by the amount of subsistence," &c. Ravenstone on Population, &c. p. 129.

has also been praised for proving that if men are multiplied, subsistence not increasing accordingly, they must be wretched. Sir James Steuart[1] had said, in that case "multiplication would be misery:" and he went further than Mr. Malthus; for he insisted, and Sirmonde follows him, that a parish priest was warranted in not marrying individuals who had not a reasonable prospect of providing for their children[2]. Mr. Malthus, I admit, has shown a peculiar genius in his geometrical and arithmetical ratios, of which he is so fond, that even in his Principles of Political Economy[3], he says, "A geometrically increasing pair, would now have filled every yard of our earth, and all the planets of our solar system; and not only those, but all the planets revolving round the stars," &c. Verily, breeding in Mr. Malthus's calculation surpasses the miraculous penny of Dr. Price, out of which he made golden the earth and many stars.

Mr. Malthus saw all sorts of horrors in population. Even in this he is not original[4]. And observe, he never cast a stray thought on the evils of a thinly peopled country. Yet to the want of population, the insalubrity of different parts of the Roman territory[5],

[1] Vol. i. p. 79. He however said, "that multiplication is the efficient cause of agriculture," vol. i. p. 114.

[2] Ibid. p. 71. [3] p. 227 et seq.

[4] Signore Giuliani was just in the same fright, and, like his successor, considered wars as necessary to keep the population within bounds. Saggio Politico sopra le Vicissitudine inevitabile della Societa civile.

[5] Edin. Rev. March 1817, p. 50. So Bell says of another

once so populous, is attributed. People purify the air and earth [1], while a declining population increases the unhealthiness of both; and a destitution of people renders unhealthy tracts pestilential.

No wonder that Mr. Malthus, whose humble followers honour him as the Scholastics did the subtle, the singular, the irrefragable, and the angelic doctors, should dread any increase of people, for such in his dialect means an increase of wretchedness. Yet this writer, absurd and inconsistent, glorifies *the goodness of the Deity*, while, in a score of places, he insists on the general pressure of population on the means of subsistence, and that this pressure is constant and universal. In short, he seems to consider that mankind are and have been afflicted with what the Syracusans called the hungry disease. Yet, notwithstanding this incessant din in his "Principles of Population" of the pressure of population against the means of subsistence [2], that is, the excess of peo-

part of the world, "There is no want of any thing but people to cultivate a fruitful soil, well watered by many of the noblest rivers in the world, and these stored with a variety of such fine fish as are seldom found in other countries. As to fine woods furnished with all sorts of game and wild fowl, no country can exceed it." Pinkerton, vol. vii. p. 431.

[1] I refer the reader to the beginning of the second book of Machiavel's History, for some views of population which never occurred to his philosophy.

[2] I know nothing like this greediness of mankind in his Population, except the Tartarian lamb mentioned by Bell. He says, some believed that the Tartarian lamb partook of the natures of a vegetable and an animal; and that this plant fed on all grass and growing things which surrounded it. Pinkerton's Travels, vol. vii. p. 284.

ple in respect to their food,—in his last work (it might be called posthumous), he, in malice to his admirers, and determined on self-destruction, declares "a fertile soil, and an ingenious people, cannot only support a considerable proportion of unproductive consumers without injury, but may absolutely require such a body of demanders in order to give effect to their powers of production [1]." Then were those justified who petitioned against coaches and caravans in 1673 [2], because, said they, before those were customary, five times as many horses and attendants were requisite for the same number of persons: and how excellent are the Asiatic to the European armies! In India warfare, a field-officer [3] has forty attendants, a captain twenty, and a subaltern ten. Mr. Malthus continues in the same strain: "The productive classes have the power of consuming all that they produce; but it is found, by experience, that though they may have the power, there is not the will, and it is to supply this will, that a body of unproductive con-

[1] Principles of Political Economy, p. 464.

[2] "First, every passenger that now travels in a coach would have one horse at least, and many of them one, two, or three servants with them, who now ride sneaking about without any attendants at all; whereby, in all probability, according to moderate computation, there would be at least forty or fifty horses upon the road instead of nine or ten that draw the coach or caravan"—in 1673. Harleian Miscellany, vol. viii. p. 36.

[3] Field officers, including those who have charge of their baggage, cannot have less than forty, captains twenty, and subalterns ten servants, &c. in a campaign in India. Dirom's Narrative of the Campaign in India.

sumers is necessary[1]." These doughty propositions he has repeated as frequently in the last composition, as their contraries in the former on Population[2]. In *that* he said Produce, he says in *this* Consume—and these lucubrations also he will of course prove consonant to the *Goodness of the Deity* and scriptural withal, though man is ordered to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow. Yet many idlers are necessary, merely to increase the occupation of mankind. Thus do the strangest errors not only die and revive, but flourish at the same time on the same stock. This admiration of idlers, and their advancement to the rank of national benefactors, is not a casual observation. I have said he states it repeatedly, and in different ways, as follows: "With regard to these latter (the unproductive) classes, such as statesmen, soldiers, sailors, and those who live upon the interest of the national debt, it cannot be denied that they contribute powerfully to distribution and demand; they frequently occasion a division of property more favourable to the progress of wealth, than would otherwise have taken place: they ensure that *consumption* which is necessary to give the proper stimulus to production; and the *desire to pay a tax*, and yet enjoy the same means of gratification, must often operate to excite the exertions of industry quite as effectually as the desire to pay a lawyer or a physician[3]." Thus taxation is good; but idle consumers, the *fruges consumere nati*, are better. What excellent helpers in our plethoric state would be Nicholas Wood[1] and the glutton Domery! they were great consumers. If this doctrine be true, then are wire-worms and locusts, and the turnip-fly, and vermin of all kinds, most beneficial. Read another passage: "As, from the nature of population, an increase of labourers cannot be brought into the market, in consequence of a particular demand, till the lapse of sixteen or eighteen years, and the conversion of revenue into capital *may take place much* more *rapidly, a country is always* liable to *an increase of the funds* for the *maintenance of labour*, faster than the *increase of population*[2]," &c. Yet this is the very man who repeated, like the burthen of a ditty, that population was always pressing against the means of subsistence.

Most glorious philosopher, who taught the world, a wondering world, that, let men do as they would, they might breed geometrically, but could only produce food arithmetically! This was your theme through five editions, and now precipitated *per se*; you invert the conclusion, and declare that men cannot consume the produce of their industry, unless assisted by a retinue of ravening idlers.

[1] Principles of Political Economy, p. 489; see also p. 332.
[2] Ibid. pp. 355. 463. [3] Ibid. p. 480; see also p. 427.

[1] Nicholas Wood could eat two loins of mutton as if they were three sprats. Domery's feats exceed this. See Ann. Register, 1800, p. 365.
[2] p. 357.

CHAPTER IV.

Vain remedy for our distress—foreign colonization.

IT was once the national law[1] to restrict emigration[2]; and many laws in England forbid an unlicensed departure. Laws also were enacted to obstruct the passage of the people abroad, under the colour of regulating passengers and tonnage; and so unfriendly were our politicians and colonists to expatriation[3], that Sir William Petty[4] wished "that the people of New England should be transplanted into Old England according to proposals of their own made within this twenty years." However, the industrious and ingenious, both English and Scotch, have lately been solicited by a free passage, and lands and implements of husbandry, to quit their own country, superabounding in manufactures, grain, and *surplus produce* of all kinds, and settle in Canada. Observe, too, that this bounty on expatriation occurred after eleven thousand nine hundred and seventy-six British and Irish had arrived at the United States in one year; after the emigration had increased in 1819; moreover, though in 1819 five thousand eight hundred and eighty-one persons sailed from the single

[1] Martens, Droit Publique, tome i. p. 99.

[2] 25 Geo. 3. c. 17, 31. Do. c. 23. Men have been in the year 1822 prosecuted under these acts.

[3] The republican spirits were detained in England in Charles the First's time, though prepared to abandon the country.

[4] p. 269.

port of Belfast: in short, when twenty-seven thousand English and Irish arrived at New York, and twelve thousand at Quebec. Under these circumstances, the Monthly Review[1] also asked if parishes would not be justified in advancing sums to transfer those who would be burthens to the parish, to our colonies in the United States: and the Quarterly Review[2] of the same month and year affirmed, that it would be better for us and our colonies to send the poor to them, at ten times the expense, than to transport them as criminals to Botany Bay.

This project of colonizing Canada was soon abandoned: and Mr. Goulburn, in the name of the Colonial Office, declared, "that His Majesty's Government have ceased to give any encouragement to individuals desirous of proceeding as settlers to His Majesty's colonies abroad." Mr. Vansittart[3] also declared that the North American provinces of Great Britain were overloaded with emigrants. Mr. Vansittart then wished to turn the tide of emigration to the Cape of Good Hope; and in 1819, one year after Mr. Goulburn's statement, he proposed to parliament a vote of 50,000*l.* for executing schemes of transplanting the people of Great Britain to the Cape, a region by the scribes of Government represented an ulterior Paradise; yet which, since the money has been obtained and the people transplanted, is called a bleak

[1] Month. Rev. Dec. 1820, p. 385.

[2] Quart. Rev. Dec. 1820, p. 257.

[3] Morning Chronicle, April 29, 1820.

and barren promontory. The Quarterly Review [1] is now disposed to moderate the disposition towards the Cape, and to move to Van Diemen's Land [2], a paradise unparadised: yet here again this outlet is checked by the Colonial Office requiring that settlers in this land should possess at least 500*l.* capital. Yet this is not the end of ministerial wavering, circling, and contradictions.

When the American colonies would not be taxed (as are the bulk of the British and Irish) without representation, and they had become free, colonies were dreadful remembrances. Then British subjects were disallowed from having any permanent establishment in India. The English went Eastward, to return rapidly rich: and so late as Lord Mornington's administration, no Englishman was allowed to remain in Oude who was not a servant of the Government [3]. Time brought forgetfulness; and it has been lately seriously proposed to colonize India, in order to relieve England [4]. The Quarterly Review particularly declares, that if population increases as it has done, it will soon be right to encourage *emigration by a bounty*, and India is marked as a fit receptacle for the superfluity;—to be sure Mrs. Graham [5] proposes that

[1] Quart. Rev. October 1820, p. 374.

[2] It is indispensable, according to the notice from the Colonial Office, that a capital of 500*l.* should be possessed by any one permitted to settle in Van Diemen's Land, or in New South Wales. Quart. Rev. vol. liii. p. 99.

[3] Mill's British India, vol. ii. p. 482.

[4] April 1814, p. 252. [5] India, p. 128.

the half-cast children should be exported from India to Britain. Whether we shall ever colonize India, or whether the English will be allowed to remain in that country, is questionable:—but we have begun with the Cape, which some with a felicity of language call the half-way house to India.

I am far from condemning colonization; but I object to it as undertaken by Government to relieve England of a supposed excess of its people. Colonization is at best a venture. 400,000*l.* were raised to establish a colony at Darien [1], and a second and a third recruit of men and provisions were added; and all failed [2]. In 1783, 50,000*l.* were expended on the journey and houses for one thousand emigrants from Geneva, who were settled at the confluence of the rivers Barrow and Suir in the county of Waterford [3]. This scheme did not succeed: and it must have failed had the people been settled in Ireland; for this colony was intended to introduce manufactures into Ireland, at a time when the "commercial propositions" were introduced into the Irish parliament,—a measure only less fatal to the manufactures of that country, than the destruction of the woollen trade in William's reign, and the ruin of all manufactures by the Union [4].

The colony of Sierra Leone [5], towards which 240,000*l.* were originally subscribed, has repeatedly

[1] Burnet, vol. iii. p. 300. [2] Ibid. p. 324.

[3] Ann. Reg. 1783, pp. 202 and 352.

[4] Even the linen trade has declined.

[5] Ann. Reg. 1798, p. 237.

suffered the greatest distress. The colony of Swiss, principally from Fribourg, of two thousand individuals to the Brazils, has experienced various calamities. The colony to the Cape of Good Hope, already mentioned, has deplorably sunk, though supported by the British Government; the population in a very short space of time being reduced from eighty-four to thirty heads of families. Such blundering and mismanagement have been exhibited on this subject, that it recalls Ali Pasha's answer, when he was told of the wretched situation of the Souliots of Gauka, "Let them perish: it was not for the purpose of living at all that I sent them thither[1]."

Suppose, however, that every colony succeeded. A vacancy is not effected by emigration. Gallicia, Asturias, Biscay, and Navarre, which supplied New Spain with people, still supported their numbers. Ustaritz and Alberoni[2] have made this remark: and Davenant[3] proved that the current of people to America had not lessened the population of Great Britain. The same fact is repeated in respect to Switzerland. Tissot lamented that the evil of emigration had become epidemical: yet we find the Switzers continue to emigrate, and even to pass in bodies to South America.

Suppose, however, the emigration so complete that the void should not be replenished by the ordinary course of events,—what could an evacuation of five thousand (the amount of the expatriation to the Cape

[1] Pouqueville, p. 59. Phillips, &c.
[2] Test. Politique, § 2. [3] Works, vol. ii. p. 3.

of Good Hope) avail toward the relief of fourteen millions? But the subduction of units from millions is still less serviceable; as their exile[1] costs the nation, in their outfit, passage, nurture, and protection, a larger sum of the public money than their maintenance in idleness at home: in fact, this expenditure, by lessening the capital, rather adds to than reduces the inconvenience to the community. If it were good to expend so much on carrying them abroad, why should not a similar sum be expended on them at home? And I am persuaded that a less sum, employed in assisting the industry of the same number in Britain (which I am far from proposing), would afford a more beneficial return, even if the expatriation were undertaken under the antiquated notion of colonizing for customers.

No project ever exhibited more absurdity than paying people to emigrate in the present circumstances of the state. It has been said by Mr. Macculloch, that the Highlanders are attracted to their country in an inverse ratio to the apparent causes of its attraction. It has been said generally, that man is of all things the hardest to move: and it was asserted in the debates on the property tax in 1799, that no one of 200*l.* a year would emigrate on account of such surcharge[2]. Yet it has happened that immense sums of money have been transferred from England

[1] In 1788 a party of English purchased large tracts of land in the Crimea. Ann. Reg. 1788, p. 19. Could this serve England? Yet being a free effort, it is not to be condemned.
[2] Ann. Register, 1799, p. 180.

to France and elsewhere; that many English families are now domiciliated abroad; that English capital is now employed in French manufactures; that English artizans have taken refuge in this rival territory of Great Britain; that native Irish and Scotch have abandoned their houses—

> And last, farewell, farewell my place of birth;
> I go to wander in the lower earth
> As distant as I can,—for dispossest,
> Farthest from what I once enjoy'd, is best.

High and low, the opulent and the needy, have emigrated; and to such extent, that we may say with Cicero—'Itaque non solum inquilini sed etiam mures migraverunt[1].'—taxation and misgovernment have effected a dispersion of the people of Britain corresponding to the discomfiture at Babel. Miserable England! when your Constitution and country are deserted for France relapsed under the degenerate Bourbons, or for wilds a world from your native seat. Emigration wants no bounty; it need not become part of the ways and means of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. An Emigrant Society is established in New York, purposely to relieve the refugees from Great Britain; and the throng that seeks this port of the new world exceeds the ability of the associated individuals to answer the demands on their humanity.

[1] Cicero ad Atticum, p. 368.

CHAPTER V.

Vain Remedy, Domestic Colonization or Relegation.

SOME individual speculators are occasionally less repulsive in their projects, limiting their relief of distress and pauperism to transplantation at home, as gardeners move trees from seed-beds into open rows. Mr. Townsend, in a Letter published by Mr. Saunders[1], insists on the practicability of colonization on the poorest and most barren lands; and to justify this observation he gives a short account of a colony on the *common mountain*. But these colonists neither pay rate nor tax. Mr. Saunders, who published this relation respecting the colony on the *common mountain*, adds an account of a pauper colony called Fredericksoord in North Holland. He says it flourishes; but the subscriptions for undertaking this novelty did not commence till March 1818. I have read of a similar establishment in the Austrian Netherlands[2]; and the account stated that it answered every expectation of the projector: what has become of this successful experiment I have not heard; it has probably suffered the fate of all artificial things. Suppose, however, it succeeded,—what then? there are strange caprices among men and their affairs. A blind man in Derbyshire was employed in laying out new roads; and another, deaf and dumb, excelled it is said as a musical composer;—yet is seeing essential to an engineer,

[1] page 104. [2] Month. Rev. Old Series, vol. lxx. p. 105.

and hearing to a musician. But a prosperous project in the Netherlands, and still less in Holland, affords an imperfect prospect for its successful adoption in Great Britain. I have stated that the colony in the *common mountain* pays no rates nor taxes: and it should not be forgotten, that each subscriber bound himself to take a certain quantity of linen or woollen stuff—a *little above* the ordinary market price, as an encouragement to the colony[1]. Then its people are exonerated while they receive a bounty on their wages; —this then is nothing to the purpose. I question the magnificent results of zealots and projectors. We have heard of prison discipline; and how creatures leprous with all sorts of pollution, confluent and coated with moral disease, emerge into the world pure and immaculate after a few months salutary management. That prisons were receptacles of misery[2]; that instead of correcting vices they quickened crime; and that they have been reformed, is true: but I have positive knowledge that the reports of the transmuting system are false and exaggerated.

Yet a plan has been adopted which far exceeds all visionary schemes, not excepting Berkley's scheme of educating the children of the Americans collegiately in the Bermudas;—I mean sending pauper children from London, to be educated in a metropolitan school of industry at Dartmoor Forest, in Devonshire.

[1] Saunders, p. 88. [2] Month. Rev. Sept. 1817, p. 63.

CHAPTER VI.

Summary of other vain remedies for England and Ireland.

MR. HAMILTON proposes to redeem the poor rates as the land tax was redeemed. Mr. Heathfield's plan[1] is, that there be an assessment of 15 per cent. on capital, which shall absorb so much debt, and thus relieve the burthensome maintenance of the unemployed poor. Some propose a return to a compulsory paper circulation. Yet let us rejoice we have not as yet heard from the *nominal* metaphysicians in 'Change Alley, of the money unit and the abstract pound,—personages much talked of about the time of publishing the Bullion Report. Some advise that all property should be rendered available to the poor rates; and an attempt was lately made at Hull to increase the liability of ships unemployed to contribute to the rates[2].

Besides the simple there are compound schemes. Bishop Watson[3] proposed that the people should be assessed in every parish to the amount of their average charge for the last seven years, which should form a fund for the support of the poor of the nation. If the fund exceeded the wants of the people, the surplus should be applied to liquidate the national debt: if the fund were less than the claims on it—then it should be supplied from the national grants.

[1] Observations, &c. on liquidating the Public Debt.
[2] Times, Feb. 20, 1821. [3] Life, p. 291.

General Craufurd would have a per-centage payable on labour—the sums levied from the labourers and their employers according to a scale furnished by him. The infirm poor he would have placed in workhouses, and the strong poor at tillage and the fisheries. He should have added to his proposal (and it would so far have accorded with Bishop Watson's scheme) the supplement to the fishery project of 1670,—"that all profits from the poor's provision should be public treasure." Yet is the General's speculation good comparatively to that of another, who would support the destitute poor by stoppages from the wages of the laborious poor, which has been advised as a means of *encouraging* industry: this is kindred to that statute professedly enacted to encourage literature, which seizes copies of the works of poor authors and transfers them gratuitously to opulent establishments.

Another compound scheme is Lord Lauderdale's[1]. He favours in a general petition, a reduced taxation, an increase of trade, and a continuance of the restrictions on the import of corn;—that is, Let us enjoy an increased trade, and exclude a principal means of effecting it. Another proposed to reduce the taxes, and annual loans to meet the reduction.

Ireland has not been forgotten in the scheme for relieving the poor. Mr. Willis and his Poultry Committee, at a meeting of emigrant or transitory Irish at the Thatched House in St. James's Street, advised that a number of patriotic Hibernians should be appointed

[1] This is a sort of manifesto, in the form of a petition, for general adoption.

as general and local commissioners, who should investigate and report on all subjects; as reclaiming bogs, improving wastes, encouraging fisheries;—and that the funds should be supplied by Exchequer bills. Various have been the plans for ameliorating the state of Ireland. Lord North consented to a tax on absentees from Ireland[1]. The Bishop of Cloyne and Dr. Ledwich proposed a poor rate[2]: and Mr. William Tighe suggested that the tax on absentees should be the basis of the fund. Education has also been urged as pregnant with advantages to Ireland. If by education be meant to read and write, the Irish are not inferior to the English:—literature is no remedy for poverty; many of the Irish are literally poor scholars[3].

Much is also expected from premiums in Ireland. In consequence, a central committee has been formed in London, with branch committees, having a treasury of 2000*l.*, to promote habits of economy and cleanliness in Ireland. The motto of this society should be "Great events from little causes." Lord Carberry wishes to disfranchise the forty-shilling freeholders, as this tenure occasions a too minute division of property. I don't know whether he favours farming on a large scale; but Mr. Townsend[4] says such farming

[1] Month. Rev. Old Series, vol. lxiv. p. 382.

[2] His is a partial introduction. "Statistical View of the Parish of Aghaboe," p. 78.

[3] By the 2d of Richard II., scholars of the University who went begging were to have letters testimonial from the Chancellor.

[4] County of Cork, p. 189.

does not answer in Ireland. The Edinburgh Review proposes raising the freehold right of voting in Ireland to 20*l.*, or sinking it to universal suffrage: And having quoted a passage from Arthur Young, that a cabin is erected with two days labour, the Reviewer says: "To strike at the root of this pernicious system, the most effectual, and we think, all things considered, the most expedient and proper method would be, to prohibit, for twenty or thirty years, the erection of cottages, except in towns and villages, to which from five to ten acres of land were not attached[1]." Why all this was the law of England, and it was executed. Strafford's Letters afford a commentary on this device: "a commission in execution against cottagers who have not four acres laid to their houses, upon a statute made the 31st of Elizabeth, which vexeth the poor people mightily[2]."

Sir James Caldwell[3], in a Letter to the Dublin Society, recommends apiaries to the national consideration.

Proselytism has in all ages been considered as wonderfully suited to serve the poor Irish. It has cost the nation many millions; and yet the people are still

[1] No. lxxiii. p. 108. This is a clever Article: there are, however, errors and contradictions in it. Thus—"It is the circumstances in which they are placed—their squalid and abject poverty—their *gross ignorance*," &c. p. 62. "The Irish peasantry are possessed of great natural talents, and are *full of intelligence!*" &c. p. 66. How can they be grossly ignorant and full of intelligence?

[2] Strafford's Letters, vol. ii. p. 117.

[3] Annual Register, 1765, p. 157.

poor, *because* they are comparatively much more Catholic than formerly.

Dr. Rogan proposes public baths—and why not champooing? Hundreds have proposed, as an effectual remedy for Irish distress, to excite a passion for artificial wants[1]. Potatoes! Potatoes! aye, those are the evils of the land. Mr. William Parnel was very outrageous against potatoes,—not because they are cheap, but the contrary. He advised, as a measure of economy, that labourers should eat flesh-meat and wheaten bread. True, the Irish grow plenty of wheat, as do the Arabians; which, says Montule[2], they do not use, it being sent to the Pasha. And as the same Arabians eat dourrha bread, the Irish, who are treated worse than the Jewish oxen[3], in pure necessity eat potatoes; and if the skins of potatoes could nourish them, they would be forced to abide by the refuse of the rind. When I read the plans for relieving the Irish[4] people, Juvenal's verse occurs[5]: "The

[1] This is the reverse of the complaints against the English. Fielding: "Of laying effectual restraints on the extravagance of the lower sort of people." &c. Increase of Robbers, p. 102.

[2] Travels, p. 97. Phillips's Travels.

[3] "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn." Deut. ch. xxv.

[4] They are very numerous in the Reports of the Dublin Society. See 27th June, 1822. This one contains a plan for hemp growing, by premiums in Ireland, and manuring by sulfure muriatique. But then they want the money for these premiums. To crown the whole, the Society voted five guineas as tithe for what produced eight pounds to the Society. "Nonsense and robbery" should be the motto of this Society.

[5] Juvenal, Sat. iii. ver. 153.

last curse of poverty is the scorn of the wealthy fool." There have been various other general remedies: Mr. Phillips, in his Pomarium Britannicum, proposes planting mulberry trees, and silk-making[1]. "I am," says he, "of opinion, that it would be the foundation of a permanent reduction of the poor rates." Mr. Salisbury proposes that the paupers near the Thames should be employed in cutting bulrushes; and in Alderman Wood's mayoralty, a meeting, at which the Duke of Sussex presided, could devise no other relief than a similar project. But the triumphant plan was that of Mr. Malthus; namely, that men should keep the market of labour scantily supplied by great reserve in marrying: and to secure this, he advised that on solemnizing marriages the parson should inculcate the moral check. But to inculcate this prime doctrine effectually, the clergy should exemplify their discourse by their conduct. I have heard of a clergyman who contrived to have two wives and twenty-eight children, on a benefice of 65*l.*[2] This man could not preach the moral check; nor could any parson who obtains a share of the hundred thousand pounds annually granted to augment their livings should they

[1] This very project was attempted under royal auspices in the year 1600. James granted a patent to two individuals, to plant mulberry-trees in all parts of England, with the intention of making Britain supply herself with silk. The scheme, it is said, for some time succeeded, numbers following the example of the royal family in feeding silk-worms, and preparing thread, &c. The original plantation of mulberry-trees at Charlton Park was sold by auction a short time ago.

[2] Annual Register, 1769, p. 73.

be married. Verily, I wish those preaching economists would read St. Basil's remonstrance to a "fallen virgin," and the *Traité de la Predication* supposed to be composed by D'Alembert. A sermon is good[1]; so is *sera venus*; for none can be more fully persuaded than I of the duty of men and women to abstain from marriage until they have a reasonable prospect of providing for their prospective family. But men are not to be abused because they are sanguine in their calculations; "Better is the life of a poor man in a mean cottage, than delicate fare in another man's house[2]." To possess a house includes the possession of a wife. I do not speak of passion; nor of length of life, which is the prerogative of married people[3]:—yet all these things should not be passed unheeded in scanning the conduct of those who marry. But whether or not, sure I am the non-breeding of labourers will not secure the whole market to the austere few. The richer country is perpetually drawing labourers from the poorer. Russia from Sweden, Holland from Germany, England from Ireland[4]. To secure the

[1] In the ancient Church some penances prevented the intercourse of the married pair. Pastoret, &c. part. 2. p. 150. This was better.

[2] Ecclus. xxix. 22.

[3] The duration of life in married women exceeds that of those who live in celibacy: and Dr. Rush said that he never found a man who was not married who had exceeded eighty years of age. Annual Register, 1794, p. 400.

[4] In Paraguay, it is said, men who can only earn three halfpence a day,—at Buenos Ayres obtain three quarters of a dollar. At Odessa a regular carpenter earns seven rubles a day. Ker Porter.

labour of the country to the working bachelors, it would be necessary to extend the Alien Act, and prohibit also the entry of Scotsmen and Hibernians into Britain. And yet one of the proposed means by the Agricultural Committee to relieve the present agricultural distress, is the *growth of our population*. And this is the remedy for the glut, if there be such, and which Mr. Malthus and many others affirm to be the existing evil.

Many proposed a maximum which the poor rates should not exceed. This is like Mr. Malthus's dismissal of intruders from the great feast of nature to which they had not contributed. The Edinburgh Review proposes to dispauperize Scotland, by separating the legal assessments from the voluntary contributions at the church door; the former to go to the support of the existing paupers, and the latter to the new cases; and that "as the old cases die out, the money which supported them should multiply churches and schools[1]."

Much is expected from select vestries. In 1821 they were appointed in 2008 parishes[2]. Very much is expected from assistant overseers; and in the same year these amounted to 2257. What is their benefit? and if any, will it continue? Mr. Nolan[3] superadds to this scheme. The learned gentleman said, that since 1720 the poor had increased in a tenfold degree, and that the poor rates have increased tenfold, which he attributes to giving too much individually. He then proposed a second assistant overseer to large parishes, and that the poor should be privileged to provide for themselves, by working at any distance *within nine or ten miles* of their settlement. The statement and remedy are equally fallacious.—These are some of the remedies for a million of paupers, and seven millions expended in their relief. There are many more: Nor should Lord Londonderry's compound scheme in the last session be omitted: it embraced a host of absurdities, with his own illustration on a former occasion of filling holes by making others; as the dead charge, the loan to parishes, &c.

> "Because I am the storehouse and the shop
> Of the whole body."

And his Lordship delivered the entire oration as usual according to the *proprietates curvarum*.

[1] March 1817, p. 24.
[2] Month. Rev. Oct. p. 244.
[3] Morning Herald, July 11, 1822.

BOOK III.

CHAPTER I.

That the suppression of monasteries destroyed the relief of the poor—That this originated the poor laws,—disproved by the state of the people and of the laws and of monasteries in various nations of Europe.

IN the last Book I enumerated the hypothetical causes of popular distress, and their fantastic remedies. I proceed now to consider another imputed cause of pauperism in Britain—the suppression of monasteries. I cannot refrain from stating at once, that this imputation seems to involve all sorts of error respecting facts, circumstances, inference, and analogy. Yet these errors are propounded by the gravest and ablest writers. Hume[1] states, "in this year (5th of Elizabeth) was enacted the first law for the relief of the poor." This inadvertence can now deceive no one. It is also affirmed and repeated, that the monasteries supported the poor, and that their abolition occasioned beggary; and that thence the poor laws and poor rates became substitutes for the monkish distributions of charity[2].

[1] History of England, vol. v. p. 484.

[2] Blackstone's Commentaries, vol. i. c. 9. John Aubrey, Esq. Sir John Sinclair. Mr. Bayley. Godwin's Reply to Malthus, p. 558.

That the suppression of monasteries did not occasion the poor laws, is provable in various ways. Laws corresponding to the English poor laws were passed in different countries of Europe where the monastic institutions were not disturbed. Charles the Fifth passed an edict in 1531 respecting the poor; yet this Emperor did not secularize convents, and he took refuge in one of them from the world. The Spanish Cortez preceded the English Parliament in legislating for the poor; for a law was made by them in 1525 restricting the indigent to their own township, and ordering that they should have a license to beg from the magistrates; which is precisely the provision appointed one hundred and six years after (in 1631) in England. Spain also preserved her monasteries, yet she swarmed with mendicants, and she continued in this beggarly state[1]. So did France, the commonalty of which country Fortescue[2] described as famishing; and Vauban[3] long afterward gave an equally frightful account of the numbers and indigence of the people: yet no monarch of France rudely dissipated those monuments which sin and dotage raised to superstition[4].

These facts are incidental to the argument. But the 22d of Henry the Eighth, in 1531, (five years before the suppression of the lesser monasteries by Parliament,) is conclusive and direct. This law, which preceded the suppression of a single monastery, declared

[1] Townsend's Travels, vol. i. p. 257.

[2] Absolute and Limited Monarchy, c. xii. [3] Dixme Royale.

[4] See two instances in Month. Rev. O. S. vol. lxi. p. 287.