

curse of murder, should amply support the poor,—“the bread of the needy is their life: he that defraudeth him thereof is a man of blood¹.” *Dies me deficiet si vellem paupertatis causam defendere*².

¹ Eccles. xxxiv. 22.

² Cicero, t. iv. p. 192.

BOOK V.

CHAPTER I.

Different petty schemes suggested for reducing the poor-rates—Chief causes of the people's poverty—the royal expenditure and example—the ecclesiastical establishment—the increased nobility—the corruption of the House of Commons—greediness of ministers—courtiers—military establishment, &c.

THOUGH I have, in the last chapter, advocated the right of the British poor to assistance, as a partial indemnity for the ample funds of which they are iniquitously deprived, yet I reiterate that my testimony in favour of the poor's rights has no disposition to favour the poor-laws. These laws tend to make “the poor,” instead of a term of tenderness and commiseration, a name of reproach. Demosthenes¹ said sarcastically, that the public money distributed to the indigent is either praised or blamed as persons are rich or poor: but the poor-laws are offensive to those who give and to those who receive. The Greek proverb, that “What is necessary is grievous²,” applies pointedly to them. Enforced charity is a contradic-

¹ De Repub. Ord., Opera, p. 113.

² Aristot. Ethic. ad Eud. lib. ii. c. 6, p. 209.

XI tion; and as it is granted without affection, it is accepted without gratitude. But the essential grievance of the poor-laws is, that they, under the show of relieving the poor, lessen the profits of labour. The poor-laws, in their execution, cheapen the whole market of labour. Ruggles¹ observes that before the rates operated, the wages of the labouring people were greater in proportion to the price of wheat than at present. Indeed, the poor-laws are in effect far more severe than the statutes for fixing wages, which act in the gross; while poor-rates apply the same principle to every individual case. This is most unjust, and equally hostile to personal and national interests².

In all ages England has had meddlers respecting the poor. Elizabeth and her sages took the lead in complication and prolixity. To her code settlements were added nicely imagined and metaphysically construed. They were to reduce the poor-rates. Much was argued on the advantage to the same purpose of

¹ Letters on the Poor Laws, vol. ii. p. 110.

² Thus the British Review: "The necessary increase of the people is raised by the poor-laws in the cheapest and most effectual manner." p. 263. This is Mr. Weyland's doctrine in the "Short Inquiry," &c. Fielding long and laboriously argued the same point: he said that farming and exportation of grain were affected by its low price, and these by the lowness of wages; the export of grain he considered of sovereign utility to the kingdom. Increase of Robbers, p. 86. Child wrote with great intentness against retrenching from the hire of the poor man; and Mr. Malthus says properly, "If a country can only be rich by running a successful race for low wages, I should be disposed to say at once, Perish such riches." p. 296.

restricting the number of ale-houses¹. Again, a sovereign project was the erection of workhouses, and this ran its devious course—it was the precursor of prison discipline, and poverty was the crime.

Then the people were to be relieved by education. Sir W. Petty 150 years ago proposed "that there be instituted *ergastula literaria*—literary workhouses, where children may be taught as well to do something towards their living, as to read and write." Mr. Yarrington in 1676 proposed schools for industry, as did Mr. T. Firmin in 1697. Mr. Locke suggested the propriety of establishing schools by which the labour of the poor might lessen the expense of maintaining them. So did Sir R. Lloyd in 1783. It was calculated that such schools would be a gain to the nation of 200,000*l*. They were tried—they at first succeeded, as had workhouses; but of course both ultimately failed.

The present day is fruitful in projects, as Mr. Bourne's scheme of increasing the potency of votes according to the contributions of each person to the pauper fund².

¹ It is said many of the country villages can date the introduction of poor-rates to the commencement of public-houses among them. Month. Rev. Old Ser. vol. xlviii. p. 20. This may be so, and yet the Scotch drink more than the English: drinking is called Scotland's skaith. Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, put down many ale-houses, permitting only one in each small town. Strutt's View &c. In 1585 ale-houses were ordered not to exceed in Westminster 100. Anderson's Commerce, vol. ii. p. 213.

² Morn. Chron. April 24, 1819. The Scotsman classed me with Mr. Bourne, whom the writer condemns.—The Edinburgh Review lauds Mr. Bourne, No. Jan. 1820, p. 96.

This is the essence of oligarchy. In open vestries the rich frequently escape paying their quota¹; but in due time, by the means of select vestries, they will throw a still greater weight of expense on the least able to support the charge. The project of abstracting the children of the poor, when chargeable, from their parents is also most unadvised²; and the proposed maximum which the poor-rates shall not exceed, has no symptom of equity or intelligence. Arthur Young³, in 1779, wished to limit them *for ever* to a sum not exceeding the average of the last seven years, excluding all persons from parochial assistance under the age of sixty years, except those with fractured limbs. Mr. Malthus also, who says he has reflected much on the poor-laws, would have a statute passed to the same effect. Many other economists consider a maximum at one time the summum bonum, and at another the forlorn hope. Some would have this maximum gradually reduced. A Committee of the House of Commons has proposed a limit to the assessment. The Edinburgh Review⁴ and Mr. Brougham suggest the same. Mr. Scarlett, more ambitious, in May 1821 actually introduced a bill which embodied this panacea in his scheme. Mr. Scarlett spoke confi-

¹ Walthew, Poor-Laws, pp. 22, 28.

² This is of old standing, and praised by Harrington: Oceana, p. 177. Yet this is most unnatural, and of course unwise.—*Nunquam aliud natura aliud sapientia dicit.*

³ Month. Rev. O. S. vol. lxi. p. 310.

⁴ Propose a maximum, &c. which should periodically decrease, and this it is said in a few years will become a minimum.—No. lxxi. p. 117 et seq.

dently: he said that he had meditated the subject much, and that his conviction had never wavered during thirty years. Yet this intuitive speculator soon abandoned his mature conception. Mr. Scarlett¹ has erred with Augustus. That politician reduced the indefinite (*αόριστος*)² multitude who received poor-rates; but he soon retraced his steps, and left the poor to be relieved unlimited as before. The only difference between the projects of the learned English lawyer (I call him learned advisedly) and Augustus is, that one would limit the number to be relieved, and the other the sum to relieve them.

This project of Mr. Scarlett and the hundred others for liberating the nation from the poor-laws, proceeds from a total ignorance of the great cause of the people's poverty and of the poor-rates. The poor-laws are not the causes, though in the circling of evil they contribute, like most moderate means, to the mischief they would remedy. For the grand mischief is, not what is given to the poor, but what in various ways is subtracted from them³. When their labour is their own, their motions free, their wages a contract honestly fulfilled, their necessities discharged of all direct and clandestine impositions,—

¹ Times, June 3, 1821.

² Dion Cassius, lib. v. c. 10.

³ Lanjuinais is right as far as he goes. He says: "The state of the poor calls likewise for legislative interference, not in the shape of a poor-rate, but for a reduction of expense and trouble in the forms required for the sale and inheritance of their little properties; and we ought also to make some modifications of the taxes that more particularly press on them." *Des Dépenses et Recettes.* Month. Rev. vol. lxxxviii. p. 511.

then the dabblers in legislation may appoint a maximum, and abolish the poor-laws altogether; for the wants of the poor would not exceed the prompt sympathy and unforced assistance of the fortunate. I wish the poor-laws were abolished: but first the *causa causans* of poverty must be removed.—What these causes are I proceed to specify.

The first in dignity, if not in importance, of the causes of the people's wants is the expense of Royalty. The expensiveness of monarchy,—and the sages of the Jews held “that to choose a king was to reject God¹,”—is as old as the institution. When Saul was made king, the royal or inordinate portion was set before him; so was the *perpetual chine* served to the Grecian chiefs in Homer's story: and, to penetrate into the very elements of kingship, Lichtenstein says that the king of the Koosas is entitled to the breast of every ox slain, which is sent to him, though he be so distant that it is putrid before it reaches his majesty. Kings are also professedly idle. Thus, in the Fox Islands the sole prerogative of the chief Tookoo is, that when he goes to sea he does not work². Milton remarked of monarchy, that its trappings would set up many republics: and it is certain that countries which flourished as republics, have actually sunk under the inherent prodigality of kingly government.

Nor are the sovereigns of this country, though the Constitution is the glory of our own and the envy of surrounding nations, remarkable for their economy

¹ 1 Sam. viii. 7.

² Coxe's Account, &c, Month. Rev. O. S. vol. lxiii. p. 6.

and moderation. The late king, besides having his civil list repeatedly increased, obtained 124,000*l.* from Gibraltar, large sums from the Leeward Islands, and the droits, which amounted to about eight millions sterling: added to all this, nine times his debts to an enormous amount were discharged by his courteous Commons. The present king's debts were also frequently liquidated by the all-complying legislature; and he now enjoys for his personal expense nearly a million sterling. Yet with this prodigious waste and consumption of human labour on one man, some individuals perversely censorious reserve their railing for the expenses of the poor and the labouring population. “What,” said the Philosopher Temple¹, “is the fantastic calculation of riches and poverty that is current in the world, by which a man that wants a million is a prince, he that wants a groat is a beggar?” Nay more, to pay the prince's million how many poor men contribute their groats, and thus give their dinner's worth to swell the royal revelry with his peers? And what is the object of this princely debt and expenditure? The splendour of the monarchy! In respect to this point the English king vies with the chief of the Ottomans; for it is a favourite adage among the Turks, “Riches in the Indies, Wit in Europe, and Pomp among the Ottomans.” Pomp is barbarous, and so reputed, throughout the world. The splendour and the pomp of the court of Lattakoo is hideous to the Turk, and the Turkish is monstrous to the English—not less so than Mahomet's religion

¹ Observations on the United Provinces, p. 50.

to our Christian clergy. And the parade of the English Court to all rational men must appear more or less absurd, as it is more or less chargeable to the industry of the laborious, whose contributions should constitute a sacred fund. Those who would honour royalty should support it on its merits; and institutions otherwise good change their character by the enormity of their expense. The prodigal and pauperizing nature of royalty, moreover, does not stop with the king's majesty; it communicates like an hereditary disease, and all its adjuncts and coincidents are infected with the same consuming excesses.

The ecclesiastical establishment is the monarchy spiritually administered. There were bishops in the early church¹; but they had no more resemblance to modern bishops, than *sacer* in its several significations of "sacred" and "cursed." Bishops are called the successors of the Apostles: yet what is less apostolic than the lives and fortunes of English and Irish bishops? They are the mere creatures of the monarchy²; and as they arose from it, they resolve their being into it. No men can be more absolutely onerous than ecclesiastics³. The labourer is worthy of his

¹ In modern Greek *δεσποτης*, it is said, is applied to ecclesiastics.

² According to the prayer of the clergy for the king, Feb. 26, 1804, which contained, "Grant that he may long continue a nursing father to thy church," &c. Ann. Regist. 1804, p. 369. This is making George the Third at once father and mother of the church; or rather emulating the Ephesian Diana, who was covered with mammæ.

³ We learn from Josiah Tucker, the celebrated Dean of

hire¹. What do they do, or can they do, equivalent to 10,000*l.*, 20,000*l.* and 30,000*l.* a-year? All their enormous and besotting wealth is to be charged to the monarchy. Some British and Irish bishops have four or five times the amount of the salary of the American President. Hence the alliance of Church and State, and the maxim—No bishop, no king:—of course the more bishops, and the more endowed the bishops of Durham, Winchester, Canterbury, Armagh, Derry, &c.² the greater the king of Great Britain and Ireland.

It may be remarked, that when Cæsar conquered Potnpey and determined on kingship, one of his first acts was to increase the ecclesiastical establishment, —*ἱερεὺς (ἀπέδειξε) ὑπὲρ το νενομισμένον*³. I am not,

Gloucester, that his political and economical writings were objected to him. On the same account Bishop Watson abandoned his chemical studies:—but no one objects to a bishop doing nothing.

¹ Yet there is no religious establishment among Mussulmen; and "it is a general rule with our doctors, that no recompense can be received for the performance of any duty purely of a religious nature." Hedaya, vol. iii. p. 338.

² A primitive bishop in the first century was the principal minister of a single church assembled under one roof: he taught the people, administered the sacraments, and aided and comforted the sick and indigent. For those duties which he could not execute himself, he availed himself of the assistance of presbyters. A primitive bishop could neither determine nor enact any thing of himself, but was bound to conform to, and carry into effect, whatever might be resolved on by the presbyters and people:—in short, it was an office of much trouble, little power, and less emolument. Vidal's Translation of Mosheim's Commentaries.

³ Dion Cassius, lib. xlii. c. 51.

however, exhibiting clerical servility to power, but the incumbrance of ecclesiastics to the revenue of the nation. Bacon says definitively, that *a numerous clergy impoverishes a state, for they bring nothing to the stock*¹. He should have added, they take much from it; and preying on each other, both prey on the people².

The nobility, those accidents of an accident, issue from the king's mouth, as the Indian casts from the person of Brahma—"a breath can make them, as a breath has made." In many states nobles are excluded from industry: and Turgot³ accounted for the reduced commerce of the city of Angoulême, notwithstanding its situation, to the facility of becoming noble: "Thus," said he, "capitals are withdrawn from trade and wasted in idleness." In England the law does not exclude the noble from industry, but custom does. Bacon, speaking of nobility of birth, said, "It slackens industry; and he that is not industrious envies another's diligence⁴." The same author says: "Nor are the people in this view to be estimated by number also; for a small number that consumes much and gains little, wears out a state sooner than a greater that lives sparing and lays up money. And therefore an over-proportion of nobility and gentry

¹ Polit. Essays, 13, vol. ii. p. 158.

² Paolo Sarpi de Beneficiis, c. xv.

³ Œuvres, tom. v. p. 265. Since the return of Louis XVIII. a merchant or manufacturer, if he receives a patent of nobility, must take out letters of relief conveying the king's pardon for having descended to trade.

⁴ Essay 6.

sooner impoverishes a state," &c. And who doubts that there is now an excess of nobility and gentry¹?

Supposing that a prerogative order is not a nuisance, the nobility have inordinately increased since 1760, when George the Third ascended the throne. The nobility were originally great territorial proprietors; a lord without land is a solecism: yet many nobles are actual pensioners of the Crown. Hence the multitude of courtiers whom Chesterfield called sturdy beggars; and whom Saville, Lord Halifax, called *well-bred fashionable beggars*². All these look to the Crown for their support; nor are they deceived. Hence influence and patronage; and thus all things become, through the Crown, the patrimony of the favoured. This is of ancient standing; and the tyrant Dionysius thought that the only good enjoyed by a tyrant was the power of conferring gifts³. Hence the higher orders (as they are called), and patron and client, both multiply the distress of the people: hence new places succeed to increased salaries, and the spawn of fortune pollutes every department.

Hence, principally, our colonies and foreign possessions are increased: this lord's brother goes to the

¹ There are four Lady Sheffields at present.

² The passage runs thus: "The court may be said to be a company of well-bred fashionable beggars. At court, if a man hath too much pride to be a creature, he had better stay at home: a man who will rise at court, must begin by creeping on all-fours."

³ Plutarch, Moral. p. 107. In Ireland, which has always been governed tyrannically, the list of public officers holding pensions fills 29 folio pages.—What a glorious Constitution!

Ionian Isles—that duke's brother is placed at the Cape of Good Hope with 10,000*l.* a year, though an English officer of plebeian independence filled the same office creditably for 1,117*l.* The Indian frontier is extended. India is a mighty outlet—a vomitory for the antiquated¹ and the young² to repair or create fortunes, who, acting wilfully and rapaciously³—for the Eastern wars come of the greed of the European spoilers—have impoverished and demoralized the Indian people. But what signifies it that gang-robbery is greatly increased in India⁴—for “thieves and robbers are the only people who live well⁵!”—

¹ The Marquis of Hastings. Also, an honourable exile for desperate ministers. G. Canning, by accident, was saved that journey. First to Portugal, then to India, then in England,—the world is the domain of these craving enemies of reform.

² “The Company's servants are sent to the enjoyment of wealth and power while they are yet boys,” Tytler, *pref.* p. 10.

³ Mr. Grant declared that the Court of Directors never sanctioned any extension of territory, but the contrary, except in the case of Tippoo Sultaun. Yet he says the territory of the Company (*Morn. Chron.* Feb. 4, 1809) consists of 20 degrees of longitude and as many of latitude; that the population amounts to eighty millions, which is governed by forty thousand Europeans civil and military. How can this government stand? The military in India are motley in every respect, consisting of King's and the Company's troops, and five parts of the whole troops are natives, who cannot rise to any considerable command. Malcolm, *Polit. Hist. of India*, p. 510. Yet a native horseman is seldom equalled by a European in single combat. Wilks's *Sketches*, vol. ii. p. 392. Besides, the half-cast children are 30,000, and always augmenting:—these are discouraged by the Government;—yet Malcolm speaks highly of their ingenuity and talents. p. 476. Are they to re-act the story of the Parthenoi?

⁴ Tytler, p. 19, Introduction.

⁵ vol. i. p. 106.

that the courts of law are ruinous¹;—that the Company's debt is monstrous and increasing, having advanced from ten millions in 1783² to 29,965,000*l.* in 1813, and further to 38,092,000*l.* in 1821?—What of all this, and the probability of a sudden expulsion?—There are for the present two hundred and fifty places of 1000*l.* each³ to be disposed of to the *genteel poor*⁴. But these colonies and possessions⁵ are reputed our strength in war, and our riches

¹ Tytler, vol. i. p. 265.

² The Company at that time said they owed only four millions, though they owed ten; Dundas justified Fox. *Ann. Reg.* 1791. p. 154.

³ *Times*, May 30, 1822.

⁴ Mr. Grant says the minister would have that number of places to dispose of, the beginning of each session of Parliament; which he, easy man, says would overthrow the balance of the Constitution had Mr. Fox's bill been adopted—*qui facit per alium facit per se*. The military places are not to be forgotten: the Marquis of Hastings claimed a share of the Deccan prize-money. Sir T. Hislop's share amounts to 300,000*l.*, it is said.

⁵ It was calculated that in 1794 the revenue of the West Indies was annually four millions, the capital embarked seventy millions; which was about six per cent. return. But then the expense of the colonies, &c. is not noticed. *Ann. Regist.* 1794, p. 126. I have been told that the original purchase-money did not return above four per cent. Our West-India colonies are held for their sugar: yet sugar could be produced for one-sixth part of the price paid for the West-India sugar. *Edinb. Review*, No. 1817, p. 47. So of the East: our trade is ruinous in that quarter. The excess against England in the India trade (including China), from 1797 to 1807, amounted to five millions. Mill's *British India*, last pages.

The whole Indian system is pernicious, except to individuals; and it is increased by the Company's monopoly. The English

in peace. Yet what madness ever exceeded colonizing for customers, except colonizing for power? All our wars have either originated in defence of our foreign possessions, or they have been mightily aggravated by their incumbrance.

The monarchy has not only made the House of Lords a subservient body, but it has swept the Commons House of Parliament within the vortex of its dominion. Mark the departure. In Elizabeth's reign, says Hume¹, "the members had no connexion with the Court: and the very idea they conceived of the trust committed to them, was to reduce the demands of the Crown and to grant as few supplies as possible." Now the object is reversed, and every artifice is imagined to increase the supplies, because the expense is small as charged individually to the members of Parliament, while it is considerable as consumed among them and their connexions. Hence Mr. Robinson² dared avow that to reduce one post-master was to diminish the influence of the Crown, and should be resisted: and Mr. Arbuthnot³ considered that such acts broke down the means of administering the affairs of the country. And these men have since been advanced, who, if the people had any influence, should have been instantly dismissed from office, for the double insult to prince and people.

pay considerably more than double for their teas, exclusive of the duty, than they would do if the China trade was open, as it is to other nations.

¹ vol. v. p. 476.

² Times, March 14, 1822.

³ Ibid. March 18, 1822.

The minister must have a great salary, and super-added an enormous sinecure and future compensation¹. Nor do I know any instance which exhibits the infatuation occasioned by the monarchy more flagrant in this respect, than the terms in which all, down to the Edinburgh Review, have spoken of Mr. Pitt's possession of the Wardenship of the Cinque Ports, the minister holding at the same time the salary of First Lord of the Treasury, &c. Yet these are the men—George Rose and his fellows—who sermonize on the expense of the poor: "a beggar envies a beggar"²:—yet the poor man has wasted his life in toil, and the sinecurist has consumed himself in idleness, destroying the produce of the industrious. It is marvellous that any society can tolerate the sinecurist and pluralist, &c. Indeed we read that Marivaux the French novelist, in pure imbecility, gave to a young healthy man who solicited alms, because the wretch answered him, "Ah, sir, if you knew how lazy I am, you would pity and relieve me." And we also read that in Cyprus³ the stupid Turks prohibit the destruction of locusts, saying that they are sent by the Almighty to punish them.

¹ Then his father took a title and a pension. O shame to manhood! Some men have not been so miserable. When Sunderland was displaced and offered a pension, "No," said he, "if I cannot serve my country, I will not plunder it." The Duke of Newcastle said nearly the same. Belsham's History, vol. v. p. 68. Halley refused an increase of salary from Queen Caroline. He said an augmentation would induce incapable men to seek the office.

² Καὶ πτωχὸς πτωχῷ φθονεῖ. Hesiod. Opera, lib. i. ver. 26.

³ Mariti's Travels.

How miserable does our glorious Constitution appear in its sordid ministers, compared to those of Holland, and still more in respect to Athens! Demosthenes, as ambassador to Philip, received little more than a labourer's wages; and Xenophon¹ was satisfied with four times the pay of a common soldier; but it was the ambition of the sons of that glorious republic to devote their time and fortune to the public service, and even to the pleasures of the people². There, to amass wealth in a state trust was esteemed sacrilegious—a robbery, not only of the temples of the gods, but of the tombs of friends and kindred³. An increasing aristocracy is a confluent malady, wasting the vigour and corrupting the virtue of the people. It is felt in England. Bacon marked the general mischief; and still more pointedly Plato, who observed, "Do you not see poor in states governed by the few? aye, they are almost all so except the governors⁴." This is largely confirmed by Aristotle, who considers the very essence and object of bad government to impoverish the people by overwhelming them with toil and taxes. "Dionysius," he says, "in five years drew the property of the state into his

¹ Xenophon made this contract after his retreat, lib. vii. p. 402. Compare this with that of a Master of the Ordnance now. The reason is, in our state inequality and inequity rule; in the Athenian the contrary, *ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ἐστὶν ὅτε νόμιμος καὶ ἴσος*. Arist. ad Eudem. lib. iv. c. 1.

² Demosth. adv. Midiam, p. 628.

³ *Ἡγούμενος ἀφ' ἱερῶν κλεπτὲν ἀπο ταφῶν ἀπο φίλων*. Plutarch. Moral. p. 399.

⁴ De Repub. lib. viii. p. 716.

exchequer¹." What has been the fate of Britain in the three concluding years of the last war? Nearly four hundred millions were drawn from the coffers of the people,—a war notoriously begun and prosecuted to support the prerogatives of kings, bishops, nobles, and borough-holders².

Connected with the monarchy and the ecclesiastical establishment and the nobility and all the privileged orders in war and in peace, is the military. So much are the military, as a domestic standing force, the creature of bad government, that the viciousness of government might be graduated by the relative amount of its soldiers. The most tyrannical government, the Russian, rates all its state agents according to a military scale. Where there is perfect freedom, soldiers as a separate order are unknown: in danger all are military, in peace all are civil officers. But under bad governments, as the aversion of the people is aggravated, the military is necessarily increased³; the

¹ De Repub. lib. v. c. 11, p. 407. This was the case in France, and recommended according to some for the English people: "Some men have said that it was good for the kyng that the comons of England wer made poer as be, the commons of France." Absolute and Limited Monarchy.

² It is continued in peace. The Norwegians proposed to equalize conditions and abolish nobility. No, said the king; hinting that this would not agree with the *monarchical principle* of Alexander and the magnanimous allies. Our Government papers rage at the poor Greeks, calling them rebels.

³ R. B. Sheridan calculated that men in the army and navy consumed, man for man, five times as much as ordinary labourers. Suppose that it is less; say three times, the cavalry seven times, for the keep of a horse is four times that of a man. See Month. Rev. Old Series, vol. viii. p. 20.

people being more hostile as they are more oppressed. Hence not only the rank and file are augmented, but barracks are superadded, still further to estrange the *caste* of arms: and as a sequel to all these regulations, Lord Palmerston insists, logically, that if a standing army be necessary, it is necessary that the officers should have a military education: therefore a military college must be supported¹. Thus episcopacy, nobles, representatives, and a standing army, are part and parcel of the monarchy; and they all resemble their patron in every respect. Bishops starve the humble of their profession; so that what was said of another church may be repeated of this Protestant: "Some be so high that they exceed the princes of the earth, and some again so base that they are under all rascals²." So of the commander of armies and his fellow soldiers:—of the Havannah prize-money, Lord Albemarle received 20,000*l.*, and privates 13*s.* 5*d.*; and of the Flushing prize-money, while general officers received 562*l.* 15*s.* 2*d.*, rank and file received 18*s.* 6½*d.* Verily all coheres admirably!—Thus His Majesty, in the general depression in 1822, when some lost half their income, and while his gained as theirs declined, returned to the state three and a half per cent. of a year's revenue³: and this was hailed as a munificent donation.

"Quantum vertice ad auras
Æthiopias, tantum radice in Tartara tendit."

¹ And, in this adjunct, each cadet costs the nation 720*l.* Of them 246 continued unprovided for. *Times*, March 21, 1822.

² Henry's Hist. b. iv. c. 7.

³ Καὶ γὰρ ἄνδρος δὴρ' οὐχ οὐκ ἔχει.

CHAPTER II.

Cause of the people's distress—Taxation—its effects on the industry and opulence of the people—argued in its variety of evils, and the sophistry in which some have involved the question exposed.

TO reduce these several causes of the poverty of the people, implies a reduced taxation. Sordidness and sophistry have perplexed this subject; I shall, therefore, argue the question in its different aberrations.—Some hold that taxation is a substantive good; and, doubtless, the legislators who taxed poor authors, by requiring them to give many gratuitous copies of their labours to opulent establishments¹, were optimists of this order. Mr. Justice Bayley, who prefaced his remarks by affirming he had long studied political economy, also assured his auditory, in a memorable charge, that taxation was the life and soul of the poor; that the *lower classes derive their employments and comforts from taxation*. Henceforward let the burthen of the ditty be, "Unfortunate Judge Bayley!" The present Archbishop of Armagh also, in 1822, in his first and last charge to his clergy, instilled into his pastoral hearers the advantages of tithe-paying to people and country: and lest the force of his observation might not be fully understood by the laity, he exemplified his doctrine by stating interrogatively—Do you not

¹ This was to encourage literature. To encourage it, the libraries should rather be obliged to pay for so many copies, &c.

see Scotland, which does not pay tithe, is poor? and England, which pays tithe, is rich?

Mr. Southey in a glorious vein also said, "That wealth which is taken from the people returns to them again, like vapours which are drawn imperceptibly from the earth, but distributed to it in refreshing dews and fertilizing showers." Mr. Malthus¹ favours taxation; for he says, "The taxes paid to the national creditor are more usefully employed than the same paid to the landlords; and that they increase the manufactured produce and the happiness and intelligence of the whole community." Yet in the same work he says, "I have called this surplus (rent) a bountiful gift of Providence, and am most decidedly of opinion that it fully deserves the appellation." Then, according to this doctrine, rent is the bounty of God, and transferring it from landlords by taxation beneficence supererogate.

Mr. Webb Hall favours taxation, as does Mr. Simon Gray². This gentleman is large in its commendation; but the national debt is his *dulce decus*: he calls it "a capacious source of wealth, and productive of nearly fifteen per cent. of the national income." While the Rev. Mr. Fellows, who wrote against Parliamentary Reform, calls it "a mine of wealth." Yet

¹ This is repeated in the Quarterly Review, &c. No. liv. p. 310. One would think he had been reading of the *rain-makers* in the same review, p. 368.

² Happiness of States, p. 659. The Rev. S. Baggs said the same in 1774. Mr. Baring said that if the country had no debt, it could not have the means of maintaining the number of men it now did. July 9, 1811. House of Commons.

there are men who speculated on the evil of this *el dorado*, and who, to prevent the monster's increase, proposed a sinking-fund in its infancy: and Mr. Pitt¹, in 1792, calculated (a proof of his financial and political sagacity²) that his sinking fund would extinguish the debt in forty-five years,—a period at which the late Chancellor of the Exchequer surmised that the nation might be relieved from the *dead charge*. No monarchy ever liquidated its debts. Talk of the sinking fund! Rather join the projector who advised the

¹ Every thing connected with the sinking fund is erroneous; it was attributed by some to William Pitt, by others to Dr. Price, who said "The smallest fund of this kind is indeed omnipotent, if it be allowed time to operate," p. 127. It was discovered by degrees that a sinking fund had been repeatedly attached to the increasing debt, and that "the sinking fund was declared by law to be appointed to pay off the said debt, and for none other use or purpose whatever." Yet was a sinking fund older than 1735 or 1734 or 1716. A sinking fund was established in Holland in 1665, and set forth in so common a book as Anderson's Commerce, vol. iii. p. 297. Mr. Pitt had the merit of forming a sinking fund out of borrowed money; and Dr. Price the merit of supposing that he could borrow at single interest and make that available at compound interest in paying a debt. The sinking fund was a great loss: above half a million has been created more than has been redeemed by it annually in perpetuity from 1793 to 1817, or about 20 millions in the 3 per cents. have been added to the whole debt in consequence.

² Mr. Pitt said, Feb. 17, 1792, speaking of the operation of the sinking fund: "We must not count with certainty on a continuance of our present prosperity during such an interval (fifteen years); but unquestionably there never was a time in the history of this country, when from the situation of Europe we might more reasonably expect fifteen years of peace than we may at the present moment."

Government to seize and appropriate the mines in Bombuc and on the Gold Coast¹, and employ them to liquidate the national debt. I never knew a fraud survive such repeated imposition. If taxation and debt be good, then are wars prodigious benefits. Hume² lamented the expensive and frivolous nature of the war which commenced in 1754;—yet how weak was his view of right and wrong and profit and loss! War generates taxes and debt—two superlatives. The debt, at the accession of George the Second, which was only 52 millions, at his death exceeded 146 millions. To be sure, one object of the aforesaid war was the security of the American colonies, and the next war was the reverse³; yet this was *good* also, for while it raised the national debt to 257 millions, it multiplied the taxes by clusters⁴. Then came our last great war, a blessing greater than all the rest, in respect to which our grave politicians may say with Othello,

My soul hath her content so absolute,
That not another comfort like to this
Succeeds in unknown fate.

Some, however, of the new light do not actually

¹ Month. Rev. vol. xxxv. p. 496.

² vol. v. p. 476.

³ In the 4th of Geo. III. c. 15, raising a revenue in the dominions of America is stated: Month. Rev. vol. xxxix. p. 20. A few months after came the stamp act.

⁴ Taxes on bricks and tiles, game, horses, hats, pawning goods, additional duties on candles, petty custom, paper, hackney coaches, postage of letters, beer, tea, windows, cocoa nuts and coffee, low wines and spirits, linens and cottons, raw and thrown silk, lead, soap and starch. Such is the abstract of the budget, or the taxes of the year 1784.

never that debt and taxation are good; they only declare they are indifferent. Dr. Purvis says taxes are not evil; they are generally spent at home, in fixed salaries to Government officers, or to pay the national debt. Mr. Ricardo¹ writes that "a generally high price of commodities in consequence of taxation would be of no disadvantage to a state," &c. Mr. F. Lewis² also said, "that the effect of taxation was only to take from the pockets of one class to give to another money already existing." Lord Castlereagh (whiffler that he was) never accidentally said that taxation was good or indifferent; and yet he did rave and rage about the people's *ignorant impatience of taxation*³; and preparatory to his death he did affirm that it was delusive and dangerous to suppose that "the distress arose from taxation, and not from the hands of Providence and the great principles of Nature."

To say that to tax one or many classes and to give the produce to others, is good or indifferent in respect to the whole, is insulting: yet I should expose it formally if my refutation of a less evil did not necessarily answer the greater; and to that I now proceed. Paley⁴ says (I quote his words), "As taxes take nothing out of the country, as they do not diminish the public stock, only vary the distribution of it, they are not necessarily prejudicial to population." Thus Frederic the Great considered his army a happy en-

¹ Political Economy, second edit. p. 283.

² Speech in the House of Commons in 1818.

³ Times, Feb. 16, 1822.

⁴ vol. ii. p. 412.

gine to distribute the sums raised by taxes. All this may be philosophical to the king, to the bishop, and to the tithe and tax taker; but what say and feel the tax payers? No impartial person ever adopted such opinions. Taxation takes, generally speaking, against the producer's will. This cannot promote production; for men exert themselves in proportion to their profits and prosperity. Men are industrious, active and enterprising, as they are assured of enjoying the fruit of their exertions; and the laws of property and the administration of justice confirm the truth of the position: this is the object of their institution.

Then what must be the effect of sinister deductions from those profits?—A comparative indisposition to labour, which is proved by the lassitude and heedlessness of those people who are ruled indiscreetly and by caprice. Industry increases as men are removed from slavery; and it is consummate as their freedom is complete. To take property from these and give it to others, without a manifest and acknowledged benefit to the contributors, of course lessens the stock of society, while it indisposes the working orders to supply the general consumption. Abstracting from some and giving to others, contrary to the will of the industrious, beside the injustice, seizes so much substance, in proportions, and at times less suitable to the convenience of the contributors, than if they expended their earning according to their wants and wishes: and on the other hand, that which is given is seldom so well employed as that which is obtained by labour or purchase, which is nearly the same. Therefore the simple proposition, that taxation trans-

fers goods from one to another; precludes the notion, that, thus transferred, they are used with the same judgement and advantage as if they had been husbanded or apportioned by the producer.

A transfer of property or profits by taxation, unless (as I have said) for an obvious general advantage, as the voluntary gift of the Biscayners¹, perverts the goods of the community, and therefore evidently tends to interrupt industry and opulence in their operations. When men talk of transferring property by taxation, it would seem that they considered the change merely as cards shuffled between right and left hands. But this transfer or change is attended with every evil of the gambler's fortune, losses, spoliations, exchequer processes, when the law's fell swoop seizes and consigns families to beggary and ruin. Constantine built his city, jumbling incongruous orders and materials brought violently from different parts of the world; and Munser, which is more to the point, who destroyed Medayein the ancient capital, in order to afford materials for constructing the city of Bagdad, might be said, according to the foregoing politicians, to have only taken so many houses from one body of citizens and given them to another: thence no injury was done. And, according to the same reasoning, Jonathan Wild and all his craft are justified:—they merely transfer property from one to another; and probably not from poor to rich, as taxation does, but from the rich to the wretched.

¹ They were not taxable, but they made a voluntary gift to the king when pressed by war.

I say that money taken one day, and returned without deduction the following to the same person, injures him. How great then must be the injury when the money taken is never returned? Taxes also do not merely transfer from one to another the same sum: for taxation implies tax-gatherers, who consume a part of the taxes in their receipt, and who have themselves been probably perverted from productive to destructive labour. These publicans and sinners in England (without noticing the financiers and treasury lords) are multitudinous. The officers employed in managing the salt duties alone amount to 255, and their salaries and emoluments to 32,000*l*. Now though we cannot ascertain the number of this most onerous order, we know the amount of their expense to the public. The collection of the revenue last year cost nearly four millions and a half sterling¹. Thus, taxation draws so many men and so much money from a productive state, and loads the remaining people with the double impost of contributing themselves and supporting others. Yet is the stipendiary expense trifling in comparison to the whole taxation—between fifty and sixty millions; which according to some is a boon, according to others a complimentary interchange of kindness, or a rarified vapour which rises with the dawn and falls in refreshing dews at the close of day: and yet this is the economical period—the halcyon time, after eight long years of peace. And observe,

¹ The customs in 1821 amounted to 9,837,279*l*. The expense of their sole collection amounted to 1,097,020*l*. *Times*, Mar. 13, 1822.

these sixty millions amount to seventy millions, by the several charges of dealers and tradesmen, before they reach the consumers.

Compare this reduced taxation to the rental of the nation. Mr. Pitt at different times calculated it at 25 and at 28 millions. From returns to the tax office the rental of the real property in England and Wales only, including mines, canals, &c. was calculated at 37 millions; and Mr. Colquhoun, who is never short in his estimates, said that the tax on property was collected on 33,975,643*l*. In 1815, allowing for deductions on debts and incumbrances, the landed interest was assessed on 32,000,000*l*. These latter estimates were calculated on war prices and in a depreciated currency. Suppose the rental during the war was 40,000,000*l*., what is now the income of the proprietors? Some say thirty, some twenty millions¹. Mr. Lockhart considers that it is fallen much lower. Whatever be the available rental, can it meet poor-rates and sixty millions of taxes, which effect a pressure now equal to eighty millions in 1813? Yet this is good, say some: It would be better if the expenditure and taxation were greater, say others: It is a mere transfer, adds a third, of funds already existing. They do not exist: and yet the transfer of property which is at present in activity or consolidating, is unequalled even by repeated revolutions, except perhaps in our Eastern dominions. Yet our proprietors are approaching the state of the ruined Zemindars in that desolated world. The French spo-

¹ Curwen, *Times*, Feb. 9, 1821.

liation of its refugees and traitors was moderate, comparatively to this prodigious subversion of property.

Taxation is mischievous in various ways. Wages and all that are called profits, rents, income, are expended or hoarded.—Now capital is derived from saving, and without increased capital there can scarcely be increased improvement. That the capital of England has not increased as it would have done had England remained untaxed (and remark that Howell¹ gloried that the people of England did not know the gabels of Italy, the tailles of France, nor the excise of Holland), or had England been even partially oppressed—is obvious. The comparative amount of capital at different periods may be estimated by the price of money, which has not fallen, but the contrary: and the reason of its enhancement is, that accumulation has been prevented by the taxes raised to pay the current expenses and the public creditors. Davenant² said in 1695, in the infancy of the funding system, that it would divert money from the channels of commerce, and raise its price to the injury of our foreign and domestic trade. Decker³ avers that such was its operation in his time. When the Government comes into the market, all compe-

¹ Retrospective Review, No. viii. p. 199.

² Works, vol. i. p. 24.

³ He says that (Introduction, p. 65) "the annals of Europe for the year 1739, affirm that the national debt first drew out of private hands most of that money which should, and otherwise would, have been lent to our merchants and tradesmen. This made it difficult for such to borrow any money upon personal security."

titors must succumb: it was so in the time of Charles the Fifth and of Philip the Second. They, said Guicciardini, allowed such high interest that all became money-lenders, "though such high interest was a great grievance to the poor, as well as a great obstruction to commerce." The consumption of capital by loans must have had similar effects in England in proportion to their extent. Thus in 1751, three years after the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, the 3 per cents. were at 101; but then we owed only 75 millions. Yet now, eight years after a peace, the funds are called high, though 20 per cent. under that price. Had our wars been necessary, and no debts national or princely, no privileged orders, no borough-mongers, nor their beggarly children and retainers, who corrupt more by their example than they impoverish by their prodigality,—what would have been the state of Great Britain now, morbid and sickening at once under the extremes of plethora and inanition?

Taxation does not merely prevent capital from accumulating, and thus impede the current of improvement; but it actually reduces that which has been prudently acquired and beneficially employed. Taxes reduce production: some land can pay a rent, yet cannot pay a tax also: in this case the tax renders the land incult. Again, land which will pay one tax will not pay two taxes or charges;—much land is abandoned on the double account of tithe and tax¹;

¹ Sir E. Knatchbull said, that in five adjoining parishes 3000 acres were returned to the landlords and thrown out of cultivation. So said Sir J. Shelley of other places. Times, April 4, 1820.

thence taxes operate as penalties and prohibitions on produce, and thus ill-organized and mal-administered governments curse with sterility the earth granted by God to man for his subsistence.

Regarding the effect of taxes in their counter-operation, how miserably do they affect consumption! The consumption of barley in malt before the war was, omitting fractions, twenty-seven millions of bushels; latterly it declined to twenty-two millions of bushels; that is, the consumption was diminished about a sixth, while the population had increased from ten and a half to above fourteen millions. Had the appetite and ability of the people continued the same, instead of about three millions of quarters, five millions of quarters of barley would have been made into malt. And yet Lord Castlereagh in 1819, when imposing an additional tax on malt, said it would be no charge:—

“A potent quack long versed in human ills,
Who first insults the victim whom he kills.”

The reduction of consumption by taxes runs through the whole history of this country. From 1660 to 1694 strong beer paid 2s. 6d. the barrel, and small 6d.; and on an average of ten years from 1684 to 1693, the amount of ale charged was, of strong 4,567,293 barrels, of small 2,376,278 barrels¹. The consumption declined; and in the year 1750 the re-

In the parish of Mayfield in Sussex, nineteen farms were untenanted. Cambridge Paper, January 25, 1822. Sir T. Lethbridge says he had seven untenanted, &c.

¹ Ann. Register, 1798, p. 150.

duction fell nearly a million of barrels of strong ale below the consumption prior to 1699. The same consequences in Scotland followed the increased duty on what was called *two-penny* beer.

That taxation affects consumption, is proved by the present Treasury accounts. The increased duty on wines sunk the produce of the taxes on them: the same results followed the taxation of various other articles: but in Ireland particularly, Swift's inverted arithmetic of two and two making one, is eminently displayed¹. The entire taxation of that country was doubled²; yet the returns to the Exchequer declined considerably; and instead of eight millions, the estimated increase by the financiers, repeated taxation sunk the revenue to less than half that amount. The Anglo-Irish Government never heard perhaps the answer of Henry the Fourth of France to one who advised him to impose a certain tax, stating that he (the king) had the right to do so: “It is not good to

¹ From 1815 the foreign wine imported in Ireland amounted to 3,169 tons, in 1816 to 1,804. I may observe, Swift in this is not original; Boccacini said, “perche nell' aritmetica ordinaria e cosa verissima che due volte cinque fa dieci, tre volte cinque quindici, e cosi di mano in mano, ma nell' abbaca aritmetica pastorale due volte cinque fa tre et tre volte cinque fa uno et quattro volte cinque fa quel zero, &c. Cento Prima. Ragg. di Parnaso, p. 151. This, if it did not suggest the allusion, is fitter for my purpose.

² In 1800 the net revenue of Ireland amounted to 4,417,446l. in 1820 to 3,500,000l. To speak of particulars of nine articles on which the duties were increased—the duties fell from 1,700,000l. (their amount in 1800) to 816,400l. The rate of duty on malt in 1817, 1818, 1819, though nearly one-half greater than it was in 1800, returned to the Exchequer about one-fourth less.

do all that one might¹." The Anglo-Irish Government would do what they could not do, what was impossible; and by adding taxes to taxes they effected insolvency, insurrection, and famine².

Taxation is most demoralizing; witness lotteries³, among the ways and means. Indeed, what are the funds themselves but one great Faro bank, at which knaves and dupes throw for the fortune of the world? Taxes induce smuggling, and as taxes are augmented the greater is the inducement to crime: hence the perjury of officers, of traders, of dealers; and note; of the whole convictions in Ireland for the last four years, amounting to 16,000, nearly 4000 were for offences against the revenue⁴: and be it also remembered, that England (the most taxed country in the world) exhibits the greatest host of offenders. Taxation seduces manufacturers and merchants to practise tricks and devices: thus, Van Egmont⁵ says, the

¹ Qu'il était bon de ne pas toujours faire tout ce que l'on pouvait. Vauban, Dixme Royale, p. 231.

² The tax on houses fell from 381,000*l.* to 159,000*l.* in 1820; and the insolvent houses proceeded in the following ratio:

In 1815	880
1816	1072
1817	1588
1818	2397
1819	3206
1820	3989
1821	4719

Cork followed the same course.

³ There is an account of a lottery club breaking up a benefit club. Morn. Chron. May 5, 1819.

⁴ Times, Feb. 8, 1822.

⁵ Travels, vol. i. p. 87.

Dutch, having deteriorated their goods sold in the Levant, lost their trade to the English, who made more substantial fabrics. How long the English shall hold their pretensions to credit is doubtful; for many English articles are reduced in quality; and it was asserted in Parliament that old woollens are wrought into *new* cloth, and that instruments have been invented to prepare rags for their resurrectionary appearance. In fact, by the aggravation of taxes nothing is what it seems;—most manufactures are spurious or adulterated. And yet, Mr. Ricardo¹ says that taxes and the increased price of labour do not subject a country to any other disadvantage, with respect to foreign countries, but the unavoidable one of paying the taxes. It impairs character; and finally it destroys both reputation and commerce.

Taxation is injurious in its causes and consequences, which are complicated and tremendous. Taxation induced the Bank Restriction Act in 1797, which defrauded creditors as the return to cash payments ruined debtors, which thus twice violated, in about twenty years, the income and inheritance and contracts of the whole country, confounding and disfiguring social life not less than the sea the earth, when the flood, driven by concurrent forces, overflows the land, and receding, leaves the once fruitful fields desolate and incumbered with the residue of their former plenty.

Consider, also, that at one period there were

¹ Principles of Political Economy and Taxation, p. 305.

139,000 surcharges and 39,000 appeals¹. Remark the *extents in aid*—Treasury processes remorseless and final. Regard the excise, a tax so utterly unknown in Elizabeth's reign, that Lord Bacon² was obliged to explain it by referring to the Netherlands. How has it flourished!—how enormous in its amount! how inquisitorial in its proceedings! Let no one talk of auricular confession, and racks, and screws;—where the excise laws exist, liberty is a vain name: even the soldiery are at the beck of the revenue officer; he may enter the Englishman's castle! his house, his cabinet, by day or night: and superadded to all this, the Lords of the Treasury have the power of mitigating, or cancelling, or confirming the penalty. Thus the prerogative of mercy is shared by right of the excise with the fiscal lords. The excise laws are a labyrinth of vexation, of crime, of poverty, of tyranny. A writer in the Harleian Miscellany, speaking of the excise as practised in the United Provinces, said: "We should think it intolerable³." And Dudley Carleton⁴ was menaced with being sent to the Tower for merely mentioning the excise in Parliament. It is now, miserable reverse! the burthen of his successors' schemes and expectations.

Look to the effect of taxation on law proceedings; it has indirectly annulled Magna Charta, for by tax-

¹ See the Report of the Committee of the House of Commons. Ann. Register, 1817.

² Works, vol. i. p. 237.

³ vol. ix. p. 498.

⁴ Howell, Retros. Rev. No. viii. p. 199.

ation justice is delayed, sold, denied. In Pearce's Treatise, &c. he states that a person was arrested for 35*l.*, which was disputed; the costs amounted to 232*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*; yet, he adds, 200*l.* more might have been added to the expense. Yet further, the most prodigious injustice is inflicted on the people by the means of the sovereign court of equity:—three fine boys in 1819 were in a workhouse in Kent, legatees of 10,000*l.*, in consequence of delays in equity¹. Besides, individuals have been imprisoned by the courts of equity for a long life², because they could not pay charges enhanced principally by taxation³. The expense of law proceedings is mainly advanced by taxes, which visit every incident connected with lawyers, agents, processes, &c.

I have shown some of the evils of taxation: but my object in respect to the subject of this book is but partially attained, till I have proved that taxes fall principally on the poor and industrious. Mr. Ricardo, when objecting to the three millions of new taxes imposed in 1819, said "he could not, however, agree that they fell on the labourers, because imposed on the objects they consumed. If they were imposed

¹ Morn. Chron. June 2, 1819.

² John Fitzgerald, Esq. was forty years a prisoner under civil processes, died in the eighty-fifth year of his age, and enjoyed good health and spirits. Major Bernardi exceeded this. Times, July 27, 1822.

³ This non-payment is in the Chancery Court a contempt. One woman eighty-one years of age had been thirty-one years confined for a contempt of court; another sixty years old had been confined nineteen years, &c. Morn. Chron. June 1820.—If this be equity, what is law?

on the luxuries of the labourer, they might indeed diminish his comforts; but the more the articles taxed approached the nature of necessities, the more completely would they fall on those who employed the labourers¹. The meaning of this is, that to work men must live, and to live they must eat. What are luxuries and necessities respecting the poor and labourious? To some flesh-meat is a necessary; to many wheaten bread; to others oaten bread: yet in Ireland all these things are luxuries. Most consider a bed a necessary; yet among the Dunkers it is a luxury reserved for the sick. A house of some kind is generally esteemed necessary; yet three-fourths of the gipsies in England live unhoused². There is also a sort of gipsy vagrants, more destitute than those in England, in Africa³, and in India⁴. Thus there is a misery beneath misery's self, and *in the lowest deep a lower deep*. Yet take necessities as low as the diet of the devotees of La Trappe; even a tax on persons so circumstanced would not fall, of course, on their employers; for it is notorious that taxes have so pressed mankind that they have banished some and annihilated others. Taxation has driven labouring men from what were esteemed necessities, to a coarser and less nutritious diet;—and those things I consider necessary which the day-labourer has been accustomed to possess.

¹ Morn. Chron. June 19, 1819.

² Annual Register, 1816, p. 105.

³ Mollien's Travels, p. 36. Phillips, &c. vol. iii.

⁴ Dubois, p. 465.

The statement of Mr. Ricardo was not a mere casual expression in debate: he thus states it in his work on Political Economy and Taxation¹: "A tax on necessities or on wages will therefore be shifted from the poor to the rich." My opinion and experience are directly the reverse: I believe that all taxes are generally shifted on the poorer orders, as in barbarous society man overpowers weak woman with drudgery. In all cases of oppression each endeavours to exonerate self:—the landlord throws the tax on the farmer; it was so in Ireland². In England also it is notorious that many landlords³ charged their tenants *by contract* with the property tax imposed on themselves; while these landlords and farmers combined to raise the price of grain on the labouring people by corn laws, as they have through all ages succeeded in lowering by law and artifice the wages of labour. If a tax on the rich is not visited on the industrious, we must suppose, that fixing wages by penal laws, and enhancing food by a monopoly of the market, avail

¹ page 318.

² Strafford says, "The people in general are in great quietness, it being most sure that the lowest sort of the Irish subjects hath not in any age lived so preserved from the pressures and oppressions of the great ones as now they do." Strafford's Letters, vol. ii. p. 93. "That in these late contributions, the nobility, in a manner, wholly laid the burthen upon the poor tenants, most unequally freeing themselves, and therefore it is reason they should pay the more now: as for example, my Lord of Cork, as sure as you live, paid towards the 20,000 pounds yearly contributions, not a penny more than six shillings and eightpence Irish a quarter." Strafford's Letters, vol. i. p. 407. 1635.

³ Walthew, p. 10.

nothing in respect to the necessaries of mankind. Mr. Ricardo says, a tax on necessaries will fall on the employers¹. And would not this injure the labourer? I say a tax on property and opulence must operate on wages, as wages depend in a great degree on capital. And Mr. Ricardo² admits that taxes oblige *the contributor in many cases to remove himself and his capital to another country*. In almost all ways, taxes injure the people: they will deduct from the fund which employs them, or they will reduce directly their means of living.

Mr. Ricardo is not only at variance with facts, but with himself: for while he insists that taxes on wages and necessaries are shifted on employers, he says, "It would not be difficult to show that all taxes fall on the consumers³." Are not the people, the laborious people, the great consumers? Theorists may talk dogmatically of taxes transitive in their operation, and running the round of society till they are defrayed by the opulent. This is imaginary. Adam Smith said truly⁴: "Taxes on the sale of land fall altogether on the seller; the seller is almost always obliged to sell, and must therefore take such a price as he can get."

¹ Hume said, "The laborious pay a considerable part of the taxes by their annual consumption." *Essays*, vol. i. p. 381.

² On Political Economy, &c. p. 305. Thus taxation has the effect of increasing the people without increasing the capital: in respect to their injury to wages, "if population increases without an increase of capital, wages fall; and if capital increases without an increase of population, wages rise." *Mill's Elements of Political Economy*, page 27.

³ *Times*, Feb. 9, 1821.

⁴ b. v. c. 2. p. 331.

And is not a labourer almost always obliged to work? It is my opinion, though I do not speak peremptorily, that taxes, let them strike where they may in the first instance, generally in the sequel affect the industrious. To talk of their diffusion over the whole surface of society¹, or of their falling on gross or manufactured produce, or on rent or capital, or profits or stock, or on consumers,—they must fall ultimately on the producers; these must pay, first or last: they created riches, they preserve them;—and what is the proportion of the industrious community to the remaining orders? If Mr. Ricardo's doctrine be right, the former custom in France, of exonerating² the nobility³, (who were as patriotic in resisting a tax on land, as the English House of Commons in opposing the property tax,) and charging the industrious poor with *corvée*, *gabelle*, &c. did not affect the necessaries of the laborious. Yet Fortescue speaks with horror of the pressure of the taxes on the poor—as driving them to the last stage of misery⁴.

¹ Thus Garnier says, A tax is eventually drawn from the whole body, "comme le sang qu'on tire d'un bras se pompe sur tout le corps."—*Say*, t. ii, p. 341. A simile is a poet's reasoning; but pursue this doctrine, and it is the same benefit to the head to bleed in the foot, &c.

² The landlord being exempted, the renter paid a *taille* the third of the rents, and the capitation tax which affected the labourer was the third of the *taille*. Dupré de St. Maur, *Essai sur les Monnoies*, p. 26.

³ This, Sir J. Steuart says, "excites the indignation of a Frenchman." *Introduction*, &c. p. 3.

⁴ "so that they may uneth live."—On a Limited and Absolute Monarchy.

Taxes, I repeat, if charged on the richer orders, oppress the whole extent of industry, and their weight is greatest at the base; but taxes on wages, or labour, or necessities, strike the people at once, they fall in a mass, and overwhelm them without preparation either to parley or to escape. Even where the tax indirectly affects necessities, the blow is tremendous. A heavy duty on rock-salt, about twenty years ago, ended the boat fishery in Ireland¹; and the depression of the leather trade deprived lately, by calculation, 70,000 persons of employment².

Repeal the taxes, then, and you may, and will, reduce the poor-rates³. You will also increase the public revenue, by facilitating manufactures and by promoting industry and consumption. This is proved by universal experience. In Europe it is notorious; in Persia⁴ it has been remarked by Tavernier; in America also, by reducing the price of quicksilver and

¹ Mr. Frazer's examination before the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1819.

² M. Villar attributed the disorders of cattle to the augmentation of the price of salt, by which farmers were prevented from giving their cattle as much as they had hitherto done. *Month. Rev. Old Series*, vol. lxvii. p. 559.

³ In the Parish of Southill, Bedfordshire, the taxes in 1792 were 374*l.*; they amounted in 1820, to 2600*l.*: the poor-rates in the same period quadrupled.

⁴ Tavernier says that in Persia some handicraft trades are incorporated, and pay a yearly duty to the king; some are free. Yet, says the traveller, "the kings gain as much by the labour of the latter as by those who pay a direct contribution." Then how much must they injure the revenue when they pay no direct contribution? *Voyages*, liv. 5. c. 12.

lowering the tribute on gold to one in twenty, and on silver to one in ten, the produce of the mines greatly increased: and in 1776, in Mexico, double the usual quantity of silver was coined, amounting to two millions and a half sterling. The advantage continued; the whole produce of the mines in America amounted to thirty millions of dollars, or four millions and a half sterling: and afterwards, when Townsend¹ wrote, the produce amounted to five millions and a half.—So in Paris, Turgot² diminished the alimentary taxes one half; and as the amount of the taxes continued the same, it is conclusive the consumption was doubled: while the consumption of salt³, the tax, being abolished, increased ten-fold. Yet it must be observed, that if the relief be delayed it may be nugatory; for though men will abandon a convenience or a necessary through the difficulty of procuring it, it does not follow that they will resume it (even if their means of repossessing it should not be exhausted) when their habit has been broken, and new appetites created or confirmed.

The people do not want sermons on abstinence;—their life implies its exercise;—nor lectures on political economy from professors and their associates; neither do they want bounties and premiums: no, nor laws sentimental in the preamble and equivocal in their

¹ vol. ii. p. 135.

² Les droits d'entrée et de halle sur la marée qui se débitait à Paris, le montant total de ces droits resta le même. *Say*, tom. ii. p. 301.

³ Chaptal, tom. ii. p. 170.

enactments,—for their relief. But they require that their earnings should be secured, and their necessities untithed and untaxed. Mark the mighty improvement of the French people, amidst wars intestine, external, universal. The French were slaves and beggars. Vauban speaks terrifically of the afflictions and misery of the labouring people of France; yet have they mightily improved in comforts of all kinds; not by a maximum¹, which so far as it operated was injurious to all, nor by projects to prevent mendicity, nor by a decree in 1794 for establishing poorhouses²—expedients as absurd, bating the mummery, as the distribution of *le pain benoit* in the presence of the generalissimo Monsieur;—but by relieving land, labour and commerce, of burthens and taxes: and to complete this system, auspiciously begun, is the sage advice of Monsieur Lanjuinais. The project is not revolutionary or innovating, except as a return from evil to good deserves such innuendoes; for in the 13th century the poor of France were exempted from contributions³. Henry the Fourth and Sully acted on the same principles⁴. Henry wished that each man might have a good dinner (*un poulet* was the expression) in his dominions; and his mini-

¹ Annual Register, 1791, p. 188.

² Ibid. 1791, p. 152.

³ In 1232. Matthew Paris says that the 40th of moveables was granted to the king, adding that nothing should be taken from any man who had not moveables to the value of forty pence at least. Lords Report, p. 82.

⁴ In Elizabeth's time it would appear that wages in France were higher than in England, that one shilling went as far as two. Hume, vol. v. p. 486.

ster seconded the monarch. Sully remitted to the provinces twenty millions of arrears of taxes¹, and he diminished the *taille*; and, contrary to the English mode of extinguishing the national debt by imposing new taxes on necessities, he in the space of fifteen years paid off two hundred millions; and on quitting the ministry he left three hundred millions in the exchequer². But kings and ministers change, and the extraordinary concurrence of two good individuals ruling the state was not repeated. Vauban³, indeed, proposed to relieve the population by discharging the poor and taxing the privileged orders. His wisdom and humanity were unheeded; the people were ground to death. Wheat and wine, necessities and the common produce of the land, they never tasted⁴, and the soil was cultivated by idle metayers⁵,—idle because they were exhausted and dispirited by the smallness of their recompense. All this is changed since the revolution⁶:—population has increased; farmers and labourers are better fed, better paid; necessities are more abundant; the poor are fewer, and these few

¹ Aussi une des premières opérations fut de remettre aux provinces vingt millions d'arrérages de taille: and he diminished it yearly, considering it a bad tax. Thomas, Eloge, &c. tom. iii. p. 272.

² Bibliothèque de l'Homme Publique, tom. viii. p. 8.

³ Dixme Royale, p. 161.

⁴ Dr. Heylin lamented this.

⁵ Turgot, Œuvres, tom. iv. p. 267.

⁶ Mr. Gray says of France, "There is an appearance of wealth, though in general, it is true, of little capital. Your soil is universally under cultivation, but with some exceptions in a very inferior style. Your people are generally employed and busy, yet not very effectually." Letter to Mons. Say.

are less miserable. I speak knowingly, having seen the country in all directions and in all its various stages of political being.

CHAPTER III.

Cause of the people's distress.—The corn laws, intended to uphold rents by upholding high prices, incongruous as well as wicked.

MR. RICARDO may repeat that taxes on necessities are shifted from the poor on the rich; yet in no instance have the people succeeded in the struggle; and surely never was the impotence of the people more notorious, not even by the statute of labourers, than by the corn laws explicitly proposed to raise the price of grain, or continue its enhancement by excluding the English from the market of the world. Foreign corn is excluded, to give a monopoly to the home growers; and this is done to enable them to pay enormous rents to the aristocracy. It is said that a great variety of manufactured articles (one hundred and fifty, I think,) are fenced and guarded by restrictions, duties, regulations, bounties, drawbacks. Such has been the policy of England. But better opinions are in progress¹: and the clothiers, those who support the staple, have renounced the laws in their

¹ I might say in action. The statute *To repeal divers ancient statutes and parts of statutes, &c.* passed last session; by which a farrago of centuries of mistaken enactments respecting the exports and imports to and from foreign countries is condemned.

favour, saying, Open the woollen trade; we disclaim the supposed benefit from a duty on the import of foreign woollens, but give us a free trade in corn.

Suppose that the restrictive policy was generally good,—and I believe it miserable,—the prime necessities should be exempted from that vexation; for there is no more certain security for cheapness and plenty, than having the stock of the world exposed to all purchasers: as, on the contrary, in a restricted market articles are often bad, and always dear. Witness the tea market in Leadenhall Street:—the monopoly of the Company doubles the price of tea to the English consumer.

It was said, indeed, by the minister, that the interests of commerce and agriculture are the same; and therefore they and their territorial partizans passed the corn law, by which foreign commerce is *pro tanto* excluded. So it was said that a free trade to the East would be injurious to British shipping; and yet the tonnage increased, by opening the trade a little, from 20,000 to 61,000 tons¹; and the trade which had fallen under the Company's direction to 10,000 tons, by being liberated increased to 102,956 tons². Thus also, opening the monopoly of the salt-works at Droitwich vastly increased the supply, and reduced the price five-sixths, from 2s. to 4d.³

¹ Morn. Chron. May 27, 1820.

² Edinb. Rev. Feb. 1818, p. 447.

³ The proprietors of the salt-pits at Droitwich prevented every one from sinking new pits, till Robert Steyner, Esq. discovered and sunk pits on his own ground in 1690. He was sued by the corporation, and defended himself at the expense of about

But a monopoly of corn, they say, is good; and thence this island, in respect to the purchase of foreign grain, by money or barter, is land-locked to all the world. The Agricultural Report of the House of Commons goes further than the minister: it insists that landlord, tenant, and consumer, have a common interest; therefore the corn law is universally beneficial. Then are all monopolies good, for the monopoly of the prime necessary equals them all. If this be philosophy, the interest of buyer and seller (hitherto at variance) is identical. When the Canada merchants said that extraordinary duties should be imposed on Baltic timber, in order that the Canada trade might be encouraged, which they said requires four times the number of sailors to convey the same tonnage to England—this is intelligible, as it agrees with the old dotage and the *wisdom of our ancestors* about the wooden walls and that palladium the Navigation Act.

So far is the interest of grower and consumer from being the same, that the interest of sellers sometimes disagrees, and that of buyers and sellers is almost always repugnant. It is for the seller's advantage that the price be high, and therefore he is served by the market being scantily supplied. Some suppose that large produce cheaply sold affords a better return than a less produce at a higher price. This is specious, but untrue. Fishmongers find it more conve-

6,000%. The monopoly was destroyed, and the price of salt reduced from 2s. to 4d. This gentleman by his expenses at law lived to receive parish allowance. Month. Rev. Old Series, vol. lxy. p. 260.

nient to destroy part of their cargoes, than to sell the whole at a reduced price. The Dutch, when they monopolized the spice trade in the East, occasionally destroyed large quantities of spices for the same reason.

The benefit of an imperfect harvest seems pretty well known by the professed wishes of many landholders of Great Britain: and their practical feelings concur with Davenant's theory. I subjoin Davenant's calculation of the contrariety of interest between buyer and seller, in respect to the produce and the price of grain¹. He introduces his estimate by remarking, that it has been observed one-tenth defect in the harvest may raise prices three-tenths; and he then furnishes the following table:

Defects in the harvest.	Prices in consequence.
1 tenth defect	3 tenths
2 ditto	8 ditto
3 ditto	1.6 ditto
4 ditto	2.8 ditto
5 ditto	4.5 ditto.

That is, the failure of a half of the harvest raises prices four times and a half. Thus a half crop, supposing the grower had a monopoly of the home market, would more than double his profits. I do not insist on the accuracy of this calculation; but I have no doubt that the supposed communion of interest between the land-owner and the corn-eater is of this sinister character².

¹ Works, vol. ii. p. 224.

² Mrs. Graham says: "The Dutch boors do not grow a third

All the corn laws have been enacted with the same fraudulent view. The bounties, the duties, the new importation acts, the county meetings respecting agricultural distress, exhibit a tissue of selfishness which degrades the nobles and gentry of the land, and sinks them into petty and impertinent chapmen. And yet these corn laws are enacted, they declare, for the common good. Indeed, some persons have marvellous notions of beneficence. Dr. Clarke, the eloquent traveller, says that the Egyptians adored Joseph as a god for his administration. Joseph's kindness, as related in Genesis, amounted to enslaving the whole people, by advising a royal monopoly of grain. The king followed the advice of this prophetic minister, and he possessed himself of all the grain. A famine ensued, and the monarch sold the stored grain to a famishing people for their fortunes and freedom: "Buy us and our land for bread, and we and our land will be servants to Pharaoh¹." If this be godlike in Pharaoh's minister, our corn laws are not merely kind—they are divine.

of the corn they might produce; for they have a notion, that the colony is prosperous in proportion to the high price of wheat, not in proportion to the quantity they might export: so that, with perhaps the most fertile soil in the world, they buy a great deal of corn from the Americans, and have been more than once reduced almost to famine. It is true, that Government requires them to produce a certain quantity of wheat, but they grow as little more as they can help." *India*, p. 178.

¹ Genesis xlvii. 19. The Chancellor of Charles the good earl of Flanders bought up all the corn; the earl obliged him to sell it at a reasonable price. This differed from the god Joseph and his king.

All these laws of bounty or prohibition proceeded from the same vile cause. In Charles the First's reign corn was cheap, and in the 25th of that king a bounty act was passed for three years. The reason was explicitly stated by Charles: "It was necessary to sooth the passions of the landed gentry by the prospect of immediate gain¹." In this case, the landlords wished that their grain should predominate in the foreign market; now they want to secure the home market from foreign competition:—in the former case they required a bounty on the export of home produce, now they require a duty on the import of foreign produce;

"Now here, now there, it flashes swiftly round,
Smites the bright hills, and runs along the ground."

The avowed notorious object of all this fluttering preposterous legislation is, that landlords may retain their rents enhanced by the late prerogative war, begun and prosecuted by their cooperation. Verily, they are fit assessors of the godlike Joseph.

Oh! but there is an universal glut of grain. So there was, as far as depression of price decides the question, about 1660; and yet the Dutch then and now and at all times preserved the trade of corn free both from duty or bounty². But is there a glut throughout the world? Sicily, though the marquis of Londonderry insisted that country was glutted,

¹ Month. Rev. Old Ser. xlii. p. 231.

² They would not admit the corn trade to be meddled with, even when they forbade the exportation of potatoes. Month. Rev. Old Series, vol. xlviii. p. 434.

was obliged to obtain its seed wheat from abroad¹. But there is a superabundance in Poland, and Flanders, and America. I don't doubt that corn has become excessive in countries which were accustomed to supply England, that supply being stopped by act of parliament. Large quantities of grain had been imported for many years: from 1787 to 1798 the average import amounted to 1,360,000 quarters of grain annually: it increased from 1799 to 1810 to 1,471,000 quarters; and a considerable import of grain continued till 1819, when the import ceased, the home price of grain being considerably lower than the tolerated importation price: for in 1820 the average price fell to 69s. 5d.; in 1821 prices continued to fall; and in 1822 wheat declined to about 38s. 10d. the quarter², the importation price being more than double that amount.

Of course, those countries which grew corn for the English market losing that vent, were disappointed, and suffered from an unproductive superabundance. This, and there are other causes, would account for

¹ Mr. Solly proved this. *Times*, May 8, 1822. Mr. Monk also said, that he understood the land-holders in Switzerland were not distressed, except those whose lands were mortgaged. *Times*, May 9, 1822.

² In this year the new and more enhanced price was enacted; as by this bill, when wheat is between 70s. and 80s. it may be imported on paying a duty of 17s. a quarter; and when it rises to between 80s. and 85s. it is to pay 5s. a quarter; after 85s. it is to pay 1s. a quarter. This, with the averages being extended to Ireland, raises the importation price to about 90s.; which, considering the rise of the value of money, makes the 80s. in 1815 100s. in 1823.

the excess of grain in the foreign markets.—With respect to the fall in the price of grain in England, I doubt if it proceeds from an actual excess; and still less can I subscribe to the causes assigned for this supposed superfluity. It is said by Lord Liverpool¹, the Government purchases have fallen from two millions to six hundred thousand pounds. What of that? Two millions expended on wheat during the three last years of the war, 1811, 1812, and 1813, would have purchased at 6l. the quarter (and the average of those years was 5l. 18s. 8d.) 999,999 quarters. Is it imaginable that the purchase by Government of 333,333 quarters of grain yearly, could have materially affected the home market, and when our population has been increased since the peace by 100,000 men? Besides, whatever might have been the effect of the extra Government purchases on the consumption of wheat, they declined with the peace, and have ceased for years.

It is also said that the supposed glut has arisen from an excessive import of grain. Why the whole import of foreign grain for the last six years amounted to seven millions of quarters; and since 1819 (when 700,000 quarters of oats were brought into England) not one bushel has been imported for the consumption of the British people.

Again, this supposed glut is attributed to abundant harvests. But we had a famine in 1817; and one year's dearth requires years of plenty to restore the deficit. Suppose not,—are we not informed that the

¹ Lord Liverpool's speech. *Star*, Feb. 27, 1822.

cultivation has been reduced and is reducing¹? It is admitted that in 1816 the crops, by wet and cold, failed throughout Europe, and that the average price of wheat in England amounted to 94s. the quarter; since that period our crops have not exceeded an average return,—they certainly were not extraordinarily productive. If, then, our glut proceeds from such harvests, we must partly agree with those ignorant Frenchmen who considered that one good harvest in England provided sufficient food for the English people during many years².

But a glut must be advocated at all events: therefore an opinion has been adopted by Mr. Peel, grounded on the evidence of Mr. Tooke, that no market is so soon gorged as that of wheat—the prime necessary in England; and that any excess above an average produce causes superabundance and depression of price. The reverse is probable. An excess of the prime necessary, and of that also which can be stored, is least liable to extreme depression from any casual plenty. But has not land fallen? Yet land has not increased in quantity or quality. On the contrary, there is less land available, as less is cultivated. Have not cows, bullocks, sheep, pigs, fallen in price? and some of them more than wheat?

The decline being general, the cause or causes must be proportioned to the consequences: nor do

¹ Agricultural Reports, Ann. Register, 1816, p. 29. Curwen, Times, Feb. 19, 1822.

² Aujourd'hui une bonne récolte peut nourrir l'Angleterre pendant plusieurs années. Eloges, tom. iii. p. 336. Bibliothèque de l'Homme Pub., tom. xii. p. 124, specifies four years.

they seem mysterious. Temple¹ says that subsequent to the wars in the middle of the 17th century, grain declined in price; so it has now in similar circumstances; and there are numerous reasons why peace should bring a reduction of prices, besides those mentioned by Temple. But the reduction of price then, was trifling in comparison to the present fall. True, but not greater than the disparity of the two wars in extent and duration.

Again, from 1693 to 1699 wheat rose from thirty to thirty-five shillings; but the guinea was worth thirty shillings. The currency was then reformed; and from 1700 to 1708 corn resumed its former price of thirty shillings. This will also account for another portion of the fall in our time²; for the circulating medium was depressed not less than the difference between 21s. and 30s.: and be it observed—for it is most material—it has fallen not by the deficiency of metal in the nominal coin, (which is in effect a reduction of the circulation,) but by an excessive and forced circulation of paper, multiplied without controul and supported by penal statutes³. As

¹ Another cause may be the great cheapness of corn, which has been for these dozen years, or more, general in all these parts of Europe, and which has a very great influence upon the trade of Holland. Works, vol. i. p. 69.

² France suffered a reduction of prices: but as the circulating medium had been metallic, it ceased soon and was comparatively small. Mr. Say states that things generally have not fallen in price since the depreciation and restoration of the paper money in England; and the falling prices in England have no analogy on the continent. Morn. Chron. Aug. 21, 1822.

³ A greater circulation was necessary when the expenditure

the circulation increased, it has rapidly diminished: for after allowing for the issue of gold coin, which is constantly transferred or transformed to a great amount, the whole coin and bank notes, public and private, are less in 1822 by one-third than the currency in preceding years¹. What a prodigious effect must this have on prices! particularly as this subtraction, universally as it reduced the public income, increased the taxes,—a taxation which has increased since 1792 from sixteen to nearly sixty millions!

Are not these causes sufficient to account for the derangement and distress of society? and principally of the people, who are universally in all disasters the greatest sufferers? In consequence, though grain is cheap in respect to the grower, it is dear in respect to the great body of consumers. This effect was ruinously exhibited in Ireland during the last year. Oats were shipped from the famishing districts, because

was greatly increased, even with all the facilities of banking: but that there was no available controul in the issue of paper is obvious from the multitude of banks which at once became insolvent at the peace.

¹ Mr. Ellice said the reduction was from 60 to 36 millions. Mr. Manning said that the paper and gold jointly issued since the passing of Mr. Peel's Act, increased the currency a million more than it was before. That is not true: 9 millions of gold and 16 millions of paper are far short of the issue in 1818, when the Bank of England had 30 millions of notes in circulation. Besides, the notes of the private banks in 1818 amounted to 12 millions, and in 1821 to 2,500,000/. Times, April 4, 1822. Had Mr. Manning said that there was an equality or an excess of circulating medium in respect to the amount of purchases in the latter year, this might have some show of truth.

the people had not the means of purchasing the article;—the grain was brought from a starving, and sold in a comparatively abundant district. Is it not obvious that there is less money or means to purchase the luxuries, comforts, and necessities of life now than formerly, when prices were double? The reason is, the public are poorer. I admit there is an excess of produce: but the excess arises not because the market is overstocked with grain and necessities, but because the people are understocked with the means of purchasing them. The increase of crime proves the truth of this position. A dear year, unless attended with extraordinary wages from some extraordinary demand, is always an immoral year. If this be founded, any great superabundance of food, except as there is a deficiency of means to purchase it, cannot be inferred from the increase of an order of wretches till lately unknown, called juvenile delinquents, nor from the general state of the calendar¹. From 1805 to 1820 the convictions have tripled; being in the former year 4802, and in the latter 13,716²: and now one hundred thousand individuals, it is said,

¹ Thus, in the Annual Register it is said, "The high price of corn was next adverted to, the frequency of theft and robbery was mentioned." 1782, p. 39.

² Compare England with France, which contains above double the population of Great Britain:

	Tried.	Convicted.
In France, in 1817, . . .	14,146	9431
1818, . . .	9722	6712

The diminution in the present year is stated to be still more considerable. Morn. Chron. Oct. 30, 1819.

pass annually through the jails of this Christian country.

Is not the distress general? Mr. Phillips said, indeed, that the manufacturers were recovering, but by low wages which could only agree with low prices. This account is not exhilarating; yet all other departments are grievously and without exception oppressed: the agriculturists are in utter despair; petitions also were presented last session from the grazing districts by Mr. Leicester. Alderman Thompson testified in the same session to the distress of the shipping interest. Have not the excise and assessed taxes declined this very year nearly a million? In short, are not all orders in difficulties except placemen, pensioners, bankers, fund-holders, that is, the tax-consumers¹?

The radical and catholic cause of the distress is taxation²; for the corn law is part and parcel of fiscal oppression³. The land-owners would uphold the

¹ Up to 1797 the profits of a proprietor of Bank stock never exceeded 7 per cent. But from 1797 down to the present time, besides receiving 7 per cent. upon his capital, by the advantages arising from the Restriction Act, and public balances, and the management of the public debt, the gains of the Bank have increased to the enormous sum of thirty millions sterling.

² Mr. Methuen spoke truly and feelingly: "The labourer was starving, the gentleman was struggling; taxation was the cause why the landlord raised his rent, the farmer his produce, and why the labourer suffered: the last was the principal victim." *Morn. Chron.* Feb. 1819.

³ Chaptal refers the general distress to the prohibition and insulation of nations, tom. i. b. 3. The corn law is principal in this estrangement.

price of grain, the expense of raising which, it is stated, has been doubled since 1792¹,—expecting by this device to uphold their rents, which are to them like "the greater fortune of the geomancers." But they forget that taxation, as it increased the difficulty of raising grain, has increased the difficulty of purchasing it. By surcharging the people's food, one would imagine that they thought the produce of the taxes had been transferred to the people, and not to placemen, pensioners, and the like. Do proprietors and legislators fancy they can raise the price of corn to double and treble the continental prices²? do they

¹ In the Lords' Report, cultivating 100 acres in 1790	£88
	1803 . 121
	1813 . 161

So say the returns to the Board of Agriculture.

² This Mr. Ricardo contemplates in his pamphlet on Agriculture. He proposes "at this moment of distress to give the monopoly of the home market to the British grower, till corn reaches 70s. per quarter. When it reaches 70s. all fixed prices and systems of averages should be got rid of, and a duty of 20s. per quarter on the importation of wheat, &c. might be imposed." p. 81. He then proposes that the 20s. duty should be reduced by 1s. a year, till it comes to 10s.; and this he proposes to be a *permanent measure*. That is, England should never taste foreign wheat at a less price than 80s. and that not till after a lapse of ten years: and this is professedly proposed to countervail the *peculiar taxes* imposed on the corn growers. What is this but throwing, by act of parliament, these peculiar taxes from the grower on the consumer? And what havoc does all this make on his various doctrines of taxes!—that they fall on the consumers—that taxes on necessaries do not fall on the laborious, but are shifted on their employers. Besides, how utterly regardless is this corn project of a free trade, and indeed of all liberal policy!

think the people would bear this enhancement, were it possible? Besides, as Decker long since said, "It is a fallacy and an absurdity to think to raise or keep up the value of lands by oppression on the people that cramps their trade." It is monstrous folly to suppose that rents can be upheld by any means that increase the expense of the people's living, without a corresponding increase of their wages. With the present wages and high priced corn, much land must cease to be cultivated; for in such circumstances one set of men must lose their capital, and another cease to propagate; while the lands which should remain in tillage would be laboured by miserable farmers, oppressed with debt, as in Ireland, or by metayers, as happened in France¹, Italy, &c. To infer a gain to the landlord by raising the price of food, supposes an increased ability, by wages or otherwise, to purchase food; but trade, manufactures, and the state of the world, cannot endure higher wages.

If taxes be the superlative evil—and they are so recognised directly and indirectly,—the gentry and nobility and proprietors should not attempt to shift them on their poor fellow-subjects, which must in some way afflict themselves: but they should reduce the taxes. Every tax reduced enables the producer to sell cheaper, or the purchaser to consume more. Indeed, a tax reduced generally implies both. To

¹ Macchiavel says of France: "Ogni huomo ne recoglie da vendere: in modo che se in una terra fusse uno che volesse vendere un moggio di grano, non troveria perché ciascuno ne ha da vendere." *Ritratti di Francia*, p. 92.

lower the price, the cost of production continuing the same, is a single service: but to reduce a tax doubles the benefit; for it serves buyer and seller. Yet, most strange, nothing is said in the Agricultural Reports by the Committees of Parliament, of taxes, tithes, or rent, all which are involved in the fatal questions—penury or plenty. No: the Agricultural Committee is afraid of a "diminution of the weight, station, and ascendancy which the landed interest has enjoyed and used so beneficially." Of the people they think nothing: they are heedless how much the working classes are crushed and dispirited. If it did not appear profane in the eyes of these emanations of Church and State, they would have the labouring people supplicate the landed interest—"Give us our daily bread." Tithing and taxation, and multiplied place-men and increased salaries, they pass unnoticed: but the Committee talk "of reviving the industry and frugality of the people¹." Why did they not enact sumptuary laws? it would agree with precedent, and the cant of ancient date. Talk of industry and frugality to the people, when their necessities are surcharged, their wages diminished, and a great proportion of them are members of benefit clubs, provident societies, or have subscribed to Saving Banks, &c.!

Were taxes reduced, home grain could compete with the foreign. It is trifling to say that wheat may be bought in Poland for 12s. the quarter, and imported at 24s., as Mr. Curwen has; or that it can be bought at Odessa for 16s., and imported at 32s.,

¹ *Ann. Register*, 1817, p. 266.

according to Mr. Solly. If so, why does not the grain of Odessa or Poland rush into those countries where the price of grain is comparatively high, and corn laws do not embarrass their commerce? If the commerce of grain was free, prices would not differ as they do between two countries, their facilities of communication being greater than between the provinces of the same country. Suppose the Dantzic or American wheat at 30s., and that of England at 50s.; the former would soon rise, and the latter decline: for it is absurd to suppose that foreign wheat should remain at its reduced price when its demand was increased¹, or that home-grown wheat should not fall when subjected to foreign competition². They would approximate each other: the one would not be so high, nor the other so low, as they are in their separate non-intercourse state.

Yet still we may be assured that in peace prices will approximate, and that the foreign corn trade will materially influence the home market. Yet for this pitiful truckling purpose, commerce is abridged, trade perplexed, manufactures stunted, the labourer forced to buy with statute wages monopolized grain; nay more,—for eventually no benefit, but the reverse, nationally considered,—our entire population is amerced through their common food to uphold the landed

¹ A. Young observes, that the rise of prices of wheat in Russia and England for an average of years was as 40s. and 41s. Month. Rev. May 1815.

² The Edin. Review takes the price of corn in the continental market on an average, in ordinary years, at 45s. No. lxxii. p. 466.

aristocracy. How do these petitioning, praying proprietors differ from their predecessors, who, holding lands near London, petitioned against turnpike roads in the distant counties! because these, by improving the internal communication, would bring the distant parts of the country into competition with their estates in supplying the capital. These would have drawn a prerogative circle round London; and, impeding the intercourse of the city with the provinces, injure both; while those would impound the whole island, in respect to the whole world, for the same selfish consideration. Excellent patriots! *how beneficially you use your ascendancy!* O sovereign politicians! both Lords and Commons, worthy of being called, as was the Roman senate, an assembly of kings, and each senator a Pharaoh!!

Nothing was ever so absurd as enhancing the necessities of life as a means of general relief. Compared to such legislation, he was a wise man who proposed granting a bounty on the corn consumed by our labourers and manufacturers². Nothing is more wicked than attempting to enhance the price of human food by law in the present depression, when

¹ Kings are great economists. Frederick the Great limited the people to Prussian eggs, excluding the Saxon. *LES ŒUFS DE SAXE en disant pour toute raison EST-CE QUE MES POULES NE PONDENT PAS.* Mirabeau, *Histoire Secrette de la Cour de Berlin*, tom. ii. p. 336.

² A writer on the Present State of Great Britain proposed "to lay a tax on horses, and give it as a bounty upon the corn consumed by our own labourers and manufacturers." Month. Rev. Old Series, p. 391.

misery, according to Mr. Lockhart, forces labourers in Suffolk to poach in the open day purposely to be apprehended; as they prefer support in the jail to distress in their own houses. Nothing can be more contradictory than our legislators making laws against monopolists, and placing the whole country under this ban and anathema, the corn laws. Procopius¹ relates as most incongruous, that while Justinian laid a heavy tax on bread, Theodora distributed three thousand medimni of grain to the poor. Yet what is this, to the acts of the same legislature authorizing the levy of seven millions for the poor, and deducting at the same time, by the corn law, more than that enormous sum from the same pauperized population?²

CHAPTER IV.

Another chief cause of the people's distress—High Rents—Falseness of the new doctrine of rent—gratuitous in its positions—erroneous in its assumptions—illogical in its conclusion—Summary of the distresses of the people.

AS in my remarks on taxation the corn law obtruded, so in the present circumstances both taxes and corn law are involved in rents. As some discovered that taxation was good, and the debt and sinking fund

¹ Hist. Arcana, c. 26.

² The Edin. Review said that in ordinary seasons the corn law imposed on the country a burthen of twenty-five millions. No. lxxii. p. 472. This is an exaggeration.

supererogate excellencies, Mr. Robinson¹ insisted that the corn law, which fixed the import price of 80s., "went, in his mind, on a clear principle of reduction, carrying down with it rents which entail no evil, but in its consequences affording an ample fund of subsistence for the poor." This mode of bringing down rents was truly a "New Way to Pay Old Debts." The corn law of 1815 is now universally condemned: yet some go much further than Mr. Robinson. He talked of reducing rents by his non-importation law; but Mr. Malthus affirms, "There is no just reason to believe that if landlords were to give their whole rents to their tenants, corn would be more plentiful and cheaper²;" and yet he admits that rack rents are an evil in Ireland³. So says Mr. Western⁴. Mr. Ricardo advances in the same line; but he outstrips the minister, and the professor, and the country gentleman; and as the position which contains his opinion is fraught with dogmatic errors, I quote the whole passage:—"The value of corn is regulated by the quantity of labour bestowed on its production in that quality of land, or with that portion of capital, which pays no rent. Corn is not high because a rent is paid, but a rent is paid because corn is high:

¹ 3d of March, 1815.

² Principles of Political Economy, p. 201. Yet he says in his Essay on Rent: "But of course every relief from taxation must tend, under any system, to make the price of corn less high." Has he never heard of countries in which rent, tax, and tithe were one assessment?

³ Essay on Rent, p. 56.

⁴ He says that if the whole rent were annihilated, which he reckons at 17. 10s. an acre, it would not lessen the quarter 10s.

and it has been justly observed, that no reduction would take place in the price of corn, although landlords should forgo the whole of their rents¹. This, no doubt, is very interesting to landlords. Yet, notwithstanding this peremptory and redoubtable statement, some landlords have since its publication reduced their rents a fourth, a third, and a half; and the price of grain has fallen in proportion still lower.

Mr. Ricardo further says: "As soon as population had so far advanced as to make it necessary to cultivate No. 2, from which ninety quarters only can be obtained, after supporting the labourers, rent would commence on No. 1." This, which is affirmed as absolutely as if he talked of abstract qualities, supposes that every man may labour land unoccupied. Yet in most countries the land has been appropriated immemorially by the king, the nobles, and the like²: these having the exclusive dominion, hold it in sterile bondage till the people can afford to hire it from them; that is, till they can liberate so much land from their monopoly. This has been the custom, probably, before one quarter of wheat was grown in Great Britain.

Try the theory by another fact. Men emigrate to America; some are scattered, and some settle in a hamlet which swells to a town, and becomes for instance Philadelphia:—the land about the town increases in price, and that in the town is still further enhanced. According to Mr. Ricardo's doctrine,

¹ p. 62.

² This happened to England after the Roman conquest; property was transferred from the many to the few, and this transfer introduced in all its austerity the feudal law.

this enhancement arises from No. 2 and No. 3, and other inferior soils in the province, having been brought into cultivation. Yet such certainly is not the fact: the price rises in this, as in all other cases, in consequence of the supply and the demand. So the price of land increased on the rocky promontory of Gibraltar, and in the plashy island of Venice, from the throng of people on them, without any regard to No. 2 and No. 3, and their respective barrenness and fertility.

So in regard to all other things, supply and demand decide the price, the rent, or hire of the inexhaustible sources of running water, and of frozen water also.—A Sicilian bishop makes a considerable profit of granting a liberty to gather snow from the heights of Etna.

Mr. Ricardo is wrong in saying that the best lands are first cultivated¹; the best or most productive lands are probably among the last cultivated, as the Polders in Flanders: the first lands cultivated in rude society are those which are most easily cultivated. Again, What is meant by poor lands? Devon and

¹ According to this doctrine in its extent, we should conclude that all Sicily should be cultivated before a terrace was raised on a Swiss hill. Mr. Ricardo's followers outgo him, for they hold that *all* the best lands are first cultivated. "It is only after the most productive lands have *all* been brought under cultivation, and when recourse is had to those of inferior quality, that rent begins to be paid." Edin. Review. So Mr. Mill: "Till the whole of the best land is brought under cultivation, and till it has received the application of a certain quantity of capital, all the capital employed upon the land is employed with an equal return." Elements of Polit. Economy, p. 13.

Norfolk, parts of Cambridgeshire, Buckinghamshire, and Gloucestershire, were originally bad or unproductive land, in respect to other counties in England¹. Again, Is any quantity of poor cultivated land sufficient to effect the rise of rents in all the richer lands? Will turning up the sod in Dartmoor Forest have this wondrous effect of forcing into landlords' pockets wealth from every gradation of superior land²? If so, cultivating a barren plot operates like creation on the whole soil—

The earth obey'd, and straight
Opening her fertile womb teem'd at a birth
Innumerable, &c.

But suppose the rich lands first cultivated, the poor lands defined, the quantity of operative barrenness specified,—to infer that the cultivation of the poorest land raises the prices of all other lands, attributes the greatest effects to the smallest cause, in fact to no cause, *to the quantity of labour bestowed on land which pays no rent.*

¹ William of Malmesbury says so of the land about Exeter. Camden's Britannia, vol. i. p. 39. Egypt brings three crops in the year. Leigh's Travels, p. 54. The Neapolitans call their country a portion of heaven fallen on earth.

² It would appear so: "The portion of produce which is raised in the least favourable circumstances regulates the price of all the rest." So says the Agricultural Report drawn up by Mr. Huskisson. So says Mr. Mill, Elements of Political Economy, p. 17. The Edinburgh Review says: "Rent consists of the difference between the produce, or the price of the produce, obtained from the best and the worst soils under cultivation." No. lxxii. p. 458.

To suppose that cultivating inferior soils causes rent, implies, that in the more productive soils labour has little effect on the measure of value; which contradicts a maxim of Mr. Ricardo, who estimates value by the labour expended on production; for the labour in improved society is least on the richest and most valuable soils, and greatest where the land affords small returns for extraordinary toil.

This doctrine of rent implies, that as more land is cultivated, the best being first tilled, the price of produce must necessarily advance. Yet Adam Smith observes, that from the middle of the 14th to the beginning of the 16th century, what was considered the reasonable or moderate, that is, the ordinary price of wheat, seems to have sunk gradually to one half¹. Then we should infer, according to the new theory, that a large portion of the poor lands ceased to pay rent and to be cultivated. Is that believed? If so, it implies a reduced population; for if we believe the population the same, and much land thrown out of cultivation, it follows that the produce of the land continued in cultivation increased in price. All which suppositions counteract each other. Hume had also remarked, that corn during the reign of James the First, and other necessaries of life, were higher than at present (1758): for by a proclamation public magazines were to be established whenever

¹ Wealth of Nations, vol. i. p. 289. I admit that the amount of silver in the coin was reduced; yet the discovery of America reduced the value of silver, as much as the coin was depreciated by the reduction of metal in it.

wheat fell below 32s. a quarter, rye below 18s. and barley below 16s., of which the usual bread of the poor was made¹. Nay more, from 1654 to 1789 the average price of a quarter of wheat was 2l. 9s. 10d., and from 1765 to 1789 the price of the same quantity was 2l. 6s. 11d. Are these statements true or false? If true, and the theory of rent be just, we must suppose that during two centuries tillage did not increase; which implies a declining or stationary population. Yet it is reasonable to believe that both population and tillage advanced²; and we know that both did advance considerably from 1765 to 1789.

This doctrine of rent also implies that the mode of husbandry and the situation of peasants continue the same; yet surely a change in culture, and in the people's condition, frequently cheapens while it extends tillage. Who has not seen or heard that the passage from slavery³ or villenage⁴ to free labour, promoted these consequences on every species of soil?

¹ vol. vi. p. 177. Mr. A. Young, taking a longer period for his second average, calculated the price of wheat in the 17th century at 1l. 18s. 2d.; and in the 18th at 1l. 18s. 7d.—Mr. Howlett, in his examination of Dr. Price's Essay on Population, &c., says, that by the accounts from the Victualling Office, the principal articles of food were on an average of ten years in the reigns of Queen Anne and George the First, as dear as they have been since. Month. Rev. Old Series, vol. lxxv. p. 134.

² Mr. Howlett gave a good reason for the contrary, in opposition to Dr. Price.

³ This is the dearest mode of tillage.

⁴ Tenants in this system were obliged to fold their cattle on their lord's land.

nay, that the poor surpassed the richest land when worked by freemen? This moral advance must more than neutralize any influence which the cultivation of poor soils could supposably have on rent¹; even if this theory, broached some years ago by an anonymous author in an Essay "On the Application of Capital to Land," and subsequently adopted by Mr. Ricardo and others, were as true as it is false.

The world of morals is a *terra incognita* to the whole race of modern theorists on man and his vocations. They treat him as brute matter.

This theory implies that the price of agricultural produce is the same, or similar, throughout the whole country². If so, any one place would give the average, as well as many together. Yet how contrary is that supposition to facts! The following account, extracted, but not selected, from the Gazette, of the different prices in different counties, decides that question.

¹ Mr. Malthus appears to be averse to the new theory of rent. He considers rent an ingredient in the cost of production, p. 98: and he says, "We cannot, therefore, get rid of rent in reference to the great mass of commodities," p. 102. Mr. Malthus also, in contradiction to Mr. Ricardo, says that "the last land in 1813 taken into cultivation did not require more labour to work it, than the last land in 1790," &c. p. 170. This is erring on the other side.

² In France, in 1817, bread was a drug in one part of France, and at a famine price in another, from the difficulty of transport, &c. Month. Rev. vol. lxxxvi. p. 475.

PRICES OF WHEAT PER QUARTER IN THE WEEK
WHICH ENDED THE FIFTH OF OCTOBER.

	s.	d.
Westmoreland (average of all)	115	1
Brecon	112	9
Durham	112	3
Montgomery	110	4
Salop	102	10
Monmouth	100	9
Merioneth	100	0
Pembroke	99	3
Cumberland	98	8
Radnor	96	2
Cornwall	95	3
Carmarthen	95	0
Devon	94	4
Carnarvon	93	6
Hereford	93	3
Northumberland	93	1
Cardigan	92	0
Stafford	90	8
Lancaster	90	7
Wilts	90	4
&c. &c. &c. down to Suffolk, the lowest	70	8

And here I may remark on the absurdity of those fears, necessarily following the new theory of rent, that a fall of prices must throw all the poorer soils out of cultivation¹; for the remunerating price may

¹ Thus Mr. Curwen says, that if there be not countervailing duties, all the poor land will cease to be cultivated, which he

vary in every country, and in every county; so does the price of ploughing, and so do the wages of labour¹. In Sussex, according to the Parliamentary Returns, agricultural wages were from 7s. to 9s., and in Lancashire they were from 15s. to 18s.

This theory implies that rent is a certain quota of profit taken at all times; yet nothing is more variable, even among calculators: Mr. Malthus² estimates rent at a fifth, Gregory King³ at a fourth, Adam Smith⁴ at a third of the gross produce. Then there are rack-rents and liberal letting⁵. Compare Ireland and England. In the former, the land is often first let at an extravagant rent⁶, then the lessee

calculated (on what data does not appear) as producing 1,500,000 quarters of grain, and employing 300,000 labourers. Times, March 8, 1821. What are, I say, poor lands with suitable tillage and a proper application of capital?

¹ The price of ploughing in Norfolk was 2s. 6d. per acre in 1787: at that time the people of Norfolk ploughed two horses a-breast, and without a driver; yet Mr. Marshall says the price of ploughing throughout England is from 7s. to 10s. per acre. Land, says Mr. Marshall also, which in Norfolk lets for 15s. per acre, would not in Surrey or Kent fetch half the price.

² Essay on Rent, p. 34.

³ Davenant's Works, vol. ii. p. 218.

⁴ Wealth of Nations, vol. i. p. 271.

⁵ A farmer answered me in Tyrone, when I asked him the rent of land—It depends on the proprietor: I pay a pound an acre, my neighbour two guineas, for similar land.

⁶ An Attorney-general said in the Irish House of Commons in 1787, "that the unhappy tenantry were ground to powder by relentless landlords—the landlord grasped the whole." The present Attorney-general (Plunkett) said nearly the same.

becomes a middleman¹, who relets the whole in portions at a still more enormous profit; and this is followed by a subinfeudation of wretches, till the occupying tenants toil and starve. Yet is their rent perhaps less than the rent paid by the *metayers*. This also is variable. In Lucca the metayers pay a third², in Florence a half, in Brazil about the same³. In France the metayer tenure varies in different provinces⁴; yet the *bordiers*, it is said, who performed every thing at their own expense, paid in effect more than the metayers. Thus misery and oppression advance, till landlords destroy the farming profession, as did the Patricians at Rome, where the land latterly was cultivated by slaves. Even in this last stage of tillage the return of slaves' labour is also various. In the Brazils this amounts to four days labour in the week; in the Hebrides to five⁵—I speak of the Scallags: in Bohemia to six days⁶. In these circumstances the slave is tenant for the land which he holds, and his labour is the rent.

¹ Mr. Curwen witnessed some of these tyrants. *Travels in Ireland*, vol. ii. p. 81. Lord Redesdale refers *all* the evils of Ireland to re-setting of land; by which, he says, the real occupiers are worse than day labourers. *Ann. Reg.* 1816, p. 28. Lord Stanhope proposed to take away the power of distress from all intermediate landlords.

² Sismondi, p. 213.

³ In Brazil the landlord receives half the produce; but he crushes the tenant's share of the cane, &c. Luccock, p. 150. No. I. *New Edin. Review*.

⁴ See Young's *Travels in France*, or *Month. Review*, vol. x. p. 287.

⁵ *Ann. Register*, 1808, p. 863.

⁶ The Emperor reduced the *corvées* from six to three days.

The whole theory is gratuitous, fanciful, and founded in a gross mistake. It is not the cultivation of bad or worst land which enhances the value of superior soils; but it is the demand for produce which the superior soils cannot answer, that induces the cultivation of poor lands: and nothing but extreme competition for produce, except when capital stagnates for want of employment, can induce men to labour poor soils, which require length of time and a great outlay of capital to render them productive. Prices advance and years intervene before men encounter the tedium, the expense, and the hazard of converting the heath and the waste to tillage.

Yet Mr. Ricardo says, "It is only, then, because land is not boundless in quantity and *uniform* in *quality*, and because in the progress of population land of an inferior quality, or less advantageously situated, is called into cultivation, that rent ever is paid for the use of it," &c. Were all land of the same quality, it would pay a rent in proportion to the demand for its produce, and rent would increase as the competition for the produce advanced. This would follow, were each and every square foot of soil in the world chemically composed of equal quantities of identical substances. Supply and demand rule the value of land, as they do all others; and thus the simplicity of the science, which sophistry would perplex, is restored.

I therefore say that rent enters into the price of the produce of land; and as this price should be re-

duced, so should the rents which tend to enhance or uphold it. But I do not agree with those who call rent the idle man's share—a reaping by those who have not sown—a deduction from capital—a fraud on labour:—rent may be, and frequently is, a hiring of so much labour or capital invested in land, and originally expended on its improvement from a comparatively barren state. Indeed, inasmuch as land is a monopoly, as when held by nobles, eldest sons, &c. it loses this liberal character; and this is the situation of land in England, which affects every incident connected with its use and application. Witness the feudal barbarism, the tyranny, avowed by the 12th of Richard the Second, which condemned all who had been brought up to husbandry until twelve years of age to abide in that profession;—the statutes of labourers in Edward the Third's reign,—the disfranchisement of voters not land-owners in Henry the Sixth's reign,—the game laws¹; the bounty laws on

¹ The reason for such laws is, that gentlemen may be induced to live a short time among their tenants. "To encourage gentlemen to live more willingly in the country, all game fowl, as pheasants, partridges, ducks, as also hares, are by proclamation forbidden to be dressed or eaten in any inns." *Strafford's Letters*, vol. i. p. 176. What good such gentlemen do the yeomen and farmers is not very obvious: they may by laws made by themselves destroy hedges, &c.; and to induce them to do so, the farmer's crops are eaten by the birds which the qualified gentlemen shoot. Should any one not qualified shoot a bird, he is imprisoned. In 1818 twelve hundred persons were committed for offences against the game laws. In this respect English gentlemen are not worse than the king in the Tonga Islands; this king's birds are more valuable than human creatures.

the export of grain, the repeated restrictions on the import of grain. In 1815 a Committee of the House of Commons (which may be considered the twice-distilled spirit of the landed interest) proposed that the import price should be advanced to a deadly enhancement. For in the dear years of 1801 and 1810 the mortality exceeded by $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. the cheap or moderate years of 1804 and 1807;—the deaths amounting in the first years to 110,829, and in the latter to 92,962¹.

But what care landlords! they would uphold their rents, which an eminent surveyor affirmed in evidence had doubled from 1792 to 1814². Yet it is obvious rents must fall below the price of land in 1792; for farmers can pay less rent now than in the former period, because they pay greater taxes, and the wages of labour cannot be reduced. From what source then can high rents be answered? Even supposing that farmers and labourers could discharge the extraordinary taxes imposed on them by extreme thrift and superadded industry, still rents must fall to the rate of leasing in 1792, that is, to one half³.

		Average Price of Wheat		
Years.		per Quarter.		Deaths.
1801	118s. 3d.	55,965
1804	60s. 1d.	44,794
1807	73s. 2d.	48,108
1810	106s. 2d.	54,864

See also the calculation to the same effect in *Mémoires de l'Institut*, &c. tom. i. p. 543 & seq.

² Report on the Corn Laws in 1815.

³ They have done so in some instances. The Rev. Mr. Lilly and Mr. A. Knight, at the Hereford meeting in January 1823, said they had reduced rents to that amount.

Old Hesiod said, "The fools know not that half is better than the whole¹."

I have thus detailed the primary and eventual causes of the suffering population of England. They begin with the monarchy, which involves a long suite of orders and institutions, with onerous and exhausting regulations, which obstruct the full value of labour, subjecting men to arrest, and their occupations and movements to peevish and pernicious interference: superadded to all this, the people having no authority in making the laws are grievously taxed, even considering labour and opulence equally assessable. Thus, the distress of the people originated principally with the anti-popular character of the Constitution: for not merely the royal million, and the hundred thousands to princes and princesses, and the five millions to the clergy, and the places and pensions to Lords, Commons, and their connexions,—but the overwhelming taxation occasioned by the American and the French wars are referable to the Constitution aristocratically administered. Thus the mystery is revealed, of scarcity and superabundance; capital sought, and capital unemployed; many penniless at home, while loans are granted to Russians, Danes, Columbians, &c.; the British people emigrating in all directions through want of subsistence, yet the market price of necessaries declining²; harvests too good, the produce

¹ Νηπιος εδ' ισασιν εσω πλεον ημισυ παντος. Opera, lib. i. v. 40.

² Take one instance in Birmingham. Seventy publicans indiscriminately taken, lost half their business though they increased their credit, and instead of 7*d.* ale sold at 4*d.* Thirty butchers indiscriminately taken, lost one-third of their business, and among

too plentiful, the people too numerous:—In short, England is to the economist's mind what London was to the eye of the South Sea savage, who, being asked how he liked it, cried "Too many houses! too many people! too much every thing!"

The great evil is taxation. Though the earth is bountiful, the seasons kind, produce which is too cheap for the grower is too dear for the consumer. This distresses farmers and pauperizes the people. The remedy is a reduced taxation—to uphold it, were it possible, by corn laws, is fantastic and absurd. Besides, what madness to imagine¹ that the people of England will endure a famine price of the prime necessary, in order that landlords may receive their paper rents in gold, and Government an enormous revenue repeatedly aggravated! The mere project leads to revolution. Taxes forced the people of Ghent, Bruges, and Ipres to insurrection¹, as they have frequently throughout the world. The great insurrection of the Lazzaroni at Naples began with the reduction of the weight of bread²: and the mighty French revolution was promoted by a scarcity of grain. Yet at this pregnant evil, this multiplied mischief, which presents itself like objects in a fractured mirror a hundred times repeated,—our wholesale critics, second-sighted philosophers, never cast a glance:

the labouring classes one half. Hucksters related the same respecting cheese and bacon. The pawnbrokers' business had declined, the property being sold, &c. Morn. Chron. Aug. 28, 1820.

¹ De Witt. True Interest of Holland.

² Giannone, lib. xxxvii, p. 761.

yet the force transmitted by the impulse of bodies and their fall in vacuum is not more certain than the disturbance and headlong fall of this state by taxation. A tax is necessarily followed by reduced comforts or increased wants; such are its effects, whether the tax be general or local. Sir F. M. Eden says, that in the parish of Llanferris in Denbighshire the whole expense up to 1719 amounted to only 5s. annually; in 1740 it declined to 2s. 6d.; and for ten years after the introduction of the poor-rates they did not exceed 1s. in the pound: *but in 1770, owing to a heavy county rate, it was 2s.* If you tax the poor and their necessities, the poor-rates must increase; and these—so preposterous are our legislators—are often increased by the means employed to relieve the poor. Whitelock¹ mentions that the parliament imposed a tax on coals, and soon after they superadded a rate on them for the relief of the London poor. This is a simple but lively representation of the poor-rates and taxation. The true relief of the poor would have been the repeal of the tax on coals: and this was effected partly on the 4th of June 1649², four shillings the chaldron being remitted by parliament expressly for the benefit of the poor. If the poor are taxed they become poorer, for they have no effectual mode to indemnify themselves. Hence it happens that taxation and the poor-rates increase together; but, I repeat, not in the same proportion. The poor-rates in Middlesex and Surrey amount to 605,707l., and the duty on coals alone amounts to 686,334l. in these

¹ Memorials, p. 408.

² Ibid.

two counties. This tax, it is true, does not fall exclusively on the poor; but this is only one tax, a single one in the predatory schedule, amidst a swarm of fiscal exactions. Yet many great critics and economists, in discussing the subjects of poverty, never animadvert on taxation, the predominant and predisposing cause of pauperism:—subtraction is no rule in their political arithmetic. The labouring people should be exempted from all taxes whatever; their wages seldom exceed their necessities¹: taxation should exclusively fall on the opulent. A stranger prince remitted the tithes, customs, and the salt-pits, and the crown taxes to the Hebrew people *for the love he bore them*². Shall our legislators treat their industrious Christian countrymen less kindly than a pagan did the Jews?

¹ Les travaux simples et grossiers pouvant être exécutés par tout homme, pourvu qu'il soit en vie et en santé, la condition de vivre est la seule requise pour que de telles travaux soient mis à circulation. C'est pour cela que le salaire de ces travaux ne s'élève guère, en chaque pays, au delà de ce qui est rigoureusement nécessaire pour y vivre, et que le nombre des concurrens s'y élève précisément au niveau de la demande qui en est faite; car la difficulté n'est pas de naître—elle est de subsister," &c. Say, tom. ii. p. 79.

² 1 Maccabees, xi. 34. This was a radical reform. Lord Liverpool is a moderate reformer: he instituted this year a charity, giving an annual reward to each of five poor families who should bring proofs of a course of the best conduct and character, with a preference to those who had not received parochial relief. Times, Jan. 4, 1822.

CHAPTER V.

That there must be in populous nations some reduced by age—diseases—casualties—these to be relieved—but not by charitable establishments—Remarks on Foundling Hospitals and others—on establishments and endowments for education perverted by the Government—Establishments, &c. causing the evil they profess to counteract—expensive—disagreeable to the poor—their funds possessed partially or entirely by those who administer them.

IT may be asked, Suppose these ameliorations effected, would there be no poor? First, what is meant by poor and rich? On this, as on all subjects, the self-constituted masters of political economy disagree: and Mons. Ganilh¹, who treats superciliously the definitions of all others respecting wealth, attributes a *passion for wealth* even to some of the brute creation. Wealth is variously estimated. Crassus did not deem a man rich who could not maintain an army consisting of six legions² and their auxiliaries: and yet Hipponicus³ the father-in-law of Alcibiades⁴ was esteemed, to use Homer's dialect, the richest of men, though his whole possessions amounted only to 200 talents. Again: some, says Seneca⁵, repute riches equi-

¹ English Version, p. 19.

² Cicero, Paradox. 6; & de Officiis, lib. i. p. 354. Pliny says one legion, lib. xxxiii. c. 10.

³ Andocydes, Orat. prima, p. 237. Isocrates de Bigis, p. 531.

⁴ Andocydes says he made the richest marriage of any Grecian, p. 30. Lysias says he received ten talents on his marriage, and ten afterward, p. 56.

⁵ Epistola lxxxvi.

page, furniture, palaces; yet the Stoics' wise man, though wanting all goods and possessions, was alone rich, according to their philosophy¹. Socrates², taking a middle course between the wise and worldly, having four minæ, said he was richer than Critobulus who had four hundred. Riches surely embrace extremes, when one considers himself rich with a few pounds, and Apicius killed himself with an abundant fortune, from the supposed desperate distress of his circumstances³. Corresponding to this is Michel's aristocratic definition of a sufficiency, "which enables a man to live without any lucrative employment on terms of equality with the most wealthy⁴." Accidents marvellously alter the import of terms. In Africa, to say a man eats salt with his victuals is the same as to say he is a rich man⁵;—this may be true. Yet I should not call a man rich, with Filangieri⁶, who by eight hours' labour a day supports himself and family; nor should I call a man poor, "whose manual labour supports him and no more⁷." Those are poor who want necessities; and necessities may be reputed things not only requisite to support existence, but which are commonly used by the industrious⁸. With this loose

¹ Ὅτι μόνος ὁ σοφὸς πλουσιός—Omnes esse divites qui cœlo et terra frui possunt. Cicero, tom. iii. p. 77.

² Xenophon de Administratione, &c. p. 822.

³ Cui sestertium centies egestas fuit.

⁴ On Legislation, p. 195.

⁵ Park's Travels, p. 280.

⁶ Scienza della Legislazione, &c. tom. v. p. 93.

⁷ Colquhoun.

⁸ See A. Smith, b. 5. c. ii. p. 346. J'appelle pauvres tous ceux qui n'ont point de bien, et qui, soit à cause de leur âge ou

definition of poverty I proceed: and I freely admit, that if all the preparatory remedies were adopted; were the industrious freed from all obstructions and privations personal and proprietary; were property equitably enjoyed—and its partial distribution is the cause and consequence of half our ills¹;—still many would be destitute. Mr. Barrow, indeed, said that in China “there are no beggars, no paupers of any description².” This met an anticipated contradiction by Osbeck³, who spoke of blind beggars in China; and the late embassy witnessed other mendicants. However, Mr. Ellis confirmed Mr. Barrow’s general account, bearing testimony to the happiness of the middle classes, and to the universal diffusion of the unsophisticated comforts of life⁴. Mr. Brougham talked more romantically of the Americans, than Mr. Barrow of the Chinese, in his speech on the Orders in Council⁵: he said, that from Canada to Florida not a single pauper was to be found. But Bristed says, that at New York, out of a population of one hundred thousand in the winter of 1817, fifteen thousand were paupers. It is to be remarked, however, that in this year the emigrants to America were most numerous and destitute: hence the strangers had no means of advancing into the country⁶; and the people of

de leurs infirmités, &c. ne peuvent gagner les nécessités de la vie. *Mem. de l’Institut*, tom. i. p. 541.

¹ The development of this topic, I repeat, I reserve for a separate treatise.

² *Travels*, p. 401.

³ *Ann. Register* 1771, p. 3.

⁴ *Ellis’s China*, p. 323.

⁵ *Edinb. Rev.* 1812, p. 243.

⁶ 27,000 landed in it.

New York, the great port of reception, wanted of course the means of employing the unexpected multitude.

But in Philadelphia the paupers supported in alms-houses amount to sixteen thousand, whose expense, according to the author of “*Democracy Unveiled*,” is 22,000*l.* sterling; and according to Mr. Fearon, 70,000 dollars. Here, then, many poor are chargeable in the capital of Pennsylvania, which at one time, according to the eccentric Lord Peterborough, “was neither oppressed with rates, tithes, nor taxes.” Where Negro slavery is prohibited—where, according to the institutions of the legislature, every child of what condition soever is instructed in some trade or profession—where labourers are paid from 3*s.* 7*d.* to 4*s.* 6*d.* a day¹—where the poor-rates are limited to one per cent.—where settlements and apprenticeships and crimping and pressing are unknown—where the laws and magistracy, as Mr. Beaujour truly says, “govern without being felt, and almost without being perceived:”—if there be paupers in this country, though the institution of alms-houses is onerous, and the influx of foreigners considerable, we may truly repeat, “The poor shall never cease out of the land².”

Suppose, then, that in extensive societies many, by age or infancy, or disease or casualties—by fire or flood—become distressed or destitute. The question is, what measures should be adopted to relieve mankind from the innumerable ills which flesh is heir to? Sir F. M. Eden says: “The necessity of a permanent establishment for supporting the poor is, I conceive, admitted to a certain degree in every country, in which

¹ Fearon, p. 161.

² *Deut.* xv. 11.

there are public schools for the education of children, dispensaries, hospitals¹, &c. I object to establishments even for pregnant women and for their delivery, and even to hospitals for the reception of foundlings:—and I begin with these, as birth precedes education. The injury of such receptacles is complicated.

Supposing that foundling hospitals relieve the libidinous from the apprehension of supporting their offspring, they clearly promote the illicit intercourse of the sexes; and it may be absolutely assumed, that where an opportunity to escape the burthen of an offence is afforded, the frequency of that offence will be increased. Foundling hospitals, then, are a bounty on loose amours and questionable parentage. Besides, Dr. Carcassione, a physician of Chalons, insists that foundling hospitals do not lessen infanticide. This opinion, I suppose, is partly founded on their implied promotion of unchasteness and bastardy. Indeed, there are some tremendous accounts of infanticide in consequence of these hospitals; as that by Louisa de Jesus, executed in 1772 for murdering thirty-three infants who had been committed to her as superintendant of the Foundling Hospital at Coimbra². Consider the mortality of infants brought through the provinces of France to the Foundling Hospital at Paris. Mercier said that almost the whole of the infants brought from Lorraine perish in Vitry. In the Foundling Hospital in Dublin, which is supported by a poor-rate on the inhabitants of that city, the mortality is frightful; and in one year one hundred and eighty

¹ vol. i. p. 412.

² Ann. Register 1772, p. 121.

children were rendered incapable of swallowing in consequence of cold. It must be so, when women without the mother's milk or a mother's love, mere hirelings, carry infants long journeys in all seasons: the feeble breath of infancy is easily extinguished. Beside the mortality just mentioned, one-third of the remaining children perished at nurse¹. The deaths have since declined a fourth; yet still the destruction of life is extreme. Observe, Foundling hospitals are not intended to kill, but preserve; and this is not the first time that poison has been administered as medicine. Plutarch² was surprised that the Carthaginians, who offered their children to Saturn, when they were childless purchased the children of the poor and adopted them: but we act more incongruously; we purchase children from the poor, and offer them not to the god of blood, but to the God of humanity. Pursue the effects still further: Suppose the infants reared;—they are weakly, infirm, diseased. Carmichael attributes a scrofulous taint affecting such children to the unenterprising state of their education.

Corresponding to these hospitals are the conservatories at Naples, inordinately praised by Mr. Eustace, where four hundred young women are educated and portioned when marriageable. So in Sicily there is a refuge for orphans, who are employed in manufac-

¹ Ann. Register, 1758, p. 93. See also, for the mortality of the children at nurse in England, Eden's Hist. of the Poor Laws, vol. iii. p. 705.

² Moralia, p. 103.

turing silk, and who at stated periods, when sixteen years old, are exhibited in a large room, where tradesmen and farmers of good character obtain them in marriage with moderate dowries¹. What can women so reared know of human life or domestic economy? and the parties are ignorant of each other. There are conservatories or lay nunneries in England. The account of the Grey Coat Hospital at York was miserable; few of the girls were healthy or of full stature, and few by their conduct in the world reflected credit on their discipline. This I believe is a common observation.

I object, and have objected, to establishments, and particularly to those for education, in my tract on that subject; and I again protest against them. I object to the 36th part, or 640 acres, reserved in each township in all new grants of land in America for the benefit of education, and of the imitation of this American scheme in Sidney, where 15,000 acres have been appropriated towards defraying the expense of girls' schools². I object to the tax in Sweden to support parochial schools, and to every thing like a national or compulsory grant or special endowment; because they become sinecures, and directly or eventually obstruct the advance of knowledge, ending, if they do not begin, by extending or confirming the dominion of the mighty.

Sir F. M. Eden placed the propriety of establishments for the poor in the most interesting view,

¹ Cockburn's Travels, vol. i. p. 430.

² Wentworth.

when he pointed to the education of the people¹. But run over the pages of history or the chart of the world, and what is the moral or intellectual advantage conferred by endowed schools and colleges and state institutions? The first object inculcated is obedience to the Sultan, King, Emperor, Consul, Protector: and this, as education is in the hands of the priesthood, and the priesthood in the hands of the sovereign chief, is impressed on children and youths by the ministers of religion, without any regard to the character or morals of the prince so honoured or anointed by them. Thence it is necessary that, as priests should reverence the sacerdotal volume, the essence of education is the Shasters, or the Zend-avesta, or the Koran, adored in India², in Arabia³, in Egypt⁴, in Fez, throughout Africa⁵; for in all these expanded regions mosques and schools are conjoined, and in Cairo⁶ and Constantinople⁷ there is no mosque of royal foundation without a well-endowed school annexed to it: for it is an error to suppose that Ma-

¹ I have discussed this subject in "National Education." The argument is here the same, though differently pursued.

² Graham's India. She adds: "the master always attending to the elder boys, while others are taught by their more advanced schoolfellows: instead of books there are alphabets and sentences painted on wood for the younger scholars." This is Bell's *invention*. The Brahmins are alone the instructors. Sir Wm. Jones's Life, p. 265.

³ Niebuhr, Travels, c. 126.

⁴ Walsh, Ann. Register 1802, p. 743.

⁵ Mollien, Phillips's Voyages, vol. iii. p. 12.

⁶ Van Egmont's Travels, vol. ii. p. 70.

⁷ Thornton, &c. vol. ii. p. 44.

homet was adverse to education theologically considered; he knew it consolidated his power:—this prophet declared that “the ink of the learned and the blood of the martyrs are of equal value in Heaven¹,” and not less than thirty-six libraries are now open in Constantinople to the inspection of the public².

This disposition to pervert all things to serve the pretensions of rulers, has been manifested in England in all its fluctuations and changes of government and dynasty. Henry the Eighth, as he varied in theology, forced men and orders to turn with his caprices. Besides, to secure the two universities, he founded five lectureships in each; these are called *regii professores*. A plan of education was proposed in the reign of Edward the Sixth, of which the monarch said, “This shall well ease and remedy the deceitful workings of the disobedience of the lower sort, casting seditious bills,” &c. The wording shows a foretaste of the six acts of 1819. Mary and Elizabeth followed the same object by different courses. Charles lost his crown and life by similar pursuits, under the tutelage of Laud. Charles being dismissed, the parliament voted “that former primers used in the late king’s time be suppressed, and new ones used³.” Cromwell followed, employing a double contrivance;

¹ Thornton, &c. vol. i. p. 9.

² Ibid. p. 27. Brown says, however, that the public institutions at Constantinople wanted books and instructors, and that the professors met to smoke. p. 1022. This is not contrary to the practice of other lecturers.

³ Whitelock, p. 473.

and “he received the University’s thanks for bestowing on the public library twenty-four Greek MSS., and for munificently ordering an hundred pounds per annum to a divinity reader¹.” Yet in 1655 he forbade any clergyman of the protestant communion to teach school public or private, or to perform any part of his ministerial functions². Thus Buonaparte’s Lyceums were instituted merely to strengthen the emperor’s domination over the chief families of France, and those teachers who were not apt for the tyrant’s purpose were cashiered.

At present, education to receive Government support must be essentially Protestant. The great defenders of the Establishment proclaim that Christianity as a belief depends on a Christian education³: and the Bishop of Chester, Dr. Law, improving on this suspicious declaration, in speaking of “Schools for All,” where the Bible without creeds is read, says, “It leaves the rising generation to pick up their religion as they can, any where or no where.” Thus, in surpassing zeal, one founds the belief of Christianity

¹ Whitelock, p. 588.

² It was so formerly. Sophocles (not the poet) proposed that no Sophist should teach school. The Sophists were friendly to liberty. J. Pollux, *Onomasticon*, lib. ix. c. 5. This law lasted but for one year. Critias declared his despotic views on the same subject; but his enmity to education and freedom was far exceeded by the thirty tyrants. Petit, *L. Attic.*, p. 303.

³ “Christianity itself, when taken in its broadest sense, would not be secure without a Christian education.” *Quart. Review*, No. xv. p. 14. And they say, “If the children of English parents were sent to Turkey for religious instruction, they would become not Christians but Mahometans.” This is dangerous ground.

in prejudice, and the other prefers creed-makers and catechists to Christ and his Apostles. Hence perhaps it is, that the English are inferior to many nations in the principles of education¹, and that in respect to religion few people can be more destitute, if Sir Thomas Bernard and the Quarterly Review may be credited. The first says that two-thirds of the lower classes of the people of London are as ignorant as heathens of their religion. And the latter says "that the populace of England are more ignorant of their religious duties than they are in any other Christian country."

¹ Eustace says that the peasantry in the north of Italy "were previously to the French invasion universally taught to read and write." Jacob says, "No person born in Spain within the last thirty years who has not been instructed in the first rudiments of knowledge." Hobhouse says, "The generality of the Greeks can write and read, and have a smattering at least of Hellenic." Every Calmuc can read and write. All the Japanese and Javanese can read. So of the people of the Birman Empire:—"A knowledge of letters," says Symes, "is so widely diffused, that there are no mechanics. Few of the peasantry, or even the common peasantry, usually the most illiterate class, who cannot read and write in the vulgar tongue." Dr. Holland, in Mackenzie's Travels, speaking of Iceland, says, "The business of education is systematically carried on among all ranks of the inhabitants; and the degree of information existing even among the lower classes, is probably greater than in almost any part of continental Europe." If all these accounts be true, England is miserably deficient. Mr. Patrick, in a sermon preached in Kingston-upon-Hull, said from the parochial registers, that from 1650 to 1750 not one inhabitant in a hundred was taught to write, and it was his boast, in 1808, "half my fellow-citizens can write, and two-thirds can read." Even Scotland sinks in the comparison. By a Report of the Society for the support of Schools in the Highlands, in two parishes containing 21,000 persons, only 2,934 could read.

Such is the state to which the people of England are reduced by the establishments for education, in despite of all the auxiliaries to foment and enliven a desire for literary pursuits. In Ireland it is worse. The cumulative powers of Government were directed to convert a Catholic people, that is, to make them body and soul subservient to the English Government. Then, should a Catholic teach school, he was to be hanged; while the institution of Protestant parochial schools was universally commanded. Each parson, on being appointed to a living, was sworn to establish a school in his parish. Yet this part of clerical duties was neglected two hundred years ago—a goodly precedent for the continuance of ecclesiastical negligence¹. So gross has been the omission, that Dr. Stuart, Primate of Ireland, September 19, 1811, in charging his clergy, told them that three-fourths of them were perjured, so many of them having neglected the institution of schools in their respective parishes.

To the evils of these expensive engines of power is to be added the monstrous establishment of Charter schools in Ireland², whose single object was to proselyte children under pretence of educating them: these might be called children of the Faith, as the Turk denominates

¹ Strafford's Letters, vol. ii. p. 7.

² In every Lord Lieutenant's speech the Charter schools were recommended. So much was this the *Constitution*, that the Earl Fitzwilliam (who came to Ireland preparatory, as he thought, to liberate the Catholics) called the attention of Parliament in 1795 to the Charter schools. The sum voted in 1813 amounted by parliamentary grant alone to 41,539*l.* It has been declining; yet in 1820 it was 29,000*l.*

poor boys in nearly similar circumstances "children of the Tribute." This abortive and humiliating villainy has cost a world of wealth. Even since the Union, above one million two hundred thousand pounds have been expended by Parliament on the partial education of the people;—partial, inasmuch as the sum is reserved for Protestants only;—so very partial, that of 38,331*l.* granted in 1818, besides the endowment, the children taught amounted only to 2430: indeed it is impossible to do less good at a greater expense, except by certain schools in Ireland endowed by individuals, which want houses, masters and scholars. Still the Charter school establishments continue in Ireland, and the parliamentary grants of money for education are reserved eventually not to instruct the population at large, but to foster those of the prerogative religion.

Neither do I see why the accident of education should confer nobility; yet according to the Spanish Constitution, no one who cannot read shall enjoy the right of citizen after 1850. This is the benefit of clergy inverted. It is pedantry to make literature a requisite of civil rights; to honour reading in this manner is inadvertently to adopt Whiter's opinion—"that letters possessed moral properties,"—or to believe with the Scandinavians, who imagined that certain Runic characters, the *literæ solutorie*¹, secured those who possessed them from being *bound*. There is something better than reading²: and what is the profit of read-

¹ Law Dict. vol. ii. p. 391.

² This the Laconian teachers called *τοῖς καλοῖς*. Plutarch.

ing Catechisms and Lives of Saints, which (according to the enterprising Semples) constitute the stock and trade of the college of the Caraccas? What the advantage of the Catholic dogmas in the University of France¹, or the Protestant dogmas in the University of Oxford² (where, by the by, all students are sworn to observe the statutes contained in a book which few read and no one observes); which monstrous passion of dogmatizing migrates with the missionaries. Far better was the conduct of the Quakers, who, instead of teaching ecclesiastical *quiddits*, instructed the Indians in cheese-making; and far more beneficial than all the missionaries stedfast in the faith, to the natives of Otaheite, was one who apostatized from Christianity, and who by his example in Tongataboo taught the people not doctrinals but horticulture.

No man, nor body, nor profession, should have the direction of the whole public mind from infancy to manhood. Yet this evil would be aggravated by adopting Mr. Brown's proposal, that public funds should be provided for general education; and by Mr. Brougham's, who would comprehend the whole body of the people in a National School under episco-

Moral. p. 378; and Philostratus *των χρησµατατων*, wisdom, fortitude, temperance; *ἐπισσι αρεται*, Apoll. Tyan. Vita, lib. 4. c. 31. Antisthenes said that the principal part of discipline was to unlearn evil things.

¹ L'université de Paris a toujours faite la religion le principal objet de ses instructions.—Borelly, *Système de Legislation*, p. 89. De la Chalotais said it was most absurd to confide education to the clergy, who knew little of the world. Borelly, &c. p. 93.

² Inquiry is made previous to matriculation, whether the individual is of the Church of England.

pal domination, submitting even the Dissenters to the Protestant clergy, and increasing the poor-rates by a school-rate for the maintenance of this cumbrous establishment. That this should be proposed by Mr. Brougham¹, who is unfriendly to the poor-laws, and who successfully exposed the errors and mischief and wickedness of endowed schools and such charitable institutions, is unaccountable. For schemes of this kind are only expectable from the friends of inveterate power, as Barruel², who would have the State alone pay the teachers of all the children of the nation; thus condemning the people to receive without stint or question those prejudices, political and fantastic, which the initiated should labour to unlearn³, and from which few can emancipate their perverted faculties. Barruel's wish under the Bourbons is accomplishing; an ultra-royalist is placed at the head of the French National Schools; books are prepared orthodox in all respects; and the ancient writers are doled out by the authority of the ministerial Board of Education to the scholars in castigated fragments.

The speculators for educating the people *nationally*, according to an identical drill system, is happily exposed by Foote in his Orators⁴. They are sordid or

¹ It would be quite in character with Lord Lonsdale: he formed an establishment for some poor persons to become ministers of the Church. Quart. Rev. No. 46. p. 580. And he has obtained the property of St. Bees, the endowment for a poor school worth much, for a trifle. See Edin. Rev.

² L'Etat seul doit être chargé de salarier ceux qui élèvent les enfans de la patrie.

³ So said Antisthenes. Diog. Laertius, p. 369.

⁴ Foote's lecture in The Orators. "I would have a law enacted

infatuate in such pursuits. Mr. Whitbread retrieved his error¹: he projected a scheme of national education; and having failed in the outset, the bill being rejected by Parliament, he afterward rejoiced, saying "he was satisfied that the great labour he had in view was effected far better without any parliamentary enactment."

Education should be independent and at large. It may be assisted by individuals, and occasionally by the public²; for I abhor the philosophy of Lord Kames³, who would exclude the labouring man from the means of instruction; but I say no man should be taxed to pay for another's instruction. In the present deplorable inequality and misapplication of property, something might be given, as in Scotland, from tithes: yet

Conf. 342

upon the plan of the Militia Bill, that annually or biennially draughts should be made from every parish, of two, three, or more (as in that act of able-bodied, so in this of intelligent persons), who at the expense of the several counties should be sent to the capital, and there compelled to go through as many courses of the professor's lectures as he shall deem sufficient: thus, by those periodical or rural detachments, the whole nation will in a few years be completely served, and a stock of learning laid in, that will last till time shall be no more. To which academy the author of these proposals does hope, sixthly and lastly, that he may be appointed perpetual professor."

¹ Speech at the Freemasons' Tavern in 1812.

² As for the four schools in St. John's Glasgow, the one hundred pounds a year are given to the four school masters out of the day collection. Speech of Dr. Chalmers in 1822, p. 53.

³ "Knowledge is a dangerous acquisition to the labouring poor; the more of it that is possessed by a shepherd, a ploughman, or any drudge, the less fitted is he to labour with content." History of Man, book i. section 10.

scholars, as in the same country, should themselves contribute something also to their teaching; for the parish schools in Scotland are not free schools¹. This would relieve learning from pauperism; open the road to generous studies and useful knowledge; and liberate teachers, who, free by their institution, might then, like the ancient grammarians², boast that they broke the bonds of prison and enabled the mind to behold the light. Under such circumstances it would be unnecessary to establish schools by authority, or, as in the Isle of Man³, to oblige all persons to send their children to school. Mankind are prone to learn, as they are curious, and fond of distinction and power⁴. And observe, as knowledge is power⁵, the Government never can favour its attainment till they unequivocally direct their energies to raise the people from their negative dependent state to a substantial political being. Education was boldly resisted in England. Servile parents could not send their children to school without the lord's consent⁶; then a disposition was manifested to have the lower orders educated in schools attached to kirks, churches, chapels. Afterward and lately, the civil and ecclesiastical minions of Government zealously promoted, to countervail a liberal and

¹ Gourlay, Poor Laws, p. 15.

² Sextus Empiricus adv. Mathemat. p. 9.

³ Johnson, p. 143. Jurisprudence in the Isle of Man.

⁴ πάντες ἀνθρώποι τὸ εἶδεναι ὁρεγόντες φύσει. Arist. Metaph. lib. i. c. 1.

⁵ Bacon says, Knowledge is power. Aristotle, Πᾶσαι αἱ τέχναι καὶ ποιητικαὶ δὲ αἱ ἐπιστήμαι δύναμις ἐστίν. Metaph. lib. ii. c. 2. p. 933.

⁶ Law Dict. vol. ii. p. 391.

irresistible system, what they dignified by the name of National Schools. These were adopted as a diversion: and sure I am that Lord Liverpool was induced by no sincere motives, when in 1816 he professed that the only remedy for Ireland's evils was the education of the people; by which he would throw back all relief interminably from that tormented country. No: the better the education of the Irish, the more enlightened in their rights, the less they can tolerate their misery and subjugation. I object to all pensioned establishments for education; even parish schools, at which the meanest of the ecclesiastical profession officiate, are claustral in their object and discipline¹.

The building and endowment of monasteries was succeeded by the erection of colleges: and they have continued their original character through all the forms and improvements of society, heedless and incapable of civil and political instruction²: they oppose

¹ Parish clerks were to be schoolmasters in country villages, by the constitution of Alexander Bishop of Coventry. Mon. Angl. tom. iii. p. 227.

² Lord Lonsdale, in his Memoir of James the Second, said: "So that in reality we are the scorn and contempt of all the courts of Europe, having scarce any body that understands any thing relating to our own or the interests of foreign powers." p. 8. And this imperfection continues: for the education of youth is in the hands of the clergy, who are as confined in their education as in their principles. Lately, a letter was unintelligible to both Universities and all the wise men of Church and State, till it came into the hands of Mr. Jackson. It came from an African prince, and was written in Arabic; and yet we English laugh at Bajy Rao, the peishwa or chief of the Mahratta empire, for his inability to read a letter from George the Third to him

the progress of intelligence, and frustrate the passion for human liberty. In Dublin College Locke's 'Treatise on Government' has been dismissed from the course¹; and the late wretched head of that University, for writing a refutation (as it is called) of Locke, and other good deeds, was episcopally promoted. While he gained a bishoprick by truckling to power, the Belfast Institution forfeited the parliamentary

in 1798. Moor's Hindoo Infanticide, p. 129. So we are in the habit of sending persons to India who know nothing of the language of the people. The first object recommended by Major Johnson for improving our affairs in Ceylon is, that the language of the natives be acquired, showing the loss to our affairs from the perfidy of interpreters. "The knowledge of the language," he says, "should be a requisite of promotion in the army." Narrative, &c. Apollonius of Tyana said as a thing wonderful his seeing a man governing a Grecian province who did not speak Greek: but we have persons hurried abroad without one lesson on *εὐλογία*, that is, according to Plutarch (Moralia, p. 81), politics and the administration of public affairs. Themistocles had such teachers, and they were common in Greece; yet the Edinburgh Reviewer (strangely) will not allow that the ignorance of foreign languages in our diplomatists injures our negotiations; he ascribes to our frequently losing by negotiation what we have gained by arms, to the *popular form of our Government*, which hampers the execution, and requires all Cabinet measures to be made public; that the people get tired of war, and force their rulers to make a peace on any terms. July 1818, p. 419. This is worse than nonsense. It was said by the late Earl Hardwicke of Sir Benjamin Keene, one of the ablest ambassadors that England ever had, "that his skill in the Spanish language contributed greatly to the success of his negotiation." Coxe's Memoir &c. Preface.

The Turin University has been broken up and reformed, principally by giving priests for the teachers of youth; wall lectures will then soon commence in that University.

grant of 1500*l.*, because its guardians would not by servile compliance disgrace themselves in the world of letters by abandoning the appointment of their professors to the Ministry.

Added to these evils, Universities, colleges, endowed schools, are most chargeable. Their great funds are misapplied; and in proportion to their enormity they are protected from amendment, inquiry, or control¹.

Charitable establishments and endowments even for good purposes are attended with a multiplicity of evils. Few acts are eventually less benevolent than obituary donations to charitable purposes; and the remark, without recurring to bequests during the dark ages, is obtruded by modern circumstances. Dr. Barrett of Dublin University, who never gave a pound when living, willed his great property generally to charitable purposes, which will probably consign it to the professors of the law. Such a bequest is the dying man's effort to make himself his heir: unkind in the management of his property when alive, he is wayward in his disposal of it at his death. To speak of a less exceptionable bequest: Mr. Raine left portions to forty maidens². If this man had kindred, the act was a fraud on their expectations;—had he no friend that he would prefer to persons *in posse*, entities of hereafter, and hereafter, and hereafter? Many of these endowments and bequests proceed from mere

¹ Thus the Universities, public schools, and charities with special visitors, were exempted from the jurisdiction of the Commissioners.

² Smollet's Hist. vol. iv. p. 379.

spite to disappoint relations, and often from overweening selfishness. Mrs. Gordon, an old maid, built an hospital for old maids¹; and Frederic the Great when old and feeble founded hospitals for the aged and infirm. Had kings been subjected to distress in their old age, these hospitals had been reserved exclusively for kings past their functions.

Another general evil of endowments and establishments is, that their purpose is often practically mistaken. Thus, according to Fielding², the great object of the poor-laws was to employ the able poor, which he fears *has been utterly disregarded*.

I have spoken of Foundling hospitals, and the mortality necessarily resulting from them. So of the systematic relief of mendicants. Those who obtruded on the public being removed to the *depôt de mendicité* at Marseilles, their places were instantly supplied by *fainéans* from the country. Giannone remarked, that a fund established at Naples to redeem Christians taken by the pirates of Tunis and Algiers increased piracy, as it ensured a ransom³.

Another enormous evil of charitable establishments is the expensiveness even of those which are formed

¹ Ann. Reg. 1770, p. 88.

² Increase of Robbers, p. 55.

³ Storia di Napoli, lib. 23. p. 409. How far the policy of the Jews might have had the same effect, I don't know: but they considered to redeem their countrymen from captivity superior to relieving the poor. Selden De Jure Gent. &c. lib. vi. c. 19. p. 776.

Thomas Bolton, a Turkish merchant, willed 13,000*l.* for a similar purpose in respect to British captives. Maitland's Hist. of London.

for economy and profit. This has been proved repeatedly in the Blue Coat Hospital. After great trouble and attention, and without counting the expense of the mansion, furniture, implements of industry, &c. ninety boys and girls from eight to sixteen earned one pound annually each, and cost twenty pounds.

Equally expensive and unproductive and tormenting are poor-houses or work-houses. The inmates are employed in teasing old ropes in some parishes. In that of St. Martin in the Fields, they pulverize oyster shells¹. In Birmingham² poor-house they are not even employed, according to Lord Castlereagh's suggestion, in opening one hole to fill another; for of six hundred so immured, one half are idle. Yet this is better than the labour at Clerkenwell, where the rude materials cost many times more than the same when manufactured³.

The origin and progress of workhouses are curious. Bacon proposed "houses of relief and coercion, which are mixed hospitals:" and Coke prophesied that when workhouses were established, neither beggar nor rogue should be seen. [New Bridewell had been established in Edward the Sixth's reign, which was a workhouse;

¹ Morn. Chron. Feb. 1, 1819.

² Month. Mag. Feb. 1, 1820. p. 19.

³ In an authentic account of the management of the poor in the parish of Clerkenwell, in which the present overseers had paid off many debts and reduced the expenditure, it yet appears that the materials cost more in their *rude* than they were worth in their *wrought* state; the former costing 433*l.* 1*s.* 2*d.*; and the latter sold for 357*l.* 14*s.* 1*d.*: and it is said that in picking oakum, what costs one shilling, only returns five farthings; that is, on every shilling there is a loss of 10*d.* Month. Mag. July 1822.

and it was also to receive "the sore and sick, that they be cured¹."] Corporation workhouses were erected in England by the 13th and 14th of Charles the Second. Sir William Temple², Davenant³, and Sir James Steuart⁴, favoured their erection. Davenant (a great name) contemplated their establishment with marked satisfaction, insisting "that if they were erected, so many new hands might thereby be brought in as would indeed make English manufactures flourish." To this point he frequently recurs⁵, and he estimates that the increased revenue from such houses would amount to 1,200,000*l.* a year.

At last, workhouses were generally ordered by the 9th of George the First; and they succeeded a little and for a time; that is, without taking into account the expense of buildings, outfit⁶, &c. they maintained the poor more cheaply than they had been hitherto supported. Of course, this soon ceased. Then the project was enlarged, and parishes huddled their poor into hundred workhouses, which agreed with Child's⁷ and Blackstone's⁸ views. The Legislature in 1782

¹ Workhouses had been established in Spain in 1508. The Government is beginning to establish them in Sicily. Thus hunting the foiled scent.

² Works, vol. i. p. 265.

³ Works, vol. i. p. 100.

⁴ Political Economy, vol. i. p. 75.

⁵ Works, vol. ii. p. 207—211, &c.

⁶ Eden, vol. i. p. 285, omits these, which were probably two parts of the whole charge.

⁷ He says that all parishes having a particular workhouse failed, except that of Dorchester. On Trade, p. 77.

⁸ He said: "in which (the 43d of Elizabeth) the only defect was, confining the management of the poor to small paro-

authorized the project, and associated parishes possessed a common workhouse. This, as usual, was auspicious at its commencement. It is said that the expense of the united parishes of Shrewsbury declined in a series of years from 4605*l.* to 2992*l.*¹ The tide of ebb followed the tide of flood in the few prosperous instances which occurred: for even in the freshness of the new system, Sir F. M. Eden², admitted that the poor increased as much in the parishes which had adopted them, as in those which had not.

The latest project was to make the poor a national concern. So says R. Owen; so said Bellers; so said Mr. Hay, who in 1735 insisted that the evil of the poor-laws would continue "until the poor are settled to work in a national, or at least a provincial fund." Now all these workhouse projects have been tried, and they have perished: yet Mr. Owen's plan starts up like Banquo's ghost—

"———The times have been,
That when the brains were out the man would die,
And there an end: but now they rise again
With twenty mortal murders on their crowns."

And this murdered ghost is recognised by a whole Committee of the House of Commons: their words are, "It (Mr. Owen's plan) might be adopted with a considerable prospect of success, as a mode of afford-

chial districts, which are frequently incapable of furnishing proper work, or providing an able director." Comment, vol. i. p. 361.

¹ Ann. Register, 1791, p. 40.

² History of the Poor Laws, vol. i. p. 270.

ing employment for the poor, permanent relief to parishes as regards their casual poor, and that a large portion of the sums expended for that purpose might be saved to the country, by consolidating parishes and districts for the purpose of creating establishments of the description in question," &c. All this is urged contrary to common sense, contrary to the experience of the evil proposed as a remedy, and contrary to the known benefit of a contrary practice¹.

How it entered into the human mind, that collecting a multitude of every age, profession, and of no profession, could be profitable, when the individuals, with all their opportunities of time, place, circumstance, and liberty, failed to provide for themselves, is marvellous. Yet the failure is greater than might be expected. Howard² mentions an establishment in which 80 men and 120 women earned in one year 18*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* Yet Colquhoun³ says the whole earnings of each pauper in England and Wales, who can perform some work, only amounted annually to 3*s.* 6*d.* a year. So according to Townsend⁴, in the hospicio of Barcelona, allowing 300 working days in the year, and excluding those who cannot work, each person does not produce above a penny a day: adding, "Yet this is greater in proportion than the

¹ The great reformation in the pauper establishment depends principally on separating parishes. Dr. Chalmers says: "On setting up of a separate parochial system, it will be found that this evil is greatly mitigated." *Christian and Civic Economy of Large Towns*, vol. ii. No. xii. p. 141. See his Speech, p. 27.

² On Lazarettos, p. 86.

³ On Indigence, p. 55.

⁴ Travels in Spain, vol. i. p. 80.

average of our workhouses in England." While such paupers do little, the charge of them is increased to the public by the preparation and retinue which attend them in their establishments.

Yet if such be the expense of establishments founded with economical views, how ruinous must be the expense of establishments in which thrift is no consideration!—Military academies for instance, the unworthy imitation of D'Argenson's *Ecole Militaire*,—the Royal Military College¹, which contained 329 pupils, and cost 30,000*l.* a year. Verily this and its fellows aggravate the evils of royal manufactures. Better, far better, to fabricate china or tapestry, than rear janizaries with such prodigality.

Expense characterizes charitable establishments. Hence Mr. Tooke expatiates on the sumptuous charitable edifices at St. Petersburg; and Mr. Eustace raves about the hospital *degli incurabili* at Naples; saying it is an institution of which England may be ashamed. Madame de Staël also sentimentalizes on the magnificent hospital at Berne. Pingeron is astounded by the profusion of plate in the hospital at Malta. The Baron de Bielfeld pursues the same strain; adding, that the English are charitable; but "we see no hospitals where duchesses by the bedside of the sick give the remedies on their knees²."

¹ Ann. Register, 1817, p. 330, it is calculated that each person educated at Sandhurst costs 1040*l.* Morn. Chron. June 3, 1820.

² This is still more magnificent. The Empress of Germany in Passion Week washes the feet of 12 women. Ann. Register, 1769, p. 98.

No, truly; because a nurse-tender can do the office better; and to relieve the sick is not a theatrical exhibition. This suits the vain pomp of the whole parade: yet I have heard of the *princely magnificence* with which sufferers are relieved in Bethlem hospital, and similar expressions respecting other institutions. There can be no greater satire on charities than such expressions. The erection of Bethlem Hospital cost 100,000*l.*, and it cannot accommodate more than 200 patients.

In like manner in destitute Ireland, Mr. Curwen¹, meaning praise, says: "All the institutions of Ireland are on a great scale, and do credit to the national taste."

Telephus et Peleus, cum pauper et exul uterque,
Projicit ampullas et sesquipedalia verba.

Yes, truly; and, as Monsieur Dupin says, the regulations of all the establishments of Dublin are imagined to serve the least possible number of individuals.

The expensiveness of public charities is monstrous; this is exhibited by a comparison of the same institutions in the same country. Thus, while in St. Luke's Hospital, each individual costs 19*l.* 19*s.* 9*d.*, in Bethlem Hospital he costs the public 29*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.* But a greater difference marks the relative expenditure in Scotland and England. Ordinary inmates in hospitals cost in England from 7*l.* 12*s.* 5*d.* to 21*l.* 13*s.* 7*d.*; yet in Paisley Hospital the charge is 4*l.* each². Whatever is expended beyond what is necessary, abridges the relief of others, and deadens the disposition to relieve.

¹ Letters on Ireland, vol. ii. p. 117. ² Burns, Hist. Disq. p. 38.

Besides, when public endowments have once obtained possession of the land, they are followed by endless accessaries. County hospitals give birth to village dispensaries, and the town surgeon emerges in many country apothecaries. Again: every man has his choice project. How many have had this and that dogmatic teacher salaried! Sermons and lectures against witchcraft have more than once been honoured by a professor and a stipend *for ever*¹. Hearne the antiquarian² proposed that men of abilities should be associated with large stipends to advance learning; and he instances Walton's Polyglot as a proof of the benefit of such a conspiracy of learned men³. Lord Kames⁴, a Judge, proposed that professors of both Scotch and English laws should be appointed. Mr. Minchin, a practising barrister, advocates the formation of a fund to enable paupers to prosecute and defend their right at law and equity. An oculist proposes "that a charity be formed on the principle of the Rupture Society," to supply the

¹ Thus the goods of murdered women, as witches, were conferred on the mayor and aldermen of Huntingdon, for an annual lecture on the subject of Witchcraft, to be preached at their town every Lady-day by a Bachelor or Doctor of Divinity of Queen's College, Cambridge. Retros. R. No. ix. p. 121.

² Preface, p. 31.

Pox on't, quoth Time to Thomas Hearne,
Whatever I forget you learn.

³ I cannot agree with Procopius in condemning Justinian for withdrawing the stipends from the professors. Hist. Arcana, c. 26. This was to break their golden chains.

⁴ Law Tracts, Preface, p. 13.

poor with spectacles. Mr. Williams, a projector, advises that electric mills be erected throughout the country, to improve the salubrity of the air and secure the people: and lately the erection of new churches was decreed, agreeably to the advice of ecclesiastics, which was quickly followed by a petition to the House of Commons¹, stating, that the people could not attend the churches for want of decent clothes, and requesting habiliments.

Charitable institutions are miserably and hideously neglected. Mr. Bennet mentioned in the House of Commons, that in the hospitals of the metropolis it was customary to mix contagious fever patients with ordinary fever patients.

But the capital objection to charitable establishments is, that their funds are diverted from the weak and poor, for whom they are intended, to the rich and powerful: the third of the tithe destined for the poor was seized by the clergy: the provision set apart at the endowment of religious houses was consumed by kings, nobles, and their followers. The Orphans' Fund, instituted for the relief of the children of the freemen of London, has frequently suffered fraud and malversation. In Charles the Second's time, the aldermen and common serjeant² lent corruptly the produce of this fund. To repair the loss incurred by them, a duty on coals brought into the port of London was imposed—an injurious tax on the poor; yet still the original debt, in consequence

¹ Morn. Chron. December 22d, 1819.

² Anderson's Commerce, anno 1694.

of the perversion of the fund, amounts to a considerable sum¹. A committee lately declared the present management a job². Thus, first a charitable fund is perverted³; then that is misapplied; and, finally, the residue is shared among palterers and impostors.

The Board of Education appointed by Government to inquire into the state of endowed schools in Ireland, developed a tissue of baseness and robbery by all the persons, clerical and civil, appointed to administer this department. Similar enormities have been dragged to light in England, old in iniquity: while Canada in its noviciate of sinning displays the same crime;—the House of Assembly voted 800*l.* a year for the support of eight schools; “but even this was soon turned into a reward for convenient persons.”

It is indifferent who are the agents of the fund—the poor are always defrauded. The subscription for the soldiers who fought at Waterloo was shared by officers of considerable rank; which is contrary even to the laws of war among Mussulmen. “It is observed that, according to our doctors, no portion of Zakat is

¹ Morn. Chron. January 21, 1820.

² Ibid. Jan. 20, and Sept. 25, 1820. Times, Feb. 21, 1822.

³ Sir T. Bernard left money to endow a free grammar school at Highgate, which endows a church and yields a large sum to a clergyman. 5000*l.* have been perverted from the funds of Greenwich Hospital, and employed in building a church for 250 persons. Hitherto the church has been the Sirbonian bog. An attempt was made to take 10,000*l.* from the 100,000*l.* granted to build churches in Scotland, to build a trophy on Calton Hill; but the churches succeeded against the trophy.

to be paid to such warriors as are in a state of affluence, none being objects of its application, but those who are poor¹. Purposes the most sacred are no security against the sordid perversion of charitable property. To say all at once, 70,000% voted to the African Committee to ameliorate the condition of the Negroes, have been in a great measure sacrificed to jobbing and patronage.

Charities are devoted to any purpose but their nominal destination. Lord Chancellor Eldon said on the 27th March, 1813, that in nine out of ten cases of charitable corporations that had come before him; the corporations themselves were the first objects of the charity. Yet is his Lordship's Court the guardian of orphans, of charities, and the like: Is it more disinterested than the corporations condemned by him? Take one of a hundred cases. Mr. Brougham stated that a cause, which had gone through all its courses from 1803 to 1808, and thus had become ripe for decision, remained undecided, and possibly may still remain so. Thus it appears that charitable endowments and institutions, in every imaginable situation and by all persons, are perpetually subjected to a sinister and malignant influence.

One remark more is necessary respecting charitable establishments. The failure of the fund is ruinous to the parties², who are frequently numerous

¹ Hedaya, vol. i. p. 55.

² Beside the robbery, lying and canting are superadded. Thus Abel Keene declared he had been induced by a cunning devil to pocket the sacramental contributions.

—as the bankruptcy of the charitable corporation instituted in 1708¹, which failed to the amount of almost half a million. The misery which this occasioned was general and extreme. Yet the evil is still greater when Governments are unable to supply the accustomed provision; as in the hospital of Bicêtre in 1795, when almost all the inmates perished².

With regard to charitable establishments, those, generally speaking, are worst which are national, and their evil is probably diminished as they are reduced from provinces to parishes, and from hospitals, lodging and dieting the distressed, to mere pensions or occasional alms. In Chelsea and Greenwich, the cheapest in-pensioner costs the State double as much as the most expensive out-pensioner; and six times as much as the least expensive out-pensioner. So that this establishment is as costly as the *fastueux hôpital* at Paris, which St. Pierre said consumed three times the sum which would support the same number of men had they been supported in their own village³. So, in respect to the poor in and out of workhouses: the paupers in workhouses in 1803 cost each

¹ The account is given in Anderson's Commerce, vol. iii. p. 242.

² L'hospice de Bicêtre près Paris renferme habituellement cinq à six mille pauvres; en 1795, année où il y eut une disette; l'Administration ne put leur donner une nourriture ni si abondante, ni si bonne que dans un temps ordinaire; l'économie de cette maison m'a assuré qu'à cette époque ils moururent presque tous. Say, tom. ii. p. 146. The bankruptcy of the burgh of Aberdeen involved the infirmaries and other charitable institutions. Lord A. Hamilton said so: Times, Feb. 21, 1822.

³ Annales Politiques, p. 209.

12*l.* 3*s.* 6½*d.* annually¹; those relieved and not in workhouses, 3*l.* 3*s.* 7*d.* So in Scotland, in the Canongate charity workhouse, the maintenance of 88 paupers cost 1005*l.*, while 99 out-pensioners (including three boarders in Bedlam) cost only 250*l.* 19*s.* We do not want an extension of the poor-laws, or of poor establishments, or of pauper villages, or of workhouses, under any new arrangement or denomination. Rather let the 2000 workhouses suffer the fate of Mr. Coke's: they have been renounced at Musselburg and Aberdeen²; and the parishioners have resumed their former practice of providing for the poor at their own houses.

In general, good would be gained, and evil avoided, if almost all hospitals³, excepting asylums⁴ for persons affected with mortally contagious diseases, were, after due preparation, also abandoned. Mr. Say⁵, indeed, the fervent and enlightened friend of liberty, strangely thinks that hospitals induce the cheapness of English merchandize. As far as they operate, they have probably a contrary effect. Dr. Price may argue, and

¹ Colquhoun on Indigence, p. 225.

² Burnis, Hist. Disq. on the Poor-Laws, p. 385 et seq.

³ At Geneva, three Essays were lately written for a prize "On the Increase of Pauperism:" they all recommended the abolition of the hospital.

⁴ George Rose, who was never a rash enemy to establishments, said "that one of the means we must look to for the improvement of the new system of poor-laws, must be to the abolition of workhouses."

⁵ That gentleman refers "le bon marché des marchandises qui viennent d'Angleterre aux hospices," tom. ii. p. 277.

Dr. Parr sophisticate in Spital sermons, against Monsieur Turgot; but his philosophy is proof against the logic of one adversary, and the ample sentences of the other. All charitable establishments should be revised; try them by their merits; and if proved injurious or nugatory, their funds should be applied to the purposes of the nation¹.

Charity should be promoted; but an establishment, though the words *poor* and *relief* are repeated in the deed of donation, is not a charity. Royal establishments are the reverse of charitable: I should prefer the eastern practice of weighing the royal person twice a year as a means of bestowing a largess on the poor², or even the Maundy Thursday dinners and pennies to a few mendicants, to all the regal establishments in Europe;—pomp and charity have no sympathy, no, not one coincidence. The fund of charity is in the heart. The produce from fines on public delinquents, or from bull-fights³, theatres⁴, balls, &c. seems incongruous also.

A charitable institution, I repeat, is an evil; and as the patron is high, the evil is greater. Thus, a regal charity has the least pretensions to doing good, and the episcopal follows the regal in the compara-

¹ Turgot said truly in respect to this point, "L'utilité publique est la loi supreme, et ne doit être balancée par un respect superstitieux pour ce qu'on appelle l'intention des fondateurs." Œuvres, tom. iii. p. 254.

² Ayeen Akbery.

³ Swinburne's Travels in Spain, p. 341.

⁴ In 1796, a tenth of all the places of public amusement was payable in Paris.

tive degree. 'Townsend' mentions that the archbishop of Toledo feeds 700 persons whom he employs in the silk manufactory. Thus, says the traveller, he has completed the ruin of the city; for he raised both the price of labour and of the raw material, while he reduced the price of wrought stuff. Those manufacturers who employed 40, 50, and 60 workmen, now employ not more than two or three. The workmen of the archbishop, beside the produce of their work, require 40,000 ducats altogether, or 6*l.* 10*s.* each a year for his support.

Ireland has always been remarkable for the mismanagement of its charities; for to the ordinary aristocracy is added an oligarchy of faith. All charities there essentially regard Protestants; while the poor are used as a subterfuge for pensioning the Protestant gentry. Hence the charity workhouse in Dublin had five governors with salaries of 500*l.* a year each; yet the clerk of St. Mary's, Islington, had only 350*l.* salary¹: and mark further, the clerk of the general session of the town of Paisley, comprising 25,000 inhabitants, receives only 15*l.* a year; yet he performs ten times more than the five Irish governors together. This has been reformed in Ireland, and how? Moderately indeed. The whole cost of the Irish workhouse was reduced from 50,000*l.* to 36,000*l.*, and afterwards to 30,000*l.*; while the salaries of the great officers continued undiminished. In 1820 four of the five governors were dismissed as

¹ Travels, vol. i. p. 194.

² Burns, Hist. Disq. p. 371.

wholly useless; but they obtained compensation on retirement. This is robbery with a *continuando*. Where did the officers of charitable establishments obtain retiring pensions, except in Ireland? But in this case, instead of pensions, they should have been forced to disgorge their plunder. To expect good from State establishments, is to dote with the ancient drunkards, who wore costly amethysts round their necks to counteract the influence of wine. Such funds are as unprofitable to the poor, as wells sunk in a desert of moving sand, or as showers which are absorbed by the burning atmosphere before they reach the earth.

CHAPTER VI.

The poor and destitute (the great and complicated means which pauperize the people that I have mentioned being removed) to be relieved by the tenderness and generosity of relations—of friends—of neighbours—of the public: these sources sufficient, proved by the advantages which the rich derive from relieving the poor, and from the inexhaustible benevolence of the English nation, even under the disturbing influence of the poor-laws, &c.

IT may be asked, Supposing charitable establishments to cease, how should the necessitous poor be relieved? By voluntary subscriptions. It may be said, This was tried, and it was found insufficient. I do not think that the supposed insufficiency of an ancient practice should decide this or any question on political economy. Originally men bartered and sold as they

could; but the passion for meddling, and the presumption of governors that they know all men's business better than themselves, occasioned various summary and minute impertinencies to be entered in the statute book. By the 25th of Henry the Eighth the prices of victuals were fixed, and grocers were ordered to sell at a reasonable rate; there was an assize of candles; and the Chancellor actually determined the prices of flesh-meat and stock-fish. In Elizabeth's time there was an assize of faggots. In George the First's, an assize of fish. Until a few years ago there was an assize of bread. All these laws regarded consumers, and in some cases the poor¹. Now this whole farrago is condemned as vicious. Nor are charitable establishments less pernicious, if men dare grapple with the evil, and seriously prepare to remedy them by an honourable policy toward the poor. To say that if the poor were referred to casual relief they would starve, is erroneous. No doubt many pay by compulsion, who would withdraw their aid if the poor-laws were abolished. What then? Suppose that some want charity, their hearts ossified, their blood-vessels collapsed, their nerves rigid,—thus deadly cold to all tenderness and affection: may not such inhuman beings, reckless of the poor man's fate, strengthen the sympathies of the feeling as their virtues become by comparison more honoured and exalted?

¹ In 1710 the assize of bread and ale was revived for the poor. Anderson's Commerce, vol. iii. p. 249 & seq. It would appear that all the bread at Rome was baked at one building. Socrates Scholasticus, Hist. lib. v. c. 18.

That the distressed may be confided to their fellow-citizens, is proveable from various circumstances. The selfish and the generous passions equally instruct the opulent. To relieve the poor secures property, for want and robbery are usual associates. Years of distress are years of wickedness. A needy man is an officious instrument for any crime.

One whom distress has spited at the world
Is he whom tempting fiends would pitch upon
To do such deeds as make the prosperous men
Lift up their hands, and wonder who could do them.

As want is intense, man is desperate; and murder and death lose their terrors—"una salus nullam sperare salutem." As want is extensive, man conspires with his fellows, outrages are committed, and the array is made. Poverty unredressed raised the greatest convulsions in every stage and vicissitude of ancient Rome. The distress of the people convulsed the State in modern Italy, and the same facts were repeated under different names. France present and past records similar events from similar circumstances. Fortescue, speaking of France, says: "Whence it seemeth that poverty hath been the whole or chief cause of all such rising. The poor man hath been stirred thereto by occasion of his poverty for to get food, and the rich man hath gone with them because he would not be poor by levying of their goods¹." General distress dissolves government. Locke² says, "that the great and chief end of man's uniting into commonwealths

¹ Limited and Absolute Monarchy, c. xii.

² On Government, b. 2, c. ix. p. 243.

and putting themselves under government, is the preservation of their property." But if the people are not only disinherited but left destitute of the means of living, their union by the necessity of circumstances is dissolved. Therefore the relief of the poor is a surety to the rich as individuals, and as an order in the State, if indeed the rich are interested to support the existing Government.

Great and general distress occasions civil wars, and the spoliation of property in the gross; partial distress produces gang robbery, as in India; while mitigated misery produces petty combinations, or solitary theft. Pastoret¹ says, that of 900 criminals condemned annually in France before the revolution, 700 were absolutely destitute. Therefore, if these 700 malefactors had been relieved, so many would have been preserved innocent,—a tremendous reflection! Hence, when it is said, "Give nothing to the wicked," it should be ascertained who are the wicked; whether the poor man who transgressed the statute, or the supercilious rich man who by neglecting God's creature was accessory to the offence. Fielding says truly: "The vices of the poor are better known than their miseries; they starve and freeze and rot among themselves, they beg and steal and rob among their betters." "Give nothing to the wicked:" but poverty and vice are conjunct². "Give nothing to

¹ Loix Penales, partie iii. p. 130.

² Chrysippus, who blamed Theognis for advising men to fly poverty (Plutarch, Moral. p. 462.), was rather critical than just.

the wicked:" better far it was said, "Give me not poverty, lest I steal¹." The vice of the poor is their poverty, and great poverty exonerates the culprit: "Men do not despise the thief if he steal to satisfy his soul when he is hungry;" but all must detest the rich who force the wretched to sin that they may live.

Theft and robbery, which timely relief might have prevented, affect in various ways the whole circle of possessions². A vast portion of property is thus consumed to secure the remainder; and police, jails³, judges, officers, transports, colonies, are often chargeable in a great degree to the distresses of the people. Thus poverty subtracts both from the value and the character of property; till in extreme misery it rather invites danger than promotes comfort. Death also follows in the train of poverty: I speak not of murder, but contagion. With poverty comes disease, which impairs health and quickens mortality. The most malignant and pestilential maladies—as typhus—are the creatures of want. In 1817, in Ireland this disease began with the poorest: but it ascended; it

¹ Proverbs vi. 30.

	In 1817.	In 1818.
² Of these were crimes against the state	433	166
persons	1,638	1,262
property	7,086	5,547

³ It is said that the cost of each prisoner in Millbank Penitentiary, with house-rent 10 per cent. on the outlay, amounts to 100l a year. The produce of labour in the House of Correction in Middlesex, according to Mr. Beaumont, is the 46th part of the expense. This is one item of expense in a single subdivision of the guards to property.

smote the higher classes, and ultimately the rich and plethoric became the greatest victims. To relieve the poor, then, mainly supports property and life¹. Hence charity is commanded by self-love, in the sordid acceptation of the term, Charity gives a little to preserve all.

If we turn our thoughts to the poor themselves, relief protects them from the extremes of excessive work and hopeless indolence. Extreme work is pernicious in a double sense; it exhausts the creature², producing premature debility; it increases the articles manufactured, which overstocking the market lessens the labourer's profits according to the amount of the superfluity.

There are other important considerations on this point. Should work increase, and marriages, the consequence of a demand for workmen, it might and does happen, as years of preparation are requisite, according to the ordinary course of breeding and rearing, that the demand which promoted the population had ceased before the supply of men could be brought into activity³. Here then is an increased supply of

¹ And sanctions the improvement of property, commerce. Thus the plague in England in 1636 excluded the intercourse of foreigners. *Strafford's Letters*, vol. ii. p. 57.

² In *Læstrigonia*, Homer says,
The sleepless there might double wages earn,
Attending now the herds, now tending sheep,
For the night pastures. *ODYSS.* lib. x.

³ This must frequently happen in such a country as England, particularly when it is subject to such sudden reverses by vilo policy as the orders in council.

men, and a diminished market for them. If such men be reviled as obtruders—a nuisance, according to the Malthusians,—if, in short, they be not protected by the opulent till they can be absorbed by the different branches of industry, they must derange the whole economy of this or that trade, multiplying work till it is a drug; and ultimately they must become themselves idle and dissolute. Poverty makes liars, gamblers¹, drunkards², suicides, blasphemers³; it changes the fairest into the vilest of all things; as snow, which sinks as it melts, and sinking loses its whiteness, till at last, a filthy residue, it leaves an unsightly blot upon the earth.

To relieve men in sickness or occasional want, upholds the state by sustaining the very foundations of society. Thus, in most cases charity is money laid out at indefinite interest in the labour-market⁴. To relieve the poor, is to augment the strength of the people and the opulence of the rich⁵. The labourer

¹ Thus it was supposed that the Lydians invented dice in a scarcity. *Herodotus*, lib. i. c. 91.

² The Pariahs, the most distressed cast in India, are most dissolute, and frequently intoxicate themselves with the juice of the palm. *Dubois*, p. 459.

³ ————— *Contemnere fulmina pauper
Creditur atque diis ignoscentibus ipsis.*

JUVENAL, Sat. iii. ver. 146.

⁴ Seneca would not consider assistance in this view charity. *De Beneficiis*, lib. iii. c. 22.

⁵ Necker says that the protection of the people at large, and the defence in particular of the poor, is an efficacious mode of augmenting the strength and prosperity of a state. *Administration des Finances*.

who is not relieved in his infirmity perishes, and a man is lost to his employers and the world. I speak not of the hideousness of letting a human being die through want of subsistence. This is so abhorrent to human nature, that criminals have seldom suffered such an end¹. Paulus the lawyer said, that should one ask relief, be denied, and die, it is homicide in the person refusing². To the same effect Quarles said, "Not to give to the poor, is to take from him; not to feed the hungry, if thou hast it, is to the utmost of thy power to kill him. That, therefore, thou mayst avoid both sacrilege and murder, be charitable³." Each poor man has a right in proportion to his distress⁴;—each rich man has a duty in proportion to his means; a duty to himself, to the poor, to God; to God as the father of all, to God as the provident administrator of the world—

"That thou mayst shake the superflux to them,
And show the heavens more just."

I believe, in all well-regulated states, or even in those partially well appointed, the miserable may depend on the reason and humanity of their fellows. How strong must be that disposition, how necessary that feeling, which pervades equally the theme of philosophy and the codes of nations! I might refer to the

¹ Creon advises that Antigone should be buried in a rocky cave; but that food be left with her, that the state might escape pollution. ver. 787.

² Petit, *Leges Att.* p. 144.

³ *Enchiridion.*

⁴ Hoc maxime officii est, ut quisque maxime opis indigeat, ita ei potissimum opitulari. Cicero, *de Officiis*, lib. i. p. 357.

second chapter of this tract to support the truth of this position; but the laws of nations abound in similar injunctions. The Jews held, that to relieve a miserable man was *justice*¹: they ordered that he should not only be relieved, but in effect assisted by loans of money²; and the mortgaged and sold land was restored periodically to the owners or their children—"that there be no poor among you³." And it appears that the Talmudists⁴, who held that the rich should not merely relieve but restore the fallen to their former comforts, judged agreeably to the ancient law. So the Tonquinese say, "A man in want is the creditor of the man who enjoys." Zerdust expressed the same sentiment more forcibly⁵.

So good, so useful is the support of the destitute, that the sovereign authority in different states has

¹ Pastoret, tom. ii. partie 3. p. 7.

² Deut. xv. 7, 8.

³ Exod. xxiii. 10. It is also said: "The king that faithfully judges the poor, his throne shall be established for ever." Proverbs xxix. 14. So the Neapolitan king was sworn—"defender le vedove pupille ed i poveri, stabilir il regno e far giustizia a ciascheduno," &c. Scipione Mazzella, p. 476.

⁴ Neque suffecisse volunt ut quis opulentus inopibus rogantibus vitæ simpliciter necessaria donaret, comparative, veluti vestitum et alimenta. Etiam utensilia domestica, &c. quin et ea insuper quæ ad pristinæ, &c. Selden *de Jure Gent.* &c. lib. vi. c. 6. p. 695.

⁵ The English generally imagine that they are the most charitable by *law* of all people. Turner says, "No human being can suffer want at Teshoo Loomboo." *Embassy*, &c. p. 330. Again, Sir G. Mackenzie says that in Iceland individuals who only pay two rix dollars to the public revenue, sometimes pay fifty or sixty rix dollars towards the maintenance of the distressed poor.

taken special cognizance of the lowest classes of the community. Mahomet said, "If the slave be incapable of labour, the owner must then be compelled either to provide them [him] maintenance, or to sell them [him], because slaves are claimants of *right*, notwithstanding their bondage¹." Thus Negroes are supported by the master in Rio Janeiro². The legislature in Barbadoes in 1785 ordered that superannuated slaves should be provided for by their masters, who were punishable if any of their slaves were seen begging³. So in Jamaica, if a slave becomes infirm or disabled, his master must maintain him. We are also informed by Heber, "that (in Russia) the aged and infirm (boors) are provided with food and raiment and lodging at the owner's expense." So in France the *metayers* and *colons* were by an ordinance to be supported by the proprietors of the lands which they worked⁴. Such laws were enacted in favour of men scarcely free or absolutely enslaved:—and shall not the British be as active, without compulsory statutes, to relieve their fellow-citizens, destitute through casualty, or disease, or age, or labour? Why, the Romans had a festival for horses and asses, when they crowned them and gave them rest⁵.

Notwithstanding the statute of wages, and all the

¹ Hedaya, vol. i. p. 418. How different are Mahomet's notion and Mr. Malthus's respecting *right* and relief! Ali Bey says that the Mahometans pay more in charity than the law commands. Travels in Morocco, p. 94.

² Luccock.

³ Steele and Dickson, p. 448.

⁴ Turgot, Œuvres, tom. vi. p. 16.

⁵ Plutarch. Moralia, p. 166.

other grinding frauds committed against the people in consequence of their constitutional impotence—having no authority personally or by representative in the legislature—the indications of the soundness of British feeling on this subject are many and important. Thus by Magna Charta a man might be amerced, *saving his contemement*¹. So by a bill passed in 1821 a bankrupt is entitled to 2½ per cent. on the residue of his property, if this proportion does not exceed a certain sum. But, what is much more interesting, notwithstanding the poor-rates, at once illusory and oppressive, from forty to fifty thousand charities were endowed with a revenue amounting to two millions in the 16th and 17th centuries, and the passion for charity continues in general active, I might say indiscriminating and restless². To say that the poor-laws have dried up the sources of charity, or hardened the heart of Britons, is false;—charity has frequently relieved where the poor-laws were not only negligent but inhuman. Witness the charitable so-

¹ Thus by the Hindoo code a dancing girl or common prostitute, guilty of a crime which subjected her to the confiscation of all her property, retains however her carpet for sitting on, her clothes, jewels, and place of abode. Halhed, p. 273. So to a soldier are left his implements of war: all professional implements are secured to the several artists by the Hindoo code. Sketches of the Hindoos.

² Thus the agents of an impostor called Purfield levied of the public 500*l*. for a charity which centred in Purfield. The Philanthropic Society was supplied in a great measure with children accused falsely by their parents of crimes. Children, it is said, collect 8*s*. a-day in London by begging.

ciety in Norwich¹, instituted to relieve the indigent Scotch and Irish in 1784, The Stranger's Friend Society, &c. The poor-rates may incumber, confuse, and corrupt the waters of benevolence; but the stream of sensibility pursues a fresh and undefiled course—and the source is most abundant. Mr. Luccock says that the poor-rates at Birmingham were 60,000/.²: yet the public and private subscriptions exceeded 40,000/. There is scarcely a casualty or misfortune which claims not an association of benevolent individuals, to countervail the evil. Imprisoned debtors³—persons discharged from the hulks⁴—deserted and abandoned females,—and a thousand others, are ministered to with zealous and effectual tenderness. Bad in this country is excessive, but the good greatly countervails. British charity expands far beyond domestic distress and the circle of the nation's suffering. Witness the subscription for the people of Lisbon on the earthquake in 1752, an act lately imitated by the Americans, when they sent five ships laden with flour to Venezuela. The English also assisted various nations on various occasions; the Russians who suffered by the conflagration at Moscow; those who suffered by the inundations in the Netherlands; those who suffered by the war in Germany; and the Irish who suffered by the failure of the potatoe crop in the west of Ireland during the last year.

¹ Eden, vol. ii. p. 524. ² Monthly Mag. Feb. 1820, p. 19.

³ Ann. Register, 1803, p. 125.

⁴ The Refuge at Cuper's Bridge. Highmore's Pietas Lond. p. 266.

Can it then be supposed that the English poor are not secure in the unenforced humanity of their opulent countrymen? Why not? Forsooth, Lords and Commons thought otherwise, and legislated accordingly. How does it happen that this law alone is good, while almost all others of the same period respecting trade, commerce¹, agriculture², sustenance³, are condemned; nay, that there is scarcely a law intended to serve a particular department, which has not been found hostile to the purpose of its enactment? Yet none display a greater illusion, and more fatal in their consequences, than the poor-laws by which charity was enforced. Charity is in its nature and essence gratuitous; therefore compulsory charity, a solecism and a contradiction, instead of being twice blessed, is

¹ The Navigation Act, which I believe Tucker *first* condemned.

² Thus the law of Richard the Second, intended to secure labourers in agriculture, by the avowal of the Commons in 1406 had a contrary effect, and induced parents to send their children to cities and boroughs. See Eden, vol. i. p. 62.

³ A writer concludes: "Il s'ensuit qu'à la longue les soins des gouvernans pour procurer des subsistances ont des effets précisément contraires à ceux qu'ils se proposent." Instit. tom. i. p. 546. It is in general absurd, and sometimes fraudulent. Sismondi speaking of Lucca: The republic itself has established a bank, "qui leur fournit chaque semaine le grain dont ils ont besoin, en le leur passant en compte sans intérêt; en sorte que l'Etat, dont les loix leur sont à peu favorables, parait au contraire sans cesse occupé de leur subsistance, et toujours prêt à faire des sacrifices pour les paysans. Cette banque fait absolument illusion aux paysans Luquois. Quoique les maîtres qui l'ont établie y trouvent leur avantage, elle est plus utile encore au Gouvernement, qui tient par son moyen dans une dépendance absolue tout le peuple des campagnes," &c. Sismondi, p. 213.

is given without affection and received without gratitude.

It is unnecessary to regulate contributions by law. "No Athenian," said Demosthenes, "is so inhuman as to deny relief to the indigent¹." No man is so unnatural as to deny assistance: and facts abound to confirm the verity of the statement. The Quakers support their poor by private subscription², and the Episcopalians in Scotland³: and let it be remembered that the British Jews, who, beside paying their quota of the rates, subscribe for their own poor, support a free school for 600 boys and 900 girls; they are also prompt in aiding the charities of different denominations of Christians.

There are no poor-rates in Idra, nor in the Isle of Man⁴. So in Munich⁵, where the paupers were once incomparably numerous. So in Hamburg, beggars, says Clarke⁶, are never seen in the street; the asylums for orphans contain five or six hundred children, who are maintained and educated by voluntary contributions. So in Holland: for I cannot call the taxes on public amusements, on marriages, private baptism, a poor-rate; any more than the tax on singing-birds

¹ Philip. 4, p. 101.

² See Eden, vol. ii. p. 203, of the Bristol Quakers. So in Ulster in Ireland, in 1819, the charge on a population of 800 individuals was about 48%: but this was trifling in comparison to the private contribution. This society is declining: in 1750 there were in Ireland 101 established congregations, at present only 42.

³ Carlisle's Topographical Dict.

⁴ Johnson, Jurisprudence of the Isle of Man, p. 134.

⁵ Rumford's Essays, p. 174. ⁶ Scandinavia, p. 28.

transferred to the poor in Munster. Yet the poor-laws from 1614 to 1649 were essentially the same in England and Holland¹: but then, "the salaries of the great officers of state were very small:"—the rich families, on whom the great offices in the commonwealth were generally conferred, "contented themselves with being useful to the public²." Nor was there tithe, nor corn-law: trade also was free, and commerce unlimited. There was no king, scarcely any nobles; all were thrifty, none were idle:—the whole body of unproductive citizens, including lawyers, soldiers, usurers, gentry without calling, &c. amounted only to 200,000. So circumstanced, the Dutch supported their poor without difficulty by voluntary contribution. And surely the population was liable to various perils by sea and land: no people were more subjected to shipwreck and disease; so strikingly insalubrious is their country, that Mr. Malthus³ imagined that *the principal cause which rendered Holland so famous for the management of the poor was the extreme unhealthiness of the country, which occasioned a much greater mortality in it than in other states⁴.*

¹ Sir William Temple, United Provinces, p. 38.

² Ibid. p. 40.

³ vol. ii. p. 334.

⁴ Population, vol. i. p. 376. edit. 4. In this he is not even original. Light says, "The Arabs (no great philosophers, it must be confessed,) consider the plague as a necessary evil, to keep down the population to the level of the means of subsistence." Old Osborne also had a foresight of the benefit of the warlike check from men in the following observation: "for if the stronger creatures did not spoil and devour the weaker, the whole mass of animals would perish by famine and strife for want of room." p. 154. Thus an ingenious naturalist explains the final cause

Who before this inventor of the geometric series in population ever calculated disease and death among the economics of the people!

The first source of relief, of course, is from parents to their children; this is compulsory in England by the 5th of George the First. The law respecting illegitimate children is nearly the same; though the law with its usual consistency holds that a bastard is *nul- lius filius*¹. This, though incongruous, is preferable to the law in Norway², which charges the maintenance of the illegitimate child to both parents; and partly superior to the Roman law³, which obliged mothers to support children *vulgo quæritos*, and they her.

As parents should support their children, so children should maintain their parents⁴. The extremes of life

why Providence permits certain creatures to be peculiarly pro- lific; as the rat, the rabbit, in order that they may devour their young. Month. Rev. Feb. 1815, p. 203. The sect called Rus- colnetz is truly Malthusian. Macmichael, Phillips's Voyages, p. 71. All this destruction, though not arising from *extreme unhealthi- ness*, is a *greater mortality*, &c. If Mr. Malthus was consequen- tial, he should refer the poverty and distress in England to the reduced mortality in England. From 1785 to 1804, the pro- gressive decrease of deaths in Great Britain is as 1 in 436 in the former year, to 1 in 474 in the latter. This is melancholy enough for the poor-rates. But Sir G. Blane makes the prospect dolo- rous indeed: he says that in London, in 1750 the annual morta- lity was 1 in 21; in 1801, 1 in 35; in 1810, 1 in 38; in 1821, 1 in 40.

¹ Fielding, Increase of Robbers, p. 66.

² Mary Wolstonecraft's Letters on Norway. Letter 8. p. 103.

³ Petit, Leges Atticæ, p. 167.

⁴ St. Paul says: "for children ought not to lay up for their parents, but the parents for the children." 2 Cor. xii. 14. I do not see the sagacity of this remark.

are equally helpless, and equally demand the assistance of the vigorous. The Digest declares the claim re- ciprocal, and neglect either way was submitted to the cognizance of the Judge¹. The 43d of Elizabeth² carries this duty downwards and upwards to the re- motest ancestry. Such is the Code Napoleon³:— and should the person chargeable with the alimentary pension be unable to pay in money, the Judge may order him to take the wanting person and maintain him at home. In Iceland every householder is obliged to maintain his relations, who cannot support them- selves, to the fourth degree. So far as such laws may operate as advice and direction, they are not objec- tionable: but as compulsory and penal, they are worse than nugatory.

Supposing the family insufficient, the next claim regards the vicinage, and so on till the world affords relief. Abraham was relieved in Egypt; yet I abhor vagrancy: in consequence, I object to badging the poor, which is a license to beg. But observe, when- ever begging is prohibited by law a poor-rate begins⁴: for if beggars obtrude after the law, they must be banished, according to Plato⁵, which is impossible,

¹ Taylor's Civil Law, p. 188.

² Ibid.

³ tom. i. p. 46.

⁴ This exactly happened at Strasbourg. Ann. Regst. 1768, p. 59. Fielding admits: "However useful this excellent law (against vagrants) may be in the country, it will by no means serve the purpose of this town," &c. Fielding, p. 139—141. He might have extended the exception.

⁵ "Let no beggar be in the state: if any one endeavour to obtain food by entreaties, let him be driven from the forum and the highways, and expelled the state." De Legib. lib. xi. p. 978.

or confined. Hence poor-houses, work-houses, either as a punishment or an asylum. Besides, no law should prohibit begging; as every one can repress mendicity by withholding assistance. It is also most impertinent to limit by law the disposition of the charitable;—as no law should enforce charity, so none should restrain it: and the Essenes¹, though submissive to the curators in all other things, assumed the privilege of relieving whom and in what measure they pleased. It is obvious, therefore, that all that I have said against charitable establishments does not regard casual charity, even though it may have the character of an establishment for the time being. On the contrary, I do not disapprove of the Mendicity Association supported by voluntary subscription in Dublin; and I entirely approve of the temporary retreat for the houseless poor in the winter of 1820; particularly as four-fifths of those who were admitted could not obtain occupation. The exceptions might be increased.

Circumstances also occur which abrogate all preconceived rules; for though the musket-ball ends life, yet it is said that General Monckton was cured of an asthmatic affection by a shot through the lungs. So exceptions may occur respecting charitable establishments. Howard, for instance, mentions the bequest of an Irish lady (he should have named her) in trust to the magistrates of St. Malo, of so much a day to every prisoner at Dennan, which the philanthropist says saved the life of many brave men². If it relieved

¹ lib. ii. c. 8. De Bello Jud.

² On Prisons, p. 11, note. And yet it is said that a large fund

any brave men, it worked its own salvation; for we must remark that humanity is older than science.

There are also peculiar circumstances which at least raise doubts respecting the propriety of charities established or to be established, as in India¹, whether there should not be some public fund for the maintenance of the half-cast children born to British fathers by native women. In Cairo also, where according to Savary there are eight thousand, and according to Forbin² twenty thousand blind persons, something more than casual charity is perhaps also required. Asylums to prevent the spread of contagious disorders³, as lazarettos, fever hospitals, and lunatic asylums, also are good; for by them a few relieve many at a moderate expense: indeed all great cities seem to require additional arrangements and conveniences, though they have been more kind to beggars from the days of Homer.

Better the mendicant in city seeks
His dole, vouchsafe it whosoever may,
Than in the villages⁴.

Yet accidents are multiplied in capital towns, and unobtrusive men are less known, being lost and forgotten amidst the multitude. One institution I am sure all such cities should possess; it is recommended

is possessed by one of the London Companies to relieve captives and shipwrecked persons, which it would appear was perverted. See Retrospect. Rev. No. 5. p. 83.

¹ Mrs. Graham's India, p. 124.

² Phillips's Travels, &c. vol. ii. p. 12.

³ Some imagine that the plague is not contagious.

⁴ Odyss. xvii. p. 422.

by Fielding and noticed by Howard¹, namely, some receptacle where persons disposed to work and who cannot obtain occupation, may rendezvous for the day and receive for their labour sufficient for the day's subsistence. These are exceptions to the general and inherent infirmity of charitable establishments, which are pernicious, whether they be well or ill administered, and frequently pure and even cumulative evils². Distress is a casualty, and it should be met with occasional and varied assistance—by fuel, clothes, food, money, medicine. The poor should be relieved at their own houses³. But should they be houseless? In Norway the desolate poor are confided to the less opulent peasantry, who receive a pension for their maintenance⁴. The poor who are houseless should be allowed to choose their own lodging⁵. These considerations, if adopted, would serve host, inmate, and community. The less man's habits are deranged, the less his feelings and freedom are violated, the more easy his relief:—thus, while the heart ministers between rich and poor, the greatest good is done for the poor at the least expense to the opulent.

¹ On Lazarettos, p. 210.

² As when work at poor-establishments is sold at an under value.

³ This was advised by Thomas Firmin in 1678: it is the practice in Tuscany. Beside costing less in one way, they can earn more at home than in crowds. The Rev. Mr. Townsend said "that the poor cost three times as much when collected as in their own cottages, and do not half the work."

⁴ Clarke's Scandinavia, p. 685.

⁵ Count Rumford says the scheme to end mendicity at Munich was completely successful: almost all the poor provide their own lodging. p. 106.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAGE	LINE
15	2, for Jhere read Shere.
19	1, insert <i>it before is</i> .
24	note, for Pauro read Pauw.
41	3, for and fed are read are fed and.
50	20, and 31 dele " ".
79	note, for 185,12,000 read 15,182,000.
95	3, dele and.
106 and 107,	for Sirmondi read Sismondi.
114	4, for unparadised read imparadised.
135	26, for its read their.
137	13, for devising read dividing.
158	12, dele :
—	13, insert <i>it after continued</i> .
163	1, for Borgamese read Bergamese.
176	18, for Burn read Burns.
190	12, for 19, &c. read 29, &c.
195	—, for 695,249, read 6,959,249.
207	17, for . insert ,
213	13, for Sirmondi read Sismondi.
315	2, for Semples read Semples.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY R. TAYLOR, SHOE-LANE.



WORKS
BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

1. PRINCIPLES of MORALITY.
2. The INDEPENDENT MAN; or, An Essay on the Formation and Development of those Principles and Faculties of the Human Mind, which constitute Moral and Intellectual Excellence.
3. NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.
4. NATIONAL EDUCATION.
5. DEFECTS of the ENGLISH LAWS and TRIBUNALS.
6. On the CATHOLIC QUESTION.
7. STATE of IRELAND.
8. No VETO.
9. STATE of EUROPE in January 1816.
10. An INQUIRY concerning the POPULATION of NATIONS: containing a Refutation of Mr. Malthus's Essay on Population.
11. RADICAL REFORM Restoration of Usurped Rights.

264. For removal of London influence by abolition
of a Postmaster General's office.

265. For removal of London influence by abolition
of a Postmaster General's office.

266. For removal of London influence by abolition
of a Postmaster General's office.

267. For removal of London influence by abolition
of a Postmaster General's office.

... of ...
...
...
...
...
...

8367



