

sured only by miles, which only feed snipes. He employs himself in feeding horses and dogs, and in hunting foxes. His whole employment is amusement. He has a residence near Mallow, in Cork, and another at Castleconnell, in Limerick. Horses and dogs to hunt and eat corn and meal; idle servants to eat bread and meat; a river, like a sea broken out of bounds, rolling and roaring through his demesne, with water-power equal to the mill-wheels of a world—is also kept idle: those are the signs of what Sir Richard de Burgho does or is likely to do, with the exception that he is at law with Mr James M’Nab, endeavouring to eject him from the farm on some informality in the lease. A similar lease under which Mr Watson, another tenant, held, has been abrogated, owing to the legal technicalities not being complied with, and it is generally feared that Mr M’Nab’s lease will be broken in the same way.

Had he taken the bog on lease, and kept it to breed snipes and frogs, miasmatic fevers and famine, he might have held it without his lease being questioned. But to have cattle and corn, and healthy farm fields, and to have much to sell to a population who require much, and the profit going into his pocket, strikes the mind of the De Burgho, chief of an ancient race, as an injustice to him, and he must try to get a share to help him to maintain his dignity, his hounds, horses, and idle servants. The lawyers tell him how to get, not only a share, but the whole; and so he goes to law.

The more honest, and I shall venture to say the more honourable and dignified way of getting possession of such farm fields as those brought from beneath the barren moss by James M’Nab, to beautify a country and feed its people, is for Sir Richard de Burgho to go to work and clear a bog for himself. He has many more to begin upon. Hundreds of people in Castleconnell and O’Brien’s Bridge are without work and food; the corn, and meal, and bread, and meat which he feeds idle horses, dogs, and servants upon, would afford them wages and food to begin work upon.

At all events, his success in taking Mr Watson’s property from him, and his attempt to take that of Mr M’Nab, though both held on lease, will not encourage other men of capital and enterprise to try to create fertility and fulness out of barrenness and famine. And, if he succeeds, one other warning will be given to agriculturists to put their money in the bank, even at a low per centage, rather than risk it in the cultivation of land, as Mr Robert O’Brien says they do.

This gentleman proceeds to say—

“The tillage is carried on with a very small amount of capital by the ‘free crop’ system. And if they do purchase manure, they consume the crop in such a way as to yield little return to the capital, and, by their crops, take out of the land rather more than they put into it. Hence the frequent failures in the overworked soil.”

The term “free crop” is thus explained:—

“The labourer, not having land of his own, gathers, during the year, heaps of manure, and in spring applies to the farmers who have land and not manure, who suffer him to put the manure on the land and cultivate a crop of potatoes; and, according to the quality of the land, sometimes a sum of money is paid, varying from 4s. to L.1 per quarter of an Irish acre, in addition to the manure, by the labourer.”

It is always on very poor land where this “free crop” of the labourer is permitted. Much of his own time and all the time of his family is employed in collecting this manure on the roads, while, strange to say, the very farmer on whose farm it is to be applied—on land exhausted by three, four, or five crops without manure—is allowing the streamlets and rivers to carry away the natural riches of his cow sheds, stables, and farm yard. This waste of manure is universal; but the free crop system is not universal.

Having explained the meaning of that term, Mr O’Brien proceeds to say that no attempt to establish agricultural societies has succeeded, because the only parties having an interest in tillage or a desire to see it extended, are the poorest of the farmers, not able to support agricultural societies; and—

“The gentry generally hold rich lands, which are kept for pasture, and do not as a class feel so direct a sympathy with those who occupy the waste and poor lands. A farmer, with little or no capital, through the medium of conacre and free crops, can sufficiently manage to hold a tillage farm; but he must have capital to hold it as a pasture farm. The consequence of such tillage tends to the impoverishment of the land, and it is for this reason that so many landlords have inserted covenants in their leases against breaking pasture land.”

Mr Smith O’Brien is one of those who do so, while he amuses himself with crying for a repeal of the union, as if *it* would repeal the covenants between him and his tenants. If he would do his part as a landlord towards providing that food for Ireland which he blames the government for not providing, he will repeal those covenants, and set himself to teach his tenants how to make their farms productive of food; he will

build habitable houses for them and for the cattle, and contrive to drain the meadow springs into the rivulets, instead of allowing the rivulets to take the farm-yard manure.

Mr Robert O'Brien continues—

"Generally, it may be established as a rule, that it is only the poor lands which have been cottiered, (tilled by a cottier tenantry ;) for, while the population is very large and poor on the hilly lands, you may find but a comparatively small population on the rich lands."

This has arisen from the clearance system. Under the old forty shilling freeholds, previous to 1829, the people, if cleared from the rich lands on the levels, were sent to the mountains to farm there, for the sake of their votes. Many of the hills were occupied by those people rent free, for the sake of their votes ; but when they were disfranchised they were called upon to pay rent, and ejected wherever the land was worth taking possession of, if they did not pay rent. If thus cleared away there, they swelled the measure of pauperism in the towns ; if left there, they became the parents of pauper families on the hills. All that the landlords of the levels did or cared for was to keep them either on the hills or in the towns, or to get them off to England or America, or anywhere, so as they did not come down to take the grass from the horned cattle which were feeding to go to England for rent.

Mr O'Brien proceeds thus, in corroboration of similar statements made by me in previous letters, before I knew that I had such a valuable witness—

"The consolidation of farms is generally that of a number of small farms in tillage, giving subsistence and labour to whole families, into large pasture farms *not requiring any labour* ; for a single herdsman, who receives no money wages, will be able to do all the labour required on a large farm, which, if kept in tillage, would employ a great many hands."

Yet on the farms of Cahermoyle, belonging to Mr Smith O'Brien, and on others near them, even the herdsman have been all the winter and spring on the relief lists of the Board of Works, the farmers, to save the herdsman's diet in the farm-houses, consenting to let some sister, or aunt, or mother, do the herding, that the herdsman might go and earn one shilling and fourpence per day on the relief works, an amount of wages never paid, never heard of, never dreamt of in that part of the country before—wages which even Mr Smith O'Brien, while railing at the government for not paying enough, would not come within fourpence of to his labourers in Cahermoyle demesne.

Relative to the increase of pauper gentry, Mr Robert O'Brien says—

"The great value of land during the war induced many who were of a respectable farming class to sublet their lands, and set up to be gentlemen; and one frequently meets with people who say their father had L.100, L.200, &c. a-year out of such and such lands."

This is another testimony against war, and against any policy of government, peaceful or warlike, which shall force consumption faster than production. Armies are paid out of taxes upon industry, and hundreds of thousands of working men and women are drawn from employment nationally profitable to supply the armies with food and clothing which is nationally unprofitable. It is another testimony against forcing money into circulation in greater amount than the industry of the nation requires to keep it in motion. A large supply of money let loose, or forced into circulation, does not necessarily give an impulse to industry and to the production of real national wealth. Its good or evil effects depend on the currents it gets into—whether it sets people to consume without producing something that is useful to others, or sets them to produce more than they consume. In the time of the war it not only excited a vast consumption, but from the universal ignorance of industrial economy which then prevailed—and which, though not universal, still prevails—the occupiers of land, when the flood-tide of an over-high circulation made eddies at their doors, ceased to work, and ceased to direct the money which flowed to their doors to the farm-fields to pay for more labour, to produce more corn; they took the money and retired with it to eat corn without working; they set themselves up as consumers, ceased to be producers, withdrew the national capital from production, and turned the current into a wrong channel.

The Irish members of Parliament, in crying for money to be poured into Ireland, and also in seeking to have a larger number of idle consumers compelled to reside in the country—the absentee landlords, horses, hounds, and non-producing servants—do not seem to know that more consumption without more production will only make the country poorer. Mr Smith O'Brien, who proposed a few weeks ago to enforce the residence of landowners, under a penalty of a tax of ten per cent. on their incomes, is himself an instance of a landlord who takes rent, buys food, clothes, and personal service with the rent, and adds no value to his land or to anything on the land.

Even those who get together a few thousand pounds by

trade in Limerick, or in other Irish towns, with the exception probably of Belfast, set up as gentry. A tradesman with L.10,000 in the bank, thinks it time to retire from business, and hunt, and keep a carriage and servants. The English manufacturers and merchants do not withdraw from business, to keep a retinue of servants and animals to consume food and clothing, and produce nothing, as soon as they have the means of retiring to be gentry out of business. They add the profits of one year to the capital of the year before, and do more business, create a greater amount of the necessaries and comforts of human requirements, and enable a greater number of human creatures to obtain them.

No. XXVI.

On the Value of Small Farms.

Small farms are a favourite theme with certain parties in England. To relieve the competition for labour they would introduce a competition for land. Let us glance at the results of competition for land in Ireland, and the evidence shewing how many acres are required in different counties to maintain a small farmer and his family.

ANTRIM:—Mr John O'Hara, a farmer who follows an improved style of agriculture, was asked:—"Can you state the smallest quantity of land upon which, in your opinion, a farmer could support himself without extraneous assistance, such as manufactures or anything else?"

"I would not say less than ten or twelve acres, (Irish, equivalent to sixteen or nineteen English,) from the mode of farming which is at present practised."

He gives the details of the cultivation of 8 acres, 15 perches, 26½ yards English measure, under a rotation of crops, and shews, at the end of the statement, "Balance for the labourer and his family, L.14: 8s."

I do not find any other witness in Antrim giving evidence on the same subject.

ARMAGH.—Mr Blacker, land-agent:—"It is considered in England that twelve acres are fully sufficient for the support of a family, but in Sussex five acres have been found sufficient. According to the ordinary method of culture it would require a great deal more, but in the case alluded to in Sussex the improved method of culture is carried into effect; the house-feeding and tanks have produced their effects.

CARLOW.—No evidence on this subject.

CAVAN.—None.

CLARE.—Rev. Mr Corbett, parish priest:—"Six or seven acres (nine and a half to eleven English) are sufficient to support a family on an improved system of agriculture."

Mr Gibson, farmer:—"The smallest farm upon which a family can support themselves is from thirteen to sixteen English acres of medium land."

Mr Keane, land-agent:—"From seven to ten English acres are sufficient to support a family."

It is necessary to observe, however, that the support of a family is reckoned from the standard of diet common to Ireland. In the succeeding quotations I have rendered the Irish acres into English to avoid the repetition of both measures.

CORK.—Mr Barry, farmer:—"The smallest farm sufficient to support a farmer and family is thirty-two acres."

Mr Biggs, farmer and land proprietor:—"Less than thirty-two acres of average land is insufficient to support a family."

Mr Burke, land proprietor:—"Less than thirteen or sixteen acres is not sufficient to maintain a farmer and family."

Mr De la Cour, land-agent:—"Thirty-two acres are capable of supporting a family."

Mr Hunt, land-agent:—"Farms of from thirty-two to forty-eight acres requisite to support families."

DONEGAL.—No direct evidence is tendered on this subject in Donegal. But on the estate of Lord George Hill, at Gweedore, which has attracted much public notice, the farms vary in size from four and three-quarter acres to sixteen. By a new system of culture those farms were supposed to be performing a great social revolution among the rural population. Lord George Hill published "*Facts from Gweedore*;" and the persons engaged in the effort of dividing all the land of Great Britain into farms of two, three, and four acres, republished the "*facts*" to strengthen them in their efforts in Worcestershire and Hertfordshire. But it is also a fact that the tenants of Gweedore are without food, and would have died on their farms but for the corn which commerce has brought from foreign shores to supply them, and but for the funds which the commercial strength of England has supplied to buy that corn.

DOWN.—Mr Sharman Crawford, land proprietor and M.P.:—"I think that the portion of land which a *labouring man* should have would in some degree depend on *the extent of employment which he could get*; if he has constant employment by hired labour, or anything approaching to it, he would require less land. If he is to be dependent for his subsistence on the land he holds he would require more. But I am of opinion that a man wholly dependent on the land he holds for

support, could support himself and his family comfortably having six statute acres of land, and be capable of paying a fair rent, provided he applied it in the best manner to the production of food."

Mr Crawford goes on to say that two acres may be made to grow the food for a family, if that family has employment elsewhere than on those two acres to earn wages. There need be no question about that; the question arises upon the getting of the wages. If it were possible for all the working men of Lancashire to have two acres and their workshop wages, the small farm system would be an excellent thing. But they cannot live upon two acres in Worcestershire and work in the workshops of Lancashire.

DUBLIN.—No evidence. Nor would it be applicable if there was. The county of Dublin is small, and the produce of the miniature farms is sold in the city, and shipped to England to people engaged in trade. According to Mr O'Connor's book on Small Farms, the intention is to divide Great Britain, for the direct purpose of destroying the manufacturing system. Yet he calculates all the prices to be received for farm produce sold and consumed off the farm to be the same as the prices of 1843, the year when the book was written.

FERMANAGH.—Mr Mair and Mr Mylne:—"We are both agriculturists, brought from Scotland by Lord Erne, to instruct the farmers in improved cultivation. House feeding has been much introduced since we came here among the small farmers. They are feeling the benefit of the improved system very much. (Mr Mylne)—Ten acres is small enough for any farmer. (Mr Mair)—I think if he has nobody but himself, five is enough for him to work by the spade. It will take two men to labour ten acres by the spade."

"You think a man could maintain himself on five acres?"—"Yes; if they have large families they could go out to service."

But if each family in the kingdom had five acres, and there were no manufactures and commerce, existing exclusively as such, where would be the service to go to? And when there was no service to go to, nor commercial cities, nor manufacturing districts, where would be the farms of five acres? They would be divided among the children as they grew up, as the case is now in Ireland and France, and reduced to perches and farm ridges measured only by the yard. If not so divided, the children would have to go to try their hands at trade again; make an effort to establish manufactures and commerce again. Would it not be as well to let them remain, and let every working man endeavour to raise himself, and help to

raise those around him, above his present social level, by the acquisition of property which he can hold, and still retain his employment in the places of manufactures and commerce?

GALWAY.—Reverend Mr Griffin, parish priest :—“ Farms of four and three quarters acres of good land, near the sea, for manure, are sufficient to maintain a family, if employed in the fisheries.”

KERRY.—Mr Holme, land-agent :—“ Farms of fourteen and sixteen acres are sufficient, if cultivated by spade, to support and supply labour to a family.”

KILDARE.—Mr Wilson, farmer and agent :—“ Competition for small farms very great.”

KILKENNY.—Mr Reade, land proprietor :—“ The size of farms is becoming smaller from the increase of population. Less than sixteen acres not sufficient to support a farmer.”

KING'S COUNTY.—Mr Lacy, farmer :—“ A farm of sixteen acres is the least which can support a family.”

Mr J. H. Walsh, land proprietor, of King's County, and intimately connected with the parish of Drum, in Roscommon, presented a statement carefully drawn up, setting forth the number of acres occupied by three classes of occupants, their rents and social condition. The most important portions are here quoted ; but it must not be forgotten that the dietary of the farmers and families refers to 1844 and years of ordinary prosperity, when dependent on their acres of land, and not, as in 1847, when the commerce of England is feeding them from foreign shores.

“ Total small farms, 838. Of these there are, first class, 146 ; in second class, 484 ; in third class, 208. The average acres of the holdings is ten English acres ; rent, L.6 : 15 : 8 each farm. (The precise measure of each seems to be omitted.)

“ Diet—Class I.—Potatoes and milk in abundance ; oatmeal, butter, and eggs, four months ; meat six or eight times in the years.

“ Class II.—Potatoes ; milk half the year ; butter, eggs, and meal occasionally ; meat twice a-year.

“ Class III.—Potatoes insufficient ; milk, none ; eggs and meal rarely ; meal perhaps twice a-year.”

LEITRIM.—Reverend Mr Evers, parish priest :—“ The average size of farms is six or eight acres ; many from two to four acres. It requires a farm to contain from eight to twelve acres to support a family.”

LIMERICK.—Mr Roche, farmer :—“ A farm of sixteen acres sufficient to support a family comfortably.”

Mr Monsell, land proprietor, states that there is no class of labourers in Limerick county who depend entirely on money wages. He pays some of his labourers by giving them land,

they paying the rent in labour ; and to others he gives conacre, potato ground for one crop only. He says he endeavours to regulate the wages in some degree according to the size of the families, by giving one shilling in summer and tenpence in winter ; “ no other person in the county,” he says, “ giving more than eightpence.”

In the letter dated from Rathkeale, which gave an account of the county as seen from the road between Limerick and that place, the agriculture was probably made to appear better than it really is. I mentioned the village of Patrick’s Well. Mr Monsell, speaking of his attendance at the petty sessions as a magistrate at that place, says, on the 26th of Aug. 1844—

“ It is decidedly desirable to have my labourers holding their ground immediately from myself. There was a curious instance occurred at the petty sessions at Patrick’s Well on Friday last ; there was a man who appeared before us, and it came out in the course of his examination that he paid *thirty days’ work for four perches of ground, and he built a house upon the ground himself*. The person he held from held eight acres and a-half, and he paid L.3 : 8 : 5 per acre, the outside value of the land being about L.2 the acre. He held it from a middleman, and that middleman from another, and he held it again from the head landlord ; and I should say such cases are not rare.”

Here we have the competition for land producing five gradations of tenant misery, the lowest tenant paying for four perches of land, the work of thirty days, and building his hovel besides. Yet with those appalling facts known to him, Mr Feargus O’Connor, himself an Irish middleman once, and deriving whatever knowledge he has of agriculture from his experience as a middleman who lived on the rents of a wretched under tenancy, attempts to introduce this pernicious competition for land in England, by parcelling the English soil into two acre, three acre, and four acre farms to begin with. At least he attempts to make the working-men of England believe that they would be independent of the wages of labour and the competition in wages if they had the land.

Mr Monsell proceeds :—

“ Subletting and dividing of farms still continues ; chiefly in the way of people endeavouring to divide even very small farms for the sake of allocating portions to their children.”

Would not all England, if divided, as propounded by Mr Feargus O’Connor, into small farms of four acres, have to be divided again to allocate portions to chartist children ? Listen to the questions and answers which expose the poverty of those

parts of Ireland where the population in desperation are still able to get some of the land to divide :—

“What, in your opinion, is the general effect of the system?”
 —“The general effect is to produce wretchedness and misery beyond description. The condition of the labourers who do not receive constant employment is very miserable indeed. I have had occasion to make a list of the persons in my parish, in which there is a good deal of employment given to the poor, and they are a good deal looked after, and I find the people are in general in a very destitute state. Out of 600 or 700, there are 158 in a state of very great destitution ; they are in a state of great poverty, because they are only partly employed.”

Yet those people have, on an average, more than the breadth of land to each family that is to be allotted to the chartist prizeholders in England ; and it is better land than that at O'Connorville, or any other in the county of Hertford. It may be alleged that the rent in Ireland eats up the produce and the profit, and that the chartist prizeholders would be differently circumstanced, having no rent to pay. But their liabilities are equal to a heavy rent at the very outset ; while the absence of rent does not save the occupiers from destitution when the land is minutely subdivided. Mr Monsell continues :

“There is one spot in the parish where the proprietor allowed people to settle and charged them no rent, and the state of absolute destitution in which those people are it is impossible to describe.” (This was in 1844.)

“Are those people, generally speaking, willing to work if they can get it !”—“Yes, perfectly willing.”

One source of the delusion under which working men in England have been induced to become shareholders in Feargus O'Connor's land company is the fictitious quantity of produce alleged by him to be derivable from the land.

But I shall not at present pursue the subject further. The English working population have neither been so well cared for, nor have they cared so well for themselves, as should have been and as will be ; but it is not by a system of general pauperism upon minute portions of land that they are to make a change for the better—they must go forward, not turn back.

No. XXVII.

Journey from Banagher to Birr, King's County.

I found myself a few days ago seated on one of Bianconi's cars with a clergyman of the Established Church. Our conversation turned upon topics of common interest, which I have not before written of in this series of letters. It is therefore repeated here.

Whistler—Why is this arch broken down half the width of the road? It seems dangerous to drive here, even in daylight; it must be worse at night; why is the arch broken?

Clergyman—It was broken by the people, in the night time, three months ago, under the impression, silly creatures, that they would prevent the transport of meal from Birr to the Shannon. The mills at Birr grind meal, and it is taken by this road to Shannon harbour, and from thence by canal to Dublin. The poor ignorant people saw it going, and fearing that none would be left in King's county, they attempted to break down the bridges—this and another between Banagher and Birr. They found the masonry too hard for them to make fast progress, and the police were brought upon them before they got more mischief done than you see. The peasantry here are very ignorant.

Whistler—I am glad to have at last met an Irish gentleman who does not justify such an interference with the free buying, selling, and carrying of corn and flour.

Clergyman—What! am I to understand by your saying so, that you have met any person, holding a respectable position in society, who has justified such an interference with the conveyance of corn and flour?

Whistler—The county newspaper, the county gentlemen, magistrates, priests, and all the clergy whom I have hitherto met in conversation, until I met you, not only have justified such an interference, they have advocated it, and condemned the government in angry words because such violence to the free buying, selling, and transport of food has not been general throughout Ireland. The last time I was in a clergyman's society he said that Lord John Russell was answerable for all the deaths arising from famine in Ireland. He said the government should have interfered to bring down the prices of corn and meal, and to take the trade out of the hands of the merchants.

Clergyman—And so do I say. Indeed I am as forward as any one you will find to say that government is answerable for the starvation of the people. But there is no analogy

between that and the poor ignorant people breaking down the bridge to interrupt the traffic of the road, is there?

Whistler—There is. The analogy would be perfect, the ignorance, error, and mischief the same in both cases, were it not that the education and ability to reflect calmly of gentlemen like yourself makes your case worse than that of the ignorant peasantry. You would have government to do violence to the usual channels of commerce, which are as indispensable to the procuration of food and its minute distribution over the kingdom, as those roads and bridges are over the King's county.

Clergyman—Well now, really, upon my word you surprise me—quite surprise me; do you compare and class together a crime of an ignorant and excited mob of people with an act which would have been the glory of an enlightened ministry, if we had been blest with one?

Whistler—But I deny that the ministry which would have undertaken the task of buying corn and grinding and distributing meal to the whole Irish nation would have been a blessing, on the contrary, it would have been a curse to Ireland and to England. The merchants are now bringing corn in such quantities that the prices are falling every day, and will fall. Had the Queen's ministers gone into the corn markets of the world, instead of the merchants, they could not have bought such quantities of corn but at an enormous price, if at all. They must have paid the merchants to buy the corn, and have competed for the freightage of ships. As it is, the merchants buy the corn without being paid by government to do so, and they get ships to carry it without government competing with them and raising the price of freights. And had government not gone into the markets of the world, but passed a law or decree that corn, when brought here by the merchants, should be sold at a certain low price—the merchants, supposing this law to have been applied to them in the autumn of last year, would not have been now pouring in the hundreds of heavily laden corn ships every week into all the ports of the kingdom. We should now have corn high in price, with absolute famine for the whole kingdom, which even mercantile enterprise could not subdue. As it is, we have now a fair prospect of corn at a moderate price.

The clergyman remains silent for several minutes. We meet and pass a jaunting car, on which is seated Mr Jones, the engineer of the Board of Works, and another gentleman, and he asks our driver who the other gentleman with Mr Jones is. The driver supposes him to be one of the assistant engineers. We go a quarter of a mile further, and pass some men and women breaking stones for the roads, and an over-

seer and a check-clerk measuring some of the stone heaps to settle the payment. We go a little farther, and meet a pay-clerk of the Board of Works on a car, with a guard of police over him and the money he carries. At last my reverend companion speaks.

Look there ! see what mismanagement, to have all those officials under the Board of Works, drawing the money in salaries which the poor people should receive as relief. The last published return of persons employed and of cash paid by the Board of Works—the return for the week ending on the 20th of March, gives—here it is ; I have it in my pocket-book—gives a total of 685,932 persons, of whom 664,432 were on the roads, and 20,490 employed on drainage. The cost of the whole was L.228,940, of which sum the superintendence costs not less than L.22,454. Is it not monstrous that so many persons at such salaries should be employed in the superintendence of those works, and yet with their great absorption of the public money acting most inefficiently, and not giving satisfaction to any one ?

Whistler.—And not giving satisfaction though well paid. Even good pay does not seem powerful enough to obtain a thoroughly practical staff of working public officers. Time and practice are required before 12,000 men can fully understand their several duties and perform them efficiently. But if 12,000 officers are required for these relief works, which are chiefly in digging earth and breaking stones, and are not able, numerous though they be, to keep the people honest in the handling of shovelfuls of earth and barrowfuls of stones, nor quite able to keep all of themselves honest, how many officers do you think would have been required to buy corn over all the world, ship it at foreign ports, land it in Irish ports, hire storehouses for it, send it to the mills to be ground, pay for conveyance and for grinding, sell the meal wholesale at the mills and stores, and retail in every parish and village in Ireland ; keeping accounts in ledgers, for the satisfaction of parliament, of every pound weight and half pound of meal sold ? Has it been a subject of calculation with you, to try to reach, even at a guess, the number of officials who would have been required to carry on a system of government corn and provision dealing, and book-keeping of that magnitude ? They would have to be reckoned, not by thousands, as the engineers and overseers on the relief works are, but by hundreds of thousands. All the clerks, book-keepers, and mercantile servants in the United Kingdom would have been called from private employment, and would have been still too few in number. A supervision to secure honesty would have been utterly

impossible. Peculation and fraud would have been universal. Merchants would have ceased to engage in the corn trade, and government would have been obliged to engage the merchants as public servants. Supplies of corn would not and could not have poured into the country as they are now pouring in. We should have had one vast mass of famine, fraud, robbery, and ruin.

The Clergyman is again silent. The Whistler, as the car jolts and jingles along, and some more wretched looking people are passed breaking stones on the roadside, pulls from his pocket a small volume and reads. The Clergyman sees the title of it on the back of the boards, and says—

I see you have got the "Black Prophet," Carleton's "Tale of the Irish Famine." What do you think of Darby Skinadre, the meal-dealer, in that book?

Whistler—He is represented as ill-looking, as a hypocrite, a usurer, a miser, a cheat, and a coward. None of those qualities are amiable; when all are combined they certainly make up a most odious man.

Clergyman—Yet a man sketched from reality. He is only a fair specimen of a griping crew of usurers and misers who horde up meal and sell it in times of distress in Ireland.

Whistler—Do no honest men horde up meal and sell it? The exalted virtue of doing so seems worthy of an honest man!

Clergyman—What! horde up the meal and sell it at an extravagant usurious price! It is hardly like the work of an honest man.

Whistler—As Mr Carleton makes Darby Skinadre the only meal-dealer of his district, and makes all the people obliged to resort to him for meal, what would have become of those people if Darby Skinadre had not had meal to sell to them? Would they not have perished utterly? Instead of being a cruel hard-hearted man, he was a benefactor whom they should have blessed and prayed for.

Clergyman—But the extortion of the man is the point in his character reprobated.

Whistler—Then they should have prayed for more meal-dealers, or have endeavoured to make more meal-dealers, and prices would have been kept down by competition.

Clergyman—They would more probably have been kept up by combination.

Whistler—When there is less food than enough, the prices go up, and no combination can keep them down. When there is more food than enough, no combination can keep them up, nor get them up. But the real question is this:—As a sense of

self-preservation—an affection for children, for wife, parents, home, country—as neither duty to neighbours nor duty to God would teach the inhabitants of Darby Skinadree's country to provide meal for themselves, not for an unforeseen famine, but for a frequent occurrence of want regular almost as the return of the summer months, (so we are informed in Mr Carleton's tale, and so also in the great blue books of the Devon Commission,) other human motives operated to provide meal for them—a desire to adventure in speculation and to realize a high profit. When there was less famine, Darby would get less profit; when there was no famine he would get no profit. We may infer that in some years he would have a dead loss, as the farmers who bought from him in time of famine, and who found enough on their own farms in time of plenty, would not in the latter case resort to his shop. To induce him to adventure in the trade of meal at all he must have looked for profit, and have got one year of gain to pay the losses of years without gain. Mr Carleton is a forcible writer. In proportion to his literary power is the force of the satire he has written on his humble countrymen, unwittingly, while intending only to satirize the most useful class of men which can exist in the time of famine—men with meal to sell. Had Captain Bligh, with his boat's crew, when deserted by the mutineers of the *Bounty*, not apportioned the small store to the breadth of the ocean before them, he would not have saved that crew. But he had eleven days' allowance to spare when he reached the haven he had sailed for. Had not Darby Skinadree stored up meal, Mave Sullivan could not have been generous, nor could she have lived to be married. Darby is made to look odious in personal appearance because he sells meal in a time of famine. A Galway fox-hunter, according to that style of literary cant—a cant not peculiar to Mr Carleton, but to all our popular novelists—would have been a fine-looking, gallant fellow, generous and worthy of every man's esteem and every lady's love, though he kept half a county in a state of agricultural disorder and waste. A legend of the goose that was killed for the golden eggs is the kind of story which should be written to illustrate an Irish famine. No subject ever probed by novelist's pen abounds with better materials for dramatic situations, pathetic narrative, natural description, and sound, healthy sentiment.

Clergyman—Perhaps you will write it?

Whistler—It does not follow that I can, because I say it might be written, yet it is possible that I may try. The corn field and the flowery meadow, the busy workshop and the

manufacturing town; the struggle of the sound sentiment with the false; the rise and fall of the men who are apostles of the one or victims of the other; territorial feudalism clinging to the skirts of advancing commerce to hold it back, that it may still be governed by it; the principle of progress struggling for existence and space to advance among the millions of working men, some of whom clear a way for it and help it on, others of whom fell it on the head with sledge hammers. The actors in this mighty drama are of every social degree: Squires, whose office is to halloo the hounds and keep human progress under foot; merchants, whose office it is to gird the earth with brotherhood; manufacturers, whose destiny it is to rise in power and position above the lords of territory; lords of territory who open their eyes and discover that they have been in error, and who join with the rest of mankind, and march on gloriously in the front ranks of progress; lords of territory who will not open their eyes and see that the great tide of time is leaving them; wives, children, hope, love, joy, sorrow, famine, pestilence, self-devotion, fire-sides, with happy children around them; summer corn, green and growing; harvests ripe and plentiful, and human hopes ripening like the corn—those are some of the materials which would readily rise to carry out and diffuse upon society the healthy doctrines of industrial economy. If I do not attempt the task it will rather be that I mistrust my power to do it justice than the possibility of making the subject popular. If I do attempt it, I shall do so in the belief that I am performing for society a service.

No. XXVIII.

COLLOONEY, COUNTY OF SLIGO.

The county of Sligo is in most respects similar to Mayo already written of in these letters, by which it is bounded on the west. It has on the south, part of Mayo and Roscommon; on the east Leitrim—the Lancashire of two hundred years ago; and on the west the Atlantic Ocean, which might carry Sligo over all the world, but which only carries it to the river Clyde in Scotland, to sell its butter, eggs, and oatmeal. The people of Glasgow who work in iron, coal, cotton, and other articles of national manufacture, consume and pay for the oats, oatmeal, and butter of Sligo and Mayo. I shall devote the next letter, or part of it, to thoughts on industrial economy suggested by this fact—that the inhabitants of Ren-

frewshire and Lanarkshire in Scotland, counties not more fertile than Mayo, Sligo, and Leitrim, not better stored with minerals, and less favourably situated for ocean transit, should be the chief wealth givers to Mayo, Sligo, and Leitrim, by paying for their agricultural produce. This letter shall take a general view of the county of Sligo.

It is forty-one miles long from east to west, and thirty-eight miles broad from north to south, measured from its extremities. The town of Sligo is 131 miles north-west of Dublin. Its extent in acres is 461,753, of which 290,696 are set down as arable, 151,723 uncultivated, 6134 in plantations, 460 in towns, and 12,740 under water. The soil is variable, some of it on mountains, much of it level; some of it a light sandy loam which the wind makes sport of; other parts, and they are extensive, a deep loam of generous fertility. Bogs are interspersed. Limestone is the subsoil on the levels. It has several lakes and short rivers, but the rivers are strong though short, and they are not all idle as some of the great rivers are in other counties. They drive water-wheels and grind meal, and perform other offices to help men to work. The falls on those streams unite the qualities of utility and beauty.

The population in 1841 was 180,886; their occupations are agricultural; oats, potatoes, and butter being the chief products. There is also some wheat grown, and the soil is suited to grow much more; but the climate is probably too moist for wheat; the moisture, however, would be favourable to green crops and stall-feeding, by which system only can manure be got and applied profitably to agriculture. But Sligo has no farm-buildings suitable for such a system, and few landlords if any willing or able to undertake their erection.

The county contained, in 1841, 7969 horses, 45,839 horned cattle, 32,708 sheep, 12,805 pigs, 164,372 head of poultry, and 3846 asses, all being of the estimated value of L.424,146.

The town of Ballina being mostly in Mayo, though partly in Sligo, the latter county has no town containing more than 2000 inhabitants, save that which gives the shire its name. The population of Sligo town is 12,272; they are a busy, industrious people, and by their industry disprove, so far as they are concerned, that general but doubtful assertion, that a Celtic population is not constitutionally fitted for commerce and industrial enterprise.

We once used to hear that it was the Catholic religion which disqualified the Irish for industrial enterprise. The people of Belgium, who are all Catholics, and at the same

time marching in the front ranks of industry and civilisation, disprove that assertion ; and we seldom hear of it now. But we hear now of the inferiority of the Celtic race to the Saxon. The leaders in Irish politics are, in some measure, to blame for provoking this odious comparison, at least for keeping it in activity. I, as a Saxon, do not believe in the natural incapacity of the Celts for becoming a commercial people. We have Saxons in England as inapt for commerce, and seemingly as ill able to search for and understand the true sources of all wealth, as any Connaught peasant ; I allude to the mis-educated landed aristocracy. Suppose we look to the Celt, and see him affectionate to excess ; full of love for the land of his birth ; trustful in leaders who appeal to his generous confidence ; faithful to the chieftains of the land ; reverential of traditional authority ; a natural-born Conservative ; all of which qualities are in themselves positive virtues ; may we not see that his faithfulness to territorial chieftainship, his belief with the mis-educated chieftains of territory that the land is the source of all wealth, has retained him on the land, and made him its serf and its pauper ?

To those qualities of constitution we may add his hardihood in bearing fatigue and hunger ; we may even add his contentedness with misery, which is a virtue of high quality degenerated into a vice, taken advantage of and abused by the objects of his social veneration, the landed chiefs of society. None of those qualities singly, nor all put together, afford a reason for believing the Celt disqualified by nature for commercial enterprise. But they afford a reason for his adherence to the land, and for his trustfulness in the landed chieftains, while *their* prejudices and contempt for the commercial spirit and industrial adventurers of their country is a sufficient reason why the Celt living on their land, clothed with tradition, bound with it, should not readily forsake them and seek subsistence elsewhere. It is at this point that the virtue of endurance and willing fellowship with misery ceases to be a virtue.

The Saxon has, in some countries, but only in some, emancipated himself from this bondage to acres of land and the owners of acres ; and his race when once emancipated and free to taste the sweets of personal wealth, the excitement of commercial enterprise goes fast forward. The Saxons of America never knew the bondage ; had it not been broken in England, their forefathers would never have peopled America. But the time is still recent when the English people lived in social wretchedness as deep as that of the Irish now, with nothing but landlords above them, nothing but land below them, and

very little but famine and pestilence on each side. And the time is still more recent when the Scotch were in that condition.

The Saxon race, as represented by the English and lowland Scotch, would seem to have more aptitude for self-emancipation than the Celtic race as represented in Ireland; or rather, more impatience under servitude, out of which arises the aptitude for commercial enterprise, which, practised through many generations, becomes the Saxon inheritance, and would become the inheritance of any race if that race were fairly set in motion.

This view of the subject might be followed up by many proofs from the Irish in America, and from instances becoming more and more common in Ireland itself. Sligo, with a Celtic population, is one of the instances. But that town also affords a proof of the suicidal policy of landlordism. The grand jurors of the county, instead of rejoicing to see a rising town of commerce, to make a market for their farm produce; instead of helping that town to grow and become strong with a healthy trade, they see in it only a strength upon which they may lay a burthen. The expense of making county roads, of maintaining the county police, which are almost exclusively made and maintained for the benefit of the landed interests, has been laid upon the town, while, for the thoroughfares of the town itself, the county cess is withheld.

The county of Sligo affords an instance of the feebleness of the "agricultural mind," even when turned in a right direction, which is worth relating; the more so as it is one of those cases sometimes referred to, to shew the impossibility of improving the Celtic population:—

The Rev. Lewis Porter, rector of Drumard, went before the Land Commissioners in 1844, on behalf of Edward Joshua Cooper, Esq., of Marknee Castle in Sligo, owner of large estates, and at that time a member of parliament. He laid four documents before the commissioners, one of which was a letter from Mr Cooper, written in 1841, stating that he would establish an industrial school on the estate, with workshops to clothe the people, and give them furniture and a model farm, to teach them agriculture. The second was a set of formal resolutions passed by certain gentlemen who called a meeting to thank Mr Cooper for his intentions; the third was a letter written in very extravagant terms of praise, also thanking Mr Cooper for his intentions; and the fourth was a set of rules for the school and workshops. Four apprentices were to be taken and made tailors, four shoemakers, four smiths, and four carpenters. They were to be taught trades at Mr

Cooper's expense. So his letter stated; but it also stated that they were to be lodged, and dieted, and provided "with decent clothing" by their parents. They were to be bound to Mr Cooper for five years, but to be discharged sooner if found to be competent workmen. The agricultural pupils were also to be apprenticed five years. Only two pupils applied for admission to the school of agriculture, one of whom is somewhere in Clare, the rector says, and the other in Scotland, where he went to work as a labourer, having got a small sum of money to carry him there. The farm and school did not pay their expenses, and were given up in two years and a half from the date of commencement. There were plenty of applications to the trades to be apprenticed; one shop had its full complement of four, the second had three, the third had three, and the fourth had two. But the tailors' shop was set on fire, and none of the shops were "encouraged by the people and the gentry, and the tenants," says the rector, as was expected. The people, it seems, who had tailors and shoemakers elsewhere did not all leave those tailors and shoemakers and go to Mr Cooper's workshops and buy clothes and shoes. The scheme did not pay, and was abandoned, as the agricultural school was, in two years and a half. There was no religious nor political opposition to it, only the people would not buy the goods made in the shops in sufficient quantity to make the scheme pay. Mr Cooper, disgusted with their ingratitude, disheartened, and his patience worn out, chose rather to lose L.1000, which the whole buildings, tools, fixtures, and masters had cost him, than go on longer and lose more. So, returning to Brighton, from whence his first letter was dated, to tell them how ungrateful and impracticable the Celtic Irish are, he sent the rector of the parish also to tell the Devon Commissioners that it was of no use to try to elevate the Irish. He, Mr Cooper, had tried shoemaking, tailoring, carpentering, and smith work in general, for two years and a half, and though his apprentices were bound for five years, he had to give up business in disgust, because they had not learned their trades in half the time, and because the people did not buy the things they made fast enough to make the scheme a paying one. The rector also speaks of the people's insensibility to this "charity" of their landlord, who thus laid out L.1000 for their benefit, which they did not repay by their purchases.

A tradesman on his own account would have had to endure a longer trial than Mr Cooper did, and keep his apprentices to the end of their time. Perhaps the last half of the five years would have found the apprentices more expert and

their work more saleable. But if not, what right had Mr Cooper to expect that he would get all the trade from other tailors and shoemakers to his shops, for work sold at full price and done by apprentices, "lodged and dieted, and provided with decent clothes by their parents?"

And the failure of this scheme, prematurely closed through the landlord's ill-humour, is adduced as an instance of the opposition of the Celtic population to improvement! It would be interesting to hear the rector tell what he thinks would have been the conduct of the Saxons under such circumstances.

I have alluded to the religion of the Irish people, and said that the Belgians are Catholics and hold a front-rank place in the progress of civilisation; yet it is true that the adherence of the Irish to the Catholic faith has been a barrier to their advancement in agriculture and the industrial sciences; not, however, in the manner alleged by those who use this argument against Catholicism; but by the opposite party debarring the Catholic from the rights and privileges of free citizens by the penal laws.

The penal laws directed by political Protestants against the Irish Catholics were various, one of them forbade that any Roman Catholic should *purchase* land under any circumstances; or hold land upon any lease, not even to build a house upon it, for more than thirty-one years. But the Catholic could not even hold the land, on which he might build, for thirty-one years; his lease was void if the land produced him more profit than one-third of the rent paid by him under the lease. He was not likely to build good houses on such land, nor to exercise much skill and industry in its cultivation; for if the crops were of more value than one-third of the rent above the rent contracted for in the lease, the lease in like manner became waste paper.

The Catholic people were pressed into the deepest degradation by these laws, and became occupiers only. The head landlords were in most cases political servants, not the most exalted in character, of the English sovereigns. They obtained the Irish estates as rewards, and sent men of desperate fortunes, not disqualified by law, to hold the estates as leaseholders, which leaseholders became middlemen, by parcelling out the land among the Catholics who were disqualified to hold it on lease. Hence arose the pernicious system of middlemen, not entirely overcome yet, though gradually on the decline. Hence arose the custom of the landlord and the middleman taking everything from the occupiers of the land, and giving nothing, no house to live in, barn, stable, shed, road, ditch, gate, or

bridge. Hence arose the custom of having all houses, barns, stables, sheds, roads, ditches, gates, and bridges of the worst kind, the occupiers being called upon to make them and pay for them, and being afraid to make the land look as if it were valuable, a custom still existing save in respect of roads and bridges, which the landed gentry have had constructed under their own direction, as grand jurors of counties, the occupiers still being called upon to pay for them.

The widest divergencies of governments from the principles of political economy have always given birth to the most widely spread human ills, and have incurred the heaviest retribution. Wars and religious persecutions are the widest divergencies from political economy. The Catholics persecuted the Protestants, and the Protestants persecuted the Catholics ; terrible has been the retribution to both. The State Protestants in Ireland, and the landed proprietors as a class, have been the most recently engaged in persecution, and they seem, as a class, to be marked out by the economic laws of nature for ultimate and immediate punishment.

There is no mystery in the operation of those laws of cause and effect called political economy. Nor is there hardship or cruelty in them. To fall from the branch of a tree too weak to bear our weight, and be bruised with the fall, is a hardship ; but it originated in our hardihood, or blindness, and not in the force of gravity—the immutable law of nature—which brought us to the ground.

It does not follow, however, that everything is correct which writers have chosen to call political economy, the doctrine of Malthus about population, and some other of his doctrines, are diametrically opposed to political economy, though he is called one of its writers.

The granting of leases to make forty shilling freeholds for political purposes ; their subsequent abolition for political purposes in 1829—they being abolished to qualify Catholic emancipation—and the granting and withholding of the L.10 leases, since these, according to the political views of the landlords, are all economic errors returning upon the landowners of Ireland with retribution, bringing them diminished rents on one side, and new bills for poor rates on the other.

In Sligo, the tenants are placed, displaced, and replaced, under political considerations as elsewhere. In Sligo, a large proportion of the land is in the hands of lawyers as elsewhere. Not far from the town there is an estate now belonging to a lawyer, who was engaged upon it professionally, and whose costs in law business relating to it were so great, that, on the property being offered for sale, nobody would have it with the

attorney's costs on it. The attorney bode for it, and got it himself in payment of his costs. His first step was to make political capital of the land. He ejected the old tenants. Some of them put up rushes and sods in the ditches by the sides of the roads and slept under them, and he brought actions at law against them for so doing, under the name of regaining forcible possession.

No. XXIX.

SLIGO.

However defective the agriculture of the west of Ireland may be now, it has, so the general testimony says, been worse. The erections of mills at Sligo, Westport, Galway, Belmullet, and other sea-coast places, to grind the oats into meal, and the settlement there of merchants to buy the oats and meal, has had the effect of gradually bringing oats to the markets in greater bulk, and in bringing land into cultivation within reach of the markets to supply the oats.

It is worthy of notice that Glasgow, Liverpool, and London are the chief places where the farm produce of Sligo and Mayo is shipped to, finally sold at, and consumed. More of it goes to Glasgow than to any of the other ports of the united kingdom. The great population, whose industrious hands in the shires of Lanark and Renfrew, in and around Glasgow, give value to the coals and iron natural to those shires and to the cotton imported there, not only pay for and eat the farm produce of Lanark and Renfrew, and other shires in the west of Scotland, they buy fat bullocks, and eat beef from Stirling and Perth, northward, and from the south-eastern counties of Haddington, Berwick, and Roxburgh; while they at the same time put their hands in their pockets and pull out money and pay for the oats, oatmeal, butter, and pork of the west of Ireland.

Lancashire, in like manner, but to a greater extent, pays for and consumes the farm produce of the east and south of Ireland, of the adjoining counties of England and Wales, and a considerable proportion of the bullocks and fat wethers, and the wheat of the English counties east and north of Manchester. The prices paid for such produce go to pay agricultural wages and agricultural rents. The nearer the position of the one to the other, or the freer the communication between the factory shires which eat and pay for their eating, and the farm-yard shires which produce food to eat and

receive the payment for it, the higher are the agricultural wages and the agricultural rents.

"A truism," you may exclaim in Manchester; "we know all this: tell us something new." Were this paper only to be read in Manchester, or within fifty miles of it, what has just been said, and what is about to be said, would probably be omitted. But there are still a great many people who do not understand the true sources of agricultural wages and rents, and possibly some of them may read this. I write for them.

Let us suppose that some of them are Galway fox-hunters. I have been several times with the Galway hounds and hunters within those few weeks bygone, and I can answer for it, that finer horses, bolder horsemen, more awful leaps, better hounds, and more cunning foxes are seldom to be seen, perhaps never to be seen; let us therefore suppose that this letter is addressed to a Galway fox-hunter, or the men of the stable and the kennel who adore the fox-hunter because he hunts in Galway and does not live in England; or the men of the Galway hovels and farm-yards, who look upon the men of the stables and kennels who serve and adore the fox-hunters, and upon the fox-hunters, as the true patrons of Galway agriculture. Those last say that, if every owner of land in Galway, Mayo, and Sligo would stay at home and keep horses and hounds, and hunt, and consume the produce of the farms, and spend the rents at home, it would be well for all of them. "See!" they exclaim "the numbers of grooms and helpers in the stables whom they would have; see the tradesmen they would employ by spending their rents here. See how easy it would be for the Galway, Mayo, and Sligo farmers to pay their rents if rent was spent at home. See how much employment they could give to labourers then; everybody would be well employed!"

As the fox-hunter of Galway has a supreme contempt for all such mean men as engage in trade, we shall believe for a minute or two, as he certainly believes every day of his life, and as all his family race believe through every generation, that to consume oats and hay with horses, oatmeal with hounds, and the flesh of cattle, and sheep, and pigs, with men who assist him in living a pleasant life, is the best way of spending rent. Let us suppose that neither Galway, Westport, Belmullet, Newport, Sligo, nor any other port is permitted to send away a barrel of oats or oatmeal, a firkin of butter, a pig, sheep, or horned beast, dead or alive, that everything produced in Galway, Mayo, and Sligo is consumed there. Let us suppose that

two divisions of the people are made, one division to hunt foxes and consume the farm produce and spend the rents, the other division to labour on the farms, provide corn and cattle, and pay the rents, and what do we see before us? I think there is a wall before us that even a Galway fox-hunter would stand at.

What rent would the consuming division *have* to expend for the benefit of the producing division? If the consuming power of both divisions be just equal to the producing power of the division which works, they cannot have more than food; they cannot advance in comforts; they may retrograde, but they will not advance. The rent which the producers will pay can only be the corn and hay of the horses, oatmeal of the hounds, beef and bread and beer of the fox-hunters and servants. The latter, consuming all the rent, will have none to pay for whips to the whipmakers, boots to the bootmakers, scarlet coats to the tailors.

If they be, as a division, possessed of greater consuming powers than the ability to produce of the other division, they will get less than enough of corn and hay, beef, bread, and beer, and will be still farther from paying for whips, boots, and scarlet coats.

If, however, they consume less than the producing divisions can furnish, some oats and hay, bread, beef, and beer will be left in the hands of the producers, who will sell it, pay the price of it to the fox-hunters as rent, who, in their turn, will pay the whipmaker, bootmaker, and tailor. It is clear that the greater the number of persons who merely consume without producing, the poorer must all be.

The fox-hunter's tailor, boot and whip maker, may think, and they do think, that fox-hunting is good for trade. So far as they may be individually and immediately concerned, they reason aright. They are employed in adding by their skill and labour a greater value to cloth and leather than cloth or leather possessed before. But if they were employed in adding value to cloth and leather for the benefit of a person engaged in adding value to timber and iron, they would be adding more to the world's wealth than they do by making boots and scarlet coats for fox-hunters who consume and produce nothing.

The men who give additional value to timber and iron, whether they fell the trees and quarry the ironstone, or stand by the right hand of Robert Stephenson and help that right hand to execute a new creation, are all, with a compound interest of industry, adding value to value, wealth to wealth. The owner of accumulated capital, who spreads the sails of com-

merce on the oceans of the world, to bring together materials for their workmanship, is one of them. So is the owner of accumulated spindles, looms, hammers, anvils, and workshops. The more which one man can do himself by his labour, or by his skill, or by his enterprise, or by his savings of industry, or by his inheritance of another's savings, to add value to something which again produces value; and the larger the number of other persons which he can assist in adding value to something useful, the more useful to the world is he himself. He is the employer of producers. Good as it is to produce by one's own labour, it is a more valuable performance to give the power of production to a number of persons who would not otherwise have it.

Some eyes see no difference between the fox-hunting squire who gives employment and wages to whipmakers, spurmakers, bootmakers, saddlers, tailors, and upholsterers, and the mill working manufacturer, who employs and pays wages to mechanics, spinners, weavers, dyers, clerks, brokers, and so forth. But the difference is, that the first makes every one work inwards for himself—the unit, the one atom of nine hundred millions; while the latter makes every one work outwards to the markets of the world, to reach as many of the nine hundred millions as possible, them all if he can.

An owner of money may withdraw his own labour and skill and enterprise from the world, and yet leave his capital in business to help others to make the raw matter of the world more valuable. The world, by his retirement, possesses less than it possessed before, by the amount of his personal labour, skill, or enterprise. If he betakes himself to a country mansion and keeps horses to eat corn and hay; servants who only minister to his pleasure, and who eat bread and meat; if he buys whips and scarlet coats, and top-boots, and hounds, and feeds the hounds, and rides after them fifty miles a-day, over fences and through fields, where ewes in lamb and cows in calf run from him and his hounds in terror, he may do some harm, but cannot do good beyond the pleasure he gives himself. Still, as his money which purchases that pleasure comes to his hand as profit upon capital working in the world for the world, he may be said to produce the purchase money of his profitless consumption of pleasure. In this he differs, and it is a great difference, from the fox-hunter of Galway who produces nothing, gives value to nothing, but consumes the produce of the land in personal pleasure.

Some persons may say, and some do say, that the land is to him what the capital of the retired merchant is in the last paragraph. Not so. The retired merchant has, as it were, a

streamlet of commerce which flows and runs over ; and he gathers the drops carefully and fills his cup of pleasure with what runs over. The main stream runs untouched. The Galway squire dips into the main stream ; and being a stream so frequently dipped into, it becomes small, and often stops, in which case, rather than restrain himself, he goes to the spring head, the tenant's farm yard, and dips in there.

But such a squire is not confined to Galway nor to Ireland, though in Ireland it is more common than in England to find a gentleman eating golden eggs to his breakfast, having killed the goose the day before. Anywhere, in England or in Ireland, the mere consumer, wear what colour of coat he may, is a fugitive from usefulness.

Those remarks, extending by no means to the end of the subject, have been suggested by the fact that the oats and oatmeal, and butter and pork, of the west of Ireland, which are sold to get money to pay rent, are carried to the west of Scotland, and paid for and consumed there by a population whose industrious hands are engaged in manufacturing human comforts for themselves and for all the people of the world who will or can buy from them. If a part, or a very considerable portion of the rent, which is the price of the oats, butter, and pigs, be sent to the landowners who do not live in Ireland, to England it may be, the loss is doubtless felt in Mayo. Those exports of farm produce and of farm rents give rise to some well founded complaints, but also to many errors. An argument for the repeal of the union is founded on the exportation of farm produce and of farm rent. And England, which is supposed to seduce those gentlemen of the west from their hounds, horses, bugle-horns, and native hills, has a great deal of scolding to hear and bear for keeping them from home. All which Henry the Second and Elizabeth and Cromwell did to Ireland is mixed up with the charge of having seduced from his home the fox-hunter of Galway and Sligo. If Henry, and Elizabeth, and Cromwell were now alive, they might very properly be spoken to on the subject of making war on Ireland ; but the persons who now eat Irish butter, pork, beef, eggs, poultry, and meal, and who *pay* for it all, have no interest whatever in, or from, anything done by the King, Queen, and Republican aforesaid. All the wars of those sovereigns and their servants were mischievous to England as to Ireland. War, like fox-hunting, consumes without producing wealth. Nor is it of any benefit to England as a nation that the Irish squires choose to go and live idly there. Whatever they or their servants may eat in a day, that day passing without their adding some value to something of usefulness in Eng-

land, is national loss, though it may not be a local loss in London.

At all events, they do not live in Glasgow, nor does Glasgow care the value of one peck of meal whether they ever do or not. She does not even question the place of residence of her own landowners. Nor had Glasgow or Scotland any share in the union of England and Ireland. Yet Glasgow receives more of the oats, oatmeal, butter, and pork, of Mayo and Sligo than London does. But she pays for them. And, hard as the case of Mayo and Sligo is, obliged to sell their farm produce in Glasgow to obtain money to send to their landowners elsewhere, there is a possibility of their being in a case still worse. As it is, there are mills to grind the oats and millers who are paid wages for adding value to the oats by reducing them to meal. There are ships, warehouses, wharves, roads, sailors, porters, carmen on the roads, road-makers, and others, all giving greater value to oats and to meal; to cows, butter, poultry, eggs, hogs, horses, and the provender of all of these. Now the worst conditions which it is possible to be in is that of having all the landowners and their families at home *to eat food and still be idle*, with no market beyond their own shores; and still, as now, nobody among themselves employed otherwise than in working on the surface of the land.

To work at something which shall become of greater worth, and to work in such aggregation or in such division of numbers as shall give the work the greatest worth in the shortest time, is the way to make national wealth; and the greater proportion of the people of a nation so employed, otherwise than on the land, the more wealth will they have to exchange for agricultural produce, and the richer will agriculture be the sooner that this is understood in Ireland, and in some other places which might be named, the sooner will Ireland rise out of destitution.

The following passages in the evidence of Mr M'Donnell, a corn-merchant of Westport in Mayo, given in July 1844, are worth notice at the present time:—

“Has the use of wheaten flour at all spread among the farmers?” “No, they do not use it themselves, they sell it. I have never known them use it by any means in this country except when they could not dispose of it. In the year of scarcity, in 1831, when we got money from the benevolent people in England, we were then, from the want of oatmeal, obliged to bring wheat from different parts of the country; but the people never make use of wheaten flour except when they cannot get oatmeal. The poor man uses oatmeal for meat and drink, when reason-

able in price. He has thin oat gruel and oaten bread, and he takes it out with him to the fields. The price of labour has been very low. During the winter there were not more than twenty men in this neighbourhood working, and they at 7d. and 8d. per day. When the potato crop has been injured by blasts from the sea, the people have suffered very much. In the year 1821, we suffered very severely in that way, and also in 1822. We had to import food from other countries."

"Was there no oats in the country?"—"Yes, there had been oats, but they had been exported previously. In truth, the vessels had met each other going out and coming in. A man may have engaged his vessels for two months before, and he must go on with his business, no matter what the consequences may be. I have imported wheat into this country, and the vessels taking out oats have actually met the vessels bringing in the wheat."

This was the case in 1846 and the year before; and even in 1847, oats have been sent from Westport to England, where they are in demand, at high prices, for horses; and Indian corn, coming to Westport, has met them in other ships. To those who have an interest in understanding the self-adjusting principles of commercial exchanges, those passages will be instructive. To those who feel desirous of knowing the chief evidence of all the witnesses examined by the Land Commission in Mayo and Sligo, and who cannot read all that was deposed to, I may say that the burthen of it was, destitution among the mass of the population every year; misery at the best of times, absolute famine often; and I may add that my belief is, that the bulk of the west of Ireland population is better provided for now by government than they used to provide for themselves; that they, never having parted with rent, but when money or produce, often the latter, was forced from them, they will not be readily induced to work on their land now for rent, when they see food given to them from some where else than from their own country.

EXTRACTS FROM IRISH LETTERS.

To conclude this account of the condition of Ireland in the year of famine and pestilence 1847, and to conclude this volume, I shall here give some passages from letters written by me on the state of Ireland in 1843. Copies of those letters were given to the leading members of parliament. At the beginning of the session of 1844, Lord John Russell, in the famous debate on the condition of Ireland, referred to them,

but said the facts detailed therein were almost too horrible for belief, and he would not read them to the house. Sir Robert Peel, in the same debate, referred to the letters as mentioned by the noble Lord, and said he had read the pamphlet in which they were contained ; the statements were indeed horrible, but he feared too true. The Marquis of Normandy, in the House of Lords, quoted the pamphlet soon after as an authority, and, about the same time, the *Dublin Review* had an article on the subject of these letters, and said that the facts were known to the writer of the article to be as truly horrible as I had given them. Indeed, as regards Sir Robert Peel's belief in the facts, he, as prime minister, had taken the best possible means of inquiring into the truth. He sent a private and confidential agent to the locality of these landlordly crimes, after my first reports were sent to London and privately laid before government, upon whose report, confirmatory of mine, the Devon Commission was issued, to inquire into the whole subject of landlord and tenant in the whole of Ireland.

Thus much, by way of introduction to the passages of the Irish letters which I now append, is deemed necessary, lest readers, innocent of knowing much about Ireland, might lift their hands and heads in wonder, and let this book fall, and cry, "Impossible ! we shall not take up that book again !"—They must take it up again ; at any rate the subject of these letters must be taken up again and again.

In different parts of the county of Kilkenny, in several directions from the town, there were what is usually called "disturbed districts." In one place a murder had been committed, and in several others there had been attempts at murder—at all events, there had been accusations against certain parties of attempting to murder ; but we shall see by-and-bye, from the trials at assizes and from other evidence, that it is no unusual thing in Ireland, and especially in a "disturbed district," to get up accusations of attempted murder for purposes which, when we come to the facts, will be easily understood.

The cases of ejectment now about to be particularized were not the cases of tenants-at-will, nor of an under tenantry who held their land from some one subordinate to the landlord ; they were leaseholders, holding direct from the landlord himself, under covenants as indisputably legal as any lease in Scotland or in England. The landlord never attempted to dispute the validity of the leases ; he knew that most of them had been granted by his immediate predecessor, and some by the predecessor's father. He knew that he could not eject any one

of the tenants by disputing about the lease, but he knew that the law gave him power to eject if the tenant did not pay his rent. But here he encountered a difficulty. The very fact which excited him to a war with his tenantry operated to defeat him. The farms were generally held at about 30s. an acre, and from that to 40s.; he knew the land could be let for more; for in some cases, where farms on the same estate were not let on lease, he had raised the rent to 60s. and 70s. an acre; and found that the people would rather pay that than renounce their holdings. Thus, because the farms were let at a moderate rent to the leaseholders, he sought to get them into his own hand, that he might re-let them at higher rents; but, because they were cheap, the tenants kept clear of arrears, and he, having no means of breaking through the leases, was at a considerable loss to know how to act; but he did act; and a history of his proceedings will not only exemplify the condition of landlord and tenant in Ireland, but will, at the same time, shew how the laws in Ireland can be set at defiance by a man who has money and is a staunch adherent of the dominant party. This last fact is most necessary to be borne in mind, because the landlord now under notice has been defended by the press of the dominant party as one of the best though worst used of churchmen. He has been heard of through the government newspapers over the world as a martyr and a Christian. How far he is entitled to the honour of either will become apparent in the sequel. Suffice it now to say, by way of preface, in addition to what is already explained, that my authority for the following statements rests, first, on the narratives of the tenantry themselves; second, on the account given me by Mr Coyne, a gentleman of respectably, who for two years acted as the agent of this landlord, but who, at last, threw up his situation, out of sheer disgust at the odious work he was called on to perform; third, on the testimony of several magistrates and other gentlemen in the towns of Kilkenny and Thomastown; fourth, on the information, very comprehensive and valuable, afforded me by the solicitor who has been engaged in defence of most of the tenants in the numerous lawsuits which have arisen during the last three years; fifth, on evidence given in various cases tried at the sessions and assizes, part of which has been published in the local papers, all of which has been recorded by official persons, who furnished me with matters of importance not published; and, sixth, from what I heard with my own ears from the witnesses in the assize court.

The district in which this estate is situated, it may be proper to say, was, until three years ago, a peaceable one; agra-

rian crime was unknown ; the people industrious and moral ; and there were no constabulary in the neighbourhood, nor any need of them. It is only four years since the present landlord came to the estate, since which he has had upwards of 250 lawsuits with his tenantry, has erected a police barrack on his property, and obtained from government a detachment of armed police to remain there continually. The military, both cavalry and foot, have been greatly augmented in the district in the same time. Several men have been tried for their lives—some transported, and some hanged. The tenantry amount to between seventy and eighty, and the estate occupies a beautiful situation on each side of the Nore at Bennet's Bridge.

CASE OF JOHN RYAN.

John Ryan had been a road contractor as well as a farmer. The landlord alleged a debt against him, and threw him into prison. While there his contract was unperformed, and he lost it, and sacrificed his security to perform it. It was satisfactorily proved, in a court of law, that the debt never existed ; that it was brought forward by the landlord at the expense of forgery and false swearing ; upon which John Ryan brought an action for false imprisonment. Had the defendant not been a landlord, the plaintiff might have prosecuted him criminally ; but, being a landlord, there was no chance of succeeding against him. Even in the action of damages there was little hope for John Ryan ; but the case was so very bad, and the judge, in summing up, made such severe comments on the conduct of the landlord, that the jury gave a verdict for plaintiff. I was present at the trial, and I quote both from my notes and from the report of the trial as published in the local papers, in giving the following words as a portion of the judge's summary :—
 "Gentlemen—If you believe that the defendant fraudulently alleged this debt against plaintiff, that he might put him in prison and ruin him, you will give a verdict accordingly. In that case you will make him worse than the man who goes boldly to the highway and robs openly. You will weigh well the evidence you have heard, and if you are satisfied that plaintiff has been injured, you will give damages accordingly. Do not give overwhelming damages ; still you must teach defendant that, though he is a gentleman of rank and property, he is not to trample on a poorer man than himself with impunity."

To this the jury gave a verdict for plaintiff—damages L.100.

The landlord, out of about 250 actions at law, of various

kinds in less than three years, has been defeated in four-fifths of them—and though he had thirteen cases at last quarter sessions, and was defeated in all—he still triumphs. He appeals to higher courts. He does not pay the L.100 damages to Ryan. He makes an appeal which will not be settled until some time next year. Meantime, Ryan, by being in prison, and by being involved in litigation, of which this is but a mere sample—by losing his contract for the roads, having all his implements and farming stock seized and sold while in prison—was unable to cultivate his land so as to enable him to pay his last Michaelmas rent. The rent being less than L.100, which the landlord owed him in damages, it might have been supposed that this L.100 would be a set-off for the rent. But no, a letter to me on the 8th of November says—“And he (the landlord) canted John Ryan to the potatoes, and did not leave his family one bit that would eat.” This John Ryan, it must be borne in mind, was a leaseholder, and never owed a farthing of rent until those proceedings were taken against him to compel him into arrears which would justify anejectionment. His case, from first to last—from the time that he was an independent man, with as happy a family around him as lived in the Queen’s dominions, living in a house of his own building, with a farm-steading erected at his own expense, which are equal to any cottage or farm-steading of the same extent in England or Scotland for cleanliness, order, and substantiality—I saw them with my own eyes, and judged for myself; from the time that John Ryan was an independent man in that farm to the present, when he and his family are potatoless and penniless, and on the point of being ejected, the proceedings against him have been of the most extraordinary kind and almost beyond belief.

CASE OF WILLIAM RING.

William Ring is also a leaseholding tenant on the estate, and is uncle to Patrick Ring. He is considered a man of substance, and was never known to owe any man sixpence unreasonably, being at all times scrupulously punctual. He has a limekiln on his farm, and makes and sells lime. On one occasion, eighteen or twenty months ago, the landlord had lime from him to the amount of L.9. William Ring sent in his account, but the landlord, through his steward, taunted him with having assisted Patrick Ring to plough and sow his land at a time when the landlord had seized and carried off Patrick Ring’s implements, (these were carried off, as afterwards appeared by the decision of the jury, when no rent nor debt of any kind was due; they were carried off that Patrick Ring

might be unable to cultivate his land and pay his rent. Patrick went to law and got damages against the landlord. He also got assistance from three of his neighbours to plough and sow his fields; all the other neighbours, though willing to help him, being afraid of the landlord, save these three, one of whom was his uncle, William Ring, whose case about the lime I am now relating.) The landlord refused to pay the L.9 for the lime, saying, through the steward, that as William Ring had thought fit to set himself against him by helping Patrick Ring to plough and sow his fields, he, the landlord, would set himself against William Ring; he would not pay the L.9 for the lime—he would let him do his best.

William Ring might have let it remain to be deducted from the next payment of rent, some one will say. But this would not do in Ireland, at least with a landlord such as his, who hesitated not to seize on tenants who owed nothing. He knew that an immediate seizure would be made on the day the rent was due if this L.9 was deducted from it, because it had become common on this estate, and is yet, as shewn by the reports of the trials at the last sessions, to proceed to distrain on the day following term day. Seizures in some cases had been made at one o'clock for rent due at twelve; and in one case, that of Mathew Dormer, brother-in-law of Patrick Ring, a distraint was made at ten o'clock of the rent-day; therefore William Ring did not let his claim for the price of his lime stand over to be deducted from the rent. He summoned the landlord, and in due course got a decree against him. The landlord had to pay; but on the same day he did so, he got a party of the armed constabulary, who are located on the estate for the purpose of carrying on the war, and with them, and a carpenter, and his steward, he proceeded to William Ring's farm. The farmhouse and haggard (garden, &c.) were sheltered and ornamented by trees and bushes which had been planted by the tenant and his forefathers, and which were highly prized by the farmer and his family. In law they were the property of the landlord; and the landlord, the carpenter, the steward, and the police, set to work, cut them all down, and carried them home to the landlord's residence.

CASES OF MATHEW DORMER AND JAMES MULLINS.

Mathew Dormer, the brother-in-law of Patrick Ring, is a leaseholding tenant, but holds only a small field of about three acres. The other farms are from twenty to fifty acres. Dormer does not depend on his land further than for potatoes to his family and for keep to his horse, with which and a cart he does jobbing work. He had assisted Patrick Ring in time of

trouble, and thus brought on himself the power of the landlord. His field can only be approached by either of two roads through other farms from the village where Dormer lives. Having paid all rent, the landlord had no power on him but by shutting him out of his field. The tenants who occupied the land through which Dormer had to pass were served with notices that, if they allowed him ingress with a cart or horse they would be ejected. I went and saw the field, and was told by Dormer and his neighbours the whole case. He had planted his potatoes without manure, and, though it was August when I saw them, they were not six inches above ground, nor did they shew symptoms of at any time being more; and this because Dormer was not allowed to carry the manure, of which he had abundance, to his field. He was told by the lawyers that he had a good case, and would be sure to gain a suit at law; but while that is pending the potato season has passed over with almost no crop, and winter has come without a potato for his family; worst of all, his barley, which occupied, I think, about two-thirds of the ground, (I saw it when nearly ripe in August,) and from which he hoped to pay his rent and get provender for his horse, was still in the field rotting on the 8th of October. Thus Mathew Dormer will be unable to pay his November rent, and a process of ejectment will of course issue and take effect.

Another case which may be mentioned now is brief and characteristic. A tenant who held on lease went with his rent to the landlord last spring on the day it was due. Says the landlord, "Mr Mullins, you need not be so particular about paying your rent, you are always very punctual, and you may perhaps want the money for some other purpose. I should advise you now to buy some cattle and sheep at the fair, and depasture your grass fields instead of making hay this year; but, even if you do make hay, you have not enough of stock." To which Mr M. replied, "I am exceedingly obliged to you; I would have bought stock had it not been for my rent; but if you forego it for the present, I will do as you suggest; and, if you have no objection, I will hire another field for the season as well, and put cattle in it." "An excellent thought," said the landlord; "buy all the cattle your money will afford; you will, no doubt, be able to hire pasturage for them." And Mr M. did as his landlord advised. But what was his astonishment when, in less than a week, indeed within three days, the landlord distrained on the whole, and sold all the cattle, and all the farm implements as well, for his rent. This, of course, gave rise to litigation, which will only end in the ruin and ejectment of the tenant, with the re-letting of the

farm at a higher rent, an object not far from being accomplished.

Since these remarks about Dormer were written, the *Kilkenny Journal* has been received, containing a report of the cases at petty sessions on the 18th of November. Of ten cases which occupied the attention of the court, seven arose out of the disputes between the landlord and his tenants in the disturbed district already described. Five of those cases were at the instance of the landlord against the tenant Mathew Dormer, who had been excluded from his field, and whose corn, as stated in a letter which I quoted, was standing rotting on the ground up to the 8th of October. It does not appear by the report of the cases decided at petty sessions whether the corn is yet in the field or carried home; but it appears to have been in the field on the 15th of November. On that day Dormer proceeded to make a gap in a stone wall, the gates being shut against him, to get into his field. For making this gap three actions were brought against him by the landlord, and two by persons whom the landlord put forward as prosecutors. It seems the first time the gap was attempted was on the 13th of October. The field through which Dormer then attempted to pass to his own field was in the occupation of the landlord himself; and the landlord now prosecuted under the Malicious Trespass Act; but the magistrate dismissed the case because it was not *malicious*. His remarks give a better exemplification of what law is in Ireland than any description of mine could do. The case is thus reported:—The steward of the landlord called “deposed that he saw the defendant levelling a wall, the property of the plaintiff; he was making a gap in it.”

Cross-examined: “I live with Mr Shee. The defendant said he would not be prevented till the law prevented him, and that he must get a passage, *and that if he got a passage he would build up the gap at his own expense*. There was no other passage to his field than that. There was formerly a passage to the farm through a field of one Ring, but Dormer was since prevented.”

The attorney for the defence then addressed the bench; stated that Mathew Dormer owed nothing to the landlord, and had a legal right to a road to his farm. He had followed the way which had been formerly used, namely, through another tenant's ground; but at the instance of the landlord this tenant had been compelled to prosecute, and Dormer had been fined for trespass by this bench. He then attempted to make this gap and have a passage, as complained of to-day, through a field in the occupation of his landlord, who was bound to give

him a passage to that farm, the rent of which Dormer would be compelled to pay as soon as it became due. What, therefore, could the poor man do? His corn was rotting in the field at that time, the middle of October.

To which the magistrate, in giving his decision, replied, "It was a hard case; but he thought Mathew Dormer had no right to break Mr Shee's wall or commit the trespass. It certainly was not malicious; and if Mr Quin (the defendant's attorney) insisted on it, the bench must dismiss the summons; but another summons might be brought for common trespass, and the case would have to be heard *de novo*. Why did not Dormer bring his action?"

The Attorney—"And so he will."

"The magistrate, after some farther discussion, agreed to dismiss the complaint, Mr Quin undertaking to prove, should another summons be brought for common trespass, that Dormer had a right to break the gap."

The point, of all others, which the English public should look at here, is the question of the magistrate, "Why does not Dormer bring his action?" The magistrate knows well that in this case Dormer would succeed in an action against the landlord; that is to say, if the jury should not be entirely a landlord's jury. But the action could not be tried before next spring or summer assizes; and the landlord might, as he has done in similar cases already, make an affidavit that he was not ready to go to trial even then. And if this was overruled, and the case proceeded with and decided against him—as it would be, provided always the jury was not one formed of men of his own rank, politics, and religion—he could appeal to a higher court. Meantime Dormer is ruined. He could not plant his potatoes last spring without committing a trespass by walking on another man's land—not the land bearing or preparing for a crop, but the footpath at the bottom of it. He planted his potatoes, however, and was fined for this trespass. But he planted them without manure, for he could not get an entrance at which to carry it in, and the crop was worthless. "Why does not Dormer bring his action?" asks the magistrate. No doubt he can bring an action, and ultimately carry it too; but his crop is rendered worthless in the meantime, and the same magistrate fines him for walking on the footpath which leads to it. "Why does not Dormer bring his action?" The magistrate who has fined him for going to his land without having first brought his action, which would occupy probably one or two years, asks this question on the 18th of November, knowing that Dormer's crop of barley was still rotting on the field, or had been so as late as the 15th, three day's before! No doubt the magistrate administers the

law as it stands ; but it is the law as it stands of which such men as Dormer complain. The object of the landlord is to render the payment of rent impossible, and a consequent ejectment certain. This is the policy by which a leaseholder is overcome in Ireland.

But the prosecution did not end by the magistrate dismissing the first summons at the petty sessions. Another prosecutor was ready. A man had been sent by the landlord to watch Dormer in case he made a gap in the wall ; and on the 13th of October, when he began to make the gap, this man, who is a mere minion of the landlord—fit for any kind of work—went to prevent him. Wherever Dormer attempted to lay the stones, this man put himself in the way, that the stones might fall upon him, and that a case of assault might be got up at the same time as that of malicious trespass. This case, however, did not succeed, Dormer having taken care not to hurt him, although he put himself in the way of the stones for the purpose. The summons was dismissed. The following is a portion of the cross-examination of this witness :—

“ He was in England last summer twelvemonths. He was there also at the time of the Whitefeet ; is not aware that the neighbours ever said he used to be out with his face blackened. Was up in Cork lately ; saw Mr Shee, who gave him travelling charges to the amount of L.1 : 5s. Had no conversation with him then about Mathew Dormer. Had a conversation with Mr Shee lately about him at Blackwell Lodge.”

The Attorney—“ On your solemn oath, did Mr Shee (the landlord) say he would give you anything in the world if you would transport Dormer ?”

“ The witness,” says the *Kilkenny Journal*, “ was silent amidst the sensation of the court, and the question was again and again repeated, and he was still silent. At length he muttered an evasive answer.”

It may be proper here to remark that Dormer is a man bearing the very best moral character. He was several years in the police, and saved some money. I saw and read the certificates of character which he held, and they bore out the good report of his moral character. Moreover, in his very appearance he carries respectability of behaviour. He is a tall man, about forty years of age, and has a wife and several young children.

The next prosecutor against him, for making a gap in the wall to get to his field and crop, was a man who alleged that the field over which Dormer trespassed was in his occupation, and not in that of the landlord. This man produced a lease, signed the 16th of November, in which he appeared to be the

tenant of the field. It was argued that Dormer made the gap previous to that lease being completed. It was a gap in the same wall at the same place as that of the 13th of October, that having been, it seems, built up. The court in this case decided against Dormer, and fined him a shilling, and cautioned him against a repetition of the offence. Two other cases of trespass came on in which the landlord was plaintiff and Dormer defendant. They were dismissed through an informality in the summonses.

These cases, though they are as innocence itself compared with some others in which the landlord has been engaged, will shew how powerless the law is to protect a tenant in Ireland, even where a magistrate inclines to mercy. But perhaps the most remarkable fact of law in connection with these cases is, that while the wages of a working man in the district is 6d. a-day, with many not able to get employment even at that, the expense of doing any work for which the law allows payment is fully as high, in some cases much higher, than similar work costs in London. The expense of building up the gap which Dormer made (not being allowed to build it himself) is 10s. It is only a *dry-stone* wall, between three and four feet high. Now, supposing the gap wide enough to admit a cart, any labouring man could rebuild it in three or four hours at the very utmost.

In the matter of seizures the charges are similar. In London, a broker who distrains can only put one man in possession, and charge for him 2s. 6d. a-day. In Ireland a landlord puts what men he chooses in possession, and charges for them from 2s. to 2s. 6d. a-day. The landlord now spoken of has, as law papers proved to me when I inspected them, seized on a man's potatoes who was working for 8d. a-day, the current wages, and put two men on as "keepers" for a week, and allowed them (the law allows him to do so) 2s. 4d. a-day.

The following extract of a letter from Patrick Ring, whose case (just ended with his utter ruin and beggary) I shall relate at length, will give some information on the high wages allowed by the law, even where men are willing to work for 6d. a-day:—

"I got my crop valued by two farmers, and they valued it at L.30. He (the landlord) then takes and puts three keepers on it to run up expenses, and canted it (sold it) for L.17: 10s., and out of that, keepers' fees and expenses were L.6: 10s."

It may also be stated that a landlord in Ireland can call on any one of his servants or labourers to act as auctioneer. If he wants to buy a bargain himself, or to ruin the tenant to have him ejected, he can give this domestic auctioneer orders to knock an article down at a price far below its value. The

landlord under notice has, in many cases, bought the effects of his tenants himself through an agent.

CASE OF PATRICK RING.

Patrick Ring held three small fields, amounting in all to about eighteen acres. He had a lease of thirty-one years and his own life. He had succeeded his father in the occupancy of the farm, who had also been on the estate far many years. Ring's mother, an aged woman, now bordering on eighty, was born on the farm so long held by her husband and son; and thus there was doubtless a strong attachment to the place on the part of the whole family. Previous to the accession of the present landlord they had been on the best of terms with those to whom they paid their rent; and, having the land at a moderate rate, they had never fallen into arrears. They are Catholics—the present landlord is a Protestant. But whether it was that he wished to serve his party by substituting a Protestant tenantry for a Catholic tenantry, Protestant jurymen for Catholic jurymen; whether it was merely to have the leases broken and the farms re-let at a higher rent; or whether it was to accomplish both objects at once, is not clear, nor is it a matter of great importance; the landlord, and those who support him in all he does, are welcome to excuse themselves on any ground they choose to take as excusable. It is sufficient to say that the ejection of Patrick Ring and many more was resolved upon.

As he owed no rent, and as no possible reason for getting rid of him as a tenant could be assigned, nor was ever offered until long after proceedings had begun, a bold stroke to make a beginning was absolutely requisite, and it was struck. The lease specified a certain day in May and in November as that on which the half-yearly rent would fall due. Those days had been strictly adhered to, and no one knew this better than the landlord. But in 1841 he obtained a warrant of distrainment, and seized on Ring on the 26th of March for rent alleged to be due on 25th. It might have been a hard enough misfortune to be distrained on the day following that of the rent being due in any case, especially in spring, when the cattle and implements of labour, as also the seed-corn and potatoes, the articles distrained, are required for the peculiar duties of that most important season, seed-time. But when such distrainment was made on such articles so indispensable in their uses, even for a day, to say nothing of weeks, and no rent nor debt of any kind owing, the case is peculiarly a hard one on the tenant.

Patrick Ring caused a replevin to be entered with the

sheriff, that is, he gave security that he would pay the rent, if rent was due, as soon as a trial at quarter-sessions or assizes could be had, that he might in the meantime have the use of the property upon which the distraint lay. He accordingly proved by his lease that he owed nothing—that no rent was due until May. But before that was done May had come, and the rent was due. He paid it punctually, and proceeded against the landlord for damages, or rather for the costs to which he had been exposed. This, being opposed, occupied much time, and before it was settled the landlord once more distrained for rent alleged to be due on the 29th of September. Again Patrick Ring replevined, and proved his rent-day to be in November and May, and not in September and March. The case of costs and trespass came to trial in respect of both seizures, and was decided in Ring's favour. Thus a jury and a judge certified by their decision that the tenant was right and the landlord was wrong. The damages awarded were very moderate, only L.12 and costs; but the tenant looked on the verdict as most important in respect of its setting, as he thought, the validity of his lease and the period of his rent-days at rest. But that the damages were too moderate as regarded the landlord was manifest from the fact that he again distrained in March for rent not due until May.

He now, it being again seed-time, took a more effectual way of crippling the tenant than before. He seized on the farm implements and stock, of which the dunghill was in his eyes the most important. He had it, without a legal sale, carried away to his own farm-yard, even to the very rakings and sweepings of the road and the yard near which it lay. This he did that Ring might have no manure for his potato ground, knowing that crops so planted would not easily afford the rent; and that, when no rent was forthcoming, an ejectment would soon follow. Other things, a plough and a horse, and some furniture, were sold, and Ring was once more involved in litigation. These things were bought in with his own money, save the dung heap, which the landlord would not give him a chance of buying in; and thus Ring was obliged to pay his rent before it was due, with all the expenses of a distraint and sale—the most expensively conducted of any distrains and sales under the British crown. He thought to recover damages for all this loss, but he was not able to pay his rent in addition to all this when it became due; and thus, by some hocus pocus of the law, the two cases became so mingled together as to be inextricable.

It would be too tedious to give a detailed account of every lawsuit that now followed; but from that time, the summer

of 1842, up to the summer assizes of 1843, the landlord proceeded in the courts for a warrant of ejectment against Ring nine times. On the first eight cases he was defeated, but he succeeded on the ninth. He had thirteen other lawsuits of various kinds with the same defendant, during which he sold his furniture five times and his horse twice. In all, he had twenty auctions of sale previous to midsummer of this year. Part of the furniture was in several of these instances only bought back by the agent, Mr James Coyne, handing money privately to Ring to pay for it. This is the agent formerly spoken of, who at last gave up his situation out of sheer disgust at the odious work he was called on to perform.

The crop of 1842 was seized on and sold at seven different times. It was much more than sufficient to pay the rent, even though the manure was carried away in the spring by the landlord; but those seven different seizures, with seven different sales, with a number of men receiving at each of the seven seizures 2s. 4d. a-day as keepers to watch the crop from the day of distraint to the day of sale—those seven seizures on a crop which might have been all seized and sold at one time, with only one set of expenses—resulted, as they were intended to do, in nearly doubling the rent. Moreover, the crop being distrained on while growing, was cut down by people whom the landlord employed, although the tenant and his family were standing unemployed; and to such work people the landlord can give any wages he chooses, to be deducted from the tenant, up to 2s. 6d. a-day! even though the harvest wages of the district be 8d. or 10d. a-day! even though the tenant, who is thus not allowed to give his own labour to his farm, may, to avoid starvation, be compelled to work to another employer for the fourth part, to wit, 7½d. a-day, of what the law obliges him to pay for workmen on his own farm.

It will give some proof of the exertions made by the tenant to pay his way when I state that, notwithstanding all the extraordinary expenses of the seizures, and of the protracted and complicated litigation, the rent was paid by the autumn of 1842. There was nothing owing by Ring save a sum of L.1 and odds, connected with the expenses of a summons which had been decided against him on some technical point of law.

For the recovery of this debt a decree was obtained against Ring, and orders were given by the landlord to arrest him and put him in gaol. This Ring endeavoured to avoid by keeping out of the reach of the officers, which he did successfully for the space of a month and some odd days. The reason why he was so averse to go to gaol, and why the landlord was so desirous to have him lodged there, is worth relating at full

length, as it is characteristic of certain customs in Ireland altogether unknown on this side of the channel.

It is a very rare thing to find a landlord in Ireland building a house or farm-offices for a tenant—the tenant builds them himself. Hence it is that so many mean houses exist in that country; and hence, also, the desperate tenacity with which the Irish peasant or farmer holds to his house when an ejectment comes upon him. If his lease has expired, or if he is ejected for the non-fulfilment of some condition of his lease, say the regular payment of his rent, he must leave the house and barn and stable which he built, the doors and gates he erected, without receiving anything for them. To live in a house which we have ourselves built, or which our father or grandfather built at no expense to a landlord, is to live in a house which we are naturally inclined to consider our own, though in law it may not be ours, and therefore an ejectment is the more distressing. It is thus that we see so many houses in every part of Ireland in ruins; that we see in the county of Kilkenny the walls of stone and lime, substantial and undecayed, but roofless and marked with violence, because the landlords, not having built the houses, nor having any fear of being obliged to rebuild them, hesitate not to unroof a house in order to eject a tenant. It is a remarkable fact, exemplified on almost every estate where the clearing away of a tenantry has been practised, that wherever an ejectment takes place, the legality of which is doubtful, the landlord, or the agent who acts for him, levels the house and farm buildings with the ground the moment the holder is forced out, lest he should come in again.

This is particularly the case on the estate where the unfortunate Pat Ring held his farm; and Ring had seen that the landlord did not always wait for an ejectment of the tenant before he pulled down the house. In one case, that of a tenant named Bushe, of whom, with many other sufferers, I have not yet spoken, the landlord resolved on an ejectment; but Bushe owing no rent, he could only proceed as he had done against Pat Ring, or by some other process of a like kind. He took a shorter one. It so happened that, though Bushe had paid his rent in order to keep the house above his head—a very good house it was, to judge from the size and worth of the substantial walls which, in most parts, were still standing when I was there—he had not paid every man in the county to whom he was indebted. He owed one person, residing at a distance, a sum of money, more, as it soon appeared, than he could pay at once. This man the landlord found out, through some of his agents appointed for such purposes, and

purchased from him the debt which Bushe owed him. This account being legally conveyed to the landlord, he at once proceeded against his tenant, the debtor, threw him into prison, and as soon as he got him there, went and took the roof off his house, turning out his wife and six young children upon the open highway. There they remained without shelter and without food until some of the people of the adjoining village assisted them. The father was in prison, and could neither resist the spoliation of the house which he himself had built, nor could he do anything, by work or otherwise, for his family's subsistence. In every respect, the proceeding was illegal on the part of the landlord; but, though the lawyers urged Bushe to prosecute, and assured him of ultimate success, he was to far gone too listen to them. He was heart-broken. He had no confidence in any redress the law might give; he had seen a rich man set the law at defiance; and the ruin of his roofless house—every piece of timber from which, and every handful of thatch, as also the doors and windows, had been carried away by order of the landlord, and by the assistance of the constabulary, who are located on the estate at the express request of the landlord, and by sanction of the government—the ruin of his roofless house, and the utter beggary of himself and family, so overwhelmed Bushe, that he would trust nothing more to law. He was heart-broken, and rather than stay among people who had known him happy in mind and comfortable in circumstances, he would leave that part of the country altogether, and be a beggar, now that he was compelled to be one, where he was not known. A less sensitive man than he was might have done differently. There have been cases in Ireland, many of them, and in that county, even in that district of the county, where fathers of families so treated have taken the law of vengeance into their own hands, and have afforded the newspapers and the police *Hue-and-Cry* the materials for publishing to the world paragraphs and advertisements of offered rewards, headed “*Unprovoked assault!*” “*Barbarous outrage!*” “*Frightful state of Kilkenny—the fruit of unchecked political agitation!*” “*Attempted murder of the excellent Protestant landlord, Richard Shee, Esq. of Blackwell Lodge!*”

Such paragraphs are by no means rare; and many people in England believe that Tipperary and Kilkenny are filled with criminals who take a savage delight in assaulting landlords and land-agents without any provocation. Others, who do not believe that every assault is so entirely “*unprovoked*” as the newspapers would make appear, have an opinion that the Irish do not allow the oppressor to escape with impunity;

but the case of Bushe is one of the many of the vast majority of such cases that prove the contrary. We hear of those tenants who, feeling or fancying a grievous wrong, avenge themselves and their starving families ; but we never hear of the many—the far greater number—who submit to die in the ditches and highways quietly ; or who, like the spirit-stricken Bushe, wander away with their wretched families, to famish in the Irish towns, or to fill the St Giles's and Peter Streets, the Cowgates and Wynds, the Saltmarkets and Vennels, of London, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Liverpool.

Now, it was the knowledge that Pat Ring had of such cases of house-demolition by order of landlords, when a tenant was out of the way—lodged safely in prison—that made him so fearful of the officers, who had a decree on which to arrest him for the non-payment of costs due to the landlord by one of the many cases then pending having been decided in the landlord's favour. The amount was not great ; but the frequent seizures, with costs of lawsuits and rent, had reduced him to less than his last penny. He had potatoes, a part of the feeble crop grown on the land which in the spring had been defrauded of its manure, and, though there were less of them in his possession than would keep his family over winter, even without feeding a pig, he might have sold some to pay this bill of costs rather than go to gaol, where he could do nothing either for his family or farm. But, though the potatoes were distrained upon, the object of the landlord was not so much the payment of the small debt of costs as the confinement of the tenant in gaol.

For more than a month Ring avoided the officers by crossing the walls and ditches and fields whenever he got notice of their approach. He slept in the fields as well, and in the shelter of limekilns and ruined houses—houses ruined as he feared his would be, and as he feared but too truly. The case came at last to a crisis, thus :—

He was seen to enter his house ; the bailiffs followed, but found the door fastened, and therefore could not legally enter ; but they kept watch outside, to see that he did not escape. They received orders that, if he did not surrender, they were to remain there night and day, and prevent the introduction of any article whatsoever into the house, food or water. The potato-store being out in the field, and no supply in the house, and the water being also outside the house, it was expected that the family would soon be starved, and that Ring must capitulate. In thus laying seige to the house, the bailiffs might not be acting according to the law of the land, but they were acting according to the law of the landlord, which, on

that estate as on many others in Ireland, is of paramount importance compared with the law of the land.

Before the first day of the seige was over, there was neither food nor drink in the house ; and there were shut up in it the father, mother, and five young children. Next day the children cried for food and for drink, but got none. Some of the neighbours and relatives of Pat Ring would have supplied them, but they were sternly told that, if they attempted to do so, they would not only be prevented, but that the landlord would cause them to regret it. Again and again, through night and through day, did the cry for water come from that famishing family. It was not the case of a shipwrecked crew at sea, with no hand to help, with "water, water everywhere, and not a drop to drink !" with no probability of being relieved but by reaching some unknown land in some unknown ocean, or by meeting a ship—blessed though rare chance—whose mariners would joyfully share their own scanty water for the relief of those perishing with thirst. It was not a case of this kind, where men in their desperation will drink salt water, and go mad from so doing ; but, having done so, do not always all die, but sometimes live to tell us of the pangs they endured, until our breasts burn with pity and our hair rises on end with horror at what they did. This was not a case like theirs. This was the captivity of a family in their own house ; foodless for days, though they had a potato-store in the field ; waterless and unquenched by any liquid, though they had a well within a minute's walk ; and all this by the mandate of a man who lived at the distance of half-a-mile, in the enjoyment of every luxury which wealth could procure and voluptuousness desire. The mother had a sucking infant, and in her attempt to save all her children from starvation by admitting them to the privilege of infancy, she but augmented their distress and her own. She saw her infant famishing, for, when she would have divided her own milk, there was none to divide ; she was herself starving, and to her infant she was without nourishment.

It was the third day, and hunger and thirst in the house were so manifest to the bailiffs outside, by the pitiful cries of the children, and the wailings of the mother—who begged for water from their own well, and for potatoes from their own store—that hopes were entertained of a speedy surrender. Reports of the symptoms of extremity were conveyed at intervals to the landlord, who, as he heard of the increasing cries for water and food, gave orders afresh to the bailiffs to persevere, to keep watch and prevent all supplies from getting in, being assured that as the pangs of hunger and thirst became

more poignant, the sooner would the beleagured family capitulate.

Mrs Dormer, the wife of the tenant who is shut out of his land, and whose crop of barley is rotting on the field in November, though he owes nothing to the landlord—this woman, who has herself a family of young children, and who is the sister of Pat Ring, went many times to the beleagured house to offer relief, but was not permitted to approach it with anything in her hand. She was allowed to approach the window when she carried nothing, that she might hear the sufferings within, and so urge her brother to surrender.

She listened to the sickly wailings of the mother and children, and at last on the fourth day heard the horrible fact from the mother that the children in desperation had drank their own urine. At this moment she seized a dish of some sort which lay in the yard, and filling it quickly from a pool of stagnant water in the yard, broke the window with her hand, before she could be prevented by the officers, and gave the unwholesome water to the family, which they drank greedily. Perhaps she would have done more, but she was compelled by the officers to desist. The landlord was informed of what she had done, and he promised that she would live to repent it. The crop of Dormer rotting in the field in November, and his potatoes poor and meagre for the want of manure, because he is not allowed a road to his field, tell whether the landlord forgets his promises.

The sufferings of the family and of himself now worked on the father until he could hold out no longer. He opened the door. He had a pitchfork in his hand, and he shewed it to the bailiffs. He bade them keep off—said he would not touch them if they did not touch him—but that the hunger of himself and family had made him desperate—that he had potatoes in his store in the field, and potatoes he would have; and he bade them prevent him at their peril.

They did not offer to prevent him; they waited until they saw him take the potatoes, and then they informed the landlord. On that instant a criminal warrant was sent for from Kilkenny. It arrived; so did also a party of the armed constabulary, who occupy the barrack built by the landlord on the estate, and the door was at once forced open, and Pat Ring was taken and lodged in gaol on a charge of robbery accompanied with threats of violence. He had stolen his own potatoes, they being under distraint, and he was in due course of time tried at Kilkenny for the felony. The jury refused to convict for a crime committed under such circumstances, and he was acquitted.

This case has now reached the month of July 1843. At

that time he was once more in prison for the non-payment of costs incurred in defending himself against the landlord.

These were paid, and a new decree for some other costs was got against him. There was also a warrant for his ejectment obtained. At this time his family were ill of typhus fever, and had been for several weeks. The sheriff refused to execute the ejectment while they so suffered. The landlord was exceedingly anxious to eject as early as possible, because (let the English reader mark this peculiarity of Irish tenures) a tenant, though ejected, may recover possession; the law says he may redeem within six months. Now Ring had an action for damages pending against the landlord, a very simple action, which could have been easily tried, and in which a jury could not have hesitated to award ample damages. To this, at the summer assizes, the landlord, through his law agents, pleaded that he was not ready to go to trial; consequently it was put off until next assizes, to wit, March 1844. If, therefore, Ring could have been ejected in July, or early in August 1843, the six months in which he could redeem possession of his land would have expired before the trial of the case postponed to March 1844—a case which promised to put Ring in a condition to redeem his land by payment of his debt to the landlord.

We need not proceed farther with those cases of injustice. The landlord now under notice has proceeded in litigation and expenses until he is no longer in the management of his estate. Others in Ireland, less tyrannical than him, but not more wise in the management of their estates, have brought Ireland to a condition unparalleled in the history of nations. It would be vain to speculate on what the future may be, we can only say that the present (end of 1847 and beginning of 1848) is deplorable. Law set at defiance; rates uncollected; and rents unpaid.

INDEX

TO

THE WHISTLER AT THE PLOUGH.

- A** road labourer, 41.
A stage-coach company, 48.
A tale of a punch in the head, 272.
A week in the west, 247.
Abingdon, Earl of, his land, agriculture, tenants, and labourers, 141.
Abingdon horses and ploughs, 127.
Adam the labourer, 330, 353.
Address to tenant farmers, model of, 153.
Admiral Stewart, 199.
Agricultural distress in 1836, 151.
Agricultural labourers, their dwellings, 172, 175.
Agricultural labourers, the distance between them and landlords to be lessened by lifting the labourers up, not by bringing landlords down, 174.
Agricultural dinner at Stockbridge, Hampshire, 414.
Agricultural fallacies about grass lands, 96.
Agricultural improvements first borrowed by Scotland from England, 201.
Agriculture, giants of, 176.
Agriculture, dwarfs of, 176, 178.
Agriculture in Meath, Ireland, 186.
Agriculture injured by politics, 200.
Agriculture of Lancashire, 51, 208.
Agriculture, code of, 216.
Agriculture, hindrances to, 247.
Agriculture, its undeveloped resources, 97.
Agriculture, unmarried men and youths employed in, 142.
Agriculture on the banks of the Vistula, 148.
Agriculture may be both ornamental and profitable, 171.
Ainsworth, Peter, Esq., 165.
Allotments, 33, 404.
Althorpe Park, 373.
Ammonia saved in guano brought from Africa, but wasted in dung taken from English stables, 398.
Andover, letter from, 256.
Anti-corn-law league, 75, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 86, 92, 93, 94, 96, 158, 159, 175, 176.
Apple pies, 18.
Artisans and farm labourers. their comparative use of butchers' meat, 336.
Ashley, Lord, 35.
Autumn flowers, 16.
Axiom of Mr Cobden, 261.
Axiom of Sir John Sinclair on the profits of farming, 131.
Aylesbury, 225.
Ayle-bury, Vale of, 15, 152.
Baillie, John, a returned convict, 39.
Banks, George, Esq. M.P., 418.
Banks of the Tweed, 198.
Banquet of the anti-corn-law league in 1843, 86.
Barnard Castle, 194.
Bates, Mr, of the Socialists, 116.
Battlefield of Naseby, 378.
Battue, the, 351.
Beaconsfield, 14.
Bearwood, family of the late Mr Walter of, 223.
Beet-root sugar, 308.
Benett, John, Esq., M.P., 61.
Bennet, Mr, of Bedfordshire, 146, 149, 153.
Berkshire, weeds in, 22.
Berkshire and Lothian compared, 23.
Berkshire, clay-land of, 105.
Berryhill, Mr Hurst of, 338.
Berwickshire, 19.
Biel estate, East Lothian, 173.
Big Ben, 287.
Birth-place of William Cobbett, 296.
Birth-place of Richard Cobden, Esq. M.P., 401.
Birth-place of the Duke of Wellington, 185, 192.
Birth-place of Feargus O'Connor, Esq. M.P., 185.

- Black and white requisite between landlord and tenant, 90.
 Black, John, Esq., of the Morning Chronicle, v, 68.
 Black rod, deputy usher of, 146.
 Blackmoor, Vale of, 333.
 Blackstone, — Esq., M.P., 127.
 Blenheim Palace, 140.
 Bloodhounds and poachers, 278.
 Bolton league tea-meeting, 159.
 Bones of Thomas Paine, 305.
 Borders of Scotland compared with Poland and Russia, 148.
 Boston, Lord, 13.
 Bournes in Wiltshire, 393.
 Bowring, Dr John, M.P., 162, 163, 164.
 Bread and lard in Oxfordshire, 143, 145.
 Breaking machinery, 153.
 Breaking machinery in Hampshire, 263.
 Breckwell, Mr, a farmer, 152.
 Bright, John, Esq., M.P. 84, 162.
 Brington, village of, 375.
 British Lion, the, 364.
 Brooks, John, Esq., 83, 162, 164, 165.
 Brothers Cheeryble, 377.
 Brotherton, Joseph, Esq., M.P., 163.
 Broughton, Hampshire, 105, 419.
 Browdie, John, of Yorkshire, in Nicholas Nickleby, 193, 201.
 Buckingham, 12.
 Buckingham, Duke of, 21.
 Buckinghamshire, 215.
 Buckinghamshire, farmers of, and Van Amburgh, 226.
 Buckinghamshire, wages in, 18.
 Buckinghamshire, morals in, 18.
 Burdett, Sir Francis, 13.
 Burke, the burial-place of the Right Honourable Edmund, 14.
 Butcher's meat, comparative consumption of, by farm labourers and artisans, 336.
 Butter merchant of Islington, 199.
 Butter, protection to, 333.
 Buxton, Mr, governor of the Socialists, 116.
 Canada flour, and farmers' dinner talk, 222.
 Capital extends the productiveness of the land, 177.
 Capital, rent paid from, 179.
 Capital destroyed by fluctuating prices, 182.
 Capital laid out on land, estimated percentages derivable from, 131.
 Carter, Joseph, a Hampshire labourer in 1845 and a swing rioter in 1830, 261.
 Cattle-dealer in Teesdale, 201.
 Cattle food and human food, 391.
 Charlton in Wiltshire, its landlord, farmers, and labourers, 388.
 Cheshire, form of leases in, 74.
 Cheshire, course of cropping, 75.
 Cheshire rent and Lothian rents, 91.
 Chiltern Hills, 14.
 Chiltern Hundreds, 15.
 Civilisation in England, 147, 153.
 Clay lands, 105, 152.
 Clover produced without being sown, 198.
 Cobbett, late W., as a master, 263.
 Cobbett, the late W., his grave, 299.
 Cobbett, late W., farm at Normandy, 303.
 Cobden, Richard, Esq., M.P., v, vii, 82, 87, 111, 133, 165, 261.
 Cockneys and countrymen, their respective knowledge of eminent persons and simple plants compared, 125.
 Code of agriculture, 216.
 Cold spring of 1845, 245.
 Colonel Windham of Petworth, Sussex, 399.
 Commerce in 1842, 92.
 Commons, and people living on them, 101, 102.
 Commons unfairly divided, 103.
 Commons, roads upon, 31.
 Company on a coach, 48.
 Convicts and paupers, 256.
 Convicts' fare at Portsmouth, 264.
 Convicts in Bermuda, 39.
 Cookham, Berkshire, 23.
 Corn against cattle and cattle against corn, 245.
 Corn in Egypt, 246.
 Corn prices for fifty years, 322.
 Correction, House of, at Petworth, 400.
 Cottage allotments destroyed at Heyshot, 404.
 Cottages built by the Duke of Wellington, 131.
 Cottages, flowery cottages emblems of good morals, 169.
 Cottages on Earl Spencer's estate, 376.
 Couch grass, 155.
 Cowdray Park, 398.
 Cranbourne, Dorsetshire, 27, 156.
 Crowhill, East Lothian, 173, 174.
 Culture of land and printing of muslin compared, 100.
 Dangan Castle, 185.
 Daughters and sons of farmers, what becomes of them, 369.
 David Keele, a Wiltshire labourer, 381.
 Davy, Sir Humphrey, 197.
 Dawson of Frogden, 68, 201.
 Dear years, 213.
 Dialogue between a farmer and the Whistler, 240.

- Digging and trenching, 216.
 Dirleton, village of, 172.
 Dirleton, Mrs Ferguson of, 173, 175.
 Diseased meat sent to London in 1845, causes thereof, 390.
 Distress of agriculturists, opinions of English and Scotch farmers thereon, 151.
 Distribution of league tracts, 84.
 Doctor Sleigh, 229.
 Dorsetshire dialogue, 229.
 Doughty, the late venerable weaver and philosopher of Pinkerton Hill, 134.
 Douglas Jerrold, 417.
 Down farm, near Andover, 256.
 Drainage, 24, 152, 203.
 Drayton Manor, 424, 429, 432.
 Dunbar, 168.
 Dupree, George, Esq., M.P., 14.
 Dwellings of farm labourers, 172, 175.
 Edinburghshire, 19.
 Education in Scotland, 25.
 Eight shillings duty, 193.
 Elliot, Mr, of Althorpe, 374.
 Ellman, John, Esq., of Glynde, 252.
 England's young queen, the anniversary of her majesty's accession in the villages of Wiltshire, 395.
 English and Scotch labourers, 70.
 English landlord and Scotch farmer, 90.
 English farmer, passages from the life of an, 338.
 Essex, Earl of, 239.
 Ewes and lambs at Strathfieldsaye, 124.
 Exeter mail coach attacked by the lioness, 106.
 Expense and profit of trenching, 218.
 Expenditure in a labourer's family, 334.
 Fallacies about grass lands, 96.
 Fallacies about land going out of cultivation by a repeal of the corn laws, 100.
 Fallacies about the price of hay, 391.
 Fallacies about horses and railways, 391.
 Fallowing of the soil the waste of a year, 187.
 Famine years of 1816 and 1817, their effect, 321.
 Farmfield ramble in Hertfordshire, 238.
 Farm labour, causes which determine its value, 146, 150.
 Farm labourers, effect of the poor law on the unmarried, 385.
 Farm yard manure, waste of, 398.
 Farmers plundering each other by protection, 6.
 Farmers, hospitality of, 55, 193.
 Farmers' sons, what becomes of them, 91.
 Farmers, how operated upon by the league, 85.
 Farmers should be travellers, 130.
 Farming in Oxfordshire, 127.
 Farms of loam and clay under different systems of culture, 152.
 Farnham in Surry, 298.
 Filthily lucre, what is it? 211.
 Fires lighted to frighten the hares from turnip fields, 399.
 Fitzwilliam, the Right Hon. Earl, 157.
 Fleet Street, a similitude, 236.
 Flowery cottages, 169.
 Fluctuations in prices detrimental to agriculture, 182.
 Fonthill Abbey, 61.
 Fox hunt in Dorsetshire, 229.
 Frederick Prince of Wales, 13.
 Frome, Somerset, town and trade of, 65.
 Funeral of the Squire, 343.
 Game, 76, 141, 398, 404.
 Geese breeding, 30.
 Germany, manure how applied in, 11.
 Getapenny, Mrs Jenny, the old woman who lived in a shoe, 176.
 Giant child and his grandmother, 236.
 Giebe lands, laws relating to the culture of, 326.
 Goldsmidt, Sir Isaac Lyon, 116.
 Garleton Hills, view from, 167.
 Graham, Right Hon. Sir James, 204.
 Grass fields at Stoke Pogis, 10.
 Grass lands, loss upon, 64, 98, 99.
 Gray the poet, 9.
 Great Marlow Workhouse, 23, 156.
 Greg, Robert Hyde, Esq., vii, 19, 21.
 Guildford, town of, 297.
 Haddington, town of, 166.
 Haddingtonshire, 19.
 Hamilton, Rev. Mr A. of Navan, 190.
 Hampden, John, 15.
 Hampshire labourer, 118, 119, 120.
 Harleston, village of, 367.
 Harmony Hall, 105, 420.
 Heirs-in-tail, 244.
 Her majesty the queen, 23.
 Hertfordshire, journey to the meadows of, 235.
 Hertfordshire, ramble in, 238.
 Heyshot, 401, 406.
 Heyworth, Lawrence, Esq., 164.
 High Wycombe, 16.
 Hindon, town of, 72.
 Hindrances to agriculture, 247.
 Hinds, Scotch, 72.
 Hoare, Sir Richard, 64.
 Hop-growing, an account of, 265.
 Hope, George, Esq., of Fenton Barns, vii, 151, 152, 153, 166, 168, 169, 170.
 Horlock, Francis, and his wife, 333.
 Hours of work, 34.
 Human food and cattle food, 391.
 Hurst, Mr, of Berryhill, 338.

- Improvements charged upon heirs-in-tail, 244.
 Independence of tenant farmers, what it is, 156.
 Per-centage of rent returned to tenants, 157.
 Innkeeper, 201.
 Isle of Wight, 391.
 Jackson of Pennycuik, 11, 198, 203, 217.
 Jedburgh, 202.
 Journey to Surry, 229.
 Journey in Sussex, 397.
 Kailyard, Scotland, 210.
 Kings' Arms Inn, Barnard Castle, 201.
 Labour often dearest where wages are lowest, 127.
 Labourers in Oxfordshire, 128.
 Labourers in the cultivation of hops, 269.
 Lammermoor Hills, 167.
 Land in the highest state of cultivation not the most profitable investment, 130.
 Landlord alarmed at the league, 87.
 Landlords and tenants, 200.
 Landlords of England, letter to, 210.
 Landlords should look to their own business, 171.
 Landowners, 93.
 Landowners, young ones, 179.
 Langdale's, Lord, decision on glebe lands, 326, 333.
 Lattimore, Charles, Esq., vii, 243.
 Leases, 69, 95.
 Leases, value of, to Mr Hope, 152.
 Le Clair of Paris, 417.
 Lefevre, the Right Hon. Ch. Shaw, 151.
 Legend of Herefordshire, 247.
 Let ill alone, 215.
 Lewis, Mr, of Berkshire, 22.
 Lime for compost, 197.
 Limestone in Teesdale, 197.
 Linlithgowshire, 19.
 Liquid manure, 98.
 Liquid manure, reservoirs for, 98.
 Longleat, 65.
 Lothian farming, 19, 24.
 Lothian farms, 20.
 Lothians, rents in, 20, 21, 23.
 Machinery, what is it ? 400.
 Mackenzie, Mr, of Spott, East Lothian, 95.
 Maclean, Mr, of Mack, 199.
 Maiden Bradley, 65.
 Maidenhead, Berkshire, 23.
 Man, his moral and animal nature at war through poverty, 92.
 Marchmont estate, 197.
 Market-places and market-dinners, sketches of, 221, 225.
 Marlborough, Duke of, 140.
 Mat White, 291.
 Maule, the Right Hon. Fox, 166.
 May morning, a sketch, 340.
 Melrose, Roxburghshire, improvements at, 202.
 Men and masters, 417.
 Merry bells of England, 395.
 Moffat, Drumfriesshire, 202.
 Moore, the Rev. —, 33.
 Morning Chronicle, iv, 174.
 Morse, A., Esq., of Swaffham, vii.
 Morton, John, Esq. vi.
 Mother Ludlam's cave, 302.
 Muirkirk, 199.
 Navan, dwellings of the people at, 190.
 Nitrate of Soda, 204.
 Norman court, Hampshire, 418.
 North British Railway and Johnny Cope, 168.
 Notes for future historians, 158.
 Notes from Yorkshire, 193.
 Old Sarum, 29.
 Orkney, Earl of, 22.
 Oxford, 138.
 Oxfordshire and Lothian, comparative value of land in each, 131.
 Owen, Robert, 116.
 Ozias Seely, 384.
 Peel, the Right Hon. Sir Robert, iii, 21, 246, 424.
 Perry, William, 363, 395.
 Penalties on tenants, 75.
 Peter robbed to pay Paul, 337.
 Petworth, Sussex, 399.
 Physical comfort must be the forerunner of moral reformation, 73.
 Pilkington, Lancashire, 208.
 Playing at farms, 290.
 Playing at shops, 290.
 Poaching, 37, 153, 272.
 Political Protestantism in Ireland, 187.
 Poor law, 45, 73.
 Potato Dick, 138.
 Potwallopers, 72.
 Preston corporation property, 89.
 Prices, 322.
 Prices excessively high destructive to farmers, 181.
 Punches on the head, 274.
 Purdie's farm, 198.
 Pusey, Rev. Doctor, 133.
 Pusey, Rev. Doctor, his prayer and celebrated sermon, 136.
 Railways and steamboats, 204.
 Reading, Berkshire, 221.
 Rejoicing on potatoes, 138.
 Rent day at the Royal George, 363.
 Rent augmented before a tenant is remunerated, 177.
 Rent, what is it ? 252.

- Rhubarb puddings, 386.
 Rice, Jem, the poacher, 282.
 Rich land lying waste in Ireland, 187.
 Rivers Wye and Monnow, 284.
 Rokeby Hall, 194.
 Ross, Herefordshire, 249.
 Rule Britannia, 14.
 Rural beauty of Oxfordshire on the Thames, 144.
 Rural districts, league operations in, 84.
 Rushes in Lancashire, 86.
 Russell, the Right. Hon. Lord John, iii, 193.
 Russian serf and Middlesex labourer, 150.
 Russian serf, Quarterly Review on, 150.
 St Giles', Dorsetshire, 33.
 Salisbury, 29, 36.
 Salisbury Plain, a day upon in June, 394.
 Sally Morgan, 286.
 Salt, John, of Drayton Bassett, 427.
 Saltpetre, 204.
 Scotch farmers borrowed improvements from Norfolk, 60, 201.
 Scotch plough, 68.
 Scotland altered since the days of Dr Johnson, 203.
 Scott, Arch., Esq., his trenching, 217.
 Security of a banker landlord, 64.
 Security of tenure, 64.
 Serfs and free labourers, their work contrasted, 148.
 Shadow and the panic, 283.
 Shaftesbury, Dorsetshire, 57.
 Shaftesbury, Earl of, 33.
 Sheepstealing, 153.
 Sheepstealing in Lothian, 95.
 Sheepstealing in Worcestershire, 95.
 Sheepstealing and poaching in different places compared, 139.
 Shepherds of Monmouthshire, 285.
 Sherlock, Mr. of Trim, 192.
 Shoe, old woman who lived in a, 76.
 Shopkeeper insane if wasting his goods like the farmer, 131.
 Sinclair, Sir John, 216.
 Skaterow, East Lothian, 173.
 Skipworth, Rev. Thomas, rector of Pickwell, Leicestershire, 326.
 Socialists, 105, 220, 420.
 Somersetshire farmer, 52.
 Sotheron, T. B. Esq., M.P., 386.
 Spade labour, 216.
 Spain, 25.
 Sparks the whipper-in, 233.
 Spencer's, Earl, estate, journey to, 366.
 Spott in East-Lothian, 95.
 Stair, Earl of, 153.
 Standard of high prices, 181.
 Stanhope, Lord, 103, 127, 238.
 Statistical account of Scotland, 202.
 Steamboats and railways, 204.
 Steam engines, 153, 168, 203.
 Stockbridge, Hampshire, agricultural dinner at, 414.
 Stoke Pogis, 9.
 Stormy Night, 63.
 Stowr, in Dorsetshire, 60.
 Strathsfieldsaye, visit to, 117.
 Strathsfieldsaye parish church, 125.
 Subsoil plough, 203, 204.
 Sugar trade and slave trade, 386, 396.
 Summer's wedding with the river Thames, 144, 145.
 Surry hills, 297.
 Sussex in the south *versus* Haddington in the north, 252.
 Tait, John, 134.
 Tall chimneys, 168.
 Taplow, 13.
 Tariff of 1842, 56.
 Teesdale, 201.
 Teesdale and river Tees, 194.
 Telling the tailors, 175.
 Tenancy-at-will, 91.
 Tenures of farms, 21.
 Tenures, insecurity of, in Teesdale, 196.
 Tenures, results of insecurity in, 127.
 Thames, river, 13, 22, 23, 144.
 The amended poor-law when it was new, 353.
 The lawyer who rode in a glass coach, a sketch, 361.
 The shadow and the panic, a tale, 283.
 The sheep washing, 356.
 The young squire, a sketch, 345.
 The young merchant, a sketch, 347.
 Thomson the poet, 14.
 Thorntonloch, East Lothian, 173.
 Thrashing mill in Oxfordshire, 140.
 Thrashing mills, 153, 168, 203.
 Trafalgar park, 36.
 Turner, William, 45.
 Turnip culture, 152, 155, 171, 172, 198.
 Udney, Aberdeenshire, 202.
 Upavon, Wiltshire, 381.
 Vices of individuals esteemed a virtue of nations, 102.
 Victims of protection, 311, 321, 326, 333.
 Wages for mowing hay, 397.
 Wages highest where labour is cheapest, 127.
 Wages in Meath, 186.
 Wages in Wiltshire, 30.
 Wages of young men, 142.
 Waggons drawn by six horses and followed by three men, 127.
 Wall, Chas. Baring, Esq., M.P., his address to labourers, 415.
 Waller the poet, 14.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Wallingford agricultural dinner, 127. | Whim, county of Edinburgh, 198. |
| Wareham, country around, in 1843, 412. | Whistler, origin of the, iv. |
| Warrender, Sir George, 13, 22. | Wilson, George, Esq., 82. |
| Wasted agriculture and low morals, 128. | Wilton, 43. |
| Waverley Abbey, 301. | Wiltshire labourers, 381. |
| Welford, George, Esq., 11. | Winterslow Hut, 106. |
| Wellington, Duke of, 15, 126. | Witch story for the year 1846, 283. |
| Wemyss, Earl of, 220. | Woburn Green, 18. |
| Westell, Mr. of Marlborough, 383. | Wolseley, Sir Charles, 45. |
| Westbury, Wilts, 67. | Wyke river, 16. |
| Westminster, Marquis of, 69, 74. | Yates, General, 116. |
-

INDEX

TO

LETTERS FROM IRELAND.

- A bushel of flour, curious use of, 523.**
Acres, number of, in Ireland, 473.
Adair Castle, 549.
Agriculture, detrimental effect of war prices upon, 580.
Agriculture, security in, 577.
Agricultural societies and catholic farmers, 515.
Arable land in Ireland, 484.
Ardagh, village of, 550.
Athlone, 512.
Ballinamuck, destruction of, 500.
Ballinasloe agricultural society, 487.
Barrow river, 445.
Belmore, Lord, 516.
Bennet's Bridge, 454.
Berry, Mr, a land agent, 489.
Bianconi, Mr, 459.
Black prophet, 590.
Bounties paid upon Irish tillage, 473.
Building of houses, 550.
Bulls of Durham and bulls of Rome, 488.
Burke, Mr Waiter, 492.
Byrne, Edward, a farmer of Roscommon, 492.
Cabins, 550.
Cahermoyle, 545.
Cahermoyle, Limerick, and Whitefield example farm, 553.
Case of Ireland by Mr Holmes, 433.
Castlebar, town of, 522.
Castle Cary. Somersetshire, 495.
Catholic tenants, 515, 518.
Cavendish, Hon. Fred., 525, 533, 534.
Celtic population, a defence of, 593.
Clanclarty, Lord, 488.
Clapperton, Mr James, 487.
Clonmel, town of, 446, 459, 461.
Collection of poor rates, 527.
Commerce and manufactures incompatible with lawlessness, 506.
Commercial politics, conversation upon, 560.
Commercial travellers in Tipperary, 449.
Conacre, 488, 494.
Conry, James, Esq., 536.
Conversion of money and of protestants, 535.
Cooper, Edward J., Esq., his means of elevating the Irish people, 595.
Cotton, 457.
- County cess, 530, 542.**
Courtenay, Mr, 517.
Crawford, Rev. George, LL.D., 500.
Crofton, Lord, evidence of, on Irish agriculture, 497.
Cry from Ireland, 455.
Cuffe, Sir Whillan, 458.
Death in the streets, 485.
Devil's mother, 526.
Devon commission, 454.
Devon, Earl of, estates of the, 560.
Digging for gold, 563.
Distrainments, 437.
Donnellan, John, a farmer of Roscommon, 489.
Doolan, Mr, of Portumna, 539.
Dungarvan, 451.
Dunrobin, Earl of, 549.
Durcan, Rev. Barnard, 524.
Dwyer, Mr, of Castle Connel, 511.
Ejection of tenantry in Longford, causes of, 500.
Enemies to Ireland within herself, 512.
Eviction of tenantry, 486.
Expenses of Irish murders, 539.
Famine prices of food in Ireland, 508.
Famine, secondary effects of, 439.
Farm buildings in Ireland, 473.
Feminine beauty in Limerick co., 568.
Fire arms, sale of, 461.
Free crops, 578.
French invasion of Ireland, 500.
Galway county, 476.
Galway fox-hunter, 600.
Good masters can make good men, 474.
Hearn, Michael, journey with, 562.
Hogg, Mr Godfrey, Roscommon, 497.
Holiday treat to London citizens, 523.
Holmes, Mr, the Irish barrister, 433.
Human skeletons working on Irish estates, 507.
Industrial economy, 601.
Industrial school, its failure, and why, 596.
Interests of England and Ireland mutual, 512.
Ireland, a drama, 486.
Ireland a prey to law and lawyers, 574.
Irish beauty, 446.
Irish farmers, food of, 584.
Irish leases, 474.

- Irish reapers, 524.
 Jones, Mr, of Clonmel, 404.
 Journey from Kilkenny to Tipperary, 459.
 Judicial butchery in Ireland, 539.
 Kelly, Mr James, 518.
 Kelly, Mr, evidence of, on Irish agriculture, 497.
 Keon, Mr, evidence of, before Devon commission, 516.
 Kilkenny, 452.
 Land tenures, evils arising from their insecurity, 434.
 Landed estates in Chancery, 456.
 Leases, 536.
 Lefroy, Baron, 502.
 Liberal politicians not always the best landlords, 507.
 Limerick and Waterford railway, 468.
 Limerick county, 537.
 Limerick, plain of, 543.
 Longford county, 499.
 Lorton, Lord, 503.
 Lough Conn, 526.
 Lough Derg, 480, 482.
 Low rent and bad cultivation, 487.
 Lucan, Earl of, 527.
 Macnab, Mr, of Castleconnell, 576.
 Mahoney, Mr, 572.
 Mannix, Mr, 455.
 Mayo, county of, 520, 521.
 Mayo, mountains of, 520.
 Meal-dealers, 590.
 Men of the Irish bogs, 477.
 Mendicancy in Carlow, a sketch, 444.
 Middlemen, their origin, 597.
 Military escorts, 447.
 Moffat, Mr David, 516.
 Monsell, Mr, of Tervoe, 493.
 More power, 496.
 Murders in Longford, causes of, 504.
 Nephin mountain, 526.
 Newcastle, county of Limerick, 558.
 Noire river, 454.
 Novels, subjects for, 592.
 O'Brien, Robert, Esq., 556, 578.
 O'Brien, W. Smith, Esq., 544.
 O'Brien's Bridge, 575.
 Ormond, Marquis of, 453.
 Penal laws, their effect on Irish prosperity, 597.
 Picture of a military escort, 550.
 Ploughmen, diet of, 551.
 Police, 437.
 Political economy misunderstood, 510.
 Political vassalage, 519.
 Poor-rate defaulters, 499.
 Poor-rates, 529.
 Popular errors of popular writers, 590.
 Population cleared from good land and located on bad, 450.
 Potato failure, statistics of, 482.
 Public works, 531.
 Public works, abuse of, 555, 579.
 Prices of corn, popular errors respecting the, 590.
 Provinces of Ireland, potato cultivation in each of the, 484.
 Pym, Mr, of Dublin, 434.
 Quakers in Tipperary, 474.
 Quantities of food required to supply the place of potatoes, 483.
 Railways, grants of public money for, 467.
 Rathkeale, 544.
 Relief works, 589.
 Religious persecution, its social and political results, 598.
 Rent and wages in Westmeath, 513.
 Rent and wages, their source, 600.
 Reynell, Mr Richard Walter, 513.
 Rooney, Mr Edward, 517.
 Roscommon, 487.
 Rundale tenures, 521.
 Sale of cotton and sale of land contrasted, 457.
 Savage and sublime in Mayo, 520.
 Saxon and Celt, 495, 593.
 Scots Greys, a day with the, 447.
 Shannon river, 475, 479, 481, 538.
 Sligo county, 592.
 Small farms, 581.
 Society of friends, 460.
 Sod drains, 458.
 Sodom, Gomorrah, Cracow, and Ballinamuck, 505.
 Songs of civil war, 475.
 South-western railway, 441.
 Spectral farm labourers, 567.
 Starvation, 507.
 Steam-boats on the Shannon, 480.
 Suir river, 459.
 Tipperary, a remarkable farmer in, 464.
 Tolls and customs, 532.
 Trade despised in Ireland, 478.
 Transfer of landed property compared with transfer of cotton, 457.
 Turf fuel in steamboats, 480.
 Wages and rent, 513.
 Wages of ploughmen, 552.
 Waterford, Marquis of, 464.
 Westmeath farming, 513.
 Whistler's manner of arming himself against the hungry peasantry, 449.
 Workhouses in Ireland, 526.

FREE TRADE AND THE LEAGUE.

FIRST DIVISION.

FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE ADVENT OF ADAM SMITH.

SECT. I.—WAUB AND WASSA THE SAVAGES.

To any nation, internal productiveness by industry and external intercourse with other nations by commerce, are the only sources of prosperity and enduring power. Commerce is the best guarantee of peace and progressive civilisation. The first element of commerce is security; the second freedom: security of person and property; freedom of locomotion and exchange.

Waub was a naked savage in a forest far beyond the Rhine, with strong fingers and long nails. When he was hungry, and had slain no enemies in war on which to appease his cannibal appetite, he scratched roots from the ground with his nails and ate them.

Wassa was also a naked savage, but not a cannibal. Being fleet of foot and hungry, he captured a goat and ate of its flesh. But he was also cold, for he was naked, and he put the skins of the goat around him for a garment.

Waub lay on the ground eating his earthy roots under a covering of grass and leaves which he had gathered, but which art had not yet rendered into a roof or a mat, when Wassa passed near him covered in the skin of the goat and eating a piece of its flesh. "Give me that flesh," cried Waub, "I am hungry." "Nay," replied Wassa, "it is my own, but if you desire to have it, give unto me of those earth nuts to eat with my flesh, and thou shalt have a piece of my flesh to eat with thy earth nuts." And they exchanged. And thus, we have heard, did the trade of exchange begin among the savages whose descendants afterwards became the kings, the nobles, and the people of England.

But while Wassa still tarried, Waub cried, "Give me that skin, I am cold." "Nay," said Wassa, "it is my own. But get thee more earth nuts, ye who fear not to scratch for them where the great boar is that ate our neighbour Gobbo, and I shall to the mountains and fetch thee a goat. We shall eat of its flesh and of your roots and fruits together; and for as many roots as shall serve me to take to the mountains when I go to lie in wait for the goats next time, thou shalt have a skin for a garment." Waub said he was willing; and so the first contract of exchange was made.

But when Wassa went to the mountains, Waub went not to the wooded dell where the plants grew with the roots called earth nuts. "For," said he, "why should I go in the way of the great boar which ate up our neighbour Gobbo, when I can get the flesh of a goat for food, and the skin of a goat to wear for a garment? I am stronger than Wassa; he is fleet of foot; but I am stronger. I shall have both skins, that which he is to fetch for me and also that which he wears for a garment."

So Waub laid hold of Wassa on his return and took both skins from him by force. He took the flesh of the goat also and gave Wassa nothing. Had resistance been made, he might have killed and eaten Wassa himself. Thus was trade hindered at the very beginning, for there was no security of person and property—the first element of commerce. Wassa betook himself to the mountains and lived apart from Waub, and had more skins than he could fasten as garments upon his body; while heavy-footed Waub, who could catch no goats, soon wore out his two skins, and once more walked in the forest naked, or covered himself with loose grass and leaves when he lay down to rest.

But in process of time they both became chiefs among savages, and made war upon each other and upon other chiefs. They took captives in the wars, of whom some were saved alive, while some were slain and eaten. Wassa and the chiefs who, like him, lived in advance of their age, said it was more useful to save the captives alive, and add them to the numerical strength of their tribes. But Waub, like the chiefs who believed with him, said it was an old custom to kill their captives and eat them, and he would not set aside the old customs; he never knew good to follow the changes called improvements. "I have always been a cannibal," said he, "and shall live and die a cannibal, as my father did before me."

SECT. II.—THEOBRAS THE FEUDAL CHIEF.

Hundreds of generations had lived and passed away, and mankind were not as they were in the days of Waub and Wassa. There had been war always, and it still continued. Commerce there had been none ; nor had its time come. Yet civilisation had begun to track the forests with its footsteps.

Theobras, a great warrior, was now chief of the boar forest where Waub had scratched for roots, and of the mountains where Wassa caught the wild goats. Upon a rock in one of the ravines in those mountains he had built a strong place of residence and defence. He had vassals under him, who for their fiefs in land, forest, and river, did him military service. They had serfs under them, and he himself yielded to the superiority of a suzerain, his cousin Theodoric.

Said the fair lady, Brensa, to him one day when he returned in triumph from the conquest of other lordly chiefs whom he had reduced to vassalage, "Why is my Theobras not kind? Is it well that I should be so many months alone within these walls, and have no men of craft left to make sandals for my feet, to tan the skins for my new robe, to carry fresh rushes to my chamber, and make me the garniture against your coming? Is it well that all my lord's men of handicraft should be makers of bows and arrows, of clubs and spears, and hammerers and grinders of that black metal called iron, which they have found in the mountains, to make you swords of war? Is it well that my lord should be long absent, and be ungallant when he returns, and withhold from me my heart's desire? Give me the freedom of John the hammerer of iron, Peter the tanner of skins, Joseph the plaiter of straw and flax, and his brother Gudge, the curious worker in wood, William also, the sandalmaker, and the expert fashioner of robes of fur, the son of Burr the herd. Let them have workshops without the walls of the castle, and dwelling-places there also. Let them have freedom to go in search of skins, of straw, of wood, and iron. Let them go far and return as they list with what they gather together. Perchance they may find gold in the mountain as well as iron. Take them not again to the wars, for they are men cunning in handicraft and they may be slain. Let them be free to serve me, my lord Theobras, if ye love me."

To which Theobras replied, Brensa, it is the glory of the age in which we live that a lady asks not a favour of her lord in vain. John, Peter, Joseph, Joseph's brother Gudge, and

the expert fashioner of robes, the son of Burr the herd, shall have workshops in which to do you service, but they cannot have liberty to go and return as they list. For, know ye not, Brensa, that to make them freemen is to lay the axe to the root of this glorious fabric of feudal society which our forefathers reared out of anarchy, and which we have inherited and consolidated? Know ye not that it would be danger to us and ruin to themselves, even as stones taken from the castle walls would be worthless if thrown loose upon the ground, while the walls would already prove that the time of their decay was come, were I to set them free? Know ye not that all men were free once, and that they were cannibals in those days, and slew one another for daily food? The authority of the lords-paramount among whom I now stand second only to Theodoric my cousin, has been reared upon the subjugation of anarchy; the liberty of each man to slay his neighbour, or take from him his bow and arrow, his club, or his goat's flesh, is now suppressed; and life and death and limb are vested in the feudal chiefs, or granted by the chief to vassals who do service for the privilege. We have redeemed mankind from barbarism, they must continue in servitude to us, else they return to barbarism again."

So John the hammerer of iron, Peter the tanner of skins, Joseph the worker in straw and flax, Gudge his brother, the curious worker in wood, William the worker in leather, and the expert fashioner of fur robes, the son of Burr the herd, continued to be bondsmen. Each pursued his craft in his workshop, but none had liberty to go abroad in search of material to work upon, or to see what kind of instruments other craftsmen worked with. Neither could they retain for themselves aught which they made, or exchange it for the work of other bondsmen's hands. And so it resulted, that though aristocracy had arisen upon the suppression of barbarous anarchy, and men were no longer savage, with power to slay one another, commerce made no progress; for its first element, security to person and property, did not exist, while its second element, freedom of exchange, could not exist, there being no security to individual property.

SECT. III.—ARISTOCRACY, MONARCHY, AND THEOCRACY.

New generations came and passed away. The noble chiefs of the highest degree under the suzerains had willingly established kingly powers and kingly titles; for each saw it to be within the scope of his intrigue or the fortune of war to become a monarch; while the nobles of inferior degree, the major part of the aristocracy, hoped in monarchy to find protection from the injustice of the great chiefs. Thus arose that institution of monarchy in modern Europe, which, through many vicissitudes and modifications, still exists. Feeble always when the feudal aristocracy were strong, and often powerless to rule, it restrained neither licentiousness of power nor ferociousness of manners, because it could not give punishment to injustice.

But there was a greater power than aristocracy and monarchy combined, which modified both—theocracy. Partaking of the spirit, the forms and the practice of the feudal ages, the church lifted its mitred head, with its superior and inferior orders, and not only exercised the temporal power co-equal with the monarchy and the aristocracy, but practised the all-supreme power of awarding to kings and nobles, to the rulers and the ruled, to the feudal lords and the feudal serfs, their spiritual destiny after this life. Theocracy had its religious creeds and its moral precepts. But it was its assumption of supernatural power which bridled the unruly lords, restrained the license of kings, and raised the feudal boors somewhat above brutishness.

The distracted vassals and serfs, and the monarchs hardly less distracted, because powerless against the turbulent chiefs of feudalism, found protection in the theocratic institutions. That they might reduce the power of the nobility by adding to their muniments of war and enjoyments of peace, the kings gave charters of freedom to the workers in timber, iron, leather, and cloth; the brewers of malt and the grinders of meal, who inhabited the fortified dwelling and working places, the future borough towns, under the protecting walls of the feudal castles. What the kings began the church extended, by drawing forth the industrial genius of the people to be exercised in arts, handicraft, and agriculture. And the theocratic power rested not until feudalism was abolished, and men ceased, in England at least, to hold property in the persons of their fellow-men.

But the track of civilisation, emerging from barbarism in the forests of savage Europe, as now traced, crossed in many instances the remnants of a former civilisation. It came upon

the municipal remnants of the Gaulic and British colonies of old Rome. Roman civilisation had arisen out of a system not unlike the feudality of the Europe which we have just glanced at. Migratory bands carried the religious castes and classes of the Asiatic east to the European west. The domination of the most powerful, perhaps the religion of all, perpetuated the class differences; but the wars of conquest in which all were engaged gave birth to individual activity of thought even in the lowest. They founded and reared the Roman state in Italy; they carried conquests far beyond Italy; and so long as they made new conquests, and took fresh plunder to Rome, their governing power endured. But they knew not the principles of commerce. They despised trade, and perished under conquerors who plundered them in like manner as they had conquered and plundered others. Without external commerce and internal manufactures and trade, states cannot endure. And without freedom of action to the industrious, and security to the property of the humblest citizen, manufactures and commerce cannot take root and flourish to sustain a state. In England at this day, the major part of all the manufacturers and merchants who have given wealth, power, and solidity to their country, have sprung at no distant date, many of them in their own persons in the last and present generations, from that class of the people which in Rome or Greece would not have been permitted to acquire property, nor to rise above the plebeian condition.

Rome and Greece perished; for their national resources were expansive only by war. A violent extinction, or slow decay and ruin, must of necessity overtake a nation which is always destructive of the world's wealth, consuming always and producing nothing. Modern states shall survive difficulties of early existence and imperfect government, and expand and become powerful, and be filled with the elements of physical comfort and mental happiness in proportion as the destructive practice of war is departed from, with its non-remunerative consumption, and in proportion as liberty to produce and exchange commodities of use is extended.

But the conquests of Rome in Gaul and Britain deposited the political seeds of that freedom which in a subsequent age germinated and grew to strength, and gave existence to a new principle—the civilizing and liberalizing principle of commerce. The impossibility of retaining so many distant colonies in subjection by the presence of Roman legions, when Rome had not legions to devote to such a duty, led to the enfranchisement of municipalities with powers of self-government. When the conquering tribes from the back-grounds

of Europe, led by the warriors who, in time, became feudal chiefs and kings, over-ran the empire and the colonies of Rome, they were not so powerful in destruction as to obliterate all traces and traditions of the municipalities. In the fief granted by a suzerain to a lord, or by a lord-paramount to a vassal, the towns and their population were included ; and the lord assumed the right of disposing of all or any of the inhabitants as his will directed him. But he could not always exercise this right. The democratic principle of Roman municipality was dormant but not dead, and it was at times, by the poignancy of the feudal oppression, roused from dormancy.

Had the theocratic, the aristocratic, and monarchial powers been content to hold the feudal rule equally between them, democracy might have slept itself to death, or, waking from sleep by oppression, have destroyed its own existence in the violence of its efforts to be free. But the theocratic power, assuming authority over the kings and lords, and possessing a sacred character, gave freedom to bondsmen, by affording sanctuary in the churches. Rebellious vassals and fugitive boors, to escape from punishment, fled to the churches within the walled towns, claimed sanctuary before the altars, and obtained it. In the towns they became residents, and traders, or craftsmen, and, from the manner of their entrance there, were not likely to be the last who would oppose, or speak of opposing, the privileges of the lords-paramount. By the sanctuary of the church, in short, there were drawn from feudal dominion assemblages of men who imbibed and propagated opinions of individual liberty, not only subversive of feudalism, but ultimately subversive of theocracy and church sanctuary itself. In like manner the monarchs gave charters of incorporation to those town-dwelling opponents of aristocracy, with the view of weakening the lord-superiors of fiefs, and of strengthening monarchy ; and the incorporated burghers ultimately became too strong even for kings, and demanded and obtained a share in the supreme government of the nation.

In later times we have seen the incorporated towns, trades, and public bodies of men, restraining the expansion of trade. Looked upon thus, they have been condemned as monopolists, and all trade charters and commercial privileges of corporation have been condemned with them, as unjust and always evil in their operation. But they were not always unjust nor always evil in their operation. Their first purpose was to protect private property and individual liberty, without which protection no commerce could have come into existence in the feudal ages. It was when the first element of commerce,

the security of individual possessions, had been long established and long out of danger, and upon which commerce had become national, and was so great as to require the complete application of its second element, freedom of exchange. It was then that corporations, once the cradles of infant trade, and for many generations its nurseries, were found to be so small for its dimensions as to restrain its growth and to cripple it.

Yet, notwithstanding the privileges of the chartered traders dwelling in towns, neither the royal protection nor the influence of the church, as a theocracy, were always able to save them from the injustice of the feudal barons. The borough trader was allowed to come without the walls with his wares to sell at castle gates and at the statute fairs; but the retainers of the lord, often headed by the lord himself, lay in watch for the burgher's return with the price of the goods he had sold. This led to the burghers raising a militia, and going forth in armed bands, which again led to warfare, and not unfrequently to the feudal chiefs uniting together, laying siege to, capturing and plundering, the refractory towns. But this again, especially in Italy and Flanders, roused the burghers to new efforts of resistance, and even to aggression upon the castles and the fiefs, whereby they asserted their independence, and wrested from the lords-paramount charters of enfranchisement and treaties of peace.

Thus we see how antagonistic principles and actions have produced results favourable to human liberty and civilisation. From the cannibalism of the savage, through all the gradations of tribe-chieftainship, aristocracy, theocracy, monarchy, municipalities, and democratic representations, we may trace the progress of security to individual property, and the nearer approach of those ages of civilisation in which men shall exchange their thoughts and their commercial commodities with equal freedom, and in which the physical and the intellectual nature of all human kind shall be enduringly exalted.

We shall now review individually those personages of history who have by laws, or philosophy, or commercial practice, taken a lead in the development of the civilizing principles of trade.

SECT. IV.—KING OFFA OF MERCA.

The last and the greatest act of statesmanship in favour of commercial freedom, previous to the time when those words before the reader's eyes were first traced on paper, was the act of Sir Robert Peel, for the abolition of all restrictions on

the importation of corn into the British islands ; an act passed in 1846, to take final effect in 1849. The last public declaration of Sir Robert Peel's sentiments upon this act, and upon the other free-trade measures passed into law while he was prime minister, was made to his constituents in the town of Tamworth, at the general election of 1847, a year after he had ceased to be prime minister.

In that same town of Tamworth the first political letters from England to a foreign ruler, establishing a treaty of commerce were written. They were the letters of Offa, king of Mercia, to Charlemagne of France. Mercia was one of the seven kingdoms into which England was divided by the Anglo-Saxons. It comprised the present counties of Lincoln, Nottingham, Derby, Leicester, Northampton, Rutland, Huntingdon, Bedford, Buckingham, Hertford, Oxford, Gloucester, Worcester, Warwick, Stafford, Salop, and Chester. It thus included the shores of the Humber, Trent, Thames, and Severn, and the Dee, at Chester, which was for many centuries after that period a chief seaport. But in addition to holding the possession of those navigable rivers, Offa was the superior of the other Anglo-Saxon kings. They held their kingdoms from him by feudal tenure.

In forming treaties of commerce with Charlemagne he acted for all England. His own letters of negotiation have not been preserved, but one of the answers received has been committed to history. It refers in the first instance to the tax upon pilgrims travelling to Rome.

"Charles, by the grace of God, King of the Franks and Lombards, and patrician of the Romans, to our venerable and most dear brother, Offa, King of the Mercians, greeting. First, we give thanks to God for the sincere Catholic faith which we see so laudably expressed in your letters, concerning the strangers who, for the love of God and the salvation of their souls, wish to repair to the thresholds of the blessed apostles, let them travel in peace without any trouble. Nevertheless, if any are found among them not in the service of religion, but in the pursuit of gain, let them pay the established duties at the proper places."

This refers to the practice of smugglers going into the dominions of Charlemagne under the disguise of pilgrims. He continues :—

"We also will that merchants shall have lawful protection in our kingdom according to our command ; and if they are in any place unjustly aggrieved, let them apply to us or our judges, and we shall take care that ample justice be done to them."

Offa began to reign in the year 757 and died in 795. Besides encouraging our internal and external commerce, he caused a ditch to be cut from Bristol to Basingwerk in Flintshire, as a barrier to the Britons in Wales. He overcame the disturbers of peace on every side and maintained peace, whereby he did more to make trade extend itself than any law directly intended for its extension could have done. Trade is as natural to human society as vegetation is natural to the earth. It will at any time, in any place, spring, grow, and flourish, if not restricted by the want of freedom or opposed by violence.

Articles of silver and gold were probably those which the pilgrim smugglers and the English merchants dealt in; for English workmanship in gold was already famed upon the continent. The returns for such commodities were probably silks from Lombardy; but more certainly they were in good part religious relics manufactured at Rome and sold in England.

Previous to this date the Jews were settled in England as traders. Possibly that enterprising but oppressed race introduced the civilizing elements of foreign commerce into Britain as they did into every other nation of Europe. Previous to the crusades which gave the warrior Christians of Europe an insight into the costumes of dress and furniture in the east, and enabled them to return to their respective countries with much useful knowledge of arts and manufactures, the migratory Jews were the only instructors of the Europeans in the uses of articles of oriental luxury.

SECT. V.—KING ALFRED.

This illustrious prince may be reckoned as one of the promoters of English commerce, inasmuch as he taught his Saxon subjects the use of a naval armament, and the practice of ship-building for the defence of the coasts and towns situated on navigable rivers. The Danes, a Scandinavian race, who were well practised and adventurous upon the sea as the Saxons had formerly been, invaded England as the Saxons had also formerly done. Alfred fought many battles with the Danes, defeating them, and being defeated in turn. They were too courageous, too well inured to the adventures of war, and too much in love with the fertile fields which the Saxons had usurped, to be easily driven away. To the future advantage of the maritime superiority of Britain, they remained, and mingled their blood and energetic natures with the slower and more solid Saxons. It has also been alleged

that Alfred instituted trial by jury, which, had it been true, might have been set down as promotive of that security to life and property which is the original source of trade. But trial by jury—a jury formed of the witnesses for and against an accused person—had been practised immemorially by the Saxons, and continued to be practised for several centuries after Alfred's time. However, there were other things done by Alfred which gave an impetus to the trading progress of the kingdom. He not only built ships and practically taught the duty of self reliance, he improved the art of house-building by the use of stones and brick, and encouraged religion and learning by the foundation of colleges, and by denying preferment, clerical or political, to priests or laymen who were not able to read Latin or English. He classified and embodied in writing the laws which before were traditional and capricious. All those good services were for the future benefit of commercial England. They would have been more immediately beneficial had not wars, as usual, interrupted the progress of the internal and external trade, which was the offspring of liberal and honest government. Alfred died in the forty-sixth year of his age and twenty-fourth of his reign, in the year 901.

SECT. VI.—KING ATHELSTAN.

This king was the grandson of Alfred, and is more remarkable than any of his predecessors for the respect he paid to trade and traders. He passed a law that every merchant who had made three foreign voyages should be created a thane, or a noble, with all the honours and privileges of nobility. He was the first monarch who ruled over the whole of England. He engaged in several wars, but peace and not conquest seems to have been his motive. He overcame the Welsh in battle, and captured Howell their chief. But he gave him his dominions back, saying it was more glorious to make a king than to dethrone one. He made the Welsh tributary to England, and entered into treaties of peace with the Scotch. He promoted the progress of religion and learning by having portions of the Bible translated into Saxon. He promoted civilisation by the free scope and favour he gave to commercial intercourse. Having reigned fifteen years and some odd months, from 925 to 941, Athelstan died at Gloucester on the 27th of October, and was buried at Malmesbury.

SECT. VII.—THE PRINCESS ELFGIVA.

Edmund, brother and next successor of Athelstan, need only be mentioned here for the sake of his wife, Elfgiva. This lady gained an illustrious place in history by the devotion of her royal influence and wealth to the liberation of villains and slaves. She purchased the liberty of those who had good ability as craftsmen, and set them to work as freedmen. She thus extended the foundations of that personal freedom and industrial enterprise which has made Britain eminent among nations. Elfgiva was celebrated in her day for all the other virtues which do honour to womankind. Her husband, King Edmund, was stabbed by an assassin named Leof, in Puckle Church, Gloucestershire, in the seventh year of his reign, and was buried at Glastonbury Abbey, in Somersetshire. Of this abbey, at that time, Dunstan, the famous blacksmith, was abbot. The next two kings, Edred and Edwy, may only be named, because Dunstan lived while they reigned, and was banished by Edwy. He was recalled by Edwy's successor, Edgar, and made Archbishop of Canterbury.

SECT. VIII.—KING EDGAR THE PEACEABLE.

This king promoted commerce and manufactures. He enjoined by law, with the advice of Dunstan, that all monks should learn some trade of handicraft, practise it in the monastic establishment, and teach it to others. He built ships, and increased the navy to 350 vessels; maintained the national supremacy in the English and Irish Channels against invasion and piracy; and reigned in greater dignity and power than any previous sovereign of England. To keep the feudal turbulence of the Thanes in moderation, he founded the Abbeys of Abingdon and Ramsey, and added much wealth and many privileges to that of Croyland, and also built forty-seven monasteries, in all of which, for the benefit of the untaught boors, who knew no arts but swine-breeding and a rude agriculture, he caused the mechanical arts to be made a monastic qualification. To restrain excessive drinking, he caused pins to be inserted in the drinking cups, and ordained that certain penalties should be paid by those who drank deeper than the next pin. To destroy the wolves of the Welsh mountains, he laid a tribute of wolves' heads on the princes of Wales, who sent him 300 each year for three years, after which they had none to send, the wolves being all dead. Edgar the Peaceable died in the year 975, in the thirty-second year of his age and seventeenth of his reign, and was buried

at Glastonbury Abbey. He was succeeded by his son Edward, a youth twelve years old, who, at the end of three years and a half, was murdered in Corfe Castle, Dorsetshire, at the instance of his stepmother, Elfrida, that her son Ethelred might be king. Ethelred was crowned by Dunstan, who was still archbishop of Canterbury. On this occasion a coronation oath was administered to the sovereign for the first time, a step towards constitutional government suggested and enforced by Dunstan. This Ethelred, second of the name, was a feeble king, always embroiled in warfare. In his reign Dunstan died. But the archbishop succeeded before his death in impressing upon the criminal Elfrida the necessity and virtue of penitence. She founded two nunneries and confined herself to one of them, that of Wherwell, three miles from Andover, in Hampshire. In accordance with the counsel of Dunstan, who never omitted an opportunity of advancing the interests of manufactures and trade, she gave freedom and corporate privileges to many of the bondmen around Wherwell, and granted them the charter of a fair. The fair is to this day a great mart for sheep, to which the farmers of Wilts and Hampshire go with their flocks. The land, which was given to the freedmen as an inheritance, is in most part now a preserve for game. We may stand on the elevated green, where sheep, cattle, and farm-implements are shewn for sale, and look abroad upon the bewildered agriculture amid the game preserves, and back upon the far distant pages of history, and be at a loss to decide, so far as any evidence there can prove, whether the world has advanced or retrograded, or only stood still, since those pages were written.

SECT. IX.—ST DUNSTAN, ARCHBISHOP AND BLACKSMITH.

If, standing on the green at Wherwell fair, in Hampshire, we be at a loss to say whether the world has advanced, or retrograded, or stood still, during the 870 years which have elapsed between the last queenly days of Elfrida the criminal, and the eleventh year of Victoria the virtuous, so far as wild beasts and birds, and the bewildered science of agriculture can help us to a decision, we shall not be at a loss to tell in which direction the world has moved if we turn to the forges of the mechanics and the science of working in iron. From the rude smithies of Dunstan at Glastonbury and Abingdon, where the simplest forgework was associated in the popular mind with the belief that the monkish mechanic was assisted by demons who were taken by the nose with his red hot tongs to hold them to their work, and who in turn took the red hot

tongs and held Dunstan their master by the nose ! Let us turn from those rude smithies, and the ruder traditions of the demon apprentices, and look upon the engine and the machine making of the Stephensons, Sharps, Fairbairns, Roberts's, or Nasmyths of Manchester, or into the workshops of a thousand other master mechanics throughout the kingdom, and what see we ? Machinery, as if it had mind and soul within it, is making machinery ; making it to work in the mine, in the ship, at the factory, at the forge, with the spindle, with the shuttle, with the hammer, with the file, upon water, upon earth, and upon all the materials which come out of water or of earth. Machinery making machinery, as if every motion was an impulse of benevolence, each heave of the motive steam an aspiration for human well-being ; making it to comfort and clothe the body, to transmute the body's rags for the mind's highest services ; making machinery to imprint, while it is yet the sleeping time of night, mind-enlarging thoughts in endless multiplication of copies ; machinery making machinery to take the speed of the wind to all the compass points at once, from whence the wind ever blew, to scatter millions of thoughts among millions of thinkers while the sun is still but rising ; making machinery to subdue time and space, highest mountains and widest oceans, to achieve conquest over enmities as deep as oceans—over differences of language, race, and prejudice, obdurate as mountain rocks and almost as ancient. And who stands by to guide that machinery whose motion is thus to create power to multiply and reproduce ? Not the evil demons whom ignorance associated with Dunstan, when English iron-working was first begun, for all the services done for mankind here are beneficent, righteous, and spirit freeing ; not the divinities fabled to be godlike, for there is nothing done here which is magical or mysterious, all is explicable, scientific, simple. Mechanic journeymen and apprentices of intelligent thought, of skilful hand, *direct* the bellows to blow the furnace, the hammers to strike the heated iron, the chisels to cut it, the incisors to incise it, the planes to plane it, the lathes to fashion it, the screws to screw and join it, and the rivets to rivet it ; and when it is fitted, joined, rivetted, and built into an engine, they give it fire and water, and it heaves and blows, and takes upon itself the offices of life and the power of locomotion, and performs more wonderful feats of strength than is attributed even in tradition to that fabled assistant whom Dunstan led forth to work by the nose with his red hot tongs.

That Dunstan was a politician, so acute in his tactics as to be accounted in history a cunning schemer, we easily need

believe. No other species of political talent could have raised him, as a monk, to be successively abbot, bishop, archbishop, and pope's legate, in times of such turbulence, and during the reign of no less than seven kings. Had he been a less ambitious man, he would have been less useful to the age in which he lived and to posterity. Had he been a less talented and patriotic man, yet not less ambitious, he would have been content to rule as an archbishop without instructing mankind and sowing the seeds of civilisation through his country as a mechanic. To his counsel given to the sovereigns under whom he lived, and to his own episcopal injunctions to the clergy whom he governed, to have all monasteries associated with workshops for the practice and diffusion of the mechanical arts, England, in her subsequent ages of industry, is deeply indebted; more indebted to Dunstan than to any single improver of the science of mechanics after him until James Watt.

But he was a painter as well as a worker in iron and all other metals. A picture of the Saviour, with Dunstan prostrate, painted by himself, and bearing inscriptions from his own hand, is still preserved at Oxford. Another branch of art to which he applied himself was somewhat analogous to the designer or pattern drawer of modern calico printers. He drew the patterns for the colours in lady's robes, coloured them, and instructed others in the art. Historians, living long after the semi-barbarous age of Dunstan, have ridiculed this distinguished churchman for the supposed puerility or vulgarity of his pastimes; they themselves being inexcusably ignorant of the unspeakable services rendered to all posterity by a man in his position rescuing a nation from industrial lethargy and ignorance.

The casting of church bells was one of his mechanical employments; and there is reason to believe that he invented moveabletypes for printing. He died in the year 989.

From this period up to the Norman invasion in 1066, there was nothing done by any individual or public event to promote trade, and not much done, save what resulted from incessant wars and revolutions, to deteriorate it. Perhaps the country derived an ultimate advantage from those wars, arising from the invasions of the Danes, which more than counterbalanced the evil done at the time. An adventurous and hardy race of maritime northerners settled in all the seaports, and sowed the ancestral energies of the future mariners of England. There was one man, however, in this period who should not be overlooked—Wulfstan, bishop of Worcester. His services to commerce resulted from his ser-

vices to humanity. In conjunction with him, we should also notice St Augustin, who had devoted himself in the same manner to teach them humanity and the spirit of Christianity several centuries earlier.

SECT. X.—THE ANTI-SLAVERY PREACHERS, ARCHBISHOP AUGUSTIN
AND BISHOP WULFSTAN.

History affirms that Britain owes the introduction of the Christian religion, through the mission of St Augustin, to the sale of English slaves in Rome. There Gregory, the patron of the Christian missionary, saw them exposed for sale, and, pitying the heathens who made commerce of their children, he sent Augustin to Britain to convert them to religion and humanity. But, unwilling as the Pagan Saxons were to embrace the new religion, they were most obdurately stubborn, and for several centuries they continued obdurate, on the business of slave dealing. Five hundred years after the conversion of the Saxon kings and people nominally to Christianity, there were regular markets for the exportation of slaves to Ireland at Chester and Bristol, those cities being the chief ports for Irish intercourse, slaves being the chief commodity exchanged for gold and silver, of which Ireland then possessed more than England. The superior knowledge of the industrial arts among the Irish in that age, which the remnants of architecture and records of learning still attest, was doubtless the attractive cause which induced the slave commerce with the less civilized but commercially inclined Saxons. William of Malmesbury, writing nearly a hundred years after the Norman conquest, affirms that the practice of selling even their nearest relations had not been entirely abandoned in Northumberland. Possibly the Romans, who were the first slave dealers in Britain whom we read of, and remnants of whom remained long in Northumberland, their descendants are alleged to be traceable there to this day—possibly the slave selling was both introduced and continued by them.

In the biography of Bishop Wulfstan, written about the time of the Norman conquest, we read the following:—

“There is a seaport town called Bristol, opposite to Ireland, into which its inhabitants make frequent voyages on account of trade. Wulfstan cured the people of this town of a most inveterate custom, which they derived from their ancestors, of buying men and women in all parts of England and exporting them to Ireland for the sake of gain. They carried women to market in their pregnancy that they might get a better price. You might have seen, with sorrow, long

ranks of young persons, of both sexes and of the greatest beauty, tied together with ropes, and daily exposed for sale; nor were they ashamed—oh, horrid wickedness!—to give up their nearest relations, nay, their own children, to slavery. Wulfstan, knowing the obstinacy of those people, sometimes stayed two months among them, preaching every Lord's day, by which, in process of time, he made so great an impression upon their minds, that they abandoned that wicked trade, and set an example to all the rest of England to do the same."

In the reign of the second Ethelred, between 978 and 1016, laws were passed, by the influence of the church, forbidding the sale of slaves out of the kingdom. But laws were enacted rather as admonitions than as statutes. The trade was not abolished until a later period.

The relative proportions of freemen and bondmen, and the various classes of those in bondage immediately before the Norman invasion, have been thus recorded.

SECT. XI.—CLASSES OF SAXON SOCIETY.

The population of England was then, about the year 1050, estimated at 1,800,000.

In thirty-four counties the burgesses and citizens amounted to 17,105; villains to 102,704; bordars to 74,823; cottars, 5947; serfs or thralls, to 26,552; the remaining population consisted of freemen, ecclesiastics, knights, thanes, and landowners. Two-thirds of the entire population, subsisted in different degrees of servitude, though the persons strictly slaves were not above one out of every seven of the higher laborious classes of villains, bordars, and cottars.

The price of a slave was quadruple that of an ox—slaves and cattle formed the living money. They passed current in the payment of debts and in the purchase of commodities, at a value fixed by law, and supplied the deficiency of coin. Thus *pecus cattle* is the origin of the Latin *pecunia*, money, and of the English word *pecuniary*. The manumission of a slave to be legal had to be performed in public, in the market, in the Hundred Courts, or in the church, at the foot of the principal altar. The lord, taking the hand of the slave, offered it to the bailiff, sheriff, or clergyman, gave him a sword and a lance, and told him the ways were open, and that he was at liberty to go wheresoever he pleased.

The operatives of the Anglo-Saxons were mostly in a servile state. The clergy and the great had domestic servants who were qualified to supply them with those articles of trade and manufacture which were in common use. Hence in monas-

teries we find smiths and carpenters, millers, illuminators, architects, agriculturists, and fishermen. Smiths and carpenters were the most numerous and important, as ministering to the chief secular pursuits of the time—war and agriculture.

The shoemaker was a comprehensive trade, uniting branches that now form distinct businesses, as appears from the following list of articles he fabricated:—Ankle-leathers, shoes, leather hose, bottles, bridles, thongs, trappings, flasks, boiling vessels, leather neck-pieces, halters, wallets, and pouches.

The salter, baker, cook, and fisherman, were common occupations.

The art of dyeing scarlet by the help of an insect was discovered about 1000. Weaving and embroidery were practised. Edward the Elder had his daughters taught to exercise their needles and distaff. Indeed spinning was the common occupation of the Anglo-Saxon ladies. Alfred, in his will, calls the female part of his family the “spindle-side.” So, too, Egbert, when entailing his estates on his male descendants to the exclusion of females, says—“To the spear-side, and not to the spindle-side.” Of the skill and industry of the ancient spinsters we have an extraordinary instance in the tapestry which is still preserved in the cathedral of Bayeux. This curious relic of antiquity is a vast linen web 214 feet long, and two broad, on which is embroidered the history of the conquest. It is supposed to have been executed by English women under the direction of Matilda, wife of William I. Many of the figures are without stockings, though none are without shoes, which makes it probable that shoes were more generally used than stockings at this period. The common people, for the most part, had no stockings, nor any other covering on their legs, and even the clergy celebrated mass with their legs bare, till a law was made against the practice in the council of Chalchnythe in 785. Wooden shoes, which are now esteemed the marks of the greatest indigence and misery, were worn by the greatest princes of Europe in the ninth and tenth centuries.

From the custom of kings making presents of rich garments, vases, bracelets, and rings to their Witans and courtiers, and of great lords doing the same to their knights, the trade for making these must have had much employment. One of the Saxon trades seems to have been the tavern or public-house; for a priest is forbidden to drink at the “wine tuns.” An ale-house and ale-shop are also mentioned in the laws.

The Anglo-Saxons, who were unacquainted with the building arts, destroyed the magnificent structures left by the Romans. Nor did they much improve in the knowledge of

architecture for two centuries after their arrival. During that period masonry was quite unknown and unpractised in this island: the walls of the churches and even of the cathedrals were built of wood. Towards the end of the seventh century masonry was restored, and some other arts connected with it introduced by two ecclesiastics who had visited Rome. These were the famous Wilfred, Bishop of York, and Benedict Biscop, founder of the Abbey of Weremouth. Wilfred was a great architect, and erected several structures at York, Ripon, and Hexham, which were the admiration of his age. Those singular structures, called round towers, of which specimens are still to be seen at Ardmore in Ireland, and Abernethy in Scotland, are supposed to have been erected in the tenth century.—(*Wade's Chronology, Craik's British Commerce, Camden's Britannia, Turner's History, Macpherson's Commerce.*)

SECT. XII.—THE ANTAGONISM OF MONARCHY, ARISTOCRACY, AND THEOCRACY, RESULTS IN THE GREAT CHARTER OF ENGLAND.

From the Norman invasion in 1066 to the signing of Magna Charta by King John on the 15th of June 1215, commerce, domestic and foreign, was sacrificed by revolutions and war, and by legislation intended for its promotion, not less detrimental than revolutions and war. The kings who reigned during that time were—*First*, William the Conqueror, who reduced many of the free Saxons to bondage, and who, through a new feudal system, turned the civilisation of England backward. *Second*, William II., his son, who, like him, laid cultivated districts of great extent and high fertility waste, for the pleasure of hunting—an evil example readily imitated by the nobility and gentry, and not yet abandoned. In Hampshire alone, they laid waste thirty-six parish churches and villages, and forty miles of country, giving no compensation to the plundered inhabitants. *Third*, Henry I., youngest son of the Conqueror, who had a literary education, and from it was surnamed Beauclerc. He did some good for trade by the regulation of weights and measures. *Fourth*, Stephen, the grandson of the Conqueror. *Fifth*, Henry II., the grandson of Henry I., and son of Geoffrey Plantagenet, a French noble. *Sixth*, Richard I., the crusader, third son of Henry II., after whom was King John, the sixth son of Henry II. In the reign of Henry I., an assembly, which is alleged to have been the first parliament, was held at Salisbury, but it consisted only of the privileged nobles and bishops. In that

reign the navigation of the Trent and the Witham was improved by a cutting seven miles long. Stephen did less for the advancement of trade than his predecessor Henry I. In him the monarchy had neither honour nor safety ; it was beset with conspiracies on every side. "The succession to the crown" not being regulated by any fixed principle, the decease of the sovereign was invariably followed by an interval of rapine and confusion. Till a new king had ascended the throne, and received the homage of his subjects, it was assumed there could be no violation of "the king's peace ;" in consequence of this mischievous doctrine, the execution of justice was suspended, and the most lawless outrages committed with impunity. The disorders which usually accompanied a demise of the crown were continued uninterruptedly during the whole of Stephen's reign. To secure a usurped throne, he was compelled to make concessions to the clergy and nobility, equally destructive to his own authority and the public tranquillity. The former considered themselves bound by their oaths of allegiance to the king only so long as they were protected in their usurpations ; and the latter, in return for their submission, claimed the right of fortifying their castles, of coining money, of making war, and exercising other functions of sovereignty. Besides the general desolation arising out of a disputed title, the country was ravaged by baronial feuds, in which the nobles, aided by their vassals and mercenary adventurers, made war upon each other with the utmost fury. During these conflicts the condition of the people was most deplorable ; no security either for person or property. The castles were so many dens of robbers, who sallied forth day and night to commit spoils on the open country, the villages, and even the cities ; the woods were infested with banditti ; and such were the dangers to which the inhabitants were continually exposed, that on closing their doors at night it was customary to put up a short prayer against thieves and plunderers.

Torture was frequently resorted to by the titled brigands to extort from the people the produce of their industry. "Some," says the Saxon chronicler, "they hanged up by the feet, and smoked with foul smoke ; some by the thumbs, or by the beard, and hung coats of mail on their feet. They put them into dungeons with adders, and snakes, and toads ; many thousands they wore out with hunger." In short, the reign of Stephen was a condensation of all the evils of lawless power—neither justice nor humanity—and the natural result of such disorder was the cessation of the arts of industry, the land was left untilld, and a grievous famine ensued,

which reduced both the spoilers and the spoiled to extreme destitution.

The manners and customs of this half-civilized age are not without interest, and shew that an uneducated period is not one of virtuous simplicity. The court, in its perambulations through the country, exhibited a motley assemblage of the kind usually congregated at Bartholomew fair. "When," says Peter of Blois, "the king sets out in the morning, you see multitudes of people running up and down as if they were distracted; horses rushing against horses; carriages overturning carriages; players, whores, gamesters, confectioners, mimics, tailors, barbers, pimps, and parasites, making so much noise, and, in a word, such an intolerable tumult of horse and foot, that you imagine the great abyss hath opened, and that hell hath poured out all her inhabitants."

More abbeys were erected in this reign than in 100 years before, and the king giving leave to the nobles to build castles, 1500 of these fortresses were erected in different parts of the kingdom. There was no regular taxation, but the contending parties maintained themselves principally by the plunder of each other's tenants.—*Wade's Chronology*.

Henry II. came more into conflict with the clergy than with the nobles who had disturbed Stephen's reign. The ecclesiastics committed many offences, they resisted the power of the civil law, upon which the king held a national assembly of lords, lay and clerical, at Clarendon, a royal residence three miles east of the city of Salisbury, in January 1164. A series of regulations for the clergy were promulgated, and called, from the name of the place, the constitutions of Clarendon. The pope refused to ratify them, and Beckitt, archbishop of Canterbury, sided with the pope. The monarchy, in the person of Henry II., for a time asserted its superiority over the church, but the church was at last powerful enough to make the king hold the stirrups while the archbishop mounted his horse. And again the church gave monarchy, also in the person of Henry II., forty stripes on the bare back. The clergy waxed more loose in their moral discipline by the increase of their power, yet still they took the lead in all works of public improvement. In this reign a priest, Peter of Colechurch, built the first London bridge. The ascendancy of the clerical power resulted well for the liberty of the lower grades of the people. In their opposition to the king and the feudal barons, the clergy liberated many bondmen, and hastened the time when all were free. And when the time came that they were all free, the excesses of the church were corrected, and its power was subdued by the united

action of the liberated bondmen of the aristocracy, from whom their freedom had been wrested, and of the monarchy which became strong as the barons, divested of their feudal privileges, became weak.

Richard I., by joining in the crusades, served English commerce by his absence and want of opportunities to do it injury. King John led the way to his own subjection and the extension of popular rights by imprisoning twenty-two noblemen in Corfe Castle, where they were starved to death. "Liberty of all kinds was vendible in the reign of John," says the *British chronologist*, "even that of commerce and commercial rights. The men of Worcester paid the king 100 shillings that they might have the liberty of selling and buying dyed cloth as formerly. Geoffrey Fitzpierre gave two good Norway hawks for leave to export a hundred weight of cheese out of the king's dominions. The Archdeacon of Wells gave one tun of wine for leave to carry 600 seams of corn whither he would. Peter Parois gave twenty merks for leave to salt fish as Peter Chevalier used to do. Richard de Neville gave twenty palfreys to obtain the king's request to Isolda Bisset that she should take him for a husband. Roger Fitzwalter gave three good palfreys to have the king's letter to Roger Bertram's mother that she should marry him. Robert de Veaux gave five of the best palfreys that the king would hold his tongue about Henry Pinel's wife." And so on did the king proceed from one bad act to a worse, until he vexed the nobles so much, that they rose against his injustice, propounded the charter to him, and bound him to it.

The charter, however, was considered rather a public recognition of dormant immunities than a concession of new privileges. But even this indicated a progression in society; for it was no slight step in constitutional liberty to have acknowledged, and defined by a public law, rights which were previously vague or obsolete.

It ordains that all freemen shall be allowed to go out of the kingdom and return to it at pleasure. One weight and one measure shall be established throughout the kingdom; courts of justice shall be stationary, and not ambulatory with the king; circuits were to be held regularly every year; and justice no longer to be sold, refused, or delayed. Merchants to be allowed to transact all business without being exposed to tolls and impositions. No freeman to be taken or imprisoned, or dispossessed of his free tenement or liberties, or outlawed, or banished, or anywise hurt or injured, unless by the legal judgment of his peers, or the law of the land. Lastly, there was a stipulation in favour of the villains, the most numerous

class probably in the kingdom, and which hitherto had been considered unworthy of legislative notice. It was ordained that they should not be deprived, by any fine, of their carts, ploughs, and implements of industry.

Civil liberty had yet, however, made little progress. Laws were only arbitrary edicts issued by the king, with the consent of his privy council. According to feudal principles, all property was held of the king, on consideration of certain services. When a baron died, the king immediately took possession of the estates, and the heir was obliged to make application to the crown, and desire that he might be admitted to do homage for his land, and pay a composition to the king. This composition was arbitrary, and frequently exorbitant, the king keeping possession of the estate till it was paid. If the heir were a female, the king was entitled to offer her any husband he thought proper of the same rank; and if she refused him she forfeited her land. Even a male heir could not marry without the royal consent; and it was usual for men to pay large sums for the liberty of choosing a wife. Justice was a regular article of traffic, even in the king's court; and in Madox's History of the Exchequer there are numerous instances of the sums paid for the delaying, expediting, suspending, and, doubtless, preventing justice.

SECT. XIII.—HISTORICAL GLANCE FROM KING JOHN TO RICHARD II.

King John died in 1216, and was succeeded by his son Henry III., who died in 1272. Henry III. was succeeded by his son Longshanks, Edward I., who died in 1307. Longshanks was a king of war and not of commerce. Fortunately both for his English subjects and his Scottish enemies, he died at a time when the warlike conquest of Scotland seemed almost certain. Had he completed the conquest, and made Scotland an integral part of a British kingdom, as it is now, the service to both countries, and to civilisation, would have been some justification of his warlike adventures. But the political policy of that age despised commercial alliances. No moderation on the part of the English would have sufficiently sweetened the bitterness of denationality among the Scotch. But there would not have been moderation. That quality of government was unknown then, and for several centuries afterwards. It was better, therefore, that Edward I. died at the time he did. He was succeeded by his son Edward II., who was monstrously put to death by a confederacy between his queen and the nobles. The external wars in his father's reign were succeeded by in-

ternal broils in his. The kingdom was still infested with robbers, who were greatly augmented in number by the famine which prevailed during most of the time of Edward II. The waste by war had led to the neglect of agriculture; the barons were unable to feed their retainers, who, being discharged, met in troops like armies, and overran the country. Edward II. was succeeded by his son Edward III., who died in 1377. He, too, was a warring and wasting king, and he had a son more mischievous than himself, Edward the Black Prince. Fortunately for England, this firebrand expired in early life. Edward III. was succeeded by Richard II., son of the Black Prince. Richard died in 1399.

During the reign of those five sovereigns, Henry III., Edward I., Edward II., Edward III., and Richard II., from 1216 to 1399, England produced several eminent servants of their country and of mankind. The names of some of them are entirely lost, though the benefits they gave to their country survive. Others are only known by name, no record tells from whence they came, how long they lived, nor when they died. One of these was a weaver of Bristol.

SECT. XIV.—THOMAS BLANKET.

While Edward III., in 1337, repeated his invasion of Scotland, and “ravaged the country with great fury, burning Aberdeen and many smaller towns,” as the historians tell us; and while he was engaged in raising an army to invade France in 1338, exacting from the impoverished English people all their wealth to waste it in war; and when he was wasting France with war, borrowing money from all foreign princes who would lend to him, pawning the English crown, which made him a king, that he might still farther extend destruction over fertile France; when, in the battles which our historians and poets have so minutely recorded, and loftily sung of, swords clashed with swords, and battle-axes rung upon coats of mail, the warrior-heroes of England, mingling their blood and hacked heads with the blood and hacked heads of the warrior heroes of France, there was a servant of mankind making a noise in Bristol, which was of infinitely greater service to England than the entire conquest of Europe would have been. This was Thomas Blanket. The noise he made was not that of the clashing sword, but of the clashing shuttle. His purpose was not to destroy what his country already possessed, but to give his country what it did not yet possess—*blankets*—a covering of comfort to go to bed with, to sleep under, that it might be refreshed in sound sleep, and rise in health and strength to

its daily work of making mankind happier by being happier itself.

Thomas Blanket was soon imitated by his neighbours, who, like him, set up looms in their own houses, and made woollen cloth like that which he made. The cloth was named by his name; and to this day, and through all time in this country, will the name be known, though nothing else is known of this weaver than that he was the first to introduce the blanket manufacture into England.

No cloth of any kind had been weaved in England before the reign of Edward III. We read that in 1331 John Kemp, from Flanders, introduced the weaving of cloth into England, that the king invited fullers, dyers, and so forth, to come from Flanders and settle here. This policy on the part of Edward was discreet; and, viewed in connection with some other of his actions, prove him to have had some perception of the real sources of national well-being. But he no sooner allowed the cloth manufacture to be implanted in England than he almost rooted it up again by restrictive enactments and oppressive taxes to carry on his wars.—(See sections 17, 18, 19, and 20.)

The manufacture of the twisted double thread of woollen, called worsted, was introduced into England about this time, or soon after. The village of Worsted, about fifteen miles from Norwich, was the first place where this thread was made, and it took the name of the village. There is no spinning nor woollen manufactures there now (1848) but from the tombs in the graveyard, and the benefactions left to the parish which are recorded in the church, we have proof that the manufacturers of Worsted were numerous, opulent, and lived there in successive generations during several centuries.

It may also be noticed here, that after inquiring into the history of the parish and manufactures of Worsted, we visited Linsey, which gave the name to the fabric known as Linsey Wolsey; and Kersey and the Mere close to it in Suffolk, where the workshops were situated in which the cloth called Kerseymere was first made. The cloth so called now differs from the original, and there is but little trade of any kind in Kersey now. But, as at Worsted, the graveyard and the church have many records of manufacturers long deceased. Their names, though now Anglocised and common in Suffolk, are all of Flemish origin.

Colchester in Essex was also the English home of many Flemish emigrants who brought their manufacturing enterprise with them. The working of baize was carried on there to a large extent; but this was long subsequent to the time of Edward III. to which we must again return.

SECT. XV.—JOHN WICKLIFF.

John Wickliff was neither a trader nor a maker of laws to promote or retard the progress of trade; nor was he a warrior who wasted the wealth and national prosperity which trade is parent to. But he was an emancipator of the human mind, the originator of that church reform in England which reduced the theocratic power from its dangerous height to a level commensurate with the development of democracy, and of that civil liberty upon which the free commerce of nations can alone be solidly reared and permanently maintained.

He was born in the reign of Edward II. 1324, at Wickliff, from whence his name, a secluded village on the Yorkshire bank of the Tees, a few miles distant from the carpet weaving town of Barnard Castle, in Durham. It is remarkable that Wickliff village, famous as the birth-place of this Protestant reformer, should have continued to be, as it still is, the property of a Catholic family. Wickliff was educated for the priesthood at Oxford, and was subsequently incumbent of the parish of Lutterworth. He was an eloquent preacher, and a bold speculator both in politics and religion. He is first mentioned in history in the year 1360, in a controversy between the different orders of friars. Soon afterwards he stepped forth and denied the supremacy of the church at Rome. He maintained that the Scriptures were the sole rule of faith; that the church was dependent on the state, and should be reformed by it; that the clergy ought to possess no estate; that the numerous ceremonies of the church were hurtful to true religion; and that where repentance is sincere confession to a priest is useless. He translated the Scriptures, but his version has never been published; his other numerous works are chiefly in manuscript in the libraries at Oxford. He died at the vestry of Lutterworth, of paralysis of the brain, while administering the sacrament on the 31st of December 1384, aged sixty.

The unhappy differences which now arose on religious questions at home and abroad, gave birth to many crimes upon both sides, and to persecutions abhorrent to reason and humanity; yet, out of those differences arose thinkers and habits of thought which ended in the good of all. Religious persecution drove the Flemings to England, not alone with their peculiar opinions about auricular confession, transubstantiation, miracles, images, and clerical authority, but with their peculiar skill in the manufacture of cloth, worsted, and "bays and says," and silk. They settled in our towns and villages, and gave us manufactures which have become the chief pillar of our national greatness.

SECTION XVI.—ROGER BACON.

There were several eminent ecclesiastics, and other learned men besides Wickliff in the time of Henry I., the first three Edwards, and Richard II., there was Michael Scot the mathematician, John Duns Scotus the learned casuist, Matthew Paris the historian, and Geoffrey Chaucer and John Gower the poets; but none of them exercised any discernible influence on politics or popular progress. None of them were pioneers to the army of thinkers who have followed and liberated mankind save Wickliff and another. That other was Roger Bacon, a monk, sometimes called a magician, but in reality a practical philosopher, and by far the greatest benefactor to his country as a mechanician, who had appeared since the death of Archbishop Dunstan.

He was born near Ilchester in 1214. The novelty of his researches in natural philosophy alarmed the monks of his order. They looked upon him as half magician, half heretic, or half of something deemed to be more dangerous than either, and confined him for a space of twenty years. But he was too much of a philosopher to affect to work miracles. Many of his writings are in the library of the British Museum, and shew him to have been a philosopher of amazing comprehensiveness, not alone for the age in which he lived, but for any age. His “*Opus Magus*,” his “*Theasarus Chemicus*,” and his “*Treatise on the Infirmities of Old Age*,” have been published.

Notwithstanding the obstacles to the discovery and diffusion of knowledge, says the author of *British Chronology*, writing of this period, there was a visible intellectual progress, to which Roger Bacon, that great luminary of the thirteenth century, most effectually contributed. This prodigy of his age recommended his contemporaries to interrogate nature by actual experiments in lieu of wasting time in abstract reasoning. No man, says he, can be so thoroughly convinced by argument that fire will burn as by thrusting his hand into the flames. Bacon himself spent two thousand pounds—a great sum in those times—in constructing instruments and making experiments in the course of twenty years; and it is a well-known fact, that by those experiments he made many discoveries which have excited the astonishment of succeeding ages. He despised magic, incantations, and other tricks, as criminal impositions on human credulity, and affirmed that more surprising works might be performed by the combined works of art and nature than even were pretended to be performed by magic. “I will now,” says he, “mention some of

the wonderful works of art and nature, in which there is nothing of magic, and which magic could not perform. Instruments may be made by which the largest ships, with only one man guiding them, will be carried with greater velocity than if they were full of sailors; chariots may be constructed that will move with incredible rapidity without the help of animals; instruments of flying may be formed, in which a man, sitting at his ease, and meditating on any subject, may beat the air with his artificial wings after the manner of birds; a small instrument may be made to raise or depress the greatest weights; an instrument may be fabricated by which one man may draw a thousand men to him by force and against their wills; as also machines which will enable men to walk at the bottom of rivers or seas without danger."

Most of the wonders here indicated have been accomplished in modern times, though by means probably very different from those imagined by Roger Bacon. The locomotive steam engine; the paddle wheel and the screw propeller; the diving bell; and the hydraulic press. Hydraulic presses are now (1848) made to raise to the height of two hundred feet the tubular tunnels of the Britannia railway bridge, weighing each thirteen hundred tons; and other presses ("all small instruments," as Bacon foreshadows) may be made to lift any weight whatever.

Of the chemical discoveries of Roger Bacon, gunpowder has become the most popular. It was his misfortune to live in an age when chemical discoveries could not serve the manufacturing industry of the country, that having hardly then come into existence. This remarkable man of sciences died at Oxford on the 11th of June 1292.

SECT. XVII.—THE LAWS OF THE STAPLE.

The word staple, in its primary acceptation, appears to have meant a particular port or other place to which certain commodities were obliged to be brought to be weighed or measured for the payment of the customs, before they could be sold, or in some cases exported or imported. Here the king's staple was said to be established. The articles of English produce upon which customs were anciently paid were wool, sheepskins, (or woolfels,) and leather; and these were accordingly denominated the staples or staple goods of the kingdom. The persons who exported these goods were called the Merchants of the Staple: they were incorporated, or at least recognised as forming a society with certain privileges, in the reign of Edward II., if not earlier. Hakluyt has printed a

charter granted by Edward II., the 20th of May 1313, to the mayor and council of the merchants of the staple, in which he ordains that all merchants, whether natives or foreigners, buying wool and woolfels in his dominions for exportation, should, instead of carrying them for sale, as they had been wont to do, to several places in Brabant, Flanders, and Artois, carry them in future only to one certain staple in one of those countries to be appointed by the said mayor and council. It appears that, upon this, Antwerp was made the staple. But, although the power of naming the place, and also of changing it, was thus conferred upon the society, this part of the charter seems to have been very soon disregarded. In subsequent times the interferences of the king and the legislature, with regard to the staple, were incessant. In 1326 it was, by the royal order, removed altogether from the continent, and fixed at certain places within the kingdom. Cardiff, in Wales, a town belonging to Hugh Despenser, is the only one of these new English staples the name of which has been preserved. It may be noted also that tin is now mentioned as one of the staple commodities. In 1328, it was enacted "that the staples beyond the sea and on this side, ordained by kings in times past, and the pains thereupon provided, shall cease, and that all merchant strangers and privy (that is, foreigners and natives) may go and come with their merchandizes into England, after the tenor of the Great Charter." In 1332, however, we find the king ordaining, in the face of this act, that staples should be held in various places within the kingdom. In 1334, all the lately established staples were again abolished by the king in a parliament held at York. In 1341, the staple was re-established by a royal act at Bruges, in Flanders. In 1348, again, after the capture of Calais, that town was made the staple for tin, lead, feathers, English-made woollen cloths and worsted stuffs, for seven years. All the former inhabitants of Calais, with the exception, it is said, of one priest and two lawyers, had been removed, and an English colony, of which thirty-six merchants from London were the principal members, had been settled in their room. In 1353, by the statute called the Ordinance of the Staples, the staple for wool, leather, woolfels, and lead, was once more removed from the continent by act of parliament, and ordered to be held for ever in the following places, and no others—namely, for England, at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, York, Lincoln, Norwich, Westminster, Canterbury, Chichester, Exeter, and Bristol; for Wales, at Carmarthen; and for Ireland, at Dublin, Waterford, Cork, and Drogheda. The "for ever" of this statute remained in force for ten years,

and no longer. From the preamble of the statute 43d Edward III., it appears that it had been ordained, for the profit of the realm, and ease of the merchants of England, that the staple of wools, woolfels, and leather, should be holden at Calais; and that there accordingly it had been holden since the first of March 1363. By this last-mentioned act, however, passed in 1369, it was again, in consequence of the renewal of the war with France, fixed at certain places within the kingdom—being for Ireland and Wales the same that have been just mentioned, but with the substitution, in the case of England, of Hull, Boston, Yarmouth, and Queenburgh, for Canterbury, York, Lincoln, and Norwich. In 1376, nevertheless, on the complaint of the inhabitants of Calais, that their city was declining, the staple was restored to that place; and it was now made to comprehend, not only the ancient commodities of wool, woolfels, and leather, and those more recently added, of lead, tin, worsted stuffs, and feathers, but also cheese, butter, honey, tallow, peltry, (or skins of all kinds,) and what are called “*gaulæ*,” which have been supposed to mean osiers for making baskets; these different articles probably comprehending all the ordinary exports from the kingdom. But this restriction of the whole export trade to one market was soon relaxed. In 1378 (by 2d Rich. II. stat. 1, c. 3) it was enacted, that all merchants of Genoa, Venice, Catalonia, Arragon, and other countries towards the west, that would bring their vessels to Southampton, or elsewhere within the realm, might there freely sell their goods, and also recharge their vessels with wools, and the other merchandises of the staple, on paying the same customs or duties that would have been payable at Calais; and in 1382 (by the 5th Rich. II. stat. 2, c. 2,) all merchants, whether foreigners or natives, were permitted to carry wool, leather, and woolfels, to any country whatever, except France, on payment of the Calais duties beforehand. In 1384 we find the wool-staple altogether removed from Calais and established at Middleburgh. In 1388 (by the statute 12 Rich. II. c. 16) it was ordered to be fixed once more at Calais; but in 1390 (by the 14th Rich. II. c. 1) it was brought back to the same English towns in which it had been fixed in 1353. The very next year, however, it was enacted that, instead of these towns, the staple should be held at such others upon the coast as the lords of the council should direct; and it would even appear (from the 15th Rich. II. c. 8) that, at least for a part of the year, the staple of wool and also of tin was still at Calais. “Staples and restraints in England, and a second staple and other restraints at the same time on the continent!” exclaims the his-

torian of our commerce, in noting this fact, "the condition of the merchants who were obliged to deal in staple goods was truly pitiable in those days of perpetual changes." It is not quite clear, however, that the English staples were still continued; it is perhaps more probable that they had been abolished when the staple was restored to Calais. However this may be, it appears, from the statute 21 Rich. II. c. 17, passed in 1398, that at that time Calais was the only staple; and such it continued to be from this time till it was recovered by the French in 1538, when the staple was established at Bruges. The old staple laws, however, had been considerably relaxed in the course of that long interval.

One of the prerogatives assumed by the crown in those days, somewhat similar in its nature to that of fixing the staple of the foreign trade of the kingdom, was the right of restricting all mercantile dealings whatever, for a time, to a certain place. Thus, Matthew Paris tells us that, in the year 1245, Henry III. proclaimed a fair to be held at Westminster, on which occasion he ordered that all the traders of London should shut up their shops, and carry their goods to be sold at the fair, and that all other fairs throughout England should be suspended during the fifteen days it was appointed to last. The king's object, no doubt, was to obtain a supply of money from the tolls and other dues of the market. What made this interference be felt as a greater hardship was, that the weather, all the time of the fair, happened to be excessively bad, so that not only the goods were spoilt, exposed as they were to the rain in tents only covered with cloth, and that probably imperfectly enough; but the dealers themselves, who were obliged to eat their victuals with their feet in the mud, and the wind and wet about their ears, suffered intolerably. Four years afterwards the king repeated the same piece of tyranny, and was again seconded by the elements in a similar fashion. This time, too, the historian tells us, scarcely any buyers came to the fair; so that it is no wonder the unfortunate merchants were loud in expressing their dissatisfaction. But the king, he adds, did not mind the imprecations of the people.

There was nothing that more troubled and bewildered both the legislature and the popular understanding, during the whole of this period, than the new phenomena connected with the increasing foreign trade of the country. The advantages of this augmented intercourse with other parts of the world were sensibly enough felt, but very imperfectly comprehended; hence one scheme after another to retain the benefit upon terms wholly inconsistent with the necessary conditions of its

existence. Of course, in all exchange of commodities between two countries, besides that supply of the respective wants of each which constitutes the foundation or sustaining element of the commerce, a certain portion of what the consumer pays must fall to the share of the persons by whose agency the commerce is carried on. It is this that properly forms the profits of the commerce, as distinguished from its mere advantages or conveniences. The general advantages of the commerce, apart from the profits of the agents, are alone the proper concern of the community: as for the mere profits of the agency, the only interest of the community is, that they shall be as low as possible. From the course, however, that the popular feeling has at all times taken, it might be supposed that the very contrary was the case; for the cry has constantly been in favour of making this agency, as far as possible, a monopoly in the hands of the native merchants, although the effect of the exclusion of foreign competition, if it could be accomplished, really could be nothing else than an enhancement of the profits of the agency, and, consequently, of the charge upon the consumer. In fact, if the exclusion were not expected to produce this effect, it never would be sought for by the native merchants. That it should be sought for by them is natural enough, but that they should be supported in this demand by the community at large is only an instance of popular prejudice and delusion. In all commerce, and especially in all foreign commerce, a body of intermediate agents, to manage the exchange of the commodities, is indispensable; the goods must be brought from the one country to the other, which makes what is called the carrying trade; they must be collected in shops or warehouses for distribution by sale; even their original production, in many cases, cannot be efficiently accomplished without the regular assistance of a third class of persons:—namely, dealers in money or in credit. But to the public at large it is really a matter of perfect indifference whether these merchants, ship-owners, and bankers, or other capitalists, be natives or foreigners. Not so, however, thought our ancestors in the infancy of our foreign commerce. The commerce itself was sufficiently acceptable; but the foreigners, by whose aid it was necessarily in part carried on, were the objects of a most intense and restless jealousy. Whatever portion of the profits of the commerce fell to their share was looked upon as nothing better than so much plunder. This feeling was even in some degree extended to the whole of the foreign nation with which the commerce was carried on; and, in the notion that all trade was of the nature of a contest between two ad-

verse parties, and that whatever the one country gained the other lost, the inflammation of the popular mind occasionally rose to such a height that nothing less would satisfy it than an abjuration of the foreign trade altogether. But it never was long before this precipitate resolution was repented of and revoked.—(*Craik's British Commerce, Macpherson's Annals.*)

SECT. XVIII.—THE CLOTH TRADE.

In the wars between Henry III. and his barons, the latter endeavoured to turn to account against the king the national jealousy of foreigners, which his partiality for his wife's French connexions had greatly exasperated. In 1261 they passed a law which may be regarded as the first attempt to establish what has been called, in modern times, the manufacturing system. It prohibited the exportation of wool, the chief staple of the country, and ordained that no woollen cloths should be worn except such as were manufactured at home. Whatever may be thought of the policy of nursing the infancy of domestic manufactures in certain circumstances by protections of this description, the present attempt was undoubtedly premature, and its authors confessed as much by appending to their prohibition against the importation of foreign cloth an injunction or recommendation that all persons should avoid every superfluity in dress. What were thus denounced as extravagant superfluities were evidently those finer fabrics which could not yet be produced in England. The effect of this law, in so far as it was enforced or obeyed, could only have been to add to the general distress, by embarrassing more or less all classes of persons that had been ever so remotely connected with the foreign trade, and above all others the chief body of producers in the kingdom. If the wool was not to go out of the country, much wealth both in money and in goods would be prevented from coming in, and all the branches of industry which that wealth had hitherto contributed to sustain and feed would suffer depression.

It would appear that, either from want of skill, or a scarcity of woad, in consequence of the usual importations from the continent being checked, dyed cloths could not be obtained in sufficient quantity in England a few years after this time; for it is recorded that many people were now wont to dress themselves in cloth of the natural colour of the wool. Simon de Montford, it seems, professed to be an admirer of this plainness of apparel, and was accustomed to maintain that foreign commerce was unnecessary, the produce of the country being fully sufficient to supply all the wants of its inhabitants. And

so, no doubt, it was, and would be still, on this principle of rigidly eschewing all superfluities; but that is the principle of the stationary and savage state, not of civilisation and progressive improvement.

The prohibition against the importation of foreign cloth, however, appears to have been soon repealed. In 1271, when disputes broke out between Henry and the Countess of Flanders, we find it renewed in terms which imply that the trade had for some time previous been carried on as usual. This second suspension also was of short duration; and on various subsequent occasions, on which the attempt was made to break off the natural commercial intercourse between the English producers and the Flemish manufacturers, the result was the same; the inconvenience was found to be so intolerable to both countries that it never was submitted to for more than a few months or weeks.

Absurd regulations, however, were from time to time imposed on the trade carried on by foreigners, the temper and principle of which would, if carried out, have led to its complete extinction, and which, half measures as they were, could only have had the effect of diminishing its natural advantages. In 1275, for instance, an order was issued by Edward I., obliging all foreign merchants to sell their goods within forty days after their arrival. If foreigners continued to resort to the country in the face of the additional risks created by this law—risks of inadequate returns if they complied with it, of detection and punishment if they attempted to evade it—we may be certain they exacted a full equivalent in the shape of higher prices for their goods; or, if they failed to do this, they must soon have been forced to give up the trade altogether, for there was no other way by which it could be made to yield its usual profits.

SECTION XIX.—THE EXPULSION OF THE JEWS.

In the year 1290 the bigotry and rapacity of Edward I. inflicted what must have proved a severe blow upon the commerce of the kingdom by the sudden expulsion of the whole body of the Jews. The principal pretence for this proceeding appears to have been that the Jews had been the chief clippers of the coin. The principal motive, no doubt, was the replenishing of the royal exchequer by the spoil of the hated and helpless race; for the Jews had always been regarded, not only as foreigners and aliens, but as, in a manner, the absolute property of the crown, which, under that view, was restrained from pillaging and otherwise oppressing them

to any extent it chose by neither law nor custom, nor by anything except a prudent calculation of how far it might go without injury to its own interests—without impairing the productiveness of the source from which it drew its iniquitous profits. In the present instance, even this consideration gave way under the pressure of some strong excitement or urgent need, the popular feeling, we may be sure, eagerly seconding the royal passion or policy. The manner of the proceeding was as barbarous as the motive, whether fanaticism or thirst of plunder, might prepare us to expect. Only two months' warning was given before the fatal 1st of November, on which day it was ordered that every Jew should quit England, never to return, on pain of death. Not only all their houses and tenements, but also all their bonds for money owing them by Christians, were seized by the king, who afterwards exacted payment of the debts, as if the money had been lent by himself. The accounts differ as to whether they were allowed to carry their movable property with them; as much, of course, was left them as might defray their charges in crossing the sea, and we may suppose they secretly conveyed away as much more as they could; it is affirmed that whole ship-loads of them were made away with by the sailors for the sake of what they had with them. The common account is that the exact number thus driven out was 16,511; and no Jew was ever afterwards allowed to set foot in this country, till, without any change having been made in the law, they quietly began to reappear after the restoration, three hundred and seventy years subsequent to the general expulsion.

SECT XX—I.—GOVERNMENT AND NATURE AT WAR.

No foreign merchants were in those days allowed to reside in England except by special license from the king; and even under this protection they were subjected to various oppressive liabilities. It was not till 1303 that a general charter was granted by Edward I., permitting the merchants of Germany, France, Spain, Portugal, Navarre, Lombardy, Tuscany, Provence, Catalonia, Aquitaine, Toulouse, Querey, Flanders, Brabant, and all foreign countries, to come safely to any of the dominions of the English crown with all kinds of merchandise, to sell their goods, and to reside under the protection of the laws. But even this general toleration was clogged with many restrictions. The goods imported, with the exception of spices and mercery, were only to be sold wholesale. No wine was to be carried out of the country without special license. Above all, no relaxation was granted of the

ancient grievous liability under which every resident stranger was placed of being answerable for the debts and even for the crimes of every other foreign resident. It appears from the records of the Exchequer that, in 1306, a number of foreign merchants were committed to the Tower, and there detained until they consented severally to give security that none of their number should leave the kingdom, or export anything from it, without the king's special license. Each of them was at the same time obliged to give in an account of the whole amount of his property, both in money and goods. Security against being subjected to this kind of treatment had been accorded in a few particular instances; but it was not till the year 1353 that the law was formally altered by the Statute of the Staple already mentioned, and the ancient practice was not wholly discontinued till long afterwards.

The general charter of 1303 was followed within four years by a still more extraordinary attempt than any that had yet been made to control the natural course of commerce. In 1307, Edward issued an order prohibiting either coined money or bullion to be carried out of the country on any account. The merchants, therefore, who came from other countries were now reduced to the necessity of either directly bartering their commodities for the produce of the kingdom, or, if they sold them for money in the first instance, of investing the proceeds in other goods, before they could be permitted to return home. This was a restriction so thoroughly opposed to every commercial principle, that it could not be rigidly maintained; the very year following its promulgation, an exemption from it was accorded to the merchants of France by the new king, Edward II., and similar relaxations of it were afterwards permitted in other cases. But, although from its nature it did not admit of being strictly enforced, it long continued to be regarded as the law of the country, and repeated attempts were made to secure its observance. In 1335, by the 9th Edw. III. st. 2, it was enacted, that no person should henceforth carry out of the kingdom either money or plate without special license, upon pain of forfeiture of whatever he should so convey away. Sworn searchers were appointed to see that the law was observed at all the ports; and it was further ordered, that the inn-keepers at every port should be sworn to search their guests: the fourth part of all forfeits was assigned as the reward of the searchers. In 1343, by the 17th Edw. III., nearly the same regulations were repeated, the principal variation being, that, to induce them to do their duty more diligently, the reward of the searchers was now raised to a third

part of the forfeits, and penalties were provided for their neglect or connivance. We may gather from all this that the law had been extensively evaded. At length permission was given generally to foreign merchants to carry away one half of the money for which they sold their goods; the law is thus stated in the 14th Rich. II. c. 1, passed in 1390, and more explicitly in the 2d Hen. IV. c. 5, passed in 1400; but it is still expressly ordered, by the former of these statutes, that every alien bringing any merchandise into England shall find sufficient sureties, before the officers of the customs, to expend the value of half of what he imports, at the least, in the purchase of wools, leather, woolfels, lead, tin, butter, cheese, cloths, or other commodities of the land.

The ignorance and misconception from which all this legislation proceeded, are exhibited in a striking point of view by the fact that the above-mentioned original order of Edward I., prohibiting the exportation of money, expressly permits the amount of the money to be remitted abroad in bills of exchange. And at all times, while the exportation of money was forbidden, the remittance of bills seems to have been allowed. But a bill of exchange remitted abroad is merely an order that a certain party in the foreign country shall receive a sum of money which is due to the drawer of the bill, and which would otherwise have to be sent to the country where he resides; if no such money were due, the bill would not be negotiable; every such bill, therefore, if it did not carry money out of the country, produced precisely the same effect by preventing money from coming in. It was fit and natural enough, however, that this simple matter should fail to be perceived in times when it was thought that a great advantage was gained by compelling the foreign merchant to sell his goods for produce instead of for the money which the produce was worth; indeed, it may be fairly said, instead of for less money than the produce was worth, for all restraints of this description inevitably operate to enhance the price of what is prevented from being openly bought and sold on the terms that would be naturally agreed upon between the parties themselves.

Another strange attempt of the English commercial legislation of those times was to impose a certain measure upon all foreign cloths brought to the country. By the act 2d Edw. III. c. 14, passed in 1328, it was ordered that, from the Feast of St Michael ensuing, all cloths that were imported should be measured by the king's aulnagers, and that all those that were not found to be of a certain specified length and breadth should be forfeited to the king. The dimen-

sions fixed by the statute were, for cloth of ray, (supposed to mean striped cloth,) 28 yards in length by 6 quarters in breadth; and for coloured cloth, 26 yards in length by $6\frac{1}{2}$ quarters in breadth. The regulation of weights and measures within the kingdom was a proper subject of legislation, and had necessarily engaged attention long before this date; although, at a period when science was unknown, the methods resorted to were necessarily very inartificial, and sometimes singular enough. Henry I., for example, soon after he came to the throne, in ordaining that the ell or yard should be of uniform length throughout the kingdom, could find no better standard for it than the length of his own arm. It might also have been found expedient, both for fiscal and other purposes, to direct that all cloth made for sale within the kingdom should be of certain specified dimensions; regulations to that effect have at least been usual down to our own day. But it was to stretch legislation on such matters beyond all reasonable limits to attempt to fix a measure for the cloth made in all foreign countries. Such a law, in so far as it was enforced, could only have the effect of diminishing the supply, in other words, of raising the prices of foreign goods. But, like most of the other absurd restrictions of the same character, the maintenance of this regulation was soon found to be impracticable: if it had been rigorously insisted upon, it would have excluded the manufactured goods of certain foreign countries from the English market altogether; and accordingly, after giving a great deal of useless annoyance both to foreign merchants and their English customers, and after special exemptions from it had been granted to several nations, it was at last repealed by the 27th Edw. III. st. 1, c. 4, passed in 1353, which provided that, "whereas the great men and commons have shewed to our lord the king how divers merchants, as well foreigners as denizens, have withdrawn them, and yet do withdraw them, to come with cloths into England, to the great damage of the king and of all his people, because that the king's aulnager surmiseth to merchant strangers that their cloths be not of assize," therefore no foreign cloths should in future be forfeited on that account, but, when any was found to be under assize, it should simply be marked by the aulnager, that a proportionate abatement might be made in the price.

This was also the era of various statutes against the supposed mischiefs of forestalling. The statute "*De Pistoribus*" (attributed by some to the 51st year of Henry III., by others to the 13th of Edward I.) contains the following empassioned description and denouncement of this offence: "But especially

be it commanded, on the behalf of our lord the king, that no forestaller be suffered to dwell in any town, which is an open oppressor of poor people, and of all the commonalty, and an enemy of the whole shire and country ; which, for greediness of his private gains, doth prevent others in buying grain, fish, herring, or any other thing to be sold coming by land or water, oppressing the poor and deceiving the rich ; which carrieth away such things, intending to sell them more dear ; the which come to merchant strangers that bring merchandize, offering them to buy, and informing them that their goods might be dearer sold than they intended to sell, and an whole town or a country is deceived by such craft and subtlety." It might be supposed from all this, that the forestaller bought the commodity for the purpose of throwing it into the sea or otherwise destroying it ; it seems to have been forgotten that, like all other dealers, he bought it only that he might sell it again for more than it cost him, that is to say, that he might preserve it for a time of still higher demand and greater necessity. But for him, when that time of greater scarcity came, there would be no provision for it ; if the people were pinched now, they would be starved then. The forestaller is merely the economical distributor, who, by preventing waste at one time, prevents absolute want at another ; he destroys nothing ; on the contrary, whatever he reserves from present consumption, is sure to be reproduced by him in full at a future day, when it will be still more needed. Were it otherwise, forestalling would be the most losing of all trades, and no law would be required to put it down. The English laws against forestalling, regrating, and engrossing, however, cannot well be made a reproach to the thirteenth century, seeing that they were formally renewed and extended in the sixteenth, and were not finally removed from the Statute Book till towards the end of the eighteenth. And even yet forestalling is considered to be a misdemeanour at common law, and punishable by fine and imprisonment.

A still more direct attempt to derange the natural balance of supply and demand was made by parliament in 1315, when, with the view of relieving the people from the pressure of a severe famine, it was enacted that all articles of food should be sold at certain prescribed prices. It was strangely forgotten that the evil did not lie in the high prices, but the scarcity, of which they were the necessary consequence. That scarcity, of course, the act of parliament could not cure. In fact, food became more difficult to procure than ever ; for even those who had any to sell, and would have brought it to market if they could have had a fair price for it, withheld it rather than dis-

pose of it below its value. What was sold was for the most part sold at a price which violated the law, and which was made still higher than it would otherwise have been by the trouble and risk which the illegality of the transaction involved. Butcher-meat disappeared altogether; poultry, an article of large consumption in those times, became nearly as scarce; grain was only to be had at enormous prices. The result was, that the king and the parliament, after a few months, becoming convinced of their mistake, hastened to repeal the act.

The same thing in principle and effect, however, was repeated not many years after, by acts passed to fix the wages of labourers—in other words, the price of the commodity called labour. In 1349, (the 23d of Edward III.) immediately after what is called the Great Pestilence, there was issued (apparently by the authority of the king, although it is printed as a statute) “An ordinance concerning Labourers and Servants;” which directed, first, that persons of the class of servants should be bound to serve when required; and, secondly, that they should serve for the same wages that were accustomed to be given three years before. This ordinance, indeed, further proceeded to enjoin that all dealers in victual should be bound to sell the same “for a reasonable price,” and inflicted a penalty upon persons offending against that enactment—although it did not presume expressly to fix a maximum of prices. The next year, by the 25th Ed. III., st. 2, after a preamble, declaring that servants had had no regard to the preceding ordinance, “but to their ease and singular covetise,” the parliament established a set of new provisions for effecting its object: this act, however, contains nothing on the subject of the prices of provisions. The Statute of Labourers was confirmed by parliament in 1360, (by 34th Edward III. c. 9,) and its principle was long obstinately clung to by the legislature, notwithstanding the constant experience of its inefficiency, and indeed of its positive mischief, and its direct tendency to defeat its own proposed object; for a law is rarely harmless because it is of impracticable execution; the unskilful surgery of the body politic, as of the body natural, tears and tortures when it does not cure, and fixes deeper and more firmly the barb which it fails to extract. By the 13th Rich. II. st. 1, c. 8, (passed in 1389-90,) it is ordained that, “forasmuch as a man cannot put the price of corn and other victuals in certain,” the justices of peace shall every year make proclamation “by their discretion, according to the dearth of victuals, how much every mason, carpenter, tiler, and other craftsman, workmen, and their labourers by the day, as well in harvest as in other

times of the year, after their degree, shall take by the day, with meat and drink, or without meat and drink, and that every man obey to such proclamations from time to time, as a thing done by statute." It is also ordered that victuallers "shall have reasonable gains, according to the discretion and limitation of the said justices, and no more, upon pain to be grievously punished, according to the discretion of the said justices." Finally, provision is made for the correct keeping of the assize (or assessment from time to time) of the prices of bread and ale. The earliest notice of an assize in England is found in the rolls of parliament for 1203, the 5th of John; but the first introduction of the practice is probably of older date. The most ancient law upon the subject that has been preserved is that entitled the *Assisa Panis et Cerevisie*, commonly assigned to the 51st Hen. III. (A.D. 1266.) The assize of bread and ale, it is to be remembered, determined the prices of these commodities, not arbitrarily, but by a scale regulated according to the market-prices of wheat, barley, and oats, so that the prices that were really fixed were those of baking and of brewing. The assize of bread was re-enacted so lately as the beginning of the last century, and was only abolished in London and its neighbourhood about thirty years ago: in regard to other places, although it has fallen into disuse, the old law still remains unrepealed. But various other articles, such as wine, fish, tiles, cloths, wood, coal, billets, &c., have at different times been made subject to assize; and in the case of most of these the assize was a perfectly arbitrary determination of the price. The present period furnishes us with a curious example of the manner in which some of these attempts operated. By an ordinance issued in 1357, (commonly called the 31st Edw. III. st. 2,) it was directed that no herrings should be sold for a higher price than forty shillings the last. But, in 1361, we find the king and his council, in a second ordinance, (commonly called the statute 35th Edw. III.) frankly confessing that the effect of the attempt to fix prices in this case had been, "that the sale of herring is much decayed, and the people greatly endamaged, that is to say, that many merchants coming to the fair, as well labourers and servants as others, do bargain for herring, and every of them, by malice and envy, increase upon other, and, if one proffer forty shillings, another will proffer ten shillings more, and the third sixty shillings, and so every one surmounteth other in the bargain, and such proffers extend to more than the price of the herring upon which the fishers proffered it to sell at the beginning." The ordinance promulgated with the intention of keeping down the price of herrings, had actually raised it.

Wherefore, "we," concludes the new statute, "perceiving the mischiefs and grievances aforesaid, by the advice and assent of our parliament, will and grant, that it shall be lawful to every man, of what condition that he may be, merchant or other, to buy herring openly, and not privily, at such price as may be agreed betwixt him and the seller of the same herring." This failure, however, did not deter the parliament two years after from fixing a price for poultry, (by the statute 37 Edw. III. c. 3 :) but the next year that also was repealed by the 38 Edw. III. st. 1, c. 2, which ordained that all people, in regard to buying and selling, and the other matters treated of in the preceding statute, should be as free as they were before it passed, and as they were in the time of the king's grandfather and his other good progenitors.—(*Craik's British Commerce.*)

SECT. XXII.—RICHARD II. JOHN BALL, WAT TYLER, AND JACK STRAW.

Of the personal qualities of the three men last named we know little. The historians of their times have obscured them in ridicule. They rose against the feudal laws with a hundred thousand followers, and demanded protection to private property and domestic sanctity. They demanded the abolition of slavery; freedom of commerce in market towns without toll or impost; and a fixed rent on land instead of the services done by villinage. Also that men should be allowed to work wheresoever and for whomsoever they chose. At that time no man was allowed to work out of his own neighbourhood except the inhabitants of Staffordshire, Lancashire, Derbyshire, part of Yorkshire, and the marches of Scotland and Wales.

The mob of a hundred thousand persons who rose at the preaching of John Ball, and at the outrage committed upon Wat Tyler's daughter by the gatherers of poll-tax, and the vengeance of the incensed father, were easily dispersed. Tyler was slain by Walsworth, Lord Mayor of London, and John Ball and the secondary general, Jack Straw, were hanged. But the principles of protection to private property, freedom of slaves, freedom of internal commerce, and liberty to working men to choose their own masters, could not be extinguished upon the gallows. The mob was dispersed, and its leaders put to death, but the people of all degrees beneath the rank of the feudal barons and the heads of corporations, who now assumed privileges over inferiors similar to baronial feudalism, in their workshops, in their fields, upon their family hearths, and in their individual minds, maintained the principles of personal freedom and security to private property.

But the extension of those principles was accelerated and carried into political society by the attempt of the king to reign in absolute sovereignty; the barons confederated, marched upon the king in London, punished his advisers, clerical as well as lay, and, that they might control him the more effectually, they appealed to the burgher class of traders and freedmen for help. This contest resulted in less power to the sovereign, more to the people, and greater trouble and danger to the barons. The latter were divided; some adhering to Richard and others conspiring to dethrone him. In the midst of these distractions his cousin Henry Duke of Lancaster appeared in open rebellion against him in Yorkshire, declaring that he came to redress grievances. The nobility and gentry flocked to his standard. Richard was deposed, and Lancaster was made king as Henry IV.

SECT. XXIII.—HENRY IV. THE PROUD CLERGY, AND THE “ILLITERATE PARLIAMENT.”

Shakespeare has put into the mouth of this troubled and troublesome king the royal aphorism, “Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown.” Henry IV. had not been long crowned until the barons conspired against him to restore Richard II.; and to sustain his kingly position he surrendered more of the kingly power to the people than they had ever possessed in England before. “Favoured by the times,” the House of Commons increased vastly in importance, and pushed their inquiries into every department of the administration. Henry’s pecuniary embarrassments, his defective title, and the frequent insurrections in favour of Richard and the Earl of March, compelled him to court the favour of the people through their representatives; and the men who were originally deemed of no other use than to raise money, became, by almost imperceptible degrees, a coequal part of the legislature.—*Wade.*

In the year 1400, many noblemen were executed for attempting the restoration of Richard; and in the same year that unfortunate sovereign was assassinated. He was thirty-three years of age, and had reigned twenty-two years and three months.

Henry, to distract the attention of the public from his personal circumstances as a usurper as much as possible, engaged in wars. But this policy, evil in its first results, extended the national liberties. To carry on those wars supplies of money were required, and men to make up the armies. The raising

of supplies suggested new thoughts to the members of parliament, and the raising of armies withdrew from slavery large bodies of men who did not willingly return to it again ; on the contrary, many of them who returned from the wars sought residence and employment in the towns, and, by their tales of the oppression of feudalism, added to that hostility which was now everywhere active in behalf of personal freedom.

In this reign also the representatives of the commons began to turn the current of popular inquiry against the church. It was the first time that the domestic power, offspring of theocracy and monarchy, assumed the right of deliberative action. Monarchy, weak and impoverished, appealed to democracy for aid ; and democracy turned upon theocracy, strong and wealthy, and directed the monarch's attention to the church's wealth. The parliament in which this was done met on the 6th of October 1404, and consisted of "such as were not skilled in the laws," so the clerical historians wrote ; and it was called by them the "illiterate parliament." It consisted, however, of the fathers of English commerce, justice, and dignity. The king demanded a supply of money from it ; and by petition it turned his attention to the revenues of the church, which consisted of one-third part of the whole lands of England, which yielded the king no personal service. The time, however, had not yet arrived for the monarchy to make such an inroad upon the theocratic institutions, and the petition was ejected. Neither were the commons strong enough to insist against the church ; they granted the required tax, and the people paid it, though not without murmurs.

In the next year, 1405, the king, sensible that he should not in justice or policy call upon the people for another levy immediately, assembled the barons and clergy, and preferred his demands to them. They refused to grant him money, alleging as an excuse that it could only be granted by parliament regularly assembled. To save their own revenues was their real motives for refusal ; but in the allegation they put forth they gave birth to a principle of popular power which in after times advanced the popular liberties, and became the safeguard of private property.

In 1406 the king, thus pressed by necessity, called a parliament, which met at Westminster ; but instead of voting supplies, it employed itself on the question of its privileges, and passed an enactment in favour of freedom of election. The king, however, kept them together until, wearied and threatened, they complied.

The merchants were by this parliament commissioned to guard the seas from May in that year to Michaelmas, in consi-

deration for which they were empowered to draw certain taxes upon wine, wool, and leather. This commission to the merchants was given because there was no naval power sufficient to guard the coasts. By plague, famine, and insurrection, the monarchy was almost powerless; and but for the development of the mercantile enterprise of the people, which grew as personal freedom grew, despite the hindrance of war, famine, and plague, and the tyranny and turbulence of the nobles—more hurtful to commerce than all the other plagues—the kingdom would have been defenceless. Yet, when the next parliament was called in 1410, the king, under shadow of the clergy, ordered the sheriffs to have no regard to the majority at elections, but to return such members as would be most subservient in the levying of taxes. The commons, however, petitioned the king to fine the sheriffs who had made false returns, and again petitioned that the revenues of the clergy might be applied to the defence of the kingdom. The petitions were refused, the king not daring to be the enemy of clerical supremacy. The commons also supplicated that the statute for burning heretics might be repealed; but instead of complying, the king ordered John Bradley, a tailor, who had spoken heresy, to be burned in Smithfield; whereupon the commons, accounting that act a deliberate insult, refused to vote supplies until compelled.

Henry once more ravaged Scotland and plundered Edinburgh; and having put more noblemen to death than had been executed in any one reign before, he died on 20th March 1413, in the 47th year of his age and 14th of his reign. He was succeeded by his son Henry of Monmouth, Prince of Wales.

SECT. XXIV.—HENRY V. AND JOHN BRADLEY THE TAILOR.

Had all men beneath the degree of feudal chiefs remained in bondage, and in the condition of brutishness which accompanied bondage, they would have neither been heretical nor seditious. Wickliff would have preached to stone walls; or if such men as Bradley the tailor heard him, they would have been insensible to his doctrines like the stones. But free inquiry followed free industry wherever it was established. In the church or in the feudal castles the doctrines of Wickliff made small progress; but they were admitted to the workshops. Thoughts became words, and words principles, even with men so humbly esteemed in those days as tailors; and one of them gave proof that thoughts, words, and principles,

when the national rights of mankind were involved in them, could survive the fires of Smithfield. They sacrificed him, put his body into a barrel and burned it, but the principles of free inquiry could not be consumed within the barrel. They escaped, and in time extended over the nation. To this day they are expanding over the world. Henry V., at that time Prince of Wales, was present at the execution, and offered the man pardon if he would recant. He would not accept life by recantation. The fire was lighted, and the prince had him unloosed, took him out of the fire, and promised him pardon and a pension provided he would recant; but he refused the offer, and suffered death.

No other two men in that reign produced such an effect upon the world as this warrior prince and this martyr tailor. The prince is illustrious in historic and poetic pages for the fires of war and disasters kindled in the land of France, and again and again heaped up afresh with new fuel. The tailor is but incidentally mentioned in history, and that partly because the prince was at his execution, and partly because the commons refused to vote supplies, deeming the execution for heresy an insult to them. The prince is famed for destroying human life and industrial property to extend his conquests and personal power, though that power did not survive himself, even to his own family. The tailor is known by name, yet hardly famed, for suffering his own life to be destroyed rather than those principles should be suppressed which have freed the nation and are fast emancipating the whole family of mankind. The prince with courage hacked Frenchmen to the earth who defended their rights, and left them on the earth to die. The tailor animated Englishmen who advocated their rights to persevere, and with courage died. How small the prince! How great the tailor!

In the early part of the reign of Henry V. some progress was made by the commons in the extension of the popular liberties, but captivated by his victories in France, they yielded themselves to his will. He died 31st August 1422, leaving an infant son who became Henry VI., and Catherine his widow a princess of France. This widow subsequently married with Owen Tudor, a Welsh gentleman, whose grandson, Henry Tudor, Earl of Richmond, became Henry VII., the first of the Tudor kings of England. He attained to the throne at the close of the wars between the houses of York and Lancaster. Those wars began soon after the death of Henry V. and the accession of his infant son Henry VI. Commerce made little progress during that time; but as the feudal

aristocracy were self immolated in the carnage, and the people of England freed from bondage by that self destruction, we may glance briefly at the events.

SECT. XXV.—OF THE HOUSES OF YORK AND LANCASTER.

Henry VI. an infant of the house of Lancaster, succeeded his father who was descended from the *fourth* son of Edward III. But he was molested throughout his life by his troublesome uncle, the Duke of York, descended from the *third* son of Edward III. The Duke of York, by the assistance of the Earl of Warwick and other nobles, was made king by the title of Edward IV. in 1461; Henry being deposed after living a miserable life of royalty from 1422 to 1461. The Lancastrians adopted a *red rose* as their badge, and the Yorkists a *white rose*. Hence the war was called the "wars of the roses." Warwick, after making Edward king, turned arms against him, took him prisoner, and placed him in confinement in Middle-town Castle, Yorkshire, while Edward's prisoner, Henry VI. remained in the tower of London. Edward escaped, and, in a great battle at Barnet, killed Warwick, who fell with 10,000 men and many nobles. Edward died in 1483, and was nominally succeeded by his son Edward V. a child eleven years old. Within nine weeks from this child's accession, he and his brother were murdered by order of their uncle, Richard Duke of Gloucester. This undutiful uncle was crowned as Richard III. on the 6th of July 1483, and was slain on Bosworth field on the 22d August 1485, by Henry Tudor Earl of Richmond and his followers. Richard had carried his ill-gotten crown for safety to the battle with him. It was at once placed on Richmond's head, and, without more crowning, he became Henry VII.

Thus ended the wars of the roses, after a desolating period of thirty years. Twelve pitched battles had been fought, besides skirmishes innumerable. Eighty princes of the blood royal had perished, and the old nobility were almost entirely annihilated. The country had been trampled by the hoofs of war, and no man's life or property were safe. But now that the turbulent nobles had worn themselves out, and the people had worn out their bondage, and were, with very few exceptions, free; and now that a vigorous monarch devoted himself to the maintenance of peace and the improvement of the laws, the nation sprung up again as plants spring up after a long and dreary winter.

SECT. XXVI.—WILLIAM CAXTON THE PRINTER.

Of no single cause or power under heaven is the emancipation of the human mind, the extension of trade, or the civilisation of nations more directly a result, than of the art and practice of printing. It was in 1473, while Edward IV. warred against the adherents of Henry VI., and Warwick and the other nobles hacked themselves, the monarchy, and the nation, in pieces with their battle-axes, that William Caxton, a man who had gone to Cologne on the business of commerce, returned to England with the art of printing. By the favour of Milling, Abbot of Westminster, he set up a press in the armoury of the abbey in 1474; the press did not immediately put on its strength and majesty, but it was destined to rule, has ruled, and will continue to be the sovereign power over all others, royalty itself obedient to its bidding, while mankind endures on earth. William Caxton died 1491.

SECT. XXVII.—THE FIRST OF THE TUDOR KINGS.

On the accession of Henry Earl of Richmond to the crown of England as Henry VII. thirty years of a ferocious internal war were followed by peace. Fourteen hundred and eighty-four years of the Christian era had passed over England, and until now the larger number of the population were slaves. One thousand and fifty-seven years had elapsed since the Romans, whose British roads had carried internal intercourse throughout the island, withdrew, and left Britain to itself and to other conquerors; and during all that time intercourse between shire and shire, lordship and lordship, town and town, had been continually subject to the interruption, alike of those who were privileged to obstruct traffic by law, and by the lawless who were privileged by a freebooter's power.

But the barons who, by their privileges, their cupidity, or their wars, had thus cankered the national commerce at its core, had lifted suicidal hands against themselves, and were now dead and buried; some in marble tombs, some in mud ditches in the battle-fields, but all, save a few that were powerless, dead. Henry was king. There had been no previous sovereign in England with such power as he now possessed. With but few exceptions he used it well for the public good; without an exception he used it vigorously.

He passed laws restraining the surviving nobility, or the new nobles whom he created from the middle ranks of society, from enlisting retainers and giving them lodges and liveries. The services of villainage expired, and the bondmen took

liberty wherever they chose, while no superior had the power of re-conveying them to bondage. He gave the nobility and other great proprietors the power of cutting off the entails upon their estates, by which measure he wisely calculated upon keeping their power within bounds by their own acts of alienating their property. He gave to the poor the right of suing *in forma pauperis*. But, greater than any of these, he established security and freedom of internal intercourse throughout the kingdom. Foreign commerce sprung up at the outposts; inland trade grew up and flourished everywhere.

The greatest error of this commercial king was committed in his enforcement of new taxes under the allegation, on belief "that what comes into the government from the people is but as moisture drawn from the earth, which gathers into a cloud and falls back upon the earth again." This error was cherished long after Henry's time; and even in these days of railway legislation the error still leads men of sagacious minds astray. (See the parliamentary proceedings in 1845, '46, '47, and '48, relative to railway capital; see also parliamentary debates in 1847, on a motion for a grant of L.16,000,000 sterling to make railways for the relief of Irish distress.) It is no longer admitted that a king or a government may draw taxes from the public as a cloud gathers moisture to be returned to the earth again. But those who, on the plea of providing employment and wages for a large body of the population by authorizing the construction of an unlimited extent of public works, thereby withdrawing capital from other investments, gathering it from every point as "moisture is gathered to the cloud to be returned to the earth," are not advanced in wisdom beyond Henry VII. though having the advantage of him by no less than three hundred and forty years of experience.

The greatest honours of Henry VII. beyond those of reigning over a nation for the first time free, for the first time during many centuries at peace, and for the first time rapidly progressing in domestic arts, inland trade, and foreign exchanges all at once, was the honour of living when Columbus and other navigators discovered the western world.

SECT. XXVIII.—HENRY VII. AND COLUMBUS.

The reign of this sovereign is memorable for the two greatest events in the history of nautical discovery and of modern commerce—the achievement of the passage to India by the Cape of Good Hope, and the revelation of the new world of

America by the voyage of Columbus. Both these great discoveries were made in the search after the same object, a route to India by sea, which serves in some degree to account for the two having been so nearly coincident in point of time. Bartholomew Diaz returned to Portugal from the voyage in which he had rounded the southern extremity of Africa in December 1487. Some years before this date, however, Columbus had conceived his more brilliant idea of reaching the oriental world by sailing towards the west; a course which, on his conviction of the earth's rotundity, he calculated would bring him to the eastern confines of the same golden continent, the western parts of which were gained by proceeding in the opposite direction. Among the various states and crowned heads to which the illustrious Genoese proposed the glory of his great enterprise before he found a patroness in Isabella of Spain, one was our Henry VII., to whom he sent his brother Bartholomew in 1488. In his passage to England, Bartholomew was captured by pirates, plundered of everything, and made a slave. After some time he made his escape, and reached this country, but in such a state of destitution that he was obliged to apply himself to drawing sea-charts for a livelihood, and for the means of procuring himself decent clothes, before he could appear in the royal presence. King Henry so far listened to his proposals as to desire him to bring his brother to England; and he was on his way to Spain for that purpose, when, on reaching Paris, he learned that Columbus had already set out on his voyage under the patronage of the Spanish court. The capture of Bartholomew by pirates, it is remarked by the historian of our commerce, "thus turned out, under the direction of Providence, the means of preserving the English from losing their industry and commercial spirit in the mines of Mexico and Peru." Columbus sailed on his memorable voyage, from the bar of Saltes, near Palos, in Andalusia, on Friday, the 3d of August 1492, and reached the island of San Salvador on the 12th of October. He afterwards discovered Cuba, Hispaniola, and others of the West Indian islands; and, on the 15th of March 1493, he again landed at Palos, bringing back to the astonished nations of Europe the tidings of his success, in having reached what he continued to believe to his dying day to be the eastern shores of the Indies; for it was not till twenty years after this time, and seven years after the original discoverer of the new world had been laid in his grave, that the Pacific was first seen from the mountains near Panama by Balboa. On the 25th of September 1493, Columbus sailed from Cadiz, on his second voyage, from which he returned to

the same port on the 11th of June 1496, after having discovered the Caribbee Islands, Puerto Rico, and Jamaica.

In the next section we present a memoir of Sebastian Cabot, the discoverer of North America.

Henry VII. died on the 21st of April 1509, in the 53d year of his age and 24th of his reign. He is alleged to have left treasure behind him equal to L.16,000,000 of the currency of 1848. He had a propensity to gather and trade in money, and historians have spoken severely of him as an avaricious miser; they seem to forget, however, that Henry VII. did not waste his resources in war. He permitted all who would engage in trade to do so; and in several projects of commerce he united with his subjects, adding to their respective revenues by their joint enterprise.

SECT. XXIX.—SEBASTIAN CABOT OF BRISTOL.

The earliest of the eminent English navigators, and greatest of them all, deserves a prominent place among the pioneers of British commerce. He was born at Bristol about the year 1475. When he was four years old he was taken by his father, Sir John Cabot, or John Gavatta, to Venice, the city of his ancestors, where he resided for some time. This circumstance, united to that of his parentage, has given some colour to the Italian account, which claims him for a countryman, and affirms that he was born at Venice, and which seems to have been implicitly received, not merely by Hakluyt, Purchas, and Churchill, but by Hume, Foster, Charlevoix, and Barrow. The authority on this point is indisputable, although it has been strangely overlooked for nearly three centuries. In Richard Eden's "Decades of the New World"—a rare and curious black-letter volume, published in 1555—the following marginal note occurs on page 255:—"Sebastian Cabot told me that he was born in Brystow, and that at iiiij. years old he was carried with his father into Venice, and so returned agayne into England with his father after certayne years, whereby he was thought to have been born in Venice."

Sebastian manifested a decided inclination to the life of a sailor, was early instructed in all the branches of navigation, and was allowed to make several short trips to sea in order to acquire a competent knowledge of the practical part of his profession. Europe was at this period "ringing from side to side" with the discoveries of the Portuguese in the east, and the still more brilliant and important ones of Columbus in the western hemisphere, and the young Cabot warmly partook of

the general enthusiasm. Speaking of the effect produced in England by the news of the discoveries of Columbus, he says, "All men, with great admiration, affirm it to be a thing more divine than human;" and afterwards, he adds, "by this fame and report, there increased in my heart a great flame of desire to attempt some notable thing." Happily the flame was cherished. It was in 1493 that Columbus returned from his first expedition; and, on the 5th of March 1496, a patent was granted by Henry VII. to John Cabot and his three sons, Lewis, Sebastian, and Saucius, authorizing them, their heirs, or deputies, to "sail to all parts, countries, and seas of the east, and of the west, and of the north, under our banners and ensigns, with five ships, of what burden or quantity soever they may be, to seek out, discover, and find, whatsoever isles, countries, regions, or provinces, of the heathen and infidels, whatsoever they be, and in what part of the world soever they be, which before this time have been unknown to all Christians." The monarch, in granting the patent, however, stipulated for one-fifth part of the profits which might arise from any enterprise undertaken upon it. The mention of the father's name in this patent has led many to suppose that he also was a distinguished navigator; but of this, notwithstanding what Hakluyt says, there is no conclusive evidence. It has never been affirmed that all the sons engaged in the voyage, and yet the presumption is just as strong with regard to each of them as to the father. All that we know of the latter is, that he came to England "to follow the trade of merchandise." Might not the wary king be looking to the funds of the wealthy Venetian as the best security for his portion, and for the faithful execution of the terms of the patent? The expedition sailed from Bristol on the spring of 1497, with the view of exploring a northern passage to India. Cabot first directed his course to Iceland, and thence launched out into the unknown seas of the west. On the 24th of June 1497, he came in sight of land to his great surprise, "not thinking to find any other land than that of Cathay." This land was the continent of North America; for, although some modern authorities assert that Cabot went no farther north than the latitude of 56° , it appears from Ramusio's preface to the third volume of his "Collection of Voyages," that he actually penetrated as far north as 67° . He even sailed a considerable distance into Hudson's Bay; but the crew wanted the enthusiasm of their captain, and, getting tired of the difficulties and toils which they here encountered, compelled him reluctantly to return to England.

Nothing daunted by the experience of the past, we find our young navigator no sooner landed upon his native shores than, making application for another patent to enable him to set out again on a fresh voyage of discovery. His request was granted and a new patent issued on the 3d of February 1498. The discovery of this important document by his recent biographer, after a tedious search in the Roll's chapel, has effectually cleared up a point of great consequence in the memoir of Sebastian and the annals of English navigation. It gives authority to John Kabotto, "That he, by him, his deputie, or deputies, sufficient, may take at his pleasure vi, English shippes in any porte or portes, or other places within this our realme of England, or abeaisances, so that, and if the said shippes be of the bourdeyn of cc. tounes or under, with their apparail requisite and necessarie for the safe conduct of the said shippes, and them convey and lede to the lande and isles of late found by the same John in our name, and by oure commaundements." Here is distinct testimony to the important fact that Sebastian Cabot was the first discoverer, or—if the Northmen did actually reach America in the eleventh century—the first civilized discoverer of the continent of America. For it is matter of history that Columbus did not effect that discovery on which his fame rests till his third voyage, upon which he set sail on the 30th of May 1498; but Sebastian, as we have seen, discovered Labrador in the month of June of the preceding year. Of the results of this second expedition little is known; nor do we hear anything of Sebastian for a period of fourteen or fifteen years after his second return to England.

In 1512 he entered into the service of Spain; but, on the death of King Ferdinand, he returned to England. In 1517 he sailed on an expedition of discovery, but was forced to put back by a mutiny of his crew. In 1518 we find him again in the employment of the court of Spain, as pilot-major; and in 1526 he took the command of an expedition to the Molucca islands, on behalf of a company formed at Seville. In this charge he visited Brazil, and afterwards explored the river La Plata as far as a small island nearly opposite where Buenos Ayres now stands, whence he proceeded to the Parana, which he explored to its junction with the Paraguay. There is reason to believe that Cabot, during his residence in South America, formed a plan for the conquest of Peru, and communicated his views to the court of Spain.

In 1548 Cabot returned to England. What the precise motives were which induced him to resign his honourable and lucrative post in the Spanish marine, are not precisely known;

but there is sufficient evidence of the high estimation in which the English sailor was held abroad, in the formal and urgent demand made by the Spanish ambassador, that "Sebastian Cabot, grand pilot of the emperor's Indies, then in England, might be sent over to Spain, as a very necessary man for the emperor, whose servant he was, and had a pension of him." The demand was not complied with; but a pension of 250 marks, (L.166:13:6,) with the office of grand pilot of England, were conferred upon him by Edward VI. It was by the advice of Cabot that Sir Hugh Willoughby's expedition to the north of Europe was undertaken. The scheme completely succeeded, and opened up a lucrative trade to the English merchants with Russia. His death took place about the year 1557. His faithful friend, Richard Eden, attended him in his last moments, and has left on record some particulars of the scene, which exhibit the master passion of Cabot's mind holding its sway to the last. Eden laments that, "even in the article of death, he had not shaken off all worldlie vaine glorie," for he talked flightily about a divine revelation to him of a new and infallible method of finding the longitude, which he was not permitted to disclose to any mortal. "When we remember," says the biographer whose labours have vindicated for Cabot his title to the highest rank in the annals of maritime discovery—"when we remember the earnest religious feelings exhibited in the instructions of Sir Hugh Willoughby, and which formed so decided a feature of Cabot's character, it is impossible to conceive a stronger proof of the influence of long-cherished habits of thought, than that his decaying faculties, at this awful moment, were yet entangled with the problems which continue to this day to vex and elude the human intellect." The dying seaman was again, in imagination, on that beloved ocean over whose billows his intrepid and adventurous youth had opened a pathway, and whose mysteries had occupied him longer than the allotted span of ordinary life. The date of his death is not known, nor, except presumptively, the place where it occurred. From the presence of Eden, we may infer that he died in London. It is not known where his remains were deposited. The claims of England in the new world have been uniformly and justly rested on his discoveries. Proposals of colonization were urged on the clearness of the title thus acquired, and the shame of abandoning it. The English language would probably be spoken in no part of America but for Sebastian Cabot. The commerce of England and her navy are admitted to have been deeply—incalculably—his debtors. Yet there is reason to fear that, in his extreme age, the allowance which

had been solemnly granted to him for life, was fraudulently broken in upon. His birth-place we have seen denied. His fame has been obscured by the English writers, and every vile calumny against him eagerly adopted and circulated. All his own maps and discoveries, "drawn and written by himself," which it was hoped might come out in print—"because so worthy monuments should not be buried in perpetual oblivion"—have been buried in perpetual oblivion. He gave a continent to England, yet no one can point to the few feet of earth she has allowed him in return.

SECT. XXIX.—THE HANSEATIC LEAGUE AND THE STEELYARD COMPANY.

The Steelyard Company was a body of German merchants, resident in England, or, when not resident, with agencies in England. They had extensive privileges to trade between London and the towns of the Hanseatic League. These Hanse towns were about seventy in number, chief of which was Lubeck. The communities within them respectively had taken up arms of defence against their baronial neighbours, who, dwelling in castles, sallied forth, robbed them, and obstructed their trade; and ultimately they leagued themselves together, and, making war upon the barons, reduced the castles, established free governments, made treaties of peace with kings and other states, and bound themselves to unite for mutual defence against all enemies. By trading to England they acquired warehouse and office property in London called the Steelyard. As it is doubtful whether they gave their trading designation to the property, or derived their designation from it, we shall waste no speculations upon the meaning of the term "Steelyard." The seventy Hanse towns which were leagued together comprised four districts, called the districts of Lubeck, Cologne, Brunswick, and Dantzic. Of the factories of the Hanse towns in foreign countries, four were accounted of chief dignity, Novgorod in Russia; London, in England; Bruges, in Flanders; and Bergen, in Norway. It is uncertain when they founded settlements in those towns, but it is conjectured that their settlement in London was more ancient and more extensive than any of the others. They were not imitated by the burghal communities of England, Scotland, or Ireland, in throwing off the baronial and kingly powers, and establishing municipal republics, which is clearly traceable to the fact already noted, that in Britain the monarchy sided with the burghal interests against the baronial privileges. But when centuries had passed away, and monopolies of associated

traders, of associated manufacturers, and of associated land-owners had come in conflict with each other, or had been allied in legislative injustice to make each other rich at the national expense; and when it came to pass in the year 1839 that the population of Britain cried to the legislature for liberty to buy corn wherever they could obtain it, and the legislature, composed chiefly of the great landowners, monopolists in corn, still denied them that liberty, a deputation of the manufacturers of Manchester assembled in London said, "Let us imitate the Hanseatic League, which resisted the great barons of Germany; let us form a league of the towns of Britain against the monopolists of corn, and cease not to oppose them until they yield." And they did this, and were successful. They formed the *National Anti-Corn-Law League*, to the labours of which this *Biographic History* is dedicated. And we shall proceed to the historic delineations of that great subject, as soon as we have glanced at the rise and progress of the government and commerce of Britain, and noted the names and services of those original thinkers and pioneers of free trade, who preceded the members of the *National Anti-Corn-Law League*.

There had been treaties between the English sovereigns and the Hanse merchants during several centuries before the reign of Edward IV., but they were violated on both sides it was alleged, and, beyond doubt, on the side of the English kings. In 1475 Edward IV. renewed the treaties in a more formal manner, and consented to pay L.10,000 as compensation due to the Hanse merchants. The Steelyard Company continued to have privileges in England, and to virtually monopolize the English foreign trade until the reign of Henry VIII. In the reign of his son, Edward VI. their privileges were abolished and transferred to the English company of merchant adventurers.

SECT. XXX.—OF SCOTTISH AND IRISH COMMERCE.

Of Scottish commerce we could do little but write of the burghers and lords, the lords and kings, striving for liberty, for mastery, for safety, or for existence as in England. Berwick was the depository of the traffic of the Hanse merchants trading with Scotland. William Elphinstone, a merchant on the Clyde, trading largely in pickled herrings and salmon, founded the commerce of Glasgow early in the fifteenth century, by drawing the fishing boats from different ports of the western coasts to the Broomielaw, the district of Glasgow where the wharfage is still situated. But as we are tracing the fortunes

of commerce as affected by the political and theocratical institutions of the nation, and not purporting to give a continuous history of commercial progress, adventure, and misadventure, we can only say of Scotland, that its trade was affected by all the adverse influences which fell upon the trade of England, while, under a colder climate and less fertile soil, it had fewer of those natural favours which, even in the times of war and waste, smiled upon England, and made England smile again.

Ireland had commercial struggles of a different kind from those of England and Scotland; she had to struggle with English conquest. The period when we may most fitly review what she had been and what she became, what she might have been and what she could not be, is that period when the great teacher of political economy and commercial freedom, Adam Smith, made a convert of one of the greatest statesmen of modern times—William Pitt. And when William Pitt made the attempt to apply the principles of free trade to the intercourse of England with Ireland, but was prevented by the English manufacturers, who had not then, nor long after, become students of Adam Smith and of their own best interests.

SECT. XXXI.—THE MERCHANT ADVENTURERS OF ENGLAND.

This association of traders originated as early as the beginning of the 14th century. In 1493, when Henry VII. entered upon a three years' quarrel with the Flemings, the merchant adventurers of England were sent out of Flanders and the Flemings were ordered away from England. During the interval of trade the English merchants continued to buy cloth from the manufacturers, say the historians, though they had no foreign outlet for it. "They were a strong company, and well underset with rich men, and did hold out bravely, taking off the commodities of the kingdom though they lay dead upon their hands for want of vent." In the reign of the next king, Henry VIII., when he was involved in a foreign quarrel, and the commodities of the nation had no vent, a royal order was issued that the merchants were to buy the manufactured goods from the "poor men" in all parts of the kingdom. But the lord treasurer's answer to the king was, that the "sullen merchants said they would not buy that which they had no use for."

This company had not only become strong enough to dare to be "sullen" to a despotic king, but they dared to assert a control over the national trade; "nay, the fellowship of the mercers and other merchant adventurers, dwelling in the city

of London, had made an ordinance and constitution that no Englishman resorting to the said marts abroad should either buy or sell any goods or merchandises there, unless he first compounded and made fine with the said fellowship of merchants of London at their pleasure, upon pain of forfeiture of the goods so by him bought or sold; which fine, imposition, and exaction, at the beginning, when it was first taken, was demanded by colour of a fraternity of St Thomas of Canterbury, at which time the said fine was but the value of half an old noble sterling, (3s. 4d.,) and so by colour of such feigned holiness it hath been suffered to be taken for a few years past; and afterward it was increased to a hundred shillings Flemish; and now it is so that the said fellowship and merchants of London take of every Englishman or young merchant being there, at his first coming, twenty pounds sterling for a fine, to suffer him to buy and sell his own proper goods, wares, and merchandises that he hath there." It is asserted that the effect of this imposition had been to make all merchants not belonging to the London company withdraw themselves from the foreign marts, whereby the woollen cloth, which was one of the great commodities of the realm, "by making whereof the king's true subjects be put in occupation, and the poor people have most universally their living," and also other commodities produced in different parts of the kingdom, were not disposed of as formerly, "but, for lack of utterance of the same in divers parts where such cloths be made, they be conveyed to London, where they be sold far under the price that they be worth, and that they cost to the makers of the same, and at some time they be lent to long days, and the money thereof at divers times never paid." On the other hand, foreign commodities, the importation of which was now wholly in the hands of the London Company, were sold at so high a price, that the "buyer of the same could not live thereupon; that is to say, could not retail them at a living profit."

We find the monarchy, in the person of Henry VIII., strong enough, with the good-will of the populace and the new aristocracy—a very different aristocracy from the feudal barons who had been self-sacrificed in the wars of the princes of York and Lancaster—we find this king, with these influences to back him, strong enough to demolish the theocratic power and plunder it; not to destroy it utterly, but to bring it to the dust, roll it in the dust, strip it of its wealth, and leave it to get up again if it could. We find the monarchy strong enough for its representative to commit crimes at once the most horrible, and proclaim by the laws that those crimes were virtues; and yet that monarchy was not strong enough to resist and set at defiance

a street riot of the London 'prentices, those 'prentices backed by the populace and the merchant adventurers in their opposition to foreigners trading and carrying on handicrafts in London, were used by the merchant adventurers to control the monarchy, deter the king from granting trade privileges to any but themselves and operate upon to extend the privileges of monopoly to themselves. It is true that the leader of the 'prentices, John Lincoln, in the riots against settlers and foreigners, was hanged, and that ten gallows on wheels were taken to the city to hang many more; but the principle of monopoly prevailed, and a law was passed in parliament granting the exclusive privileges which the 'prentices had been urged to demand by street rioting.

SECT. XXXII.—THE PROGRESS OF COMMERCE AND MONOPOLY.

The discoveries of Columbus, Cabot, and the earlier navigators, together with the commercial spirit of Britain, quickening and expanding every year, now that all men were free to go whither they would, led other adventurers to the sea. In the reigns of the other Tudor sovereigns who succeeded Henry VII. and Henry VIII., namely, Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth, several enterprising navigators went forth upon the oceans of the world to extend the political and commercial dominion of England. Sir Martin Frobisher voyaged in search of new routes to India by the north; and, though not succeeding, he discovered useful products of nature, and added to geographical knowledge; he brought products also which were not useful, black stones supposed to be transmutable to gold, and was sported with for the folly. Sir John Hawkins voyaged to the coast of Africa, and—accursed be the day—discovered that he could make gold out of black men, by selling them to slavery. He brought the gold home, and was neither rebuked for his folly nor his sin; on the contrary, others joined him in the trade. Sir Francis Drake voyaged round the world, took gold from the Spanish Americans, incurred some discredit for piracy but much applause for enterprise, and added greatly to commercial and geographical knowledge.

Elizabeth, to the Spanish ambassador, who demanded to know by what right Drake or any English navigator dared to go into the Indian seas, (the Western Atlantic, Gulph of Mexico, and Pacific,) replied that "she understood not why her subjects, or those of any other province, should be debarred from the Indies, (the Americas,) to which she could not admit that the Spaniard had any just title." She maintained that no imaginary right of property, asserted either by the

Spaniards or the Portuguese, could hinder others from trading to those countries ; " nor," she continued, " could she or any other prince be with reason prevented from freely navigating that vast ocean, seeing the use of the sea and the air is free to all. Neither can a title to the ocean belong to any people or private persons, forasmuch as neither nature nor public use and custom permitteth any possession thereof." If the recent voyages of the English navigators inspired this high remonstrance worthy of a queen of England, it is not less certain that this dignified assertion of national rights led to the great national adventures, perseverance, and success which followed.

Captain John Davis penetrated to the north, discovered the straits which bear his name. Cavendish, Merrick, Richard Hawkins, Weymouth, Lancaster, and many others, penetrated southward and east, and traversed India. Some were fortunate for themselves, others had nothing but misfortunes ; yet all added to the extension and knowledge of foreign trade.

Sir Walter Raleigh and his brother, Sir Humphrey Gilbert, directed their talents and enterprise to colonization. Gilbert perished with four ships on the coast of Newfoundland. Raleigh, not discouraged by two failures, of which this was one, voyaged to the west again, and discovered that part of the continent which forms the states of North Carolina and Virginia, the latter being so named by Queen Elizabeth.

It is to be regretted that Elizabeth did not perceive that companies or individuals among her own subjects, who monopolized the trade to certain parts of the world, or in certain professions at home, were equally blameable with the sovereigns or nations who sought to monopolize the American seas and coasts, and whom she so regally rebuked for wrongdoing. The company of merchant adventurers, imitating the foreign company of the steelyard, was imitated by many other companies, some of them of magnitude with great purposes, others contemptible in persons and purposes.

From companies the monopolies descended to individuals, until it became customary to sell exclusive privileges of trading in particular articles, or in particular localities, to any person who could pay to the crown a price for the privilege, and exercise sufficient interest with the ministers of the crown to be preferred. Among other excellent services to the commerce of this country, we find Sir Walter Raleigh denouncing those monopolies in parliament ; with what effect is uncertain ; occasionally they were revoked ; but only, as it appeared, to be sold at a higher price to new competitors.

It must be observed, however, that most of the companies trading abroad were liable to depredation at sea from

enemies, as the factors and factories, settled by them in far-off lands, were liable to attacks from savages, or natives rising against them, to protect one another, and to be at the joint expense of armed defences in their first settlements, they united together in companies—the Turkey Company, African Company, Spanish Company, (trading to South America,) the East India Company, and others.

Having, in previous sections, traced the origin of commerce, and the progress of personal liberty, up to the reign of Henry VII., at which period of time all classes of men were, for the first time in England, free; without which personal freedom, trade, the foundation of national greatness, could not flourish; and having now glanced at the progress of geographical discovery and commercial enterprise, in the reigns of the five Tudors, sovereigns whose vigorous governments preserved the monarchy entire on one hand, and the personal freedom of the people on the other, we come to the period of the first of the Stuarts, James I.

SECT. XXXIII.—EDWARD MISSELDEN, FREE TRADE.

The monopolies sold by the crown and bought by ministerial favourites increased in number to an unparalleled extent in the reign of James I. and his son Charles I. In 1622 we find a gentleman named Edward Misselden, dedicating a small but important work, entitled *Free Trade*, to the Prince of Wales, Misselden adopts the errors common in his time, which were hardly admitted to be errors two hundred years after, when the first commercial reformer of the board of trade, Huskisson, endeavoured to instruct the legislature on subjects of commerce, namely, that the wealth of the nation is derived from the difference which the price of goods exported out of the country bears over goods imported into the country. He believes, erroneously, that gold paid for the produce of foreign countries is a national loss. But he sees clearly that the monopolies of traders at home, who exclude one another from dealing where they can or choose is a loss. It is against such monopolies as these that he directs his missive, *Free Trade*.

Sir Edward Coke, the famous lawyer, declared that “monopolies are like hydra’s heads—they grow up as fast as they are cut off.” Sir William Petty, ancestor of the Marquis of Lansdowne, a family which has produced several eminent public men, seems to have been the first practical writer who can be called a free trader.

SECT. XXXIV.—SIR WILLIAM PETTY.

There is a small town in the middle of Hampshire, in a valley with powerful streams of water running through it, called Rumsey. In that town, engaged in the manufacture of cloth, on one of those streams, there lived, at the beginning of the 17th century, a manufacturer named Anthony Petty. He had a son called William, born in 1623, who became an eminent scholar, physician, inventor, statesman, and commercial philosopher. In forming his own opinions on commercial policy, and in attempting to form the opinions of others, he was the earliest and the soundest thinker and writer on free trade who had yet appeared.

In childhood and throughout life he displayed a genius for the mechanical arts. He made rapid progress in polite literature, the Greek, Latin, and French languages. Thus accomplished at the age of fifteen, he went in search of farther improvement to Caen in Normandy. On returning to England, he obtained a situation in the money office, and having saved about threescore pounds, he deemed this small sum sufficient to defray the expenses of travelling in foreign parts.

He embarked for the Netherlands about the year 1634, taking with him his younger brother, Anthony, whose education he also undertook. He visited several universities and studied for a physician at Paris, and was there the friend of his celebrated countryman, Thomas Hobbes. He returned to England in 1646, bringing with him ten pounds more than he took away; his mercantile genius having turned his attention, it is supposed, to traffic, although a pupil of medicine.

In 1647 he obtained a patent for an instrument resembling the modern pantograph, whereby two copies of the same thing might be written at once. Some time after this he fixed his abode at Oxford, where he practised physic and chemistry with great success, and assisted Dr Clayton, the anatomist, in his dissertations. Having had university honours and a fellowship conferred on him, he became anatomy professor to the university, and professor of music to Gresham College. In 1652 he was appointed physician to the army in Ireland. He was likewise physician to three successive lord-lieutenants, Lambert, Fleetwood, and Henry Cromwell. His fertile genius, however, could not be confined to the science of medicine alone. Being an excellent mathematician, he observed that, after the Rebellion in Ireland of 1641, the forfeited lands, which had been allotted to the soldiers for suppressing it, were very defectively measured, and made such representations upon the subject to Oliver Cromwell, that he granted

him a contract in 1654, to make new admeasurements, which he executed with great accuracy. By this contract he gained upwards of ten thousand pounds. And it appears, by authentic records, that in 1655 he had surveyed 2,800,000 acres of forfeited improvable land, part of which he had divided amongst the disbanded soldiers. Henry Cromwell being appointed lord-lieutenant of Ireland in the course of that year, he chose Dr Petty to be his secretary; and in 1657 made him clerk of the council, and procured him a seat in the English parliament, in which he served for the borough of Westlow in Cornwall. He met with a severe mortification, however, in being impeached in March 1658, by Sir Hierom Sankey, for high crimes and misdemeanours in the execution of his office of surveying and distributing the Irish lands. The matter came not to a final issue, the parliament being suddenly dissolved by Richard Cromwell. But Sir Hierom Sankey commenced a more vigorous prosecution against him in Ireland, upon his return thither soon after the dissolution of the parliament; and though he published a justification of himself, yet neither this performance, nor a letter written in his favour by Henry Cromwell, to his brother the protector, could prevent his being dismissed from all public employment as soon as Richard Cromwell had resigned, and the remnant of the long parliament had re-assumed the reigns of government.

On the Restoration, Dr Petty came to England, and was very graciously received by his majesty; soon after he resigned his professorship of Gresham College, the king having appointed him to be one of the commissioners of the Court of Claims, established in Ireland in 1662, to settle the claims relating to forfeited estates in the kingdom. His majesty likewise conferred on him the honour of knighthood, granted him a new patent constituting him surveyor-general of Ireland, and, in his instructions to the Court of Claims, ordered that all the forfeited lands which had been assigned to him, and of which he had been possessed in May 1659, before his dismissal from his former employments, should be confirmed to him for ever. Sir William Petty's estates amounted now, according to his own account, to six thousand pounds per annum.

Upon the institution of the Royal Society of London, in 1662, Sir William Petty was elected one of the council, and though he no longer practised as a physician, his name was inserted on the list of the fellows, upon the renewal of the charter of the College of Physicians in 1663. Sir William about this time invented a double-bottomed ship, to sail

against wind and tide, which performed one successful voyage very expeditiously, from Dublin to Holyhead, in July 1664. He gave a model of this vessel to the Royal Society, which is still preserved in their repository; he likewise communicated to that learned body, in 1665, a discourse on ship-building. Sir William employed great part of his time for many years in attempts to improve upon his ship; and after having made upwards of twenty models at great expense, he at length had a vessel completed according to his own instructions, which was publicly tried in the harbour of Dublin, in December 1684. Sir William had asserted "that he would construct passage-boats between Dublin and Chester, which should be a kind of stage-boats; for they should be regular in going and returning on set days, in all weathers, as the stage-coaches between London and a country town;" "but this experiment completely failed, yet the vexation occasioned by the disappointment did not deter Sir William from continuing his studies for the improvement of shipping during the remainder of his life, and though he made no more public experiments, he wrote several ingenious essays on the subject."

In the year 1666, Sir William published a book entitled *Verbum Sapienti*, containing an account of the wealth and expenses of England, and the method of raising taxes in the most equal manners, shewing likewise that England can bear the charge of four millions annually, when the occasions of the government require it. Though this was the first tract on the public revenues published by our author, yet it appears that his famous treatise on *Political Arithmetic* was presented by him to Charles II. in a manuscript, upon his restoration. He had likewise published a small piece on a more limited plan in 1662, entitled "A Treatise on Taxes and Contributions, shewing the nature and measures of crown lands, assessments, customs, poll-money, lotteries, benevolence," &c.; but his *Verbum Sapienti* was a better display of his abilities as a political calculator, and was well received from its novelty, there being at that time scarcely anything extant upon the finances or the property and resources of the kingdom.

In 1667, he married Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Hardnesse Walbe, and relict of Sir Maurice Fenton, baronet; and from this time he engaged in various pursuits. He opened lead mines, and began a trade in timber; he likewise set up an iron-work, and established a pilchard fishery, all in Ireland, by which he greatly benefited that country and enriched himself. Though he now resided chiefly in England, yet he made frequent visits to Ireland, and promoted the establishment of a philosophical society at Dublin, in imitation of the

Royal Society of London, of which he was president in 1684. In 1685 he made his will, which is as remarkable as any other transaction of his life. Amongst other things, he takes notice that, from thenceforward "he should confine his studies to the anatomy of the people, to political arithmetic, and to the improvement of ships, land-carriages, and pumps, as of most use to mankind, not blaming the study of other men." But death put a period to his useful labours in the year 1687, when he was carried off by a gangrene in his foot, occasioned by the gout. Sir William Petty was the first able financier of this country who reduced the art of raising and applying the public revenues of the kingdom to a scientific system. His *Political Arithmetic* is a masterpiece of its kind, considering the time at which it appeared, and long served as a grammar to the students of political economy. It was published in London, by his son, in 1698, in 8vo, and has been frequently reprinted. Sir William Petty's eldest son was created Baron Shelburne, in the county of Waterford, by William III., but dying without issue, he was succeeded in that honour by his younger brother, Henry, who was created Viscount Dunkeran, in the county of Kerry, and Earl of Shelburne, in 1718. From this nobleman is descended the present Marquis of Lansdowne. Sir William Petty's history affords a remarkable instance of the establishment of a noble family from the united efforts of ingenuity and industry in one man, who, from so small a beginning as sixty pounds, and after being reduced to such penury in France as to be obliged "to live for a week on two or three penny worth of walnuts," hewed out a fortune to himself, and left his family at his death, £6500 per annum in land, above £45,000 in personal effects, and a plan of demonstrable improvements on his estate, to produce £4000 per annum more.

From his *Political Survey of Ireland*, we make the following extracts, which are curious; they refer to the year 1676:—

"The number of the people in Ireland is about 1,100,000, viz., 300,000 English, Scotch, and Welsh Protestants, and 800,000 Papists, whereof one-fourth are unfit for labour, and about 75,000 of the remainder are, by reason of their quality and estates, above the necessity of corporeal labour; so as there remain 750,000 labouring men and women, £00,000 whereof do perform the present work of the nation.

"The said 1,100,000 people do live in about 200,000 families or houses, whereof there are about 16,000 which have more than one chimney in each; and about 24,000 which

have but one; all the other houses, being 160,000, are wretched, nasty cabins, without chimney, window, or door to shut, even worse than those of the savage Americans, and wholly unfit for making merchantable butter, cheese, or the manufacture of woollen, linen, or leather."

Sir William Petty was in favour of a union between England and Ireland, not politically alone, but one of free commercial intercourse. In 1664 an act passed in England prohibiting the importation of cattle and beef from Ireland. Of this act Sir William Petty said—"If it be good for England to keep Ireland a distinct kingdom, why do not the predominant party in parliament, suppose the western members, make England beyond Trent another kingdom, and take tolls and customs upon the borders?—or why was there ever any union between England and Wales?—and why may not the entire kingdom of England be farther cantonized for the advantage of all parties?"

In a work entitled *A Treatise on Contributions, shewing the nature and measures of Crown Lands, Assessments, Customs, Poll Money, Lotteries, Benevolences, &c.*, Sir William Petty expounds the economical truth, that the value of commodities depends more frequently on the labour required to produce them than on any other cause. Mr Maculloch pronounces this to be "one of the most remarkable of the early tracts in any branch of political economy." Petty illustrates his subject thus:—

"A collateral question may be, how much corn or rent this English money is worth? I answer, so much as the money which another single man can save within the same time, over and above his expense, if he employed himself wholly to produce and make it: viz., let another man go travel into the country where is silver, there dig it, refine it, bring it to the same place where the other man planted his corn, coin it, &c., the same person, all the while of his working for silver, gathering also food for his necessary livelihood, and procuring himself covering, &c., I say the silver of the one must be esteemed of equal value with the corn of the other, the one being perhaps twenty ounces and the other twenty bushels. From whence it follows that the price of a bushel of this corn ought to be an ounce of silver.

"And forasmuch as possibly there may be more art and hazard in working about silver than about the corn, yet all comes to the same pass; for, let a hundred men work ten years upon corn, and the same number of men the same time upon silver, I say that the neat proceed of the silver is the price of the whole neat proceed of the corn, and like parts

of the one the price of like parts of the other, although not so many of those who wrought in silver learned the art of refining and coining, or outlived the dangers and diseases of working in the mines. And this, also, is the way of pitching the true proportion between the values of gold and silver, which many times is set, by popular error, sometimes more, sometimes less, diffused in the world; which error (by the way) is the cause of our having been pestered with too much gold heretofore, and wanting it now."

"If a man can bring to London an ounce of silver out of the earth in Peru, in the same time that he can produce a bushel of corn, the one is the natural price of the other. Now, if by reason of new and more easy mines, a man can get two ounces of silver as easily as he formerly did one, then corn will be as cheap at ten shillings the bushel as it was before at five shillings."

"Natural dearness and cheapness depend upon the few or more hands requisite to necessities of nature; as corn is cheaper where one man produces corn for ten, than where he can do the like but for six, and withal, according to the climate, disposes men to a necessity of spending more or less. Corn will be twice as dear where are two hundred husbandmen to do the same work which an hundred could perform."

SECT. XXXV.—LEWIS ROBERTS, MERCHANT AND CAPTAIN OF THE CITY OF LONDON.

This author published a work entitled "the Merchants' Map of Commerce," and another of the "Treasure of Traffic," from which we make a few extracts to shew the nature of the merchandise in which some of the principal companies dealt previous to the year 1641.

Roberts was one of the first writers who justified the exportation of gold under any circumstances, and the first, we believe, who wrote of the Manchester cotton trade. "When I survey," he exclaims, "every kingdom and great city of the world, and every petty port and creek of the same, and find in each of these some English prying after the trade and commerce thereof, . . . I am easily brought to imagine that either this great traffic of England is at its full perfection, or that it aims higher than can hitherto, by my weak sight, be either seen or discerned. I must confess England breeds in its own womb the principal supporters of its present splendour, and nourisheth with its own milk the commodities that give both lustre and life to the continuance of this trade which I pray may neither ever decay nor yet have the least diminution

But England being naturally seated in another corner of the world, and herein bending under the weight of too ponderous a burden, cannot possibly always and for ever find a vent for all those commodities that are seen to be daily imported and brought within the compass of so narrow a circuit; unless there can be, by the policy and government of the state, a mean found out to make this island either the common emporium and staple of all Europe, or at leastwise of all these our neighbouring northern regions." He then proceeds to observe that English commerce was formerly confined to the export of the staple merchandise of the country, "such as are cloths, lead, tin, some new late draperies, and other English real and royal commodities," and to the import from foreign parts of mere supplies for ourselves; but that "the late great traffic of this island hath been such that it hath not only proved a bountiful mother to the inhabitants, but also a courteous nurse to the adjoining neighbours;" so that whatever trade they had lost we had gained, and they now obtained a large portion of what they consumed of the produce of distant parts of the world through the medium of England. Thus England, he proceeds, had fallen into the traffic with India, Arabia, and Persia, which was formerly enjoyed by Venice, and now furnished that very city plenteously with the rich commodities of these eastern countries. London also supplied the place of Venice to the rest of Italy. To France England still brought the excellent commodities of Constantinople, Alexandria, Aleppo, and the rest of the Turkish dominions, the French having almost lost their own trade with those parts. Nay, to the Turks themselves England now conveyed the precious spices of India, after their own merchants had ceased to carry on that trade. "Will you," continues our author, "view Muscovia, survey Sweden, look upon Denmark, peruse the East Country, and those other colder regions, there shall you find the English to have been; the inhabitants, from the prince to the peasant, wear English woollen livery, feed in English pewter, sauce with English Indian spices, and send to their enemies sad English leaden messengers of death. Will you behold the Netherlands, whose eyes and hearts envy England's traffic, yet they must perforce confess that, for all their great boasts, they are indebted to London for most of their Syria commodities, besides what of other wares else they have of English growth. Will you see France, and travel it from Marselia to Calais, though they stand least in need of us, yet they cannot last long without our commodities. And for Spain, if you pry therein from the prince's palace to the poor man's cottage, he will *voto a Dios* (vow to God) there is no

clothing comparable to the English bay, *nor pheasant excelling a seasonable English red herring !*"

The India Company, he says, trading to Persia, India, and Arabia, export to these countries our English commodities, and bring back thence "pepper, cloves, maces, nutmegs, cottons, rice, calicoes of sundry sorts, bezoar stones, aloes, borax, calamus, cassia, mirabolans, myrrh, opium, rhubarb, cinnamon, sanders, spikenard, musk, civet, tamarinds, precious stones of all sorts, as diamonds, pearls, carbuncles, emeralds, jacynts, sapphires, spinals, turques, topazes, indigo, and silks, raw and wrought into sundry fabrics, benjamin, camphire, sandal-wood, and infinite other commodities." "And, though in India and these parts," he adds, "their trade equalizeth not neither the Portugals nor the Dutch, yet, in candid, fair, and merchant-like dealing, these Pagans, Mahometans, and gentiles hold them in esteem far before them, and they deservedly have here the epithet of far more current and square dealers. And, although for the present this trade and company do suffer under some adverse clouds, and groan under some unkind losses by the falsehood of the Netherlanders, and sad accidents at sea, yet their adventures and acts are praiseworthy, and their fair endeavours for England's honour in point of trade meriteth due commendations and just applause." The affairs of the company, in truth, had been all this reign in a very depressed state.

The Turkey Company is the next that Roberts notices. Of this body he says, "Not yearly, but monthly, nay, almost weekly, their ships are observed to go to and fro, exporting hence the cloths of Suffolk, Gloucester, Worcester, and Coventry, dyed and dressed, kerseys of Hampshire and York, lead, tin, and a great quantity of the abovesaid India spices, indigo, and calicoes; and in return thereof, import from Turkey the raw silks of Persia, Damasco, Tripoly, &c., galls of Mosolo and Toccat; chamlets, grograms, and mohairs of Angora; cottons and cotton-yarn of Cyprus and Smyrna, and sometimes the gems of India, and drugs of Egypt and Arabia, the muscadins of Candia, the corance (currants) and oils of Zante, Cephalonia, and Morea, with sundry others." The mention of cotton by Roberts in these accounts of the exports of the East India and Turkey companies appears to have been generally overlooked; the earliest notice either of the English cotton manufacture or of the import of the raw material being commonly stated to be that found in his subsequent work, "The treasure of Traffic," published in 1641, where, it is said, "The town of Manchester, in Lancashire, must be also herein remembered, and worthily for their encouragement commend-

ed, who buy the yarn of the Irish in great quantity, and, weaving it, return the same again into Ireland to sell. Neither doth their industry rest here; for they buy cotton-wool in London that comes first from Cyprus and Smyrna, and at home work the same, and perfect it into fustians, vermillions, dimities, and other such stuffs, and then return it to London, where the same is vented and sold, and not seldom sent into foreign parts, who have means at far easier terms to provide themselves of the said first materials." This account implies that the cotton manufacture had already reached a point of considerable advancement, so that it must have been established for some years at the time when the "Treasure of Traffic" was written. Various old acts of parliament and other authorities, it may be observed, make mention of Manchester cottons and cotton-velvets before the seventeenth century; but it is certain that the fabrics so denominated were all really composed of sheep's wool. The manufacture of cottons, properly so called, in England, cannot be traced farther back, than to the period with which we are now engaged, the early part of the reign of Charles I.—(*Craik's British Commerce.*)

The ancient company of the Merchant Adventurers is the third in Roberts' list. They are described as furnishing the cities of Hamburgh, Rotterdam, and others in the Netherlands, with English cloth of sundry shires, and some other commodities, monthly, and as bringing back thence to England tapestries, diaper, cambrics, Hollands, lawns, hops, mather, (madder,) steel, Rhenish wines, and many other manufactures, as blades, stuffs, soap, latten, wire, plates, &c.

The Eastland and Muscovy (or Russian) Companies are stated to "export principally cloth, as the best commodity, as also tin, lead, with some spices of India, and other southern commodities, and to bring home ashes, clapboard, copper, deals, firs, rich furs, masts, pipe-staves, rye, timber, wainscot, wheat, fustians, iron, latten, linen, mathers, quicksilver, flax, hemp, steel, caviare, cordage, hides, honey, tar, ropes, tallow, pitch, wax, rosin, and sundry others."

The exports of the French Company were cloths, kerseys, and bays of English manufacture, with galls, silks, and cottons from Turkey; their imports, buckrams, canvas, cards, glass, grain, linens, salt, claret, and white wines, wood, oils, almonds, pepper, with some silk stuffs and some other petty manufactures. England and France, however, were at this time, as they have continued to be, with little interruption, down almost to the present day, jealous rivals, when they were not open enemies, in trade as in everything else, and the commer-

cial intercourse between them was extremely insignificant. Although Roberts here speaks of the French Company, it does not appear that the English merchants trading to France were really incorporated. The merchants trading to Spain, he proceeds to inform us, carried to that country bays, says, serges, perpetuanos, lead, tin, herring, pilchards, salmon, Newland (Newfoundland) fish, calf-skins, with many other commodities; and brought back wines of Xeres, Malaga, Bastard, Candado, and Alicant, rosins, (or resins,) olives, oils, sugars, soaps, anise-seeds, licorice, soda barillia, pate, (?) and sundry West India commodities. This account embraces also the trade with Portugal, for the present united under the same sovereignty with Spain; although in 1640, two years after the publication of Roberts' book, the great revolution which placed the Duke of Braganza on the Portuguese throne again separated the two countries for ever—an event which, by depriving Spain of the Portuguese possessions in the East Indies, compelled her to depend upon the English and Dutch for her supplies of the produce of that part of the world, and thereby opened a new and valuable field to the trade of both these nations.

"The merchants of England trading into Naples, Sicilia, Genoa, Leghorn, and Venice, &c., which I term Italy, are not," says our author, "observed to have any joint society or company;" but, trading separately, they export to Italy, he tells us, "bays, says, serges, perpetuanos, kerseys, lead, tin, cloth, and many other native commodities, besides pepper, indigo, cloves, and other Indian commodities, in great abundance; and for returns thence have cloths of gold and silver, satins, velvets, taffetas, plushes, tabins, (?) damasks, alum, oils, glass, anise-seeds, rice, Venice gold and silver, great quantity of raw silks of sundry sorts, and divers other commodities." "And here likewise," he adds, repeating nearly the same formula with which he has wound up every preceding paragraph, "all other foreign nations give willingly place to the English, as the prime and principal merchants, that either abide amongst them or negotiate with them." Of some other branches of our commerce he gives merely a naked enumeration; thinking it unnecessary "to insist upon the reliques of that famous Barbary trade," or to mention "the petty adventures of the English to Guinea and Beny," (or Benin;) "neither," says he, in conclusion, "need I nominate the homeland commerce of this kingdom to Scotland and Ireland; neither go about to particularize the large traffic of this island to their late plantations of Newfoundland, Somers Islands, Virginia, Barbadoes, and New England, and

to other places which rightly challenge an interest in the present trade and traffic of this kingdom."

SECT. XXXVI.—THOMAS MUNN, MERCHANT OF LONDON.

This commercial writer is chiefly noticeable now, because he was one of the ablest exponents of what was called the "Mercantile System;" also because he continued to be referred to, up to a recent period, as a mercantile authority. From the omission of commercial men, no matter how eminent, from biographical literature, it is impossible now to do justice to the memories of some of these old merchants. The following remarks on Munn we quote from Mr Maculloch:—

"Munn may be considered as the earliest expositor of what has been called the *Mercantile System* of commercial policy. It was found to be indispensable to the profitable carrying on of the trade to India and the East generally, that the exportation of gold and silver, which had hitherto been prohibited, should be permitted. But though Munn, in accordance with the prejudices of his time, admitted that the precious metals were the only real wealth a country could possess, he contended that their exportation might be safely allowed, provided the *balance of payments* were in our favour; that is, provided the total value of the exports exceeded the total value of the imports; for in that case, said Munn, the balance must be paid in bullion, and our riches will annually increase by its amount. It would be useless to take up the reader's time by entering into any lengthened statements illustrative of the hollowness of this theory. Everybody is now aware that the circumstances which determine the importation and exportation of bullion are the same with those which determine the importation and exportation of other things; and that, though the balance of payments were 10 to 20 millions in our favour, or against us, not a single ounce of bullion would be imported or exported, if there were any other article whatever that might be imported or exported with greater advantage. Everybody is also aware that but little bullion can be exported from one country and imported into another, without so raising its value in the exporting, and lowering it in the importing country, as to put an end to its transfer. And everybody further knows that, in all ordinary cases, the value of the imports *must* considerably exceed the value of the exports; and that the excess of the former, (and not its defect,) is the measure of the profit realized in the trade with the foreigner. But, such as it was, this theory

kept its ground for a lengthened period, and was all but universally assented to by the merchants and legislature. Hence the bounties and premiums so frequently given on the exportation of domestic produce, and the formidable difficulties thrown, by means of prohibitions and heavy duties, in the way of importing foreign produce; and hence also the fact that, though its principles have been completely overthrown, it still continues to exercise a powerful practical influence.”—(*Literature of Political Economy.*)

SECT. XXXVII.—SIR JOSIAH CHILD.

This eminent merchant published a defence of the East India Company about the year 1609; but he is better known for his “New Discourse on Trade,” published in 1668, and written in 1665, “in the sickness year at his country house,” as he states. His views on many subjects were in advance of his age; but there is certainly no soundness in the leading doctrine of the present work, which is, that the principal cause of national wealth is a low rate of interest established by law, the fact being, that the natural rate of interest, being merely another name for the price of credit, is always dependent upon the state of the market of credit, that is to say, upon the supply of disposable capital, and the demand for it by borrowers; and that all that the establishment of a legal rate of interest can do is in some degree to impede and disturb the course of the influences which regulate the natural rate, and which, if they were left to themselves, would determine the actual rate. In other words, a low rate of interest, instead of being, as Child imagined, a cause of national wealth, by which he meant the accumulation of capital, might more truly be said to be a consequence of such accumulation; for if the rate of profit, and consequently the demands of borrowers, should continue the same, the rate of interest would be brought down by the mere growth of disposable capital. But, notwithstanding this fundamental mistake of the book on a theoretical point, it may, from the position and opportunities of the author, be safely taken as a trustworthy authority in regard to most of the statements as to matters of fact contained in it.

The branches of English commerce which Child speaks of as having been most extended in his time are the trade with Spain and Portugal, and with the East Indies. In his preface he asserts that, since the year 1640, our exports of native commodities to the Peninsula had been more than trebled. He was

himself a director of the East India Company, and he strenuously insists upon the great national profits and advantages of the trade with that region, in opposition to the outcry raised against it, principally on the ground of its carrying a large balance of specie out of the country—the simple test by which the common prejudice of the time at once decided whether any trade was profitable or the reverse. Child, without having very clear notions on the subject, is much inclined to qualify the vulgar doctrine on the balance of trade generally; but in this particular case his chief argument is, that, although the imports of the company were in great part paid for in money, the same money, or rather a larger sum, would otherwise have had to be paid to the Dutch for the same commodities. We should have had to buy from them the saltpetre necessary for the making of gunpowder, as well as our pepper and calicoes, for which they would have made us pay as dear as they did for nutmegs, cinnamon, cloves, and mace, of which they then had the monopoly; or, if we did not use calicoes, we should have been obliged to resort to foreign linens. The company, he states, then employed from thirty-five to forty sail of the most warlike mercantile ships of the kingdom, with from sixty to a hundred men in each; and, besides supplying the country with saltpetre, pepper, indigo, calicoes, and several useful drugs, to the value of between L.150,000 and L.180,000 yearly, for home consumption, procured us calicoes, printed stuffs, and other merchandise for our trades to Turkey, France, Spain, Italy, and Guinea; most of which trades, according to this author, could not then be carried on with any considerable advantage but for those supplies; “and those goods exported,” he adds, “do produce in foreign parts, to be returned to England, six times the treasure in specie which the company exports from England to India.” In other branches of trade he represents the Dutch as going far a-head of us. The Turkey, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese trades, by means partly of our Indian commodities, partly of our native wool, were more active and prosperous than at any former period. The trade with our American plantations was a new branch of commerce, of great and rapidly growing importance, which was wholly in our own hands. Accordingly, in proof of the general fact of the vast increase of the wealth of the country within the preceding twenty years, Child adduces the following particulars:—

“First,” he says, “we give generally now one-third more money with apprentices than we did twenty years before. Secondly, notwithstanding the decay of some, and the loss of other trades, yet, in the gross, we ship off now one-third more

of our manufactures, and of our tin and lead, than we did twenty years ago. Thirdly, new-built houses in London yield twice the rent which they did before the conflagration in the year 1666; and houses immediately before that fire generally yielded one-fourth more rent than they did twenty years ago. Fourthly, the speedy and costly rebuilding, after that great fire, in London, is a convincing, and to a stranger an amazing, argument of the plenty and late increase of money in England. Fifthly, we have now more than double the number of merchants and shipping that we had twenty years ago. Sixthly, the course of our trade, from the increase of our money, is strangely altered within these twenty years; most payments from merchants and shop-keepers being now made with ready money, whereas formerly the course of our general trade ran at three, six, nine, and eighteen months' time." He admits that people complained, notwithstanding, very greatly of the scarcity of money; but "this humour of complaining," he replies with much truth, "proceeds from the frailty of our natures; it being natural for men to complain of the present, and to commend the times past." "And I can say, with truth," he adds, "upon my own memory, that men did complain as much of the scarcity of money ever since I knew the world as they do now:—nay, the very same persons who now complain of this and commend that time."

SECT. XXXVIII.—SIR DUDLEY NORTH.

In respect of time, Sir Dudley North, a Turkey merchant at Smyrna and Constantinople, sheriff of London, and commissioner of the customs, comes next after Sir William Petty, as an enlightened writer on the philosophy of trade; but he ranks before Sir William Petty and every other writer up to Adam Smith, as a political economist. He died more than eighty years before *The Wealth of Nations* was published, yet he developed the principles of Adam Smith's first work at that early period, not so fully as Smith himself, though in language and illustration not less clear and forcible. He had the misfortune in the later periods of his life to be involved in violent party politics, not seemingly of his own choosing, but beyond his power to control, and hardly within his power to avoid; his elder brother, Lord Guildford, being keeper of the Great Seal to Charles II. Like his brother, he was too conscientious to be the minion of the licentious court party of Charles II., or of the Catholic party which ruled the court of James II.; he, his brother, and all their families

being Protestant churchmen, consequently they were never in favour with the courts of Charles and James, though employed in high offices. The legal ability of the one brother, and the financial and commercial knowledge of the other, rendered their services indispensable to governments, which had so little of business talents as those of Charles and James. Upon the other hand, their adherence to the Stuarts and the kingly prerogatives so vehemently opposed by the populace, the whig statesmen, and the religious dissenters of those days, covered them with popular disrepute. Roger North, the younger brother of Sir Dudley, writing of him several years after his death, intimates a belief that his work in which was developed the true principles of trade, was destroyed as soon as he was dead. There is too much reason to fear that this was done from personal or party malice. It could not be from enmity to the principles of the work alone; for it had no sooner disappeared, so that even a brother could not obtain or trace a copy of it, than an adherent of the popular party in politics, the famous John Locke, produced a work embodying similar principles, which was at once admitted to be worthy of a cherished existence.

But the work of Sir Dudley North being that of a practical merchant and financier, was more practical than the essays of the scholastic Locke, while it seems to have been not less philosophic. Who can tell how different the fate of the Stuarts might have been, had they taken the counsel, and been guided by the able service, of such conscientious adherents as the Norths? Who can tell how much the trade of Britain might have gained, had the trade discourses of Dudley North been preserved, studied, and reduced to national practice?

It seems that the same virulence of parties led to the Lord Keeper Guildford being omitted from the historical records of contemporary writers, a proof, as the younger brother shrewdly remarks, that those writers had nothing to say to the disparagement of the Lord Keeper. To rectify their omission, Roger North, at a late period of his life, wrote biographies of his "best brother," the lord keeper, and of "the merchant," Sir Dudley, also of the Rev. John North, another brother. To these biographies, little known to the public, we are indebted for what we know of this historically ill-used family. The life of Sir Dudley North has not yet appeared in any collection of memoirs previous to the preparation of this *Biographic History of Free Trade and the League*.

It seems that one or two copies of this work were discovered many years after the death of the author, and that some were privately printed and circulated in Edinburgh.

(For a farther account of which the reader is referred to Appendix A, at the end of this work.) The following is the preface to the work—“*Discourses upon Trade, principally directed to the cases of the Interest, Coynage, Clipping, and Increase of Money.*”

“That the whole world as to trade is but as one nation or people, and therein nations are as persons.

“That the loss of trade with one nation is not that only separately considered, but so much of the trade of the world rescinded and lost; for all is combined together.

“That there can be no trade unprofitable to the public; for if any prove so, men leave it off, and whenever the traders thrive, the public, of which they are a part, thrive also.

“That to force men to deal in any prescribed manner may profit such as happen to serve them, but the public gains not, because it is taking from one subject to give to another.

“That no laws can set prices in trade, the rates of which must and will make themselves. But when such laws do happen to lay any hold, it is so much impediment to trade, and, therefore, prejudicial.

“That money is a merchandise, whereof there may be a glut as well as a scarcity, and that even to an inconvenience

“That a people cannot want money to serve the ordinary dealing, and more than enough they will not have.

“That no man will be the richer for making much money, nor have any part of it, but as he buys it for an equivalent price.

“That the free coynage is a perpetual motion found out, whereby to melt and coyn without ceasing, and so to feed goldsmiths and coyners at the public charge.

“That debasing the coin is defrauding one another, and to the public there is no sort of advantage from it, for that admits no character, or value, but intrinsic.

“That the sinking by alloy or weight is all one.

“That exchange and ready money are the same, nothing but carriage and re-carriage being saved.

“That money exported in trade is an increase to the wealth of the nation; but spent in war, and payments abroad, is so much impoverishment.

“In short, that all favour to one trade or interest is an abuse, and cuts so much of profit from the public.”

Mr M'Culloch, in his *Literature of Political Economy*, remarks of this work that “it contains a more comprehensive statement of the true principles of commerce than any that had previously appeared, either in the English or any other language.”

After this the Student of Free Trade biographies will be prepared to peruse the memoir here presented to him with more than ordinary interest.

SEC. XXXIX.—MEMOIR OF SIR DUDLEY NORTH.

The Hon. Sir Dudley North, Knight, was the third surviving son of the second Lord North, Baron of Kirtling, and was born the 16th May 1641. "He was a very forward, lively, and beautiful child, and thereby entitled to be, as he really was," says his brother, "his mother's favourite." Living in London, to attend the parliament, and devoting money, which he could not afford to support the ill-advised and worse fated Charles I., Lord North reduced himself and family to straitened circumstances.

His London house was in King Street, Westminster, and, though a sorry one, was remarkable for being the only brick house in that street for many years. The chief airing which the child Dudley had was with his attendant at the door, where, by his forward familiarities, he had made himself known to most people who had to do thereabouts; and nothing so common as his being at his post with an audience in the street to share his conversation.

This over-forwardness had like to have cost him dear; and it is at least a curious coincidence that he who lived to be the first exponent of a comprehensive system of free trade, was, like Adam Smith, at the same age of childhood, (eighty years afterwards,) stolen by a beggar or gipsy. Adam Smith was recovered after a pursuit of the gipsies by his uncle, in Leslie Wood in Fife. Dudley North, says his brother, was swept away by a beggar woman when there was some bustle at the door about a coach, and, after the coach was away, the child was wanted. The servants ran out several ways to look for him, and one, by chance, found him in an alley leading towards Channel Row, in the hands of the beggar, who was taking off his clothes. So the child was recovered; but the woman ran away and escaped punishment.

It fell out, says Roger North, in the great plague, that his father's house was shut up; for he and a little sister, named Mary had the plague together. His father removed, because of his promiscuous converse; but his excellent mother stayed, and with her own hands nursed her two tender children. I have heard her say, that once feeling a swelling upon the little boy's head, the plague-sore (as it proved to be) broke in her hand. This incomparable piety and courage in her was providentially rewarded, first by the recovery of both her

children, and next by her own and her family's wonderful escape ; for neither she nor any one else in her house had the plague. I well know, by ocular inspection, that the gross scar of this sore was very manifest to be seen upon this gentleman's head all the days of his life.

But now to bring the young man to a grammar-school : He was placed at Bury, under Dr Stephens, but made an indifferent scholar. He had too much spirit, which would not be suppressed by conning his book, but must be rather employed in perpetual action. With all that, his parts were so quick, that a little application went a great way with him ; and, in the end, he came out a moderate school-scholar. But no thanks to his master ; for, had he been treated with discretion, the goodness of his nature was such, that he might have been brought down to such assiduity as would have made him an incomparable scholar. But though from what stars it proceeded I know not, it is certain that the master took a great aversion to him, and most brutally abused him ; correcting him at all turns, with or without a fault, till he was driven within an ace of despair, and (as I have often heard him declare) making away with himself.

This gentleman was designed by his parents to be a merchant, but how early I know not, and rather think they had no positive determination, but according as natural tendency and seasonable opportunity invited. And this backwardness at school, and a sorry account that the master gave of him, might turn the scales towards an employment that needed less learning. But the young man himself had a strange bent to traffic, and, while he was at school, drove a subtle trade among the boys, by buying and selling. In short, it was considered that he had learning enough for a merchant, but not phlegm enough for any sedentary profession. Which judgment of him was made good by the event.

According to this scheme, the next step was the being placed in London at a writing-school, to learn good hands and accounts ; where, being once settled in that way, he ran a great risk of being utterly ruined for ever. And if, together with his restless spirit, he had not conjoined a manly reflection reserved within himself, and also a resolution of sometimes checking his own extravagances, (which not only in his youth, but also in many important emergencies in his life, he executed by making short and sudden turns,) he had been lost. The writing-school was a place of entire liberty ; he might come and go as he would ; he might learn if he pleased ; and as freely let it alone. But he minded his business, at times, well enough, and acquired amply what he came there for, which was fair writing and accounts.

Another of his darling sports was swimming in the Thames. He used that so much, that he became quite a master of it. He could live in the water an afternoon with as much ease as others could walk upon land. He shot the bridge divers times at low water, which shewed him not only active but intrepid; for courage is required to bear the very sight of that tremendous cascade, which few can endure to pass in a boat.

He and his comrades usually hired a known porter to keep their clothes; and when they were all naked, as I have often heard him say, he was not at all ashamed of his company; but when their clothes were on, he cared not to be seen with them. He hath told me that, having lodged his clothes not far from the bridge at early ebb, he hath run naked upon the ooze up almost as high as Chelsea, for the pleasure of swimming down to his clothes before tide of flood.

The next step our youth made towards an advancement of his fortunes was into a serious and steady course of employment, by being bound to a Turkey merchant, upon the ordinary terms, to be sent abroad. His master was one Davis, a single man; he had L.350 with him, and no more. They boarded with one Mr Andrews, a packer in Threadneedle Street, a very substantial and just man. This merchant's business was not enough to keep a man employed; and, having left off rambling, much of young Dudley's time lay upon his hands. He could not endure to be out of action or idle; therefore, to fill up his intervals, he fell to work at the packing-press, and other business of that trade, by which he made himself a complete master of the mystery of that trade. This was not any loss of time; for that is one of the chief trades which the Levant merchants are concerned with, for the skilful packing their cloths sent into Turkey. The young gentleman took also a fancy to the binding of books; and, having procured a stitching-board, press, and cutter, fell to work, and bound up books of account for himself, and divers for his friends, in a very decent manner. He had a distinguished genius towards all sorts of mechanic exercises.

I do not remember anything farther remarkable of this young gentleman during his serving as a merchant's man in London, until his master thought fit to send him out; and that he did upon a voyage, than which there could not have been contrived one more desperate and discouraging. It was first as supercargo, with an adventure to Archangel, and there to negotiate the cargo, and to ship another; and then to sail with that by the back of Shetland and Ireland, round about through the Straits, and so to Italy and Smyrna, where he was to reside, as factor in the Turkey trade. It was a hard case for a raw youth to embark in such a voyage with-

out company, or so much as a face in the ship that he ever saw before, and bound almost as far northward as Zembla, and to reside amongst, and traffic with, barbarous people, and then to return through all the bad weather the skies can afford. But he went, not only willingly, but ambitiously, and formalized upon nothing that led towards the end he most earnestly desired, which was to be settled as a factor in Turkey. His resolution was inexpugnable; and, not only in this, but in many other instances of his life, he considered well what was best for him to do; and, after that point once determined, he had no thought of difficulties; he was not master of his fortunes, and resolved, at all adventures, to advance them, and therein to use the utmost of his industry and understanding, leaving the rest to Providence.

He kept a careful diary, and sent it home from time to time to his brother Francis, (afterwards Lord Chief Justice and Lord Chancellor.) He described the islands of the White Sea, the manner of trading with the Russian, the housing and law at Archangel, the social customs and superstitions, religion, tar-making, baths, (or *bastoes*.) and the severe voyage which ensued from Archangel to Italy. His ship being detained some months at Leghorn, he visited Pisa, Lucca, and Florence, and wrote lively descriptions of the cities, country, social customs, and trade. Of the Tuscan people at Leghorn, he intimates that they had then become partial to English manufactures.

"The women of this place are, for the most part, black-haired; some of them fair and well-featured, and for the better sort go after the English or French fashion. I remember I have heard you say that fashions and manners generally travel from south to north, which opinion I would have you recant, for here she counts herself not fine that hath not something English about her. And to say this or that comes from England, gives a greater esteem than we conceive when, at home, we call anything French or Italian. And this, not for some particulars, but for all manner of things; the men also are habited in the same way."

When Mr North wrote these remarks he was inexperienced in that active life of commerce, twenty years of which, at Smyrna and Constantinople, and many years subsequently in the city of London, taught him the value to the wealth of all nations of a free interchange of commodities; yet here he affords us evidence of the fact. Tuscany was the first state in Europe to establish a system of free trade, and the first to carry the attempt partially into operation before the system was established. It was about the year 1658 that Mr North saw the Tuscan women clothed in English fabrics formed in

the English fashion, each "counting herself not fine that had not something English about her." How many of the women of Britain have, since then, accounted themselves fine by wearing elegant bonnets of Tuscan straw? The interchange has served the people of both countries to a profitable advantage.

Mr Dudley North was the first free trader from England who visited Tuscany and wrote of it. Mr Richard Cobden visited that country in 1847, about 190 years after Mr North, when free trade had been long tried there, proved, and cherished. It is now the distinctive characteristic of Tuscan nationality. Perhaps the system was at no time more severely tested than in 1847, when the scarcity of corn all over Europe was more general than in any year of recent times. There was scarcity also in Tuscany. Some of the citizens of Florence and Leghorn had proposed a temporary prohibition, or restriction, on the free exportation of wheat. This proposition was no sooner mooted than the population, from the government down to the peasantry, exclaimed against it, as an unnecessary, impolitic, and un-Tuscan act, which would be alike hurtful and discreditable to their interests and reputation.

Mr Cobden being then in Tuscany, and having so recently inculcated the doctrine of a free trade in corn in England, and having just seen that doctrine established in the houses of the British Legislature, was a willing listener to the free traders of Leghorn, who expounded to him the operation of their system of exporting corn in a time of scarcity. A practical agriculturist took him to his rural estate one day, and shewed his barns, in which were Tuscan wheat of his own growth, which he would export, part of which he had exported; and Odessa wheat, which he had imported to be consumed by his family, and sold to his neighbours for consumption, at a lower price than that at which they could purchase Tuscan wheat.

Mr Dudley North thus described the country between Leghorn and Florence, in the month of March:—

"The road to Florence is all along very pleasant corn-fields, green on all sides, and planted with willow or sallow trees, pretty thick, but orderly, which serve only for stakes to the vines which are planted at their roots. The country in the plains is very fruitful and pleasant, and very well watered with rivulets, which spring from the rocky mountains not far off. On all my way to this city I have not seen any fallow ground at all; but they use dunging the ground so much that it is a very ordinary calling for young fellows to travel the

roads with a basket at their necks to pick up horse dung, &c., which they sell to countrymen at a price according to the quality. The manner of landlords dealing with tenants is quite different from the common use in England; for they bargain with a country fellow as well as they can, for what share of the crop the man will allow, he being at the charge and pains to till the ground, and the landlord usually finding half the seed, and hath commonly the same part of the crop; but they regulate their bargains according to the fruitfulness of the land. So also with wine and oil.*

The lengthened detention of Mr North and his ship at Leghorn, while voyaging to Smyrna, was caused by waiting for an armed Dutch convoy. To a mind like his this mercantile delay and loss would naturally suggest the loss which all nations sustain from war, as he has pointed out in his *Discourse on Trade*. He arrived at last at his destination. His brother Roger thus writes of him:—

“After these troublesome voyages were over, our young factor found himself, what he infinitely desired to be, an agent and factor for his master, settled at Smyrna. His chief dependence was upon the benefit of his commissions, for his own capital was inconsiderable; he had from his parents but one single hundred pounds, advanced for him to trade with. But his mother, out of a hoard she had made of small legacies given her, and some old gold of her own, and other matters she had scraped together, made up about sixty pounds more, and his ‘best brother’ sent him what money he had, which was about two hundred pounds, his whole inventory scarce amounted to four hundred pounds—and this was all the beginning this famous merchant had. It doth not appear that he was entertained as partner in any house, or *ragion*, as they call it, where young men are as apprentices a while, to observe and learn before they take the post of acting in the part of buying and selling; but he was independent, and stood upon his own legs. But it is probable that, as usual in such cases, he was recommended to some merchants upon the spot for advice and direction in difficult matters at first.”

He did not, as most young factors, set up himself in an expensive way of living, after the example of those that he found upon the place; for he wore plain and cheap clothes, and kept no horse, and put himself to diet as cheap as he

* For a more detailed account of the progress and posture of free trade in Tuscany, and its prospects in other European states, together with some account of the principal exponents of political economy in these countries, see the Notes on the Tour of Mr Cobden among the Friends of Free Trade in Europe, in the *ninth* and *tenth* divisions of this work.

could ; and, in all this reasonable conduct, he was forced to muster up his spirits in opposition to those who slighted him for it, whom he as much slighted by a steady perseverance in his own way. There wanted not those who expected more gaiety from him, as well on account of his quality, as of the ordinary example or mode of the factors there, although some had occasion for as much thrift as himself.

He was a gentleman, ever brisk and witty, a great observer of all incidents, and withal, very friendly and communicative ; which made him be generally beloved, and his company desired by the top merchants of the factory. He was not a good fellow, as it is called, and, on the other side, not morose ; but went along with his company, and not seldom beyond the measure he desired. He was ever a thorn in the sides of the foolish and malicious, and wanted not inventions to divert himself and others by exposing them. This made all choose to stand fair with him, for he was a creature that had sharp claws and scaly sides. A young man, among his equals, had need be at least as well armed as the rest, for they are not given to moderation in making sport with each other, but rather on the other side, according as a companion shews an unguarded part, with tricks and stratagems always aiming to attack him in that quarter. This makes the breeding of youth to be always best among equals, and not with either superiors or inferiors. The former makes them abject, and the other insolent, and both unfit for common conversation, which, abroad in the world, is ordinarily among equals. He said that he never was caught in any of their novice-traps, of which one, alluding to horses in a stable, is called "tying up" the head ; and this they practise upon young or shallow traders who deal by themselves. If they happen to have a large import, and all their warehouses are full, the old factors, fearing the young men should be too quick and get the custom, conspire to discourse of not selling but at a price ; the young men, with good reason, as they think, resolve the same, and then the others undersell and leave them without opportunity, for their heads were "tied up" from their meat.

We shall not go into the details of the Turkey trade with which he was connected. For several years he advanced little beyond the condition of an agent for the house which sent him to Smyrna. He returned to England and made new arrangements ; went to Constantinople, carried on an extensive and lucrative traffic, and finally returned to England a rich merchant, after an absence of twenty years.

He took a large house in Basinghall Street, and entered extensively into trade. In discoursing to his brothers, he

caused them to wonder, particularly the Lord Chief Justice North, at his new ideas about trade and money, whereof they had never heard the like before. "One of his doctrines," says Roger, "was, that you could never permanently drain the country of money by any system of foreign trade, by paying away the money for foreign merchandise; because those who had got the money would, when they discovered that it was scarce in this country, come with it and sell it again. They would take as the price of the money whatever we could afford to give most of, and which might be suitable to them." Thus Mr North contended money would always equalize its own circulation, if nations traded freely with one another.

The Lord Chief Justice, finding his brother falling thus pell-mell into the affairs of trade, and perceiving in his conversation that he had an uncommon penetration and capacity, both in general and particular direction of matters to be transacted by the application of many heads and hands, thought sincerely that he should do his majesty a signal piece of service in recommending him to some post, of which, in the revenue business, there were not a few that needed such an one as he was; and if withal he did good to his brother, his integrity and service to the king his master was never the less. Accordingly he took an opportunity to speak of him to my Lord Rochester, (then at the head of the Treasury,) and told him that he had a brother lately arrived from Turkey, who understood trade and the marine perfectly well; and he believed it would be for his majesty's service if his Lordship thought fit to recommend him to any employment in the customs, or where such a person might be useful; and that really he believed that no man in England was so well qualified to serve the King as his brother was. But his Lordship so little thought that there could be an impartial man in the world, that, for answer, he only smiled; which was as much as to say that he thought my Lord Chief Justice came to palm his brother upon him. By this it appeared that the Lord Rochester did not understand men; but his mind altered afterwards.

Mr North's marriage is worthy of a brief notice, from circumstances connected with his father-in-law and his own political connexions. He was set up as one of the candidates for the sheriffwick of London and Middlesex by the court party. The religious Protestant Non-conformists, and other opponents of the court, among whom the Catholics were perhaps the most powerful, opposed the appointment of Mr North as sheriff. The most of their opposition consisted for a time in

ridicule, writing anonymous letters to his friends, caricaturing him as an ass, "which," says Roger, "made matter of discourse, and sometimes merriment among ourselves, but altered not the state of his case one jot."

But one thing the party did which was really malicious, and might have had an unfortunate turn upon him. They found out that at this time he was in full courtship of a widow lady, very beautiful, and rich, the daughter of Sir Robert Cann, a morose old merchant of Bristol. They caused letters to be sent to this old gentleman from some one in London whom he valued, intimating that his daughter was going to throw herself away upon a new comer that all people believed was not worth a groat, else he would not act so desperately as he did to be sheriff; for if he went on he would certainly be hanged. And the lady herself was plied with gossips, but her penetration was not so shallow as their tittle-tattle. She lodged in the house of an understanding merchant, one Mr George Sitwell, and it is likely that the gentleman gave a good account of his proceedings, and, as it fell out, all this wind shook no corn in that quarter.

Meanwhile he was elected sheriff amid great disturbance; but during all these turbulences in the public, Mr North did not neglect his main, which was to accomplish his match with the lady Gunning. Concerning which I must remember that, as soon as it was seriously thought of, I took upon me to write to Sir Robert Cann, her father, with whom I was well acquainted, and proposed the match to him, setting forth Mr North with all the advantage I could. The old knight returned an answer, and in it an immense demand, viz.—that when Mr North had purchased an estate in land of three or four thousand pounds a-year, (I know not which,) whereby he might make settlements suitable to his daughter's fortune, he would hearken to my proposition, but none of less estate in land must pretend to her. This was cold water, and I desisted. But when a good advance was made in the lady's favour, she adhering resolutely to have her father's consent, without which she would never marry, Mr North himself wrote to Sir Robert, in general terms, for his consent upon making such settlements as should be approved. His answer was to the same effect, viz.—that when he had produced his particulars, &c. Then Mr North wrote again a proposition to settle twenty thousand pounds to purchase an estate, &c. The old man answered thus:—"Sir, My answer to your first letter is an answer to your second.—Your humble servant, R. C." Mr North returned—"Sir, I perceive you like neither me nor my business.—Your humble servant, D. N." And there

ended the correspondence with the father at that time. But, in the mean time, he had wrote to his daughter, to shew her the precipice she was upon—going to marry a desperado, not worth a groat, and one that would certainly be hanged.

But the old man, at length, finding this would be a match, when the dust raised by party-work was well cleaned off, fell in; and, since he could not have his will in the person, he resolved to have it in the settlements. So, besides what Mr North settled, he must turn over all his wife's fortune, of all kinds, for her separate disposal. This done, he consented, and the match, with a very honourable attendance, was solemnized. But the lady, whose judgment and penetration were superior to most of her sex, took care, before she went to church, to commit her separate maintenance to the flames, as being, for the most part, a make-bait, and never of use but in the cases of young folks, whose characters are not known. Any one that hath lived in the view of the world, as she had done, might easily discern a good man from a bad one. The marks of family, company, reputation, successes, &c., seldom fail to indicate a man's moral character. It was almost impossible but this match must prove happy, for here were two persons joined that were wise and sincere, and who meant the same thing, that is, to make each other happy. I have heard Mr North say, that he never feared an ill wife if the woman was wise; for then she would go to her interest, and he could make that so plain to her as she could not mistake it.

But to shew how this lady condescended to oblige her husband after she was married, I must observe that, contrary to her nature and humours, which was to be retired, she kept him company in public at his feastings, sitting at the upper end of the table at those noisy and fastidious dinners. And it did not a little illustrate his happiness in the midst of these shrieval troubles when the citizens came, that a lady so beautiful and rich, with her *belles airs*, advanced, receiving and saluting so much company. But it was to continue only for one year, so she endured it. The old knight, her father, came at last to be proud of his son, for when the first visit was paid at Bristol, Mr North, to humour the vanity of that city and people, put himself in a splendid equipage; and the old man, in his own house, often said to him, "Come, son, let us go out and shine," that is, walk about the streets with six footmen, in rich liveries, attending. But when he found the separate deed given up, and the furniture she had there packing away, he was enraged, and told her she was cheated, &c. He made her so afraid of him, that she durst not stay in his house without her husband, but chose to accompany him over

sea to St Brevill's, where her jointure lay. But all was well at last.

After the invasion of James II., Judge Jefferies proceeded on the western circuit, with a military commission in addition to that of Chief Justice. At Bristol, he discovered, or pretended to discover, that the mayor and aldermen had been engaged in kidnapping young people and selling them to the American and Indian plantations as slaves. The allegation against them seemed to be grounded on the fact of their extra-judicially threatening offenders with extreme punishment, who, voluntarily going into banishment to the plantations, escaped the threatened extremity. Sir Robert Cann was one of the aldermen implicated, and was greatly alarmed for the consequences, as Jefferies had ordered the military guards into the court-house at Bristol, to take the mayor and aldermen into custody.

The Norths in London were at undisguised enmity with the Chief Justice; but from the terror which the old merchant was suffering under, and the actual danger, they proceeded with him to the chambers of Judge Jefferies in London, and, after much trouble and entreaty, the Judge, addressing Sir Robert Cann, said, "Go thy way, and sin no more, lest a worse thing befall thee!"

Whereupon the Bristol merchant retired greatly relieved, greatly rejoicing that his daughter had married into a family whose members had rendered him such a service; yet so shaken with the alarm, that he never again recovered his wonted cheerfulness. He died soon after.

Mr North was appointed one of the commissioners of the customs, and afterwards of the treasury. His business habits and commercial knowledge set in order the indolence and irregularity of his colleagues. His integrity seems to have been more offensive to them. The necessity for new taxes to carry on a war against the French and Dutch became too strong to be resisted. The national jealousy of the commercial superiority of the Dutch rendered such expenditure popular. Mr North, now knighted as Sir Dudley, was applied to on this question of finance. His brother Roger relates the subject thus:—

Divers proposals were made, some for a land-tax, on purpose that the duty might be unpopular; some for a tax upon new buildings; and others had their projects, which they had little reason for, but only in reserve that they were like to come to nothing. Sir Dudley North took a strict account of all the commodities in trade, from the custom-house books, and considered which would best bear a farther imposition;

for if commodities are over-rated, it amounts to a prohibition. At last he thought fit to propose a tax of one farthing upon sugars, and one halfpenny upon tobacco imported, to lie upon English consumption only, and not upon the exports, and this, as he estimated, would yield the sum expected; and would scarce be any burthen sensible to the people. In short, this tax was approved and voted at the committee, and a bill directed, which was drawn up and brought in.

It came not thus far without much opposition and contention; and Sir Dudley North was forced to stand the attacks of a numerous and valuable party in the house; some suspecting his integrity, and others his understanding; but he stemmed them all. After the bill was brought in and read, and copies went abroad, whereby the invention was known, there was a general muster of noises and clamour from all parts of the town, not only of merchants importers, but of consumptioners, retailers, &c., raised up against it, as if the utter ruin of all the plantations was to follow; and all trading from thence, and all dealing whatever in those commodities, were all to be confounded at one single stroke. One that lived in that and in this age, must wonder that, in the matter of taxing, the one should strain at a gnat and the other swallow camels. The pretence of the tradesmen was, that in the end it would be found to fall upon the plantations trade, and to tax the exports as well as the home consumption. For, although it was pretended that all goods exported, being unaltered, should take back the custom of so much, the practice would be so puzzling and troublesome at the custom-house, that men would rather quit than lose their time about it; and then, a rise of the commodity at home would lessen the trade, so as it would not be worth their while to deal in it, whereby the plantations must sink. And a parcel of grocers, sugar-bakers, and tobaccoists, also came to my lord treasurer, and declared to him positively, that if that bill passed, they would trade in those goods no longer. This startled his Lordship, and he ordered them to attend the next day, intending that Sir Dudley North should be present; and he was sent for accordingly.

At the time there came a great muster of the tradesmen, and divers of them talked one after another, and all concluded it to be *their common resolution*, if that bill passed, *to trade in sugars and tobacco no more*. Sir Dudley North stared at them, and admired their impudence in lying so brazenly. At last, my lord treasurer said, "Sir Dudley North, what say you to this?" "My lord," said he, "I desire only to ask them a question;" then, turning to the chief of them, "Sir," said he,

"if one comes to your shop to buy sugar, will you sell any?" The grocers, on a sudden, answered "Yes." "Then," said Sir Dudley North, "*if you will sell, I am sure you'll buy;*" and fell a laughing. Then again he asked them whether, if they could get money by trading, they would not trade? To which they could not tell what to say. These stabs made them look woodenly upon one another, and the ferment seemed to be laid. They did not expect the questions, and could not on the sudden qualify their answers, and so were caught. My lord treasurer was satisfied they were a parcel of party knaves that came to hinder the king's business; so the bill, which had like to have been given up, was determined to go on.

In the passing of this bill, the work lay wholly upon Sir Dudley North to satisfy the House, as he did, by unfolding the nature of the tax, declaring his estimates, and making the consequent practice at the custom-house understood. And at the committee, when the bill was gone over, paragraph by paragraph, he sat by the table, with the draught and a pen in his hand, dictating amendments in numerous instances, and divers of the old members were diverted by seeing a fresh man, and half foreigner, act his part in parliament so well. And his schemes being well judged, and built upon truths well known to him, he, maintaining his character as to candour and sincerity to a scruple, he had confidence, and stood buff against all the reflections made at him, and at times repelled them.

There was a law passed, or rather was continued, this parliament, called the coinage. This was a certain tax laid to pay for coining money, whereby any man who brought bullion into the mint took out coined money reduced to sterling weight for weight. Sir Dudley North was infinitely scandalized at the folly of this law, which made bullion and coined money pass, so that any man might gain by melting, as when the price of bullion riseth, a crown shall melt into five shillings and sixpence; but on the other side, nothing could ever be lost by coining, for, upon a glut of bullion he might get that way too, and upon a scarcity melt again, and no kind of advantage, by increase of money, as was pretended, like to come out. The lord treasurer gave some of the banker goldsmiths, and Sir Dudley North, a meeting. Charles Duncomb, a great advancer, had whispered somewhat in his lordship's ear that made him inclinable to the bill. Sir Dudley North reasoned with them against it beyond reply; and then the argument was, "Let there be money, my lord, by G—d, let there be money." The reasons why this scheme prevailed were, first, that the crown

got duty by the coinage; next, that the goldsmiths who gained by the melting trade were advancers to the treasury and favourites. The country gentlemen are commonly full of one profound mistake, which is, if a great deal of money be made, they must, of course, have a share of it, such being the supposed consequence of what they call plenty of money. So little do assemblies of men follow the truth of things in their deliberations; but shallow, unthought prejudices carry them away by shoals. In short, the bill passed; and the effects of it have been enough seen and felt; however, the evil hath been since, in some sort, but not wholly, remedied.

Another thing which gave him great offence was the currency of clipped money. He looked upon coined money as merchandise, only (for better proof and convenience) used as a scale, having its supposed weight signed upon it, to weigh all other things by, or, as a denomination apt for accounts. But if the weight of it differed from its stamp, it was not a scale but a cheat, like a piece of goods with a content stamp, and divers yards cut off. And as to the fancy that common currency might reconcile the matter, he thought that, when a man takes a thing called a shilling, putting it off, it is also called a shilling nominally true; but as to the deficiency it is no other than a token, or leather money, of no intrinsic, by what name soever it be called; and that all markets will be regulated accordingly; for as money is debased prices rise, and so it all comes to one reckoning. This was seen by guineas, which, in the currency of clipped money rose to be worth thirty (clipped) shillings. Sir Dudley North was resolved, that if ever he sat in another session of parliament, he would bid battle to this public illusion. And, being full of the subject, he eased his mind by laying down his reasons upon paper, and the fancy took him to do it in the form of a speech in the House of Commons; though if he had had twenty speeches beforehand he could not have rehearsed one of them as they were penned, but must, as his use was, fall directly upon the point, *ex se nata*, and as the reason of things and the quality of the debate prompted. He could improve his notions, but he could not confine himself to any premeditated composure.

He knew, indeed, that he stood alone; and except some, and not many, of his fellow merchants, scarce any person appeared to join with him. Corruption, self-interest, and authority, he knew were winds that would blow in his face; but yet he believed his reasons were no less impetuous, and that he should be able to impress them; and that, being once understood, the business would make its own way. But the

parliament in which he served was dissolved, and he came no more within that pale. But afterwards, finding that the grievance of clipped money became insupportable, and with design, that, since he could not, some other persons might push for a regulation, as well of this as of some other grievances relating to trade in general, and to incite them to it, he put his sense in the form of a pamphlet, and, sitting the convention (or some time after it was turned into a parliament) in 1691, published it, printed for J. Basset, and entitled "*Discourses upon trade, principally directed to the cases of Interest, Coinage, Clipping, and Encrease of Money.*"

Discourses upon such subjects used to be frequent in the conversation between these brothers, where the general good of England was as seriously and sincerely deliberated as in the parliament house itself. Whatever may be thought, I am sure I do not hyperbolize in this, since it was my good stars to be an eye and ear witness of what I affirm.

It was a great misfortune to Sir Dudley North to be sheriff of London and Middlesex in 1683. In that year (guilty or not guilty may never now be known) the Lord William Russell was beheaded in Lincoln's Inn Fields for his share in the alleged Rye House plot; and Walcot, Bone, and Rouse, were executed at Tyburn, for a similar offence, which two of them confessed. In the same year Algernon Sidney was beheaded on Tower Hill, "glorying that he died for the good old cause in which he had been engaged from his youth." It was the unpleasant duty of Sir Dudley North to officiate at those executions. He had been forced somewhat injudiciously into office by the party which rejoiced in prosecuting Sidney and Russell with rigour, and could not escape sharing in that odium which properly should have fallen only on them.

It was a question frequently mooted though not raised in a court of law, whether he was legally sheriff or not. He was elected by the citizens with Mr Box his colleague; but the aldermen opposed to him kept the poll open after the Lord Mayor had officially closed it; whereby two other gentlemen were placed in a majority over North and Box. A proclamation was then issued by the crown, ordering a new election, at which North and Box were elected, and so sworn in. Lord Grey of Werk, Alderman Cornish, and others, were tried and heavily fined for the share they had in keeping the election open after it was closed by the Lord Mayor.

When William III. was king, and the friends of Lord Grey, Lord Russell, and Algernon Sidney, were in possession of political power, they made an attempt to raise a prosecution against Sir Dudley North, to establish the illegality of

his election as sheriff, which, had they done, they hoped to follow it with the farther declaration by law, that the executions for treason were *murder*, and so obtain the restitution of their confiscated estates. King William, however, felt himself too infirmly seated on the throne as a revolutionary king, to favour any such attempts at opening up the old question of the Rye House Conspiracy, in which he had possibly had a deeper hand than Lord William Russell.

Sir Dudley North having no farther connection with politics, betook himself once more to trade as a merchant. He joined with others in building three ships of warlike strength to trade to Turkey, and, by their defensive strength, be able to cope with the pirates of the Mediterranean. One of them was taken by the French, who were now at war with England; the others were lost.

Sir Dudley North's discourse upon trade, embodying the results of his practical experience and strong reasoning powers, was intended, his brother states, for the information of the "Convention, afterwards called a parliament, summoned by the Prince of Orange at the revolution." This shews him to have had higher principles than party politics. It was published in 1691; but it soon became so scarce, or, says Roger, was "utterly sunk," that no "copy could be obtained for money."

Mr John Locke, a political adherent of William III., and the whigs, produced, about the same time, a work on the coining, clipping, and money-interest subjects expounded by North, and was rewarded with a pension of L.1000 for the performance.

Sir Dudley North died on the 31st of December 1691, aged 50 years. He was interred in the Church of St Paul, Covent Garden, in London; but, twenty years afterwards, on the death of his widow, his dust was removed, in accordance with her will, and interred beside her body at Glensham in Suffolk, where he had purchased an estate, and provided amply for her and his two sons.

The first penny-post for the town delivery of letters in London was established at the time that Sir Dudley North was elected as sheriff. It was established by one Murray, and some of its earliest work was the conveyance of numerous letters, most of them anonymous, warning North against being sheriff; threatening him, and conveying to the lady whom he was then courting, and who became his wife, insinuations against his character. This penny-post soon after merged in the general post of the government, complaints having been made that it interfered with the government interests.

SECT. XL.—MISCELLANEOUS WRITERS ON THE MERCANTILE
SYSTEM.

Charles Davenant, LL.D., was inspector of the customs in the reign of Charles II., and furnished many interesting statistics. He was an adherent of the "mercantile system" in theory, and laboured to prove it sound; but his statistics proved it unsound. In one year he stated that several millions sterling had been paid by Britain for foreign commodities, chiefly French, more than had been paid by any foreign country for British commodities. He says that the balance being so greatly against Britain, there must have been a loss, yet, as every person knew, there had been a prosperous trade, and the country *seemed* to be thriving. He could not account for it; the country was thriving, not seemingly so, but in reality. Dr Davenant's commercial works were collected and published under the editorship of Lord Whitworth in 1771.

In the latter half of the 17th century, the delusion that the English trade with France was a continued loss to England increased every year. The alleged partiality of the Stuarts, Charles II. and his brother, for the French, and the unpopularity of these sovereigns among the religious non-conformists in England, afforded means for the latter to strengthen their political opposition, by alarming the people about the balance of trade with France being against England. And when William III. came to the throne, on the expulsion of the Stuarts in 1688, he found it popular with the nation and safe for himself to extend and confirm the delusion.

In 1677 an anonymous work was issued, entitled "*England's Great Happiness*." It was directed against the mercantile theory, and the absurd belief which then alarmed the nation, that it was annually losing a million sterling in payments to France. No subsequent writer seems to have hazarded an opinion as to who the writer was. Comparing it with the circumstance of Sir Dudley North being then in a situation which would not admit of his publishing a work with his name, being connected with the court, or of hoping to have the privilege of seeing his work escape popular destruction if he gave it with his name; looking at the style, graphic in illustration and pointed in argument; referring also to the fact mentioned by his brothers in their notes upon him, that he did occasionally write pamphlets, it seems so far within probability that "*England's Great Happiness*" was his production, that we run little risk in doing injustice to any other author by so setting it down.

It is written in the form of dialogues; the speakers are *Complaint* and *Content*. The following is an extract:—

Complaint.—"You speak plain; but what think you of the French trade, which draws away our money by wholesale? Mr Fortrey, whom I have heard you speak well of, gives an account that they get L.1,600,000 a-year from us, as the balance of trade which was against England according to the mercantile system."

Content.—"Tis a great sum; but, perhaps, were it put to a vote in a wise council, whether for that reason the trade should be left off, 't would go in the negative. For paper, wine, linen, Castile soap, brandy, olives, capers, prunes, kid-skins, taffaties, and such like, we cannot be without; and for the rest, which you are pleased to style *apes* and *peacocks*, (although wise Solomon rankt them with gold and ivory,) they set us all agog, and have increased among us many considerable trades. * * * I must confess I had rather the French would use our goods than money; but if not, *I would not lose the getting of ten pound because I can't get an hundred*; and I don't question but when the French get more foreign trade, they'll give more liberty to the bringing in foreign goods. I'll suppose John a-Nokes to be a butcher, Dick a-Styles an exchange man, yourself a buyer; will you buy no meat or ribbons, or your wife a fine Indian gown or fan, because they will not truck with you for indentures which they have need of? I suppose no; but if you get money enough of others, you care not though you give it away *in specie* for these things. I think 'tis the same case with the French trade."

Of this work Mr Macculloch remarks:—

"The author is, in fact, a decided and intelligent opponent of all commercial restraints, and of all laws for restraining, or in anywise limiting, private expenditure; and is favourable to the immigration of the foreigners, and the practice of enclosing, &c. Perhaps, however, the spirit of this remarkable tract may be best inferred from the titles of some of the dialogues. Among others, we have 'To export money, our great advantage;' 'The French trade, a profitable trade;' 'Variety of wares for all markets, a great advantage;' 'High-living, a great improvement to arts;' 'Invitation of foreign arts, a great advantage;' 'Multitude of traders, a great advantage;' 'The word Impossible, a great discourager of arts,' &c. But how conclusive soever, its influence was too feeble to arrest the current of popular prejudice. In the year after its publication (1678) the importation of French commodities was prohibited for three years. This prohibition was made perpetual in the reign of William III., when the French trade was declared to be a *nuisance*—a principle,

if we may so call it, which has been acted upon down to our own times."

For a list of the writers on political economy and commerce, with notices of their works, reference should be had to Lord Lauderdale's collection of scarce tracts, or, failing that, to the more comprehensive and serviceable work of Mr Macculloch, the *Literature of Political Economy*.

SECT. XII.—POSTS, POST OFFICE, BANKS.

Brief and guilty as the reign of Richard III. was, the merit of establishing the first posts for the conveyance of intelligence is due to him. The post office, next to the printing office, has done so much for the promotion of free trade in recent times that we cannot omit a glance at its origin.

James I. established an office for the reception and conveyance of foreign letters; and in 1632, his son Charles I., "for the convenience of English merchants," continued the patent of it, which had been granted to William Frizell and Thomas Witherings.

In 1635, a home post office was established for the conveyance of inland letters. A royal proclamation concerning it states that, up to that time, there had been no intercourse between the kingdoms of England and Scotland; wherefore the postmaster of England for foreign parts is commanded to settle a running post or two, to run night and day between London and Edinburgh, to go thither and come again in six days; and to take with them all such letters as shall be directed to any post town in or near that road. Byposts are, at the same time, ordered to be connected with several places on the main line, to bring in and carry out the letters from and to Lincoln, Hull, and other towns. A similar post to Chester and Holyhead, and another to Exeter and Plymouth, are at the same time ordered to be established; and it is promised that, as soon as possible, the like conveyances should be settled for the Oxford and Bristol road, and also for that leading through Colchester and Norwich.

The rates of postage are fixed at twopence a single letter for any distance under eighty miles; fourpence up to a hundred and forty miles; sixpence for any longer distance; eightpence to any place in Scotland. It is ordered that no other messengers nor footposts shall carry any letters but those alone which shall be employed by the king's postmaster-general, unless to places where the king's posts do not go, with the exception of common known carriers, or messengers

particularly sent on purpose, or persons carrying a letter for a friend.

The mode of conveyance contemplated by this scheme was by persons riding on horseback, which indeed continued to be the general system of our post office down to near the end of the 18th century. Witherings, who was now inland as well as foreign postmaster, was superseded in 1640 for abuses in both his offices; and they were sequestered into the hands of Phillip Barlamachy, to be exercised henceforth under the care and oversight of the king's principal secretary of state. From that date, therefore, the post office may be considered as a public establishment.*

A penny post in London was established about 1682, by a private individual, but it merged within two years in the general post.

Banks for the deposit of money seem to have arisen out of these two circumstances, that Charles I. despotically seized upon the money of the merchants of London, which, according to custom, was deposited for safe keeping in the Mint. He took it as a loan; but the merchants not choosing to be parties to such loans, took to themselves indentured servants, called apprentices, as cashiers, (not apprenticed lads, as has been erroneously recorded,) to whom they gave the custody of their cash.

Second. The civil wars which arose out of the despotism of Charles I. gave scope and encouragement to runaways. The indentured servants of the merchants did not all prove honest; some decamped to the wars with their master's money, which set the merchants to try other expedients. They fell next upon the plan of committing the money to the custody of the goldsmiths. This occurred first about 1645. When Mr Dudley North returned from Turkey, more than thirty years after this period, he was solicited on 'Change every day, his brother Roger writes, by the goldsmiths, who came with low obeisances to him to place his money in their hands, for that custom had grown up while he was resident in Turkey. He did not like it; and when asked by other merchants where he kept his money, he replied, "At home, to be sure; where should I keep it!" But he found the inconvenience of keeping it at home at last, and placed it in the shop (bank) of Sir Francis Child, at Temple Bar. From this time, banks for the deposit of money became common, and the dealings with the goldsmiths gradually ceased. Several of them betook themselves to the business of banking.

* For a farther account of the post office, and its services rendered to free trade, see the Memoirs of Mr Robert Wallace of Kelly and Mr Rowland Hill.

SECTION XLII.—WILLIAM PATERSON, FOUNDER OF THE BANKS OF ENGLAND AND OF SCOTLAND, PROJECTOR OF A GRAND SCHEME OF FREE TRADE.

It is questionable if this gentleman was more remarkable for the great Darien project of free trade which failed, or for his project of the banks of England and of Scotland, which have succeeded.

William Paterson was born, it is supposed, in the year 1660 at Skipmyre, in the parish of Tinwald, Dumfriesshire. It is deeply to be regretted that no satisfactory memorials have been preserved of this remarkable man. Of his education nothing is known; but it is stated in one memoir that he was bred to the church. He is also said to have represented the burgh of Dumfries more than once in the Scottish Parliament; to have gone out to the West Indies in the character of a Christian missionary, for the purpose of converting the negroes; and to have, while in that quarter, joined the buccaners, a gang of desperadoes who infested the shores of America and the West Indian islands, making prizes indiscriminately of the ships of all nations; and it is in this character he is said to have acquired that intimate knowledge of the seas and coasts of America which led him to form the splendid idea of a settlement at Darien, by which he meant to connect the seas on the opposite sides of the globe, and to form a grand emporium of the productions of all the quarters of the earth. That Mr Paterson, however, was either a churchman or a buccaneer at any period of his life appears a gratuitous assumption, unsupported by any direct evidence, and at variance with the known course of his after life. It is certain, however, that he was in the West Indies; but it is much more likely that his pursuits there were commercial than either clerical or piratical. In whatever capacity he may have acquired his commercial and geographical knowledge, he returned to Europe with a scheme of trade wholly different from the methods and principles of any of the then trading companies of England, and which he was desirous of establishing under the protection and patronage of some European power, which might give greater privileges and immunities than were consistent with the laws of England then in force. This scheme he seems to have laid first before the merchants of Hamburg, afterwards before the Dutch, and then before the Elector of Brandenburg, who all, however, received his proposals coldly. Paterson next applied to the merchants of London, and with them concerted the plan of

the Bank of England, of which there seems no reason to doubt that he gave the first hint. As it has very frequently happened, however, in similar cases, though he was admitted one of the original directors, his richer associates no sooner became fully possessed of his ideas, than they found out prettexts for quarrelling with him, and finally expelled him from all share in conducting that business of which he had been the author. Under these circumstances he became acquainted in London with some of his countrymen, particularly with Fletcher of Salton, who had penetration enough to see and to appreciate the simple splendour of his project with regard to Darien, and patriotism enough to desire to secure the benefits of it to his own country. Paterson had all the patriotism of Fletcher, without any of that national partiality which, in the former, somewhat dimmed its lustre and lessened its effect; but he was yet, from the manner in which he had already been treated by all to whom he had communicated his plans, easily persuaded to give the benefit of his conceptions to the country to which he owed his birth, and where he had as yet suffered none of that painful mortification, of which he had experienced less or more in all the places he had yet visited. He accordingly came to Scotland along with Fletcher, who introduced him to the Scottish administration, at the time greatly embarrassed by the affair of Glencoe, and who easily persuaded King William that a little more freedom, and some new facilities of trade, would have a happy effect in diverting the public attention from the investigation of that unfortunate affair, in which his Majesty's credit was almost as deeply implicated as their own. The Earl of Stair, in particular, gave the project of Mr Paterson the support of his powerful eloquence.

The result of all this was, that an act was passed by the Scottish Parliament on the 26th of June 1695, "constituting John Lord Belhaven; Adam Cockburn of Ormiston; Lord Justice Clerk; Francis Montgomery of Gippen; Sir John Maxwell of Pollock; Sir Robert Chiesly, present Provost of Edinburgh; John Swinton of that ilk; George Clark, late bailie of Edinburgh; Robert Blackwood, and James Balfour, merchants in Edinburgh; John Carse, merchant in Glasgow; WILLIAM PATERSON, Esq., James Fowlis, David Nairn, Esqs., Thomas Deans, Esq., James Chiesly, John Smith, Thomas Coutes, Hugh Frazer, Joseph Cahaine, David Ovedo, and Walter Stuart, merchants in London, with such others as shall join with them within the space of — after the 1st day of August next, and all others whom the aforesaid persons, and those joined, or major part of them, being assembled, shall admit, and join into their joint-stock and trade, who shall all be

repute, as if herein originally insert, to be one body incorporate, and a free incorporation, with perpetual succession, by the name of the Company of Scotland trading to Africa and the Indies : Providing always, like as it is hereby in the first place provided, that of the fund or capital stock that shall be agreed to be advanced, and employed by the said undertakers and their copartners, the half at least shall be appointed and allotted for Scottishmen within this kingdom, who shall enter and subscribe to the said company before the 1st day of August 1696. And if it shall happen that Scotsmen living within the kingdom shall not, betwixt the foresaid term, subscribe for, and make up the equal half of the said fund or capital stock, then, and in that case allennarly, it shall be, and is hereby allowed to Scotsmen residing abroad, or to foreigners, to come in, subscribe, and be assumed for the super-plus of the said half, and no otherwise." By the same act, the lowest subscription was fixed at L.100 sterling, and the highest at £3000. The shares of Scotsmen, too, it was provided, could be sold and alienated only to Scotsmen. The company was also vested with full powers to hold parliaments, make laws, and administer justice, &c. in any colonies they might plant ; enter into treaties of peace and commerce with sovereigns, princes, estates, rulers, governors, or proprietors of land, in Asia, Africa and America, all their ships being bound, under penalty of confiscation, to return with their cargoes, in the first instance, to this country, without breaking bulk by the way. They had also the exclusive privilege of trading to Asia, Africa, and America for the period of thirty-one years ; together with the free and absolute right of property to all lands, islands, colonies, cities, towns, ports, and plantations they might come to establish or possess ; paying yearly to his majesty, and his successors in sovereignty, one hogshead of tobacco, in name of blench duty, if required. They had also the power of purchasing, for the enlargement of their trade and navigation, from foreign potentates, such exceptions, liberties, privileges, &c., as they might find convenient. Their ships were also exempted from all customs, cesses, and supplies, and their stock in trade from all taxes for the space of twenty-one years. All persons concerned in the company were declared denizens of the kingdom, and all persons settling in any of their colonies, cities, &c., were to be reputed natives of the kingdom, and enjoy privileges accordingly. This act, of which the above are some of the outlines, was drawn up under the eye of Mr Paterson, and was certainly highly favourable for his purpose. The Isthmus of Darien, where there was a large tract of land bordering on both seas,

the Indian and the Atlantic, which had never been in possession of any European nation, was the spot he had fixed upon for the scene of his operations, and the advantages of which he thus graphically pointed out: "The time and expense of navigation to China, Japan, the Spice Islands, and the far greater part of the East Indies, will be lessened more than half, and the consumption of European commodities and manufactures will soon be more than doubled. Trade will increase trade, and money will beget money, and the trading world shall need no more want work for their hands, but will rather want hands for their work. Thus this door of the seas, and key of the universe, with anything of reasonable management, will, of course, enable its proprietors to give laws to both oceans, without being liable to the fatigues, expenses, and dangers, or contracting the guilt and blood of Alexander and Cæsar. In all our inquiries that have been anything universal, the conquerors have been obliged to seek out and court their conquests from afar, but the universal force and influence of this attractive magnet is such as can much more effectually bring empires home to the proprietors' doors. But from what hath been said you may easily perceive that the nature of these discoveries are such as not to be engrossed by any one nation or people with exclusion to others; nor can it be thus attempted without evident hazard and ruin, as we may see in the case of Spain and Portugal, who, by their prohibiting any other people to trade, or so much as to go to or dwell in the Indies, have not only lost that trade they were not able to maintain, but have depopulated and ruined their countries therewith, so that the Indies have rather conquered Spain and Portugal than they have conquered the Indies; for by their permitting all to go out, and none to come in, they have not only lost the people which are gone to the remote and luxuriant regions, but such as remain are become wholly unprofitable, and good for nothing. Thus, not unlike the dog in the fable, they have lost their own countries, and not gotten the Indies. People and their industry are the true riches of a prince or nation, and, in respect to them, all other things are but imaginary. This was well understood by the people at Rome, who, contrary to the maxims of Sparta and Spain, by general naturalizations, liberty of conscience, and immunities of government, far more effectually and advantageously conquered and kept the world than ever they did or possibly could have done by the sword." Seeing clearly his way, Mr Paterson seems not to have had the smallest suspicion but that others would see it also, and "he makes no doubt but that the affection we owe to our

sister nation will incline the company to be zealous in using all becoming endeavours for bringing our fellow-subjects to be jointly concerned in this great, extensive, and advantageous undertaking. That a proposal of this kind from the company will be other than acceptable ought not to be supposed, since by this means the consumption and demand of English manufactures, and, consequently, the employment of their people, will soon be more than doubled. England will be hereby enabled to become the long-desired seaport, and yet its public revenues, instead of being diminished, will thereby be greatly increased. By this their nation will at once be eased of its laws of restraint and prohibitions, which, instead of being encouragements, always have, and still continue to be, the greatest lets to its trade and happiness." These liberal views seem to have made a greater impression on the public mind than at that time could have been anticipated. In the month of October 1695, Lord Belhaven, Mr Robert Blackwood, and Mr Balfour, went on a deputation to London, accompanied by Mr Paterson, where the subscription books were first opened, and in the course of nine days £300,000 were subscribed; one-fourth of all subscriptions being paid in cash. This promising state of things, however, was, by the jealousy of the English monopolists, suddenly reversed. The East India Company were the first to take the alarm, and they communicated their terrors to the House of Lords. The latter requested a conference with the Commons on the alarming circumstances, and a committee was appointed to inquire by what methods such an Act had been obtained, who were the promoters, and who had become subscribers to the company. This was followed by an address to the king from both Houses of Parliament, stating "that, by reason of the superior advantages granted to the Scottish East India Company, and the duties imposed upon the Indian trade of England, a great part of the stock and shipping of this nation would be carried thither, by which means Scotland would be rendered a free port, and Europe from thence supplied with the products of the east much cheaper than through them, and thus a great article in the balance of foreign commerce would be lost to England, to the prejudice of the national navigation and the royal revenue." The address went on to state that when the Scots should have established themselves in plantations in America, the western branch of traffic would also be lost. The privileges granted their company would render their country the general storehouse for tobacco, sugar, cotton, hides, and timber; the low rates at which they would be enabled to carry on

their manufactures, would render it impossible for the English to compete with them ; while, in addition, his Majesty engaged to protect, by the naval strength of England, a company, whose success was incompatible with its existence." This address his majesty received graciously, observing, "that he had been ill served in Scotland, but he hoped some remedy might yet be found to prevent the inconvenience that might arise from the act." To satisfy his English parliament that he was in earnest, William dismissed his Scottish ministers, and among the rest the Earl of Stair.

The English parliament, with a spirit worthy of the darkest ages, and the most barbarous nations, proceeded to declare Lord Belhaven, William Paterson, and other members of the deputation, guilty of a high crime and misdemeanour, for administering in that kingdom the oath *de fidei* to a foreign association. Those of their own people who had become partners in the company were threatened with an impeachment, and were by this means compelled to withdraw their subscriptions. Upwards of L.200,000 had been subscribed to the scheme by the merchants of Holland and Hamburgh, and the English resident at the latter city, Sir Paul Rycault, was instructed to present a remonstrance on the part of the king, to the magistrates, complaining of the countenance they had given to the commissioners of the Darien Company, who had formed, and were prosecuting, a plan fraught with many evils ; a plan which his majesty did not intend to support, and from which, if the Hamburghers did not withdraw their aid, they might be prepared for an interruption of that kindly feeling, and those good offices, that it was the wish of his majesty to cultivate and to exercise towards them. The answer of the city was worthy of itself in its best days. "They considered it strange that the King of England should dictate to them, a free people, how, or with whom they were to engage in the arrangements of commerce ; and still more so, that they should be blamed for offering to connect themselves in this way with a body of his own subjects, incorporated under a special act of parliament." From this interference, however, the Hamburghers, aware that the company was to be thwarted in all its proceedings by the superior power of England, lost confidence in the scheme, and finally withdrew their subscriptions. The Dutch, too, equally jealous of commercial rivalry with England, and influenced perhaps by the same motives with the Hamburghers, withdrew their subscriptions also, and the company was left to the unassisted resources of their own poor and depressed country. The eagerness with which the scheme had been patronized abroad by the wealthy individuals, and the

bitterness of the opposition directed against it by the government of England, equally tended to give it importance in the eyes of Scotsmen, and they determined to go on with such means as they could command, secure of abundant support when the practicability of the plan should be demonstrated. The books for subscription were not opened in Glasgow and Edinburgh till the month of February 1696, and they were not filled up till the month of August, when, owing to the interference of the English, and the consequent withdrawal of the foreign partners, another L.100,000 sterling was shared in Scotland fourteen months after the passing of the act. Nothing could exceed the eagerness with which all classes of the Scottish people hastened to enroll themselves in the magnificent copartnery now forming. Every burgh, every city, and almost every family of any consequence, became shareholders. L.400,000 were subscribed, an astonishing sum, when it is known that, at that time, the circulating capital of the kingdom did not exceed L.800,000 sterling. To this enthusiasm a variety of causes contributed. The scheme of Paterson was politically good. It was drawn up with great ability, and promised important results in a moral and religious, as well as in a commercial point of view. Many of the subscribers, indeed, were influenced solely by religious motives, as they considered the setting up of a church, regularly constituted, on the continent, the most likely means for spreading the gospel among the natives, and as affording facilities for that purpose which could not in any other way be obtained. But it must be admitted that the scheme, having become a national mania, was not left to work its way by its own intrinsic merits. The scene of the intended operations became the subject of numberless pamphlets, wherein fancy was much more largely employed than fact. The soil was represented as rich, and teeming with the most luxuriant fertility; the rivers as full of fish, and their sands sparkling with gold; the woods smiling in perpetual verdure, at all times ringing with the melody of spring, and loading every breeze that swept over them with the most delightful odours.

Having completed their preparations, and the public authorities having assured them of protection and encouragement, the colony, in presence of the whole city of Edinburgh, which poured out its inhabitants to witness the scene, embarked, Mr Paterson going first on board at Leith, from the roads of which they sailed on the 26th of July 1698. The fleet consisted of five ships, purchased at Hamburgh or Holland, (for they were refused even the trifling accommodation of a ship of war which was laid up at Burntisland,) and were named the *Caledonia*, *St Andrew*, *Unicorn*, *Dolphin*, and *Endeavour*, the

two last being yachts laden with provisions and military stores. The colony consisted of twelve hundred men, three hundred of them being young men of the best Scottish families. Among them were also sixty officers who had been thrown out of employment by the peace which had just been concluded, and who carried along with them the troops they had commanded; all of whom were men who had been raised on their own estates, or on those of their relations. Many soldiers and sailors, whose services had been refused—for, many more than could be employed had offered themselves—were found hid in the ships, and, when ordered ashore, clung to the ropes, imploring to be allowed to go with their countrymen without fee or reward. The whole sailed amidst the praises and prayers, and the tears of relations, friends, and countrymen; and “neighbouring nations,” says Dalrymple, “saw, with a mixture of surprise and respect, the poorest nation of Europe sending forth the most gallant colony which had ever gone from the old to the new world. The parliament of Scotland met in the same week that the expedition for Darien sailed, and on the 5th of August they presented a unanimous address to the king, requesting that he would be pleased to support the company. The Lord President, Sir Hugh Dalrymple, and Sir James Stuart, Lord Advocate, also drew out memorials to the king in behalf of the company, in which they proved their rights to be irrefragable, on the principles both of constitutional and public law. All this, however, did not prevent orders being sent out by the English ministry to all the English governors in America and the West Indies, to withhold all supplies from the Scottish colony at Darien, and to have no manner of communication with it either in one shape or another. Meanwhile the colony proceeded on its voyage without anything remarkable occurring, and, on the 3d of November, landed between Portobello and Carthagená, at a place called Acta, where there was an excellent harbour, about four miles from Golden Island. Having obtained the sanction of the natives to settle among them, they proceeded to cut through a peninsula, by which they obtained, what they conceived to be, a favourable site for a city, and they accordingly began to build one under the name of New Edinburgh. They also constructed a fort in a commanding situation, for the protection of the town and the harbour, which they named St Andrew; and on the country itself they imposed the name of Caledonia. The first care of the council, which had been appointed by the company, and of which Mr Pater-son was one of the chief, was to establish a friendly correspondence with the native chiefs, which they found no difficulty in doing. To the Spanish authorities of Carthagená and Pana-

ma they also sent friendly deputations, stating their desire to live with them upon terms of amity and reciprocal intercourse. On the 28th of December 1698, the council issued a proclamation, dated at New Edinburgh, to the following effect:—"We do hereby publish and declare, that all manner of persons, of what nation or people soever, are, and shall, from henceforward, be equally free, and alike capable of the said properties, privileges, protections, immunities, and rights of government, granted unto us; and the merchants and merchant-ships of all nations may freely come to and trade with ours, without being liable, in their persons or goods, to any manner of capture, confiscation, seizure, forfeiture, attachment, arrest, restraint, or prohibition for or by reason of any embargo, breach of the peace, letters of marque, or reprisals, declarations of war with any foreign prince, potentate, or state, or upon any other account or pretence whatsoever. And we do hereby not only grant, concede, and declare, a general and equal freedom of government and trade to those of all nations who shall hereafter be of or concerned with us, but also a full and free liberty of conscience in matters of religion, so as the same be not understood to allow, connive at, or indulge, the blaspheming of God's holy name, or any of his attributes, or of the unhallowing or profaning the Sabbath day; and, finally, as the best and surest means to render any government successful, durable, and happy, it shall, by the help of Almighty God, be ever our constant and chiefest care, that all our further constitutions, laws, and ordinances, be consonant and agreeable to the Holy Scriptures, right reason, and the examples of the wisest and justest nations; that from the righteousness thereof we may reasonably hope for and expect the blessings of prosperity and increase." So far all was well, but the want of a leading spirit, of one who could overawe the refractory, and of summary laws for their punishment, soon began to be felt. Mr Paterson was too modest a man himself to assume such a position, and the event shewed that he had trusted too much to the constancy and good sense of others. After all his expense of time and trouble of contrivance, he seems to have reserved nothing for himself above the meanest councillor upon his list. In the original articles of the company, it had been agreed that he should be allowed two per cent. on the stock, and three per cent. on the profits, but he had given up both these claims long before leaving Scotland. "It was not suspicion of the justice or gratitude of the company, nor a consciousness that his services could ever become useless to them, but the ingratitude of some individuals, experienced in life, which made it a

matter of common prudence in him to ask a retribution for six years of his time, and ten thousand pounds spent in promoting the establishment of the company." "But now," he continues, "that I see it standing upon the authority of parliament, and supported by so many great and good men, I release all claim to that retribution, happy in the noble concession made to me, but happier in the return which I now make for it." With the same simplicity and generosity of character which led him to relinquish the pecuniary advantages he had secured for himself, he relinquished all claim to any superiority in the direction of the colony, which was entrusted to men evidently but of ordinary capacity, and under regulations which supposed the persons composing it to be men of better tempers and greater self-command than they really were. The whole management was vested in a council of seven, under regulations, the fifth of which ran thus:—"That, after their landing and settlement as aforesaid, they, the council, shall class and divide the whole freemen inhabitants of the said colony into districts, each district to contain at least fifty, and not exceeding sixty freeman inhabitants, who shall elect yearly any one freeman inhabitant whom they shall think fit to represent them in a parliament, or council general, of the said colony, which parliament shall be called or adjourned by the said council, as they see cause; and, being so constituted, may, with consent of the said council, make and enact such rules, ordinances, and constitutions, and impose such taxes as they think fit and needful for the good of the establishment, improvement, and support of the said colony; providing always, that they lay no further duties or impositions of trade than what is after-stated." This parliament was accordingly called, and held at least two sessions. During the first session, in the month of April 1699, it enacted thirty-four statutes for the regulation of civil and criminal justice in the colony. This is a curious document, and in several items bears strong marks of the liberal spirit and philosophic mind of Paterson. It discovers a marked regard to personal liberty, and great jealousy of its infraction. Violations of women is declared a crime to be punished with death, though the women should belong to an enemy; and to plunder Indians is rated as common theft. No man was to be confined more than three months before being brought to trial; and in all criminal cases no judgment was to pass without the consent and concurrence of a jury of fifteen persons. No freeman could be subjected to any restraint for debt unless there should be fraud, or the design thereof, or wilful or apparent breach of trust, misapplication, or concealment, first

proved upon him. One of the councillors, writing at this time to the directors at home, says—"We found the inconvenience of calling a parliament, and of telling the inhabitants that they were freemen so soon. They had not the true notion of liberty. The thoughts of it made them insolent, and ruined command. You know that it's expressly in the 'Encouragement,' that they are to serve for three years, and at the three years' end to have a division of land." It was the opinion of this director that no parliament should have been called till at least the three years' of servitude had expired. Even then, from the character of the settlers, who had not been selected with that care which an experiment of such vast consequences demanded, there might have existed causes for delaying the escape. Among the better class there were too many young men of birth. These were inexperienced, and wholly unfit for exercising authority, and equally ill adapted for submitting to it. Among the lower class were many who had been opposed to the revolution, and who had resorted to the colony purely from dissatisfaction with the government at home. These, instead of submitting with patience to the privations and labour necessary in that state of society in which they were now placed, would gladly have laid aside the mattock and axe, and have employed themselves in plundering incursions upon the Indians or the Spaniards. The subscribers to the scheme were so numerous, that the idle, the unprincipled, and profligate, had found but too little difficulty in attaching themselves to the infant colony. Those who were nominated to the council, too, had been selected without judgment; and it was not till after a violent struggle that Paterson could prevail on his colleagues to exercise their authority. "There was not," he writes in a letter to Mr Shields, "one of the old council fitted for government, and things were gone too far before the new took place."

Mr Paterson, when he first established his colony, had taken the precaution to land his people at the beginning of winter, the best season for Europeans first encountering the climate of Darien, and the first letter from the council to the directors, thus expresses the satisfaction of the colonists with their new destination:—"As to the country, we find it very healthful; for, though we arrived here in the rainy season, from which we had little or no shelter for several weeks together, and many sick among us, yet we are so far recovered, and in as good a state of health as could hardly anywhere be expected among such a number of men together. In fruitfulness this country seems not to give place to any in the world, for we have seen several of the fruits, as cocoa-nuts, barillas,

sugar canes, maize, oranges, &c. &c., all of them in their kinds, the best anywhere to be found. Nay, there is hardly a foot of ground but may be cultivated, for even upon the very tops and sides of the hills there is commonly three or four feet deep of rich earth, without so much as a stone to be found therein. Here is good hunting and fowling, and excellent fishing in the bays and creeks of the coast; so that, could we improve the season of the year just now begun, we should soon be able to subsist of ourselves; but the building and fortifying will lose us a whole year's planting." This was, however, no more than all of them must have foreseen; and they never doubted of obtaining more provisions than they could want from the West India Islands, or from the American colonies. Orders, however, as has already been noticed, were sent out after them to all the English governors, prohibiting all communication with them. These proclamations were rigidly adhered to, and the unfortunate Scottish colonists were denied those supplies which had seldom been withheld from lawless smugglers, buccaneers, and pirates. In addition to this, which was the principal source of all their misfortunes, those who superintended the equipment of the expedition had, through carelessness or design, furnished them with provisions part of which were uneatable, the consequence of which was, that the colony had to be put on short allowance, when the sickly season was thinning their numbers, and bringing additional duty on those who were in health. In this emergency, their Indian friends exerted themselves on their behalf, putting to shame their Christian brethren, who, from a mean jealousy, were attempting to starve them; and they might still have done better, had not insubordination broken out among themselves and a conspiracy been formed, in which some of the council were implicated, to seize one of the vessels, and to make their escape from the colony. After matters had come this length, Paterson succeeded in assuming new councillors, a measure which had the effect of checking the turbulence of the discontented. The new council also dispatched one of their own number to Britain, with an address to the king, and a pressing request to send them out supplies of provisions, ammunition, and men. On receiving this dispatch, the directors lost no time in sending out the requisite supplies. They had already sent dispatches and provisions by a brig, which sailed from the Clyde in the end of February 1699, but which unhappily never reached her destination. On the arrival in Britain of another of their number, Mr Hamilton, who was accountant-general to the colony, and whose absence was highly detrimental to its interests, the *Olive Branch*,

Captain Jamieson, and another vessel, with three hundred recruits and stores of provisions, arms, and ammunition, were dispatched from Leith Roads on the 12th of May 1699. Matters in the colony were in the meantime getting worse; and on the 22d of June they came to the resolution of abandoning the place within eight months of the time they had taken possession of it. The unfortunate projector himself was at the time on board the *Union*, whither he had been conveyed some days before in a fever, brought on by anxiety and grief for the weakness of his colleagues and the frustration of those hopes which he had so sanguinely cherished, and which he had found so nearly realized. The depression of his spirits continued long after the fever had left him; and while he was at Boston, in the month of September following, one of his friends writes concerning him:—"Grief has broke Mr Paterson's heart and turned his brain, and now he's a child; they may do what they like for him." He, however, recovered the full powers of his mind at New York, whence he returned to Scotland, to make his report to the company, and to give them his best advice regarding the further prosecution of their undertaking. Two of their captains, Samuel Veitch and Thomas Drummond, remained at New York, to be ready to join the colony. Should it be again revived, the *Olive Branch*, the vessel alluded to as having gone out to the colony with recruits and provisions, was followed by a fleet of four ships, the *Rising Sun*, *Hope*, *Duke Hamilton*, and *Hope of Borrowstownness*, with thirteen hundred men. These ships all sailed from the Isle of Bute, on the 24th of September 1699, and reached Caledonia Bay on the 30th of November following. With this fleet went out William Veitch, son of the Rev. William Veitch of Dumfries, and brother to Samuel already mentioned. This person went out in the double capacity of a captain and a councillor. Individuals were also sent out by various conveyances, with bills of credit for the use of the colony. Everything now, however, went against them. The *Olive Branch* and her consort having arrived in the harbour of New Edinburgh, the recruits determined to land and repossess themselves of the place, the huts of which they found burnt down and totally deserted; one of their ships, however, took fire and was burnt in the harbour, on which the others set sail for Jamaica. When the fleet which followed arrived in November, and, instead of a colony ready to receive them, found the huts burned down, the fort dismantled, and the ground which had been cleared overgrown with shrubs and weeds, with all the tools and implements of husbandry taken away, they were at a loss what to do. A

general cry was raised in the ships to be conducted home, which was encouraged by Mr James Byres, one of the new councillors, who seems to have been himself deeply impressed with that dejection of spirit which, as a councillor, it was his duty to suppress. Veitch, however, assisted by Captain Thomas Drummond, who had come out in the *Olive Branch*, and had taken up his residence among the natives till the fleet which he expected should arrive, succeeded in persuading the men to land. As the Spaniards had already shewn their hostility, and having been defeated by a detachment of the colonists in the preceding February, they were preparing for another attack, encouraged, no doubt, by the treatment which the colony had met with from the English government; Drummond proposed an immediate attack on Portobello, which they could easily have reduced, and where they might have been supplied with such things as they were most in want of. In this he was cordially seconded by Veitch, but was prevented by the timidity of his colleagues and the intrigues of Byres, who at length succeeded in ejecting him from the council. Two ministers, Messrs James and Scott, went out with the first expedition, but the one died on the passage, and the other shortly after landing in New Caledonia. The council having written home to the directors, regretting the death of their ministers, and begging that others might be sent to supply their place, the commission of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, at the particular desire of the board of directors, sent out the Reverend Messrs Alexander Shields, (the well-known author of the "Hind let Loose," "Life of Renwick," &c.) Borland, Stabo, and Dagliesh. These persons sailed in the last fleet. They were instructed, on their arrival, with the advice and concurrence of the government, to set apart a day for solemn thanksgiving, to form themselves into presbytery, to ordain elders and deacons, and to divide the colony into parishes, that thus each minister might have a particular charge. After which it was recommended to them, "so soon as they should find the colony in case for it, to assemble the whole Christian inhabitants, and keep a day together for solemn prayer and fasting, and with the greatest solemnity and seriousness to avouch the Lord to be their God, and dedicate themselves and the land to the Lord." The church of Scotland took so deep an interest in the colony of Darien, that the commission sent a particular admonition by the ministers, of which the following may be taken as a specimen:—"We shall, in the next place, particularly address ourselves to you that are in military charge and have command over the soldiery, whether by land

or sea. It is on you, honoured and worthy gentlemen, that a great share of the burden of the public safety lies. You are, in some respects, both the hands and the eyes of this infant colony. Many of you have lately been engaged in a just and glorious war, for retrieving and defending the Protestant religion, the liberties and rights of your country, under the conduct of a matchless prince. And now, when, through the blessing of the Lord of hosts, his and your arms have procured an honourable peace at home, you, and others with you, have, with much bravery, embarked yourselves in a great, generous, and just undertaking, in the remote parts of the earth, for advancing the honour and interest of your native country. If in this you acquit yourselves like men and Christians, your fame will be renowned both abroad and at home.” The ministers found the colony in circumstances very different from what the address of the commission naturally supposed ; and it was but few of their instructions they were able to carry into effect. Two of them, however, preached on the land, and one on board the *Rising Sun*, every Sabbath day. But, in addition to the unfavourable aspect of their affairs, the irreligion and licentiousness of the colonists, oppressed their spirits and paralyzed their efforts. With a view of forming an acquaintance with the natives, they undertook a journey into the interior, accompanied by a Lieutenant Turnbull, who had some slight knowledge of the Indian language. They spent several nights in the cabins of the natives, by whom they were received with great kindness ; and on their return brought back to the colonists the first notice of the approach of the Spaniards. When apprised of all the circumstances, the directors felt highly indignant at the conduct of those who, upon such slight grounds, had left the settlement desolate, and whose glory, they said, it ought to have been to have perished there, rather than to have abandoned it so shamefully. In their letters to their new councillors and officers, they implored them to keep the example of their predecessors before their eyes as a beacon, and to avoid those ruinous dissensions and shameful vices on which they had wrecked so hopeful an enterprise. “It is a lasting disgrace,” they add, “to the memories of those officers who went in the first expedition, that even the meanest planters were scandalized at the licentiousness of their lives, many of them living very intemperately and viciously for many months at the public charge, whilst the sober and industrious among them were vigilant in doing their duty. Nor can we, upon serious reflection, wonder if an enterprise of this nature has misgiven in the hands of such as, we have too much reason to believe, neither feared

God nor regarded man." They have also blamed the old council heavily for deserting the place, without ever calling a parliament or general meeting of the colony, or in any way consulting their inclinations, but commanding them to a blind and implicit obedience, which is more than they ever can be answerable for, "wherefore," they continue, "we desire you would constitute a parliament, whose advice you are to take in all important matters. And in the mean time you are to acquaint the officers and planters with the constitutions, and the few additional ones sent with Mr Mackay, that all and every person in the colony may know their duty, advantages, and privileges." Alarmed by the accounts which they soon after received from Darien, the council-general of the company dispatched a proclamation, declaring "that it shall be lawful to any person of whatever degree inhabiting the colony, not only to protest against, but to disobey, and oppose any resolution to desert the colony;" and "that it shall be death, either publicly or privately, to move, deliberate, or reason upon any such desertion or surrender, without special order from the council-general for that effect. And they order and require the council of Caledonia to proclaim this solemnly, as they shall be answerable." Before this act was passed in Edinburgh, however, New Caledonia was once more evacuated. The men had set busily to the rebuilding the huts and repairing the fort; but strenuous efforts were still made in the council to discourage them, by those who wished to evacuate the settlement. Veitch was with difficulty allowed to protest against some of their resolutions; and for opposing them with warmth, Captain Drummond was laid under arrest. Speaking of Drummond, Mr Shields says, "Under God, it is owing to him and the prudence of Captain Veitch that we have stayed here so long, which was no small difficulty to accomplish." And again, "If we had not met with Drummond at our arrival, we had never settled in this place. Byres and Lindsay being averse from it, and designing to discourage it from the very first; Gibson being indifferent, if he got his pipe and dram; only Veitch remained resolved to promote it, who was all along Drummond's friend, and concurred with his proposal to send men against the Spaniards at first, and took the patronizing as long as he could conveniently, but with such caution and prudence as to avoid and prevent animosity and faction, which he saw were unavoidable, threatening the speedier dissolution of this interest, if he should insist on the prosecution of that plea, and in opposition to that spate that was running against Drummond. But now Finab coming, who was Drummond's comrade and fellow-

officer in Lorne's regiment in Flanders, he is set at liberty." This was Colonel Campbell of Finab, who, with three hundred of his own men, had come out and joined this last party about two months after their arrival. The Spanish troops meantime, from Panama and Santa Maria, conducted through the woods by negroes, were approaching them, they had advanced to the number of sixteen hundred men, as far as Tubusantee, in the immediate neighbourhood of the colony, when Finab marched against them with two hundred men, and defeated them in a slight skirmish, in which he was wounded. The victory, which at one time would have been of signal service to the colony, was now unavailing; a fleet of eleven ships, under the command of the governor of Carthagena, Don Juan Pinienta, having blocked up the harbour, and landed a number of troops, who, advancing along with the party which had found their way through the woods, invested the fort. Cut off from water, reduced by sickness, and otherwise dispirited, the garrison was loud in its demands for a capitulation, and the council had no other alternative but to comply with it. Finab being laid up at the time with a fever, Veitch conducted the treaty, and was allowed honourable terms. The inhabitants of the colony having gone on ship-board, with all that belonged to them, they weighed anchor on the 11th of April 1700, and sailed for Jamaica, after having occupied New Caledonia somewhat more than four months. The *Hope*, on board of which was Captain Veitch and the greater part of the property, was wrecked on the rocks of Colonades, on the western coast of Cuba. Veitch, however, was dead before this accident happened. The *Rising Sun* was wrecked on the bar of Carolina, and the captain and crew, with the exception of sixteen persons who had previously landed, were lost. Of the few survivors, some remained in the English settlements, some died in Spanish prisons, and of the three thousand men that at different periods went out to the settlement, perhaps not above twenty ever gained their native land.

In this melancholy manner terminated the only attempt at colonization ever made by Scotland. That it was an attempt far beyond the means of the nation must be admitted. The conception, however, was splendid, the promise great, and every way worthy of the experiment, and but for the jealousy of the English and the Dutch, more particularly the former, might possibly have succeeded. The settlers, indeed, were not well selected; the principles attempted to be acted on were theoretic, and too refined for the elements upon which they were to operate; and, above all, the council were men of

feeble minds, utterly unqualified to act in a situation of such difficulty as that in which they came to be placed. Had the wants of the Scottish settlers been supplied by the English colonies, which they could very well have been, even with advantage to the colonies, the first and most fatal disunion and abandonment of their station could not have happened; and had they been acknowledged by their sovereign, the attack made upon them by the Spaniards, which put an end to the colony, would never have been made. Time would have smoothed down the asperities among the settlers themselves, experience would have corrected their errors in legislation, and New Caledonia, which remains to this day a wilderness, might have become the emporium of half the commerce of the world.

Mr Paterson, not disheartened by the failure of his Darien project, instead of repining, revived the scheme in a form that he supposed might be less startling, and which might induce England, whose hostility had hitherto thwarted all his measures, to become the principals in the undertaking, reserving only one-fifth part for Scotland. The controversy between the nations, however, was now running too high, and the ill blood of both was too hot to admit of anything of the kind being listened to.

Mr Paterson, though he was pitied, and must have been respected, was almost entirely neglected, and died at an advanced age in poor circumstances. After the union, he claimed upon the equivalent money for the losses he had sustained at Darien, and none of the proprietors certainly had a fairer claim, but he never received one farthing. Had Paterson's scheme succeeded, and it was no fault of his that it did not, his name had unquestionably been enrolled among the most illustrious benefactors of his species; and if we examine his character in the light of true philosophy, we shall find it greatly heightened by his failure. Though defrauded of the honour due to him in the formation of the Bank of England, by persons, as has been well said, "as inferior to him in genius as they were in generosity," we never hear from him a single murmur. When disappointed or defeated, he did not give way to despair, but set himself coolly and calmly to another and a still greater undertaking, for which he had no guarantee for the gratitude of mankind more than for the former. When this too failed, through the injustice of those who ought to have been his protectors, and the imbecility of those whom he ought to have commanded, he never seems for a moment to have thought of abating his mortifications, or of vindicating his fame by recrimination, though he might, with the utmost

truth and justice, have recriminated upon every one with whom he had been connected. So far from this, however, he only sought to improve his plan, and enable them to correct their errors ; and even when this, the last and bitterest insult that can be offered to an ingenious mind, was neglected, he modestly retired to the vale of private life, and seems to have closed his days almost, if not altogether, without a murmur at the ingratitude of mankind. There is one part of his character which, in a man of so much genius, ought not to pass unnoticed. "He was a man void of passion ; and he was one of the very few of his countrymen who never drank wine."—(*Lives of Eminent Scotsmen.*)

SECT. XLIII.—JOHN LOCKE ON LABOUR AND PROPERTY.

This philosophic writer, who thought deeply on all subjects, and threw light upon the deepest and darkest, turned his mind to the contemplation of civil government and the coining of money, as well as the human understanding. He lived contemporary with Sir Dudley North ; espoused a different side in politics, and had patrons who were the virulent enemies of the North family. His essays on the philosophy of trade were extolled, North's were decried and destroyed. Locke received a pension of L.1000 per annum for what he wrote on trade and politics ; North received contumely and nothing more. Yet North's writings, speeches in parliament, and opinions, could not be unknown to Locke, who followed them both in respect of time and manner of treatment.

John Locke was born in the year 1632, at Wrington, in the county of Somerset. He was one of two sons. His father had been a parliamentary captain in the wars of Cromwell. John was educated at Westminster and Oxford, and went to Germany as secretary to Sir Walter Vane, ambassador at Brandenburg. He declined public employment in Spain, and again in Germany, after his first engagement there ; and also church preferment. Mental activity, physical inaction, many friends, and few wants, seem to have formed his personal and social characteristics. He associated with Lord Ashley, afterwards Earl of Shaftesbury, and all the eminent men of Oxford, where he lived easy for a number of years. His difficulty in contending with them in argument led to his committing his metaphysical thoughts to paper to be read to them ; and these, it is said, formed the original manuscript of the "Essay on Human Understanding."

On Shaftesbury falling into discredit with the court of

Charles II., and going into exile, Mr Locke followed him; for so doing he was deprived of his fellowship at Oxford. When, in consequence of the insurrection raised by the Duke of Monmouth, at the death of Charles II., the English government demanded the apprehension of several English fugitives residing in Holland, Locke's name appeared in the list, and he went into hiding during several months.

The successful revolution of 1688, which placed William Prince of Orange on the throne of England, opened more favours of employment, rank, and income, to Mr Locke than he could take advantage of. His health was failing; and, in reply to some of these offers of favours, he said, "As it would be unpardonable to betray the king's business by undertaking what I should be unable to go through, so it would be the greatest madness to put myself out of the reach of my friends during the small time I am to linger in this world, only to die a little more rich or a little more advanced." He died on the 28th of October 1704, aged 72. He wrote thus, on—

"Labour and Property"—This is certain, that in the beginning, before the desire of having more than man needed had altered the intrinsic value of things, which depends only on their usefulness to the life of man; or had agreed that a little piece of yellow metal, which would keep without wasting or decay, should be worth a great piece of flesh or a whole heap of corn; though men had a right to appropriate, by their labour, each one to himself, as much of the things of nature as he could use, yet this could not be much, nor to the prejudice of others, where the same plenty was still left to those who would use the same industry. To which, let me add, that he who appropriates land to himself by his labour, does not lessen, but increase, the common stock of mankind; for the provisions serving to the support of human life, produced by one acre of enclosed and cultivated land, are (to speak much within compass) ten times more than those which are yielded by an acre of land of an equal richness lying waste in common. And, therefore, he that encloses land, and has a greater plenty of the conveniences of life from ten acres than he could have from an hundred left to nature, may truly be said to give ninety acres to mankind; for his labour now supplies him with provisions out of ten acres, which were by the product of an hundred lying in common. I have here rated the improved land very low, in making its product but as ten to one, when it is much nearer an hundred to one; for, I ask, whether in the wild woods and uncultivated wastes of America, left to nature,

without any improvement, tillage, or husbandry, a thousand acres yield the needy and wretched inhabitants as many conveniences of life as ten acres, equally fertile land, do in Devonshire, where they are well cultivated.

“ Before the appropriation of land, he who gathered as much of the wild fruit ; killed, caught, or tamed, as many of the beasts as he could ; he that so employed his pains about any of the spontaneous products of nature, as any way to alter them from the state which nature put them in, by placing any of his labour on them, did thereby acquire a property in them ; but if they perished in his possession without their due use, if the fruits rotted, or the venison putrefied, before he could spend it, he offended against the common law of nature, and was liable to be punished—he invaded his neighbour’s share, for he had no right farther than his use called for any of them, and they might serve to afford him conveniences of life.

“ The same measures governed the possession of land too : whatsoever he tilled and reaped, laid up and made use of, before it spoiled, that was his peculiar right ; whatsoever he enclosed, and could feed, and make use of, the cattle and products, was also his ; but, if either the grass of his enclosure rotted on the ground, or the fruit of his planting perished without gathering and laying up, this part of the earth, notwithstanding his enclosure, was still to be looked on as waste, and might be the possession of any other.

“ Nor is it so strange as, perhaps, before consideration it may appear, that the property of labour should be able to overbalance community of land ; for it is labour indeed that puts the difference of value on everything ; and let any one consider what the difference is between one acre of land planted with tobacco or sugar, sown with wheat or barley, and an acre of the same land lying in common, without any husbandry upon it, and he will find that the improvement of labour makes the far greater part of the value. I think it will be but a very modest computation to say that, of the products of the earth useful to the life of man, *nine-tenths* are the effects of labour ; nay, if we will rightly consider things as they come to our use, and cast up the several expenses about them, what in them is purely owing to nature and what to labour, we shall find that, in the most of them, ninety-nine hundredths are wholly to be put on the account of labour.

“ There cannot be a clearer demonstration of anything than several nations of the Americans are of this, who are rich in land and poor in all the comforts of life, whom nature having furnished as liberally as any other people with the materials of plenty, *i. e.*, a fruitful soil, apt to produce an abundance of

what might serve for food, raiment, and delight ; yet, for want of improving it by labour, have not one hundredth part of the conveniences we enjoy ; and a king of a large and fruitful territory there feeds, lodges, and is clad worse than a day-labourer in England.

“ To make this a little clear, let us but trace some of the ordinary provisions of life through their several progresses, before they come to our use, and see how much of their value they receive from human industry. Bread, wine, and cloth, are things of daily use and great plenty ; yet, notwithstanding, acorns, water, and leaves, or skins, must be our bread, drink, and clothing, did not labour furnish us with these more useful commodities ; for, whatever bread is more worth than acorns, wine than water, and cloth or silk than leaves, or skins, or moss, that is wholly owing to labour and industry ; the one of these being the food and raiment which unassisted nature furnishes us with, the other, provisions which our industry and pains prepare for us, which, how much they exceed the other in value, when any one hath computed, he will then see how much labour makes the far greatest part of the value of things we enjoy in this world ; and the ground which produces the materials is scarce to be reckoned on, as any, or at most but a very small part of it ; so little, that even amongst us, land that is wholly left to nature, that hath no improvement of pasturage, tillage, or planting, is called, as indeed it is, *waste* ; and we shall find the benefit of it amount to little more than nothing.

“ An acre of land that bears here twenty bushels of wheat, and another in America which, with the same husbandry, would do the like, are, without doubt, of the same natural intrinsic value, (utility ;) but yet the benefit mankind receives from the one in a year is worth L.5, and from the other, possibly, not worth *one penny*, if all the profit an Indian received from it were to be valued and sold here ; at least, I may truly say, not $\frac{1}{1000}$. 'Tis labour then which puts the greatest part of the value upon land, *without which it would scarcely be worth anything*. 'Tis to that we owe the greatest part of all its useful products ; for all that the straw, bran, bread, of that acre of wheat is more worth than the product of an acre of as good land which lies waste, is all the effect of labour. For, 'tis not merely the ploughman's pains, the reaper's and thrasher's toil, and the baker's sweat, is to be counted into the bread we eat : the labour of those who broke the oxen, who digged and wrought the iron and stones, who felled and framed the timber employed about the plough, mill, oven, or any other utensils, which are a vast number, requisite to this

corn, from its being seed to be sown to its being made bread, must all be charged on the account of *labour*, and received as an effect of that; nature and the earth furnished only the almost worthless materials as in themselves. 'Twould be a strange catalogue of things that industry provided and made use of about every loaf of bread before it came to our use, if we could trace them. Iron, wood, leather, bark, timber, stone, bricks, coals, lime, cloth, dyeing, drugs, pitch, tar, masts, ropes, and all the materials made use of in the ship that brought away the commodities used by any of the workmen to any part of the work, all which 'twould be almost impossible, at least too long, to reckon up.

"From all which it is evident that, though the things of nature are given in common, yet man, by being master of himself, and 'proprietor of his own person, and the actions or labour of it, had still in himself the great foundation of property;' and that which made up the greater part of what he applied to the support or comfort of his being, when invention and arts had improved the conveniences of life, was perfectly his own, and did not belong in common to others. Thus labour, in the beginning, gave a right of property."

SECT. XLIV.—DANIEL DEFOE AND THE PROGRESS OF TRADE.

It was a prevalent opinion of politicians in Defoe's time that the nation was decaying, and that trade did not progressively improve, but retrograde. Others, who did not go quite so far as to assert that Britain was retrograding, maintained that all trade was a loss of time, human strength, and of national resources. The best of Defoe's commercial works were directed against these errors. We select a few passages:—

"*Land and Trade.*—It is evident where the difference lies. An estate's a pond, but trade's a spring: the first, if it keeps full, and the water wholesome, by the ordinary supplies and drains from the neighbouring grounds, it is well, and it is all that is expected; but the other is an inexhausted current, which not only fills the pond and keeps it full, but is continually running over, and fills all the lower ponds and places about it.

"*Wealth of the Nation.*—As to the wealth of the nation, that undoubtedly lies chiefly among the trading part of the people; and though there are a great many families raised within a few years, in the late war, by great employments, and by great actions abroad, to the honour of the English gentry, yet how many more families among the tradesmen have been

raised to immense estates, even during the same time, by the attending circumstances of the war, such as the clothing, the paying, the victualling, and furnishing, &c., both army and navy ! And by whom have the prodigious taxes been paid, the loans supplied, and money advanced upon all occasions ? By whom are the banks and companies carried on ?—and on whom are the customs and excises levied ? Have not the trades and tradesmen borne the burden of the war ?—and do they not still pay L.4,000,000 a-year interest for the public debts ? On whom are the funds levied, and by whom the public credit supported ? Is not trade the inexhausted fund of all funds, and upon which all the rest depend ?

“ *War has not Enriched the Nation.*—War has not done it ; no, nor so much as helped or assisted to it ; it is not by any martial exploits ; we have made no conquests abroad, added no new kingdoms to the British empire, reduced no neighbouring nations, or extended the possession of our monarchs into the properties of others ; we have gained nothing by war and encroachment ; we are butted and bounded just where we were in Queen Elizabeth’s time ; the Dutch, the Flemings, the French, are in view of us just as they were then. We have subjected no new provinces or people to our government ; and, with few or no exceptions, we are almost, for dominion, where King Edward I. left us ; nay, we have lost all the dominions which our ancient kings for some hundreds of years held in France—such as the rich and powerful provinces of Normandy, Poitou, Gascoigne, Bretagne, and Aquitaine ; and instead of being enriched by war and victory, on the contrary, we have been torn in pieces by civil wars and rebellions, as well in Ireland as in England, and that several times, to the ruin of our richest families and the slaughter of our nobility and gentry, nay, to the destruction even of monarchy itself, and this many years at a time, as in the long bloody wars between the houses of Lancaster and York, the many rebellions of the Irish, as well in Queen Elizabeth’s time as in King Charles I.’s time, and the fatal massacre and almost extirpation of the English name in that kingdom ; and, at last, the late rebellion in England, in which the monarch fell a sacrifice to the fury of the people, and monarchy itself gave way to tyranny and usurpation for almost twenty years.

“ These things prove abundantly that the rising greatness of the British nation is not owing to war and conquests, to enlarging its dominion by the sword, or subjecting the people of other countries to our power, but it is all owing to trade, to the increase of our commerce at home, and the extending it abroad.

“It is owing to trade that new discoveries have been made in lands unknown, and new settlements and plantations made, new colonies placed, and new governments formed in the uninhabited islands and the uncultivated continent of America; and those plantings and settlements have again enlarged and increased the trade, and thereby the wealth and power of the nation by whom they were discovered and planted. We have not increased our power, or the number of our subjects, by subduing the nations which possessed those countries, and incorporating them into our own, but have entirely planted our colonies, and peopled the countries with our own subjects, natives of this island.

“As trade has thus extended our colonies abroad, so it has, except those colonies, kept our people at home, where they are multiplied to that prodigious degree, and do still continue to multiply in such a manner, that if it goes on so, the time may come that all the lands in England will do little more than serve for gardens for them, and to feed their cows; and their corn and their cattle be supplied from Scotland and Ireland.

“*Trade is Self-productive.*—Again, all our manufacturers are so useful to, and depend on one another so much in trade, that the sale of one necessarily causes the demand of the other in all parts. For example, suppose the poorest countryman wants to be clothed, or suppose it be a gentleman wants to clothe one of his servants, whether a footman in a livery, or suppose it be any servant in ordinary apparel, yet he shall in some part employ almost every one of the manufacturing counties of England for making up one ordinary suit of clothes. For example:—

“If his coat be of woollen cloth, he has that from Yorkshire; the lining is shalloon from Berkshire; the waistcoat is of calamanco from Norwich; the breeches of a strong drugget from Devizes, Wiltshire; the stockings being of yarn from Westmoreland; the hat is a felt from Leicester; the gloves of leather from Somersetshire; the shoes from Northampton; the buttons from Macclesfield in Cheshire, or, if they are of metal, they come from Birmingham or Warwickshire; his garters from Manchester; his shirt of home-made linen of Lancashire or Scotland.

“If it be thus of every poor man’s clothing, or of a servant, what must it be of the master and of the rest of the family? And in this particular the case is the same, let the family live where they will, so that all these manufacturers must be found in all the remotest towns and counties in England, be it where you will.

“Again, take the furnishing of our houses, it is the same in proportion, and according to the figure and quality of the person. Suppose, then, it be a middling tradesman that is going to live in some market-town, and to open his shop there ; suppose him not to deal in the manufacture, but in groceries, and such sort of wares as the country grocers sell.

“This man, however, must clothe himself and his wife, and must furnish his house ; let us see, then, to how many counties and towns, among our manufacturers, must he send for his needful supply. Nor is the quantity concerned in it ; let him furnish himself as frugally as he pleases, yet he must have something of every necessary thing ; and we will suppose for the present purpose the man lived in Sussex, where very few, if any, manufactures are carried on ; suppose he lived at Horsham, which is a market-town in or near the middle of the county.

“For his clothing of himself—for we must allow him to have a new suit of clothes when he begins the world—take them to be just as above ; for as to the quality or quantity, it is much the same ; only, that instead of buying the cloth from Yorkshire, perhaps he has it a little finer than the poor man above, and so his comes out of Wiltshire, and his stockings are, it may be, of worsted, not of yarn, and so they come from Nottingham, not Westmoreland ; but this does not at all alter the case.

“Come we next to his wife ; and she being a good honest townsman’s daughter, is not dressed over fine, yet she must have something decent, being newly married too, and especially as times go, when the burghers’ wives of Horsham, or any other town, go as fine as they do in other places : allow her, then, to have a silk gown, with all the necessaries belonging to a middling tolerable appearance, yet you shall find all the nation more or less concerned in clothing this country grocer’s wife, and furnishing his house, and yet nothing at all extravagant. For example :—

“Her gown, a plain mantua-silk, manufactured in Spitalfields ; her petticoat the same ; her binding, a piece of chequered-stuff, made at Bristol and Norwich ; her under-petticoat, a piece of black callamanco, made at Norwich—quilted at home, if she be a good housewife, but the quilting of cotton from Manchester, or cotton-wool from abroad ; her inner petticoats, flannel and swanskin, from Salisbury and Wales ; her stockings from Tewksbury if ordinary, from Leicester if woven ; her lace and edgings, from Stony Stratford the first, and Great Marlow the last ; her muslin from foreign trade, as likewise

her linen, being something finer than the man's, may perhaps be a guilick-Holland ; her wrapper, or morning-gown, a piece of Irish linen, printed at London ; her black hood, a tain English lustring ; her gloves, lamb's-skin, from Berwick and Northumberland, or Scotland ; her ribands, being but very few, from Coventry or London ; her riding-hood, of English worsted-camblet, made at Norwich.

"Come next to the furniture of the house. It is scarce credible to how many counties of England, and how remote, the furniture of but a mean house must send them, and how many people are everywhere employed about it ; nay, and the meaner the furniture the more the people and places employed. For example :—

"The hangings, suppose them to be ordinary linsey-woolsey, are made at Kidderminster, dyed in the country, and painted or watered at London ; the chairs, if of cane, are made at London ; the ordinary matted chairs, perhaps in the place where they live ; tables, chests of drawers, &c., made at London ; as also looking-glass, bedding, &c. : the curtains, suppose of serge from Taunton and Exeter, or of camblets, from Norwich, or the same with the hangings, as above ; the ticking comes from the west country, Somerset and Dorsetshire ; the feathers also from the same country ; the blankets from Whitney in Oxfordshire ; the rugs from Westmoreland and Yorkshire ; the sheets, of good linen, from Ireland ; kitchen utensils and chimney-furniture, almost all the brass and iron from Birmingham and Sheffield ; earthenware from Stafford, Nottingham, and Kent ; glass ware from Sturbridge in Worcestershire, and London.

"I give this list to explain what I said before, namely, that there is no particular place in England where all the manufactures are made, but every county or place has its peculiar sort, or particular manufacture, in which the people are wholly employed ; and for all the rest that is wanted they fetch them from other parts."

Since Defoe's time manufactures in the localities named by him have in some cases decayed, as the making of broad cloth in the west of England, of buttons at Macclesfield ; and in other cases have prodigiously increased, as the making of cottons at Manchester, and the working of metal at Birmingham ; yet, taking a general view of England, they remain and are characteristic of the same localities now as in his day. The greatest change has taken place in Scotland, where, since the beginning of the eighteenth century, new manufactures of great value and some manufacturing towns of great extent

have arisen. It was a glory to the trade then established in England, of which Defoe boasted, that the young men of England refused to be soldiers, they were so well employed, paid, and fed through trade; while the young men of Scotland and of Ireland, for the want of means to live otherwise, sought and took military service in every country of Europe.

“Foreign and home trade equally the causes of national greatness.—We are the greatest trading country in the world, because we have the greatest exportation of the growth and product of our land, and of the manufacture and labour of our people, and the greatest importation and consumption of the growth, product, and manufactures of other countries from abroad, of any nation in the world.”

MEMOIR OF DEFOE.

Daniel Defoe was the author of at least two hundred and ten separate publications, probably more—some of them works of magnitude; one of them, Robinson Crusoe, the most popular story, from the day it first appeared to this day, ever written in the English language. He was born in the city of London in the year 1661. His parents were in religion dissenters, in trade hosiers. He was educated at the dissenting academy of the Reverend Charles Morton, at Newington Green, and afterwards put to the trade of his father. This did not occupy his mind as it sought to be occupied, so he took up the profession of author. He published first in 1683, but in 1685 he was a soldier and a rebel under the Duke of Monmouth. Once more he became an author, his subjects being chiefly religious controversy, mingled with the politics of the day. But all politics were at that time mixed with religious controversy.

In 1692 he was a bankrupt, but the writ was superseded, and he paid his creditors a composition by unwearied industry and good faith. At a future time, when some of those creditors who had accepted his composition and given him an acquittance, became embarrassed, Defoe voluntarily came forward, being then in a condition to do so, and paid his former debts in full.

After the Revolution of 1688, when the Prince of Orange became King William III., he enjoyed considerable court patronage; but it has been said that “he never allowed the sunshine of royal favour to blind him to the great cause of civil and religious liberty.” About this time he published a remarkable work, entitled “The original Power of the Collective Body of the People of England examined and asserted.”

Of this work his admirers have said that it vies with Locke's famous tract in powers of reasoning, and is superior to it in the graces of style. His "Reasons against a War with France" is also an able work; it is useful for the people of England and of France, to study, understand, and act upon now, as it was a hundred and forty years ago.

The death of William III. and the accession of Anne placed Defoe, and the dissenters generally, in peril. Anne and her immediate advisers inherited the hostility of the Stuart family, of which she was a daughter, to everything like non-conformity in church or state. Defoe had fought for Monmouth; had opposed King James her father; had vindicated the revolution which dethroned him; had panegyricized King William; had defended the rights of the collective body of the people; and had offended the Queen's favourites, some by argument and some by ridicule; and now the accumulated vengeance for all these deeds hung around him like a thunder cloud ready to burst.

It soon burst. In January 1703 a proclamation appeared offering a reward of L.50 for Defoe's apprehension. He was described in the Gazette as a "middle sized spare man, about forty years old, of a brown complexion, and dark brown hair, though he wears a wig, having a hook-nose, sharp chin, gray eyes, and a large mole near his mouth." He gave himself up, and maintained that the tract which was the immediate cause of the proclamation was written in jest. It was entitled "The Shortest Way with the Dissenters," and recommended the government to slay them. Neither the dissenters nor government would look on it as a jest. He was tried at the Old Bailey in the month of July 1703, sentenced to pay a fine of 200 merks, to stand three times in the pillory, and be imprisoned during the Queen's pleasure. He was taken to the pillory, accompanied by the populace, who expressed their sympathy for him aloud; and when taken down, loud bursts of applause broke forth from the surrounding multitude. He treated the whole affair with the contempt it deserved, and published a "Hymn to the Pillory," full of pointed satire against his prosecutors.

In August 1704 he was released from prison through the influence of Mr Secretary Harley, who recommended him to the Queen as a person of talent who might be useful to government. Accordingly, in 1706, he was employed by government, and sent to Scotland to assist in the momentous work of the union between England and Scotland. When this was effected he published a "History of the Union." He died on the 24th of April 1731.

In summing up the public services and traits of character of this remarkable man, a writer in *Fullarton's Lives* says, "Such was the man who by his writings exercised a greater influence over the public mind in the beginning of the last century than any of his gifted contemporaries. He was framed for the period in which his lot was cast: the times were troublous, and the politics of the day too often of a suspicious and shifting cast. But Defoe's principles were of the sternest kind, and his own character was one of adamantine firmness. Unawed by threats; undeterred by suffering; uninfluenced by personal interest, he held on the upright tenor of his way, amidst difficulties which would have crushed a less intrepid soul than his; and it is for a grateful posterity, now rejoicing in the possession of these civil and religious liberties, to a full sense of the importance of which Defoe first awoke his countrymen, to award him a place among the purest, most intrepid, and, on the whole, most successful of England's patriots."

This has been said without reference to his clear-sighted and useful writings on the dignity and advantages of trade from which we have quoted. It is for his services as a commercial philosopher that he is placed in this volume among free-traders.

Defoe's Review, a periodical which he conducted nine years, gave to Steele and Addison, it is said, the first idea of their celebrated *Guardian* and *Spectator*. It may also be possible that his writings on trade as already quoted suggested to Addison the well-written essay on that subject in the 69th number of the *Spectator*. But whether it be an original composition or a borrowed idea, we must rank the eminent writer of that essay as one of those who also understood the utility and dignity of trade.

SECT. XLV.—JOSEPH ADDISON AND THE BENEVOLENCE OF TRADE.

At Milston, in Wiltshire, Joseph Addison was born on the 1st of May 1672, his father was rector of that parish. He was educated at Amesbury, near Stonehenge; at Salisbury; at the Charter House, London; and at Oxford. His father was dean of Litchfield as well as rector of Milston; and his mother's father was bishop of Bristol. He had Dryden for a literary friend; the Lord Chancellor Somers and Lord Halifax, chancellor of the Exchequer, for patrons, while still young; but what was of greater advantage to him than any of those favours, he possessed talents of a high order, and

the disposition to make use of them. According to the custom of political patronage and literary dependance in those days, Addison seems to have hired himself out, first to King William III., who granted him a pension, and next to Godolphin, minister to Queen Anne, in 1704, when the Battle of Blenheim was fought. The ministry wanted a poet to put the campaign and battle in an array of poetry and beauty, and Lord Halifax introduced Addison, who, in due time, delivered himself of "The Campaign," a poem long since dead and forgotten, never to be resuscitated; not so the fragment of Southey entitled the *Battle of Blenheim*, written a century afterwards.

"What was it they fell out about?
Asked little Wilhelmine."

Addison's controversial pamphlets were numerous, some of them not creditable to his reputation. His literary sketches on the contrary are exquisite; some of those in the *Tatler*, *Spectator*, and *Guardian*, will endure with the English language; we quote a passage from the 69th number of the *Spectator*. He filled several political offices; married the widowed countess of Warwick; was unhappy; was appointed one of the secretaries of state; could not make a speech in parliament; had official letters to write, and could not do so without study; resigned; wrote ill-natured remarks on his old friend Sir Richard Steele; and died at the age of 48 years.

Commerce, its Benevolence and Dignity.—"Nature seems to have taken a particular care to disseminate her blessings among the different regions of the world, with an eye to this mutual intercourse and traffic among mankind, that the natives of the several parts of the globe might have a kind of dependance upon one another, and be united together by their common interest. Almost every degree produces something peculiar to it. The food often grows in one country and the sauce in another; the fruits of Portugal are corrected by the products of Barbadoes; and the infusion of a China plant is sweetened by the pith of an Indian cane. The Philippi Islands give a flavour to our European bowels. The single dress of a woman of quality is often the product of an hundred climates. The muff and the fan come together from the different ends of the earth. The scarf is sent from the torrid zone, and the tippet from beneath the pole. The brocade petticoat rises out of the mines of Peru, and the diamond necklace out of the bowels of Hiadostan.

“If we consider our own country in its natural prospects, without any of the benefits and advantages of commerce, what an uncomfortable spot of earth falls to our share! Natural historians tell us that no fruit grows originally among us besides hips and haws, acorns and pignuts, with other delicacies of the like nature; that our climate of itself, and without the assistance of art, can make no further advances towards a plum than to a sloe, and carries an apple to no greater a perfection than a crab; that our melons, our peaches, our figs, our apricots, and cherries, are strangers among us, imported in different ages, and naturalized in our English gardens; and that they would all degenerate and fall away into the trash of our own country if they were wholly neglected by the planter, and left to the mercy of our sun and soil. Nor has traffic more enriched our vegetable world than it has improved the whole face of nature among us: our ships are laden with the harvest of every climate, our tables are stored with spices, and oils, and wines; our rooms are filled with pyramids of China, and adorned with the workmanship of Japan; our morning’s draught comes to us from the remotest corners of the earth; we repair our bodies by the drugs of America, and repose ourselves under Indian canopies. My friend, Sir Andrew, calls the vineyards of France our gardens; the Spice Islands our hot-beds; the Persians our silk weavers; and the Chinese our potters. Nature indeed furnishes us with the bare necessities of life, but traffic gives us a great variety of what is useful, and, at the same time, supplies us with everything that is convenient and ornamental. Nor is it the least part of this our happiness, that whilst we enjoy the remotest products of the north and south, we are free from those extremities of weather which give them birth; that our eyes are refreshed with the green fields of Britain at the same time that our palates are feasted with fruits that rise between the tropics. For these reasons, there are not more useful members in a commonwealth than merchants; they knit mankind together in a mutual intercourse of good offices, distribute the gifts of nature, find work for the poor, add wealth to the rich, and magnificence to the great. Our English merchant converts the tin of his own country into gold, and exchanges his wool for rubies. The Mahometans are clothed in our British manufacture, and the inhabitants of the frozen zone warmed with the fleeces of our sheep.

“When I have been upon the ’Change, I have often fancied one of our old kings standing in person where he is represented in effigy, and looking down upon the wealthy concourse of people with which that place is every day filled. In this case

how would he be surprised to hear all the languages of Europe spoken in this little spot of his former dominions, and to see so many private men who, in his time, would have been the vassals of some powerful baron, negotiating like princes for greater sums of money than were formerly to be met with in the royal treasury ; trade, without enlarging the British territories, has given us a kind of additional empire ; it has multiplied the number of the rich, made our landed estates infinitely more valuable than they were formerly, and added to them an accession of other estates as valuable as the lands themselves."

SECT. XLVI.—WILLIAM PENN.

William Penn was born in London on 14th of October 1644. He was the son of Admiral Sir William Penn, an able naval commander. He was sent to school at Chigwell, in Essex, near Wanstead, where his father resided. When about eleven years of age, he was surprised one evening at twilight, as he sat alone in his chamber to study, by what seemed to him to be an external glory, and as it were an internal lifting up of the soul, which suddenly came upon him. This, the result probably of an excited imagination, impressed him with the belief that he was specially called to a holy life. At twelve years of age he was sent to a school at London, and at fifteen to Christ Church, Oxford. At the university he formed friendships with youths afterwards distinguished for talent and high station ; with John Locke the philosopher, and Robert Spencer, afterwards Earl of Sunderland.

At this time Thomas Loe, who had belonged to the university, but had become a quaker, was in the habit of preaching to the students, and with such effect, that several of them withdrew from the established worship and held meetings of their own. Penn was the leader of those dissenters ; his boldness led him into a violent opposition, and he was expelled from the university.

He found no comfort on his return home. His father was ashamed of him. After a vain trial of argument against his opinions, he applied personal chastisement, but that was powerless. He turned the young man out of doors, but soon after re-admitted him to his affections. William Penn betook himself to preaching, and underwent many hardships and persecutions for the sake of his opinions.

His father died in 1670, leaving him an ample fortune. In 1672, having returned from a tour through Holland and Germany, undertaken to propagate the doctrines of the Society of

Friends, of which he was now an eminent member, he married and settled at Rickmansworth, in Hertfordshire. For several years his time was spent chiefly in preaching and in writing. In 1677 he again preached through Holland and Germany. In 1680 the enterprise which has made his reputation all enduring was entered upon. For a number of years a debt had been due to his father from the court of Charles II. no part of which had been repaid. He offered in lieu of the debt to accept of a tract of land in the North American colonies, bounded on the east by the Delaware river, on the south by Maryland, and extending northward as far as it could be occupied. After a delay, arising chiefly from a dislike to Penn's religious opinions, the grant of this great tract of land was made by a charter, dated 4th March 1681. He was constituted absolute proprietor of the whole province; and by special royal command it was called Pennsylvania, in perpetuation of the owner's name.

The enlightened policy, moral and political, of that owner, in laying down laws and giving examples for the government of the province, has been the best preserver of his name. In his preface to the frame of government which he drew up for the province, he said, "I know what is said by the several admirers of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, which are the rule of one, of a few, and of many, and are the three common ideas of government which men discourse on that subject. But I choose to solve the controversy with this small distinction, and it belongs to all three: any government is free to the people under it, whatever be the frame, *when the laws rule, and the people are a party to those laws*, and more than this is tyranny, oligarchy, or confusion."

The purpose of the government promulgated by him is thus expressed in a summary: "We have, with reverence to God, and good conscience to men, to the best of our skill, contrived and composed the frame and laws of this government, to the great end of government to support power in reverence with the people, and to secure the people from the abuse of power, that they may be free by their just obedience, and the magistrate honourable for their just administration; for liberty without obedience is confusion, and obedience without liberty is slavery."

The government or constitution consisted of twenty four articles, by which the power was lodged in the governor and freemen of the province. These were to form two bodies, a provincial council consisting of seventy two members elected by the freemen; a third of these went out every year. To this assembly was entrusted the entire management of the province,

and with them all legislative measures originated, the second body, named the general assembly, was to consist, for the first year, of all the freemen, and subsequently of two hundred annually elected. The only power possessed by this lower house was that of rejecting bills sent to them by the upper. The governor was perpetual president of the provincial council, but without any other distinction than that of possessing a treble vote. All elections were by ballot.

An additional grant of land of large extent was obtained, called the Territories, chiefly, if not entirely, inhabited by the native Indians. When this grant was ratified, William Penn set sail from England, and, in October 1682, landed at Newcastle, and was received with every mark of respect by the old possessors of the soil. His first step was to summon the general assembly, by which an act of union annexing the territories of the province; an act of settlement relative to the form of the constitution; a bill of naturalization and a number of laws, in addition to those already enacted by the governor, were passed. Perfect liberty of conscience was enacted for all who acknowledged a Governor of the Universe, and an obligation to observe peace and justice in society. All who professed faith in Jesus Christ, who were of unstained character, and above twenty one years of age, were to be electors. The pleadings in the courts of law were to be as short as possible. There were to be only two capital crimes, treason and murder. And "all prisons were to be considered as workshops, where the offenders might be industriously, soberly, and morally employed."

The next act of this illustrious apostle of peace and good will to all men is that which more especially brings him within this biographic history of the early pioneers of free commercial intercourse.

The assembly having broken up, he proceeded to a solemn treaty with the Indians, at which he confirmed the promises of peace and amity which he had before made to them, and received their pledges of friendship in return. All the intercourse between them was to be conducted on the principles of the strictest justice; and they lived for many years afterwards in the most perfect concord. Voltaire said of it, "This was the only treaty between those people (the Indians) and the Christians which was not ratified by an oath and which was never broken."

The next employment of William Penn was to found a city, to which he gave the name of Philadelphia, in token of the spirit of peace on earth and good will to all men which attended him in his undertaking. Many of his own sect,

persecuted in England, and other dissenters, sought an asylum in those distant lands. Next year trial by jury was established, and the political and social foundations of a great nation were laid.

William Penn returned to England in 1684, was again engaged in preaching, and again visited his colony in 1699. He lived in those troublous times in England preceding and following the Revolution of 1688, when probably all religious sects, and certainly all political parties seeking toleration or promotion for themselves, pursued no other road to either than by being intolerant and hostile to one another. William Penn, as a religious preacher at home, shared in the troubles and the troubling of the times. In 1701, while actively engaged in his great mission of peace in America, where his enlarged views and original projects of philanthropy did not jar with old creeds and customs as in England, he obtained information that the cunning King, (William III.) who had never been inclined to consider any property or dignity safe which the Stuarts, and not himself, had conferred, was designing to take all the land granted to private parties in America from them, and particularly that from William Penn, under pretence of mismanagement. Penn returned to oppose the measure, which had originated in the House of Lords, but it was abandoned. It was certainly a bold allegation for a king who had come to England as William did, who had at once plunged the nation into war, imposed new taxes to carry on the war, and accumulated an enormous debt for future generations to groan under; whose entire policy was to excite hatred between England and her nearest neighbour, France, and whose practice was the daily destruction of human life wherever he shewed his face, leaving officers of injustice behind, where he turned his back, as in Ireland, to destroy life, to break faith with his subjects, to strip the ancient possessors of the soil of their inheritance, to give their inheritance to venal flatterers, and to put down freedom of conscience by the fiercest persecution known in history; it was certainly a bold allegation for such a king to make against the administration of William Penn, the peaceable, the humane, the just, that in Pennsylvania he had mismanaged his great trust to the detriment of the people living under him. But King William was stopped by the hand of God. He was dead by the time that Penn returned to defend his province from rapacity; and Queen Anne, probably from a knowledge of the kindly sentiments which her father James II. bore towards William Penn, received him at court with distinction and respect.

A lawsuit, in which he was engaged soon after this, having

been decided against him, Penn was obliged to take up his residence within the rules of the Fleet Prison ; to release himself from which he mortgaged his province for L.6600. The intelligence from the province embittered his reflections at this time, as the inhabitants of the province of the territory fell into disputes, which led to differences between the governor and the assembly. But he soon ceased to hear of them. Sinking into a mental lethargy, he lingered several years in a feeble existence, and died on 30th July 1718, in the 74th year of his age. The only defect in his government of Pennsylvania seems to have been his occasional absence. Had he resided there, it is probable that his original mind and high moral example would have controlled the settlers better than his laws could do when he was not present, excellent though the code was.

SECT. XLVII.—CAPTAIN WILLIAM DAMPIER.

This eminent navigator is entitled to a place in this work, from his just conception of the principles which should have guided the Dutch (and also the English) in the East Indies in their transactions with the native inhabitants. We annex in this memoir an extract from one of his works as an example.

William Dampier was born in 1652, his father, a gentleman of the county of Somerset, died when he was young, and, leaving him little to inherit, he was bound an apprentice to the master of a trading vessel at Weymouth.

After seeing a variety of service, and being wounded in the war with the Dutch, he sailed for Campeachy, with a captain Hudsel, on a mercantile speculation. This was profitable, and was repeated. During his second voyage he conceived the idea of exploring the Musquito shore in company with a Mr Hobby. They had proceeded no farther than the western shore of Jamaica, when some of the officers and crew proposed to go upon a buccaneering expedition to the Spanish Main, whence Dampier, though not at first a leader, accompanied them. After an attack on Porto-Bello, they set forth, on the 5th of April 1680, across the Isthmus of Darien, and when they reached the South Seas, embarked in such canoes and vessels as the Indians furnished them with. During the next six years, Dampier and those of his companions in adventure and crime who survived, and numerous others with whom they joined, continued on the South American and African coasts incessantly engaged in plundering Spanish ships at sea

and Spanish settlements on shore, an employment highly applauded in England by those who shared in the spoils which the buccaneers carried home, and by those who were delighted to hear of injuries inflicted on any people connected with Spain, or upon any people whose religion was not English protestantism.

Dampier became either alarmed at the incessant danger of a buccaneer's life on the Spanish Main or ashamed of its crimes. With a crew of 150 men he parted company with other associates and sailed for the East Indies from California and the coast of Mexico. The disreputable lives of his crew, their indisposition to all employment except plunder, caused him and two other persons to abandon them. He was put ashore on the island of St Nicholas. After escaping many dangers, he arrived at Bencoolen, where he was well received, and was appointed master gunner of the Dutch fort there. Yet he continued uneasy, anxiously looking for an opportunity to return to England. He effected his object by creeping through one of the port holes of the fort and getting on board an English East Indiaman.

Eight years seem to have elapsed before he was again on a foreign voyage. This occurred in 1698, when raised to the rank of a captain in the Royal Navy, and appointed to the command of the *Roebuck*, a small frigate, ordered for a voyage of discovery. He proceeded by the Cape of Good Hope to New Holland; and after much time and fatigue in exploring the coasts, was wrecked, and the ship lost, on the Island of Ascension.

In 1704 he set out upon another voyage. Having put into the Island of Batavia he was imprisoned by the Dutch, who seized all his effects. On his release he returned to England, and was not, so far as is known, again employed in the Royal Navy. He afterwards accompanied Captain Wood Rogers in his voyage round the world, in the capacity of master, and returned with him to England in 1711. Nothing is known of him afterwards.

The history of his first voyage was published in 1697, and was translated into several European languages. The following passage shews that he was advanced in intelligence on commercial politics beyond his age, and held views regarding civilisation more in accordance with the free-trade philanthropists of the middle of the nineteenth, than with the buccaneers of the latter end of the seventeenth century.

"The people of Barcalis, though they are Malayans as the rest of the country, yet they are civil enough engaged thereto by trade; *for the more trade, the more civility*; and on the

contrary, the less trade the more barbarity and inhumanity. For trade has a strong influence upon all people who have found the secret of its bringing with it so many of the conveniences of life as it does."

But of the Spanish Americans who had no trade, he said :—
 "With trade they will be in danger of meeting with oppression—*men not being content with a free traffic*, and a just and reasonable gain, especially in those remote countries ; but they must have the current to run altogether in their own channel, though to the depriving of the poor natives they deal with of their natural liberty, as if all mankind were to be ruled by their laws.

"The Islands of Sumatra and Java can sufficiently witness this: the Dutch having in a manner engrossed all the trade of these, and several of the neighbouring islands to themselves; not that they are able to supply them with a quarter of what they want; but because they would have all the produce of them at their own disposal. The natives (of Sumatra) would gladly comply with any who would come to trade with them, notwithstanding the great endeavours the Dutch make against it; for this island is so large, populous, and productive of pepper, that the Dutch are not able to draw all to themselves. I find the Malaysians are in general implacable enemies to the Dutch; and all seems to arise from an earnest desire they have for a free trade, which is restrained by them (the Dutch) not only here, but in the Spice Islands, and all other places where they have any power.

"But it is freedom only which must be the means to encourage any of these remote people to trade, especially such of them as are industrious, and whose inclinations are bent this way, as most of the Malaysians are, and the major part of the people of the East Indies, even from the Cape of Good Hope eastward to Japan, both continent and islands. For though in many places they are limited by the Dutch, English, Danes, &c., and restrained from a free trade with other nations, yet have they continually shewn what uneasiness that is to them. And how dear has this restraint cost the Dutch when yet neither can they with all their forts and guardships secure the trade wholly to themselves, any more than the Barlaventa fleet can secure the trade of the West Indies to the Spaniards."

Captain Dampier, as an Englishman, writing at a time when it would have been like treason to say that the English committed any outrage on the rights of other nations as the Dutch, the French, or the Spaniards did, is cautious to say little of the erroneous policy of his own countrymen.

SECT. XLVIII.—JACOB VANDERLINT.

This gentleman was a merchant of London, and published in 1734 a remarkable work entitled, "*Money Answers All Things ; or, an Essay to make money sufficiently plentiful amongst all ranks of people ; and increase our foreign and domestic trade.*" This work has always been so scarce since public attention was systematically directed to its subject, that it is not now found in the principal national libraries. Nor is Jacob Vanderlint known in biography. Professor Dugald Stewart, who probably found a copy of the work in some of the old libraries of Edinburgh, introduces in his appendix to the life of Adam Smith some extracts which shew Vanderlint to have been a thinker out of the usual range of the mercantile and political men of his time. The professor introduces him by the following remarks on political economy.

"The system of political economy which professes to regulate the commercial intercourse of different nations, and which Mr Smith has distinguished by the title of the Commercial or Mercantile System, had its root in prejudices still more inveterate than those which restrained the freedom of commerce and industry among the members of the same community. It was supported not only by the prejudices with which all innovations have to contend, and by the talents of very powerful bodies of men interested to defend it, but by the mistaken and clamorous patriotism of many good citizens, and their blind hostility to supposed enemies or rivals abroad. The absurd and delusive principles too, formerly so prevalent, with respect to the nature of national wealth, and the essential importance of a favourable balance of trade, (principles which, though now so clearly and demonstrably exploded by the arguments of Mr Smith, must be acknowledged to fall in naturally and almost inevitably with the first apprehensions of the mind when it begins to speculate concerning the theory of commerce,) communicated to the mercantile system a degree of plausibility, against which the most acute reasoners of our own times are not always sufficiently on their guard. It was accordingly at a considerably later period that the wisdom of its maxims came to be the subject of general discussion ; and even at this day (1810) the controversy to which the discussion gave rise cannot be said to be completely settled to the satisfaction of all parties. A few enlightened individuals, however, in different parts of Europe, very early got a glimpse of the truth, and it is but justice that the scattered hints which they threw out should be treasured up as materials for literary history I have thought of attempt-

ing a slight sketch on that subject myself; but am not without hopes that this suggestion may have the effect of recommending the task to some abler hands. At present I shall only quote one or two paragraphs from a pamphlet published in 1734, by Jacob Vanderlint, an author whose name has been frequently referred to of late years, but whose book never seems to have attracted much notice till long after the publication of the *Wealth of Nations*. He describes himself, in his preface, as an *ordinary* tradesman, *from whom the conciseness and accuracy of a scholar* is not to be expected; and yet the following passages will bear a comparison, both in point of good sense and of liberality, with what was so ably urged by Mr Hume twenty years afterwards, in his essay on the Jealousy of Trade.

“All nations have some commodities peculiar to them, which, therefore, are undoubtedly designed to be the foundation of commerce between the several nations, and produce a great deal of maritime employment for mankind, which, probably, without such peculiarities could not be; and in this respect, I suppose, we are distinguished, as well as other nations; and I have before taken notice, that if one nation be by nature more distinguished in this respect than another, as they will by that means gain more money than such other nations, so the prices of all their commodities and labour will be higher in such proportion, and consequently they will be richer or more powerful for having more money than their neighbours.

“But if we import any kind of goods cheaper than we can now raise them, which otherwise might be as well raised at home; in this case, undoubtedly, we ought to attempt to raise such commodities, and thereby furnish so many new branches of employment and trade for our own people, and remove the inconvenience of receiving any goods from abroad which we can anywise raise on as good terms ourselves: and, as this should be done to prevent every nation from finding their account with us by any such commodities whatsoever, so this would more effectually shut out all such foreign goods than any law can do.

“And as this is all the prohibition and restraint whereby any foreign trade should be obstructed, so, if this method were observed, our gentry would find themselves the richer, notwithstanding their consumption of such other foreign goods as, being the peculiarities of other nations, we may be obliged to import. For if, when we have thus raised all we can at home, the goods we import after this is done be cheaper than we can raise ourselves, (which they must be, otherwise we

shall not import them,) it is plain the consumption of any such goods cannot occasion so great an expense as they would if we could shut them out by an act of parliament, in order to raise them ourselves.

"From hence, therefore, it must appear that it is impossible any body should be poorer for using any foreign goods at cheaper rates than we can raise them ourselves, after we have done all we possibly can to raise such goods as cheap as we import them, and find we cannot do it; nay, this very circumstance makes all such goods come under the character of the *peculiarities* of those countries which are able to raise any such goods cheaper than we can do, for they will necessarily operate as such."

The same author, in another part of his work, quotes from Erasmus Philips, a maxim which he calls a *glorious one*. "That a trading nation should be an open warehouse, where the merchant may buy what he pleases, and sell what he can. Whatever is brought to you, if you don't want it, you won't purchase it; if you do want it, the largeness of the import don't keep it from you."

"All nations of the world, therefore," (says Vanderlint,) "should be regarded as one body of tradesmen, exercising their various occupations for the mutual benefit and advantage of each other. I will not contend," (he adds, evidently in compliance with national prejudices,) "I will not contend for a free and unrestrained trade with respect to France, though *I can't see it could do us any harm even in that case.*"

Professor Stewart refers in the same edition, that of 1810, of his life of Adam Smith, to the danger which existed in 1793, when the life was first published, of saying anything in political economy or of any other system than the old commercial one of restriction. The revolution in France was the cause of that. The same danger of discussing any new opinion or theory existed, and for the same reason, (that it involved the safety of the crown and reigning sovereign,) long before. To enable the public to discuss new theories, Sir Robert Walpole, at whose period we have now arrived, did great service; whatever his motives may have been, he took the task of government and responsibility from the crown, and invested the power in the cabinet ministry to carry great measures. Public opinion led by agitation has forced changes of ministry and threatened farther changes when it would have been treason to change or threaten the dynasty.

SECT. XLIX.—SIR ROBERT WALPOLE.

At the beginning of the 18th century, that popular sentiment which was the most widely diffused and the most deeply implanted in the national mind, was hatred and jealousy of our nearest national neighbour, France. The "No Popery" sentiment was more fervently expressed by some sects and classes of people, but it was not so generally diffused. At the end of the 18th century this bitter enmity towards our neighbour had not abated. We shall glance at some of the causes of that jealousy and hatred.

First, there were the prejudices and evil dispositions arising from unneighbourly habits in the two nations, in like manner as these arise between unneighbourly families. Taking the families as an illustration, the parents had been through all recorded generations quarrelling with one another; they had been deceitful and cruel; their children were taught by precept as well as example to be deceitful and cruel also. They had no dealings at each other's shops, they did each other's shops all the injury they could devise and inflict. When they were at peace, it was only a peace consequent on their powerlessness to fight, kick, break legs, break heads, break windows, and destroy each other's goods. Each family suspected that the other would, at the earliest opportunity, break the peace, for each knew such a design to be its own: thus duplicity and enmity had become an inheritance transmitted from one generation to another. As in the two families, so was it in the two nations of England and France.

A second cause which operated at the beginning of the 18th century, was the dread which a large proportion of the English and Scottish people had of the political ascendancy of Roman Catholicism, and of the restoration of the banished Stuarts.

The Stuarts had favoured a generous commercial intercourse with France. James II. completed the design, and opened a free trade between England and France. During the two years, 1686 and 1687, which this free trade lasted, both countries derived an immediate benefit; and had not the mercantile theory on the one hand, and the No Popery policy on the other, united to restore the enmity and hostility of the two nations, free commerce, peace, and prosperity might have continued from that time forward. The No Popery cry led the English into the belief that James II. was giving them and their interests to the King of France. The mercantile theory led them to believe that if England purchased com-

modities from France to a higher amount in money than that country purchased from England, there would be a balance of trade against them. In the two years of free trade with the French under James II., the balance was against England. But this last only shews that in this country our forefathers required a large quantity of those commodities which France could supply, and that they were able to pay for them.

Another cause operating in the promotion of hostilities with France at the end of the 17th and beginning of the 18th century was one closely allied with those just named. The Protestant gentry of mean condition, who had been raised to dignities and wealth by having the confiscated property of Catholics conferred upon them, whether caring for the principles of the reformed church or not, were all vehement declaimers against the Catholics; they dreaded any change in King James' policy which would restore their wealth to the rightful owners, and they invented and propagated all manner of pretences for dethroning the king, and of placing another in his stead, who would be more especially their king.

Thus it was that the fear of the restoration of the political power of the Roman pontiff in England, a power so dangerous to popular liberty; and that the ill-founded belief that a free intercourse in buying and selling between England and France was a loss to England if she did not sell more than she bought, and in any case a discouragement of her manufactures; thus it was, those two sentiments being allied in the public mind, that the holders of ill gotten wealth and dignities inflamed the people and changed the king. And thus it was, when they got a king of their own making, William III. whose leading policy was to fight with France, they used all the political power derived from their ill-gotten property, from the act of having made him king, and from the public whom they had artfully excited, and voted supplies of money to carry on the war against France. He, in return for their compliance, conferred on them farther grants of land, confiscating the great estates of the Irish landowners for the purpose. In farther gratitude for Irish estates, they voted English taxes to enable him to "humble the king of France," as he called his destruction of commerce and of human life. New taxes were laid upon English manufactures, a tonnage tax upon all vessels, a tax upon leather, soap, candles, paper, and other things, to raise money to injure French commerce; and in addition to those taxes, which continued for one hundred and forty years to cripple our own trade, some of which, as that on paper, continued to derange important domestic manufac-

tures to this year, (1848,) money was borrowed by millions and the national debt began, the interest of which we have still to pay.

The madness of England at the beginning of the 18th century in imposing taxes on her own trade, and hanging a debt upon the necks of all future generations, for the one sole purpose of "humbling the King of France," by injuring the commerce of nations and destroying the trade of the French in particular, was only equalled by the madness of England at the end of a hundred years in doing all that and more to destroy a certain set of opinions in France.

William III. began his reign in England in 1688; and after thirteen years of sovereignty, ten of which were years of war, died, sixteen millions of debt surviving him.

It is a lesson which should not be lost upon those who would regulate or promote commerce by legislation, that in the reigns of Charles II. and James II. two kings who, whether viewed as kings or men, had hardly one good quality, our domestic trade and foreign commerce flourished and advanced farther, merely by being let alone, than they advanced before or since in the same space of time. One of these kings was too much engaged in the indulgence of sensuality to have time or inclination to interfere with the practice of trade, and the other was too intent upon other designs. Both were too weak in sovereign power and personal ability to do trade injury by giving it laws. Neither of them did good from a design to promote it. They engaged themselves otherwise than in attending to the greatest interests of the nation; and the greatest interests of the nation, left to those who can best promote them, (the merchants and the industrious people,) flourished. Their successor, William III., morally superior to either of them, had the ability to interfere with trade, did interfere, and left the nation a legacy of mischief.

In the three years of peace that followed the treaty of Ryswick, and with which the reign of William concluded, commerce and national prosperity took new life, new strength, and advanced. In the nine years of war (the wars of Anne and the whigs, and the women of the bedchamber) conducted by the Duke of Marlborough, domestic trade advanced little, foreign trade retrograded. New taxes were imposed. Advertisements were taxed, a grievous impost still existing to the great detriment of business. The stamp duty on newspapers and the window duty, taxes on the light of intelligence and the light of the sun, both the light of heaven, were imposed, that the darkest errors committed in the government of nations might be perpetrated.

When, on the 5th of May 1713, peace was proclaimed, consequent on the treaty of Utrecht, signed on the 30th of March, the whole nation was filled with joy ; so we read in the records of that time. But when, on the 29th of the same month, copies of the commercial treaty with France included in that of Utrecht were laid before parliament, we are told that “mercantile prejudice and political artifice combined to oppose the equalization of the duties on French and Portuguesewines ; and the Commons refused to give effect to the treaty of commerce by a majority of 194 to 185 voices.” The Methuen treaty (so called from the name of the English ambassador) which had been entered into in 1703 with Portugal, binding England to that poor country and to its bad wine in preference to France, the richer country with the better wine, was one of the obstacles in the way of the tory statesmen who now proposed a more liberal treaty with France. The greatest obstacles, however, were the whigs, now out of office, who had promoted the wars of William and Anne against France, to preserve office to themselves. They once more inflamed the public mind on the danger of holding intercourse with our nearest national neighbours, and defeated the liberal measures of the tories.

The prohibition upon commerce, and the enmity excited by that party towards France, continued during the long period intervening between the years 1713 and 1786. In the latter year William Pitt the second, who was at the head of a tory ministry, carried into effect a treaty of reciprocity between England and France. Adam Smith had by that time published the “Wealth of Nations.” William Pitt believed in what the great apostle had written ; and, in respect of Ireland at home and France abroad, attempted to carry Adam Smith’s doctrines into practice. The whigs, led by Charles James Fox, once more took their stand upon the ground of hostility to France ; and the manufacturers took their stand upon monopoly and the fear of competition with Ireland. We shall see how they opposed William Pitt and the principles of free trade when we arrive at that minister and have passed Adam Smith.

In defence of the commercial treaty of Utrecht, Daniel Defoe contended like a giant, as he was, in the *Mercator* newspaper which had the secondary title of *Commerce Retrieved* ; and against him there were ranged a staff of formidable writers, Mr Charles King at their head, in the *British Merchant*, which had the secondary title of *Commerce Preserved*. The popular opinion, or rather the popular ignorance, accorded with the prohibitory and anti-French principles of the *British Merchant*.

Queen Anne died on the 1st of August 1714, amid the wrangling of her statesmen, leaving the national debt (incurred to

carry on war against France,) at L.53,681,076, bearing annual interest payable out of the taxes to the amount of L.2,811,904.

George I. whom the whigs made king, and through whom they had a firm hold of office, died on the 10th of June 1727, the debt somewhat reduced in amount, and the national prosperity greatly augmented, there having been no French wars in his reign.

George II. who succeeded him, died on the 25th of October 1760, leaving the nation involved in wars with France, which, on being concluded two years afterwards, had more than doubled the debt. That down-draught on the national energies then amounted to L.146,682,843, leaving interest (the interest paid from taxes imposed in time of war and continued in time of peace) to the amount of L.4,840,821.

In glancing at the life and policy of Sir Robert Walpole, at the policy of his political opponents, and of his political successors, who held the power of government up to the accession of the second William Pitt, we shall see why the nation went to war with its commercial neighbours to augment its debt and hinder its prosperity.

Sir Robert Walpole was born at Houghton in Norfolk, on the 26th of August 1676, and died on the 18th of March 1745, in the 69th year of his age. With slight intermission he was prime minister of England from October 1715 to February 1742; and he was employed in the government for several years before 1715. One of his biographers quotes Hume, who says, "His ministry has been more advantageous for his family than the public, better for this age than for posterity, and more pernicious for bad precedents than real grievances." But though the biographer says he cannot more fitly sum up Walpole's character as prime minister than in those words, he elsewhere says that Sir Robert Walpole is "the first British statesman whose practical system of government still affects the government of this country, and the man under whom Britain acquired the characteristics of her present mercantile power." This is the truth. Hume's estimate of Walpole was given to the world when experience had not proved whether his system of government would benefit posterity or not. Posterity must regret that Walpole, to maintain peace and control the royal ignorance of English interests and the court intrigues; keep the factious opponents of peace and social order in subjection; and restrain the popular delusion which ran in favour of war; posterity must regret that Walpole for those good ends had recourse to corrupt purchases of public men and parliamentary majorities. But posterity,

deriving the benefits of a system of ministerial and legislative government, which was substituted by Walpole for the royal authority, inquires and questions if political society could have been acted upon, corrupt as it was at that time, by other than corrupt means. Experience has taught the generations which were the posterity of that time, that governments take their character from those who are governed, and not the governed from the governors. This fact becomes broader and more marked as the people become enfranchised and intelligent. It is to Sir Robert Walpole that we owe the origin of that wholesome system of government. Those who affect to be shocked at his expenditure of a few hundred thousand pounds of public money, in bribing adherents to support him in his new system of limiting the power of monarchy, should be mute when the expenditure of millions of public money, and of hundreds of thousands of human lives, is justified by them to change a king, or some abstract principle of religion or politics.

In politics and morals, England was radically depraved in those days. It was told in Walpole's family as a good joke, that his father, who was a member of parliament, owning a good landed estate and two parliamentary boroughs, (Castle Rising and King's Lynn,) and who employed himself, as a country gentleman of such possessions was expected to do, in returning members, voting, and sitting over the jolly bottle, it is told that, to prevent Robert his son from deriving a bad example by seeing a father intoxicated, he used to bid his son take two glasses for his one, that the son might be carried to bed first. Robert lived more wisely than this precept of his father might lead us to expect. An anecdote worth repeating is told of the village schoolmaster who first taught him his letters. During his long and high career as minister, the humble teacher never obtruded upon him; but when he was driven from power and humbled by the resolute opposition, the schoolmaster visited him in retirement. Being asked why he had never been seen as a visitor during the many years of political prosperity, the reply was, "I did not trouble you, for I knew that you were surrounded by so many petitioners craving preferment; and you had done so much for Norfolk people, that I did not like to intrude. But," he added, "I always inquired how Robin went on, and was satisfied with your proceedings."

Had Sir Robert Walpole retired in 1738, when caused by the united opposition of the tories and a few disappointed whigs to declare war against Spain, the act of resignation would have done him honour. The complaint against Spain was, that the British merchant ships were impeded in

the American seas by the *Guarda Costas* of Spain, and sometimes robbed by them. But little was said of the notorious fact that those seas were always infested with buccaneers or pirates from England; and that English ships of war, often in the absence of declared hostilities, lay in wait for and captured the Spanish galleons returning from Peru to Old Spain with treasure.

The elder William Pitt, impetuous, ambitious, eloquent, and unscrupulous, was now the most formidable of Walpole's opponents. In March 1738, merchants, ship captains, and others, were examined at the House of Commons, to give evidence of the cruelties of the Spaniards. One of them, Jenkins, captain of a Scottish merchant ship, stated that he was boarded by a *Guarda Costa*, who, after ransacking his ship and ill-treating his crew, tore off one of his ears, and, throwing it in his face, told him to "take that to his king." Upon being asked what he thought when he found himself in the hands of such barbarians, he replied, (evidently tutored by the war party,) "I recommended my soul to God and my cause to my country." These words, and the display of his ear, which, wrapped up in cotton, he always carried about with him, filled the house with indignation. It is observable, however, of the "fable of Jenkins' ear," as Burke calls it, that it had happened seven years ago, (Coxe's *Memoirs*), and was one of the many relations got up and aggravated for the purpose of forcing the peaceful minister into a war, and thereby displacing him.

Walpole was dexterous at giving an opponent any difficult work to do which that opponent tried to force upon him. Lord Cartaret, a whig out of place, was exceedingly troublesome. He joined with Dean Swift in exciting the Irish against the new coinage of half-pence, in which they alleged there was corrupt jobbing. The agitation against the alleged job (a patent to Mr Wood) became so dangerous to the peace of Ireland, that Walpole deemed an alteration of the patent necessary, and yet he would not withdraw it entirely. He appointed Cartaret Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; by which he got rid of an opponent, and punished him by a plunge into political hot water at the same time.

And with the fiery member for Ipswich, Admiral Vernon, who was one of the most violent about the "fable of Jenkins' ear," he dealt similarly. Vernon declared in the house that certain fortified places in the West Indies, belonging to Spain, could be taken, and the Spaniards humbled and punished in a few hours; and so sure was he of the fact, that he was ready to risk his life and honour in the attempt. It was not believ-

ed that he really meant what he said ; but the minister took him at his word. That minister would have done himself more credit had he given up office rather than have given Vernon such a commission. But he quietly chuckled at getting rid of such a troublesome opponent by giving him such an appointment as the command upon an expedition which was not expected to succeed.

The first act of the expedition, however, did succeed. Porto-Bello was taken in a few hours ; the Spaniards who defended it were " humbled and chastised ;" and the Spaniards who were not in it were of course exasperated and rendered more hostile to English ships of commerce. At home, Vernon became the popular idol. " The mothers of England," says the historians, " taught their babes to lisp the name of Vernon." But though he tried again and again, he had no more successes against Spain.

The war continued with much disaster and no glory ; the debt was augmented, and new taxes were imposed. The opposition of tories, jacobines, and stray whigs united, poured their bitterness upon Walpole for the absence of success in that war which they had forced upon him ; and at last, 9th of February 1742, he had himself created Earl of Orford, and two days after resigned.

It does not fall within our prescribed tract to follow the political history of the 18th century. After the fall of Walpole, all the chicanery and corruption which he had been guilty of was practised by the several prime ministers who succeeded him and one another, without one of them evincing a regard for, or seeming to have any comprehension of, those principles of commercial and industrial development by which nations became powerful and respected. The whigs retained office, agreeing that the tories (from whom they only differed in liberality on the question of toleration to certain sects of dissenters) should not get in. They agreed in nothing else. Pitts, Pelhams, Rockinghams, Bedfords, Grenvilles, and Graftons, contended for the chieftainship of office, but for that only. Those who were out cried for peace when the minister who was in declared for war. When that minister, to have peace with them, would have given the world peace, they cried for war. When another got in on the principles of peace, and all the rest were crying out war, he would rather let them have war, and see all Europe at war, than come willingly out to let them in.

But, it was the nation from whom the ministers took their policy. When the national voice was for peace, so were the ministers. When all classes and orders of men overlooked or

misunderstood the first principles of national wellbeing, believing in the necessity for commercial restrictions and prohibitions between nations, and believing that if war crippled the commerce of those countries against which England warred, that England would be benefited; we should rather lament that the nation was so ignorant than rail at the cabinet ministers for being so vicious.

SECT. L.—MR SAMUEL RICHARDSON AND SIR MATHEW DECKER.

Amid the errors and wilful wrongs of political rulers and the obstinate blindness of the industrial orders of every rank, from the merchant to the mechanic, there were a few far-seeing men, who now and again gave sparks of coming light to the blinded. Mr Richardson was a bookseller and publisher, a printer, a newspaper writer and proprietor, as well as a distinguished novelist. He was born in 1689 and died 1761. He is now known chiefly as the author of *Pamella*; but he was famous in his day for the printing and publishing office in Salisbury Court, Fleet Street, London. The "*True Briton*," "*Daily Journal*," and "*Daily Gazetteer*," were published by him. Men of rank, talent, and opulence associated with him. Onslow, speaker of the House of Commons, was one of them, Sir Mathew Decker, an eminent London merchant, was another.

Little more is recorded of Decker than that he was a merchant, and a thinker who thought on the principles of commerce differently from the other merchants of his time. He is known to have written several tracts, but Richardson, having written on the same subject, and having published for Decker—the latter withholding his name—there is some uncertainty as to which of them was the author of certain tracts. For this reason we have placed their names together. The following are brief extracts:—

Trade cannot be forced nor prohibited.—"Trade cannot, will not be forced; let other nations prohibit by what severity they please, interest will prevail; they may embarrass their own trade, but cannot hurt a nation whose trade is free so much as themselves. Spain has prohibited our woollens; but, had a reduction of our taxes brought them to their natural value only, they would be the cheapest in Europe of their goodness, consequently must be more demanded by the Spaniards, be smuggled into their country in spite of their government, and sold at better prices; their people would be dearer clothed with duties and prohibitions than without, consequently must sell their oil, wine, and other commodities dearer; whereby other nations, raising the like growths, would

would gain ground upon them, and their balance of trade grow less and less. But should we, for that reason, prohibit their commodities? By no means; for the dearer they grow, no more than what are just necessary will be used; their prohibition does their own business; some may be necessary for us; what are so we should not make dearer to our own people; some may be proper to assort cargoes for other countries, and why should we prohibit our people that advantage? *Why hurt ourselves to hurt the Spaniards?* If we would retaliate effectually upon them for their ill intent, handsome premiums given to our plantations to raise the same growth as Spain, might enable them to supply us cheaper than the Spaniards could do, and establish a trade they could never return. Premiums may gain trade, *but prohibitions will destroy it.*" But trade cannot be forced even by premiums.

SECT. LI.—SIR JAMES STEWART, FATHER OF POLITICAL ECONOMY
IN SCOTLAND.

Scotland has had its share, perhaps more than its proportion compared with other countries, of political and commercial theorists. Though generally admitted to be sound in their theories, few of them, until very recently, were practically connected or acquainted with trade. Sir James Stewart, David Hume, Dr Adam Smith, Dr James Anderson, and Professor Dugald Stewart, are instances which readily occur to the memory.

Until after the war, which ended in 1762, in the second year of George III., Scotland could hardly be said to have a foreign commerce, or any domestic manufactures sufficiently valuable to entitle the country to the distinction which in the 19th century it has so well earned. Up to the time named it imported a few luxuries for its landed gentry and town bailies, but nothing for its people. The cause was its poverty: except cattle, wool, and skins, the country had little to exchange. It furnished soldiers to the armies of Europe at any time, no matter for what country or for what cause, but though these might reduce the numbers of poor gentlemen, and of peasantry starving, but hardly poorer than the gentlemen, their absence did not enrich their country.

Several of the sovereigns at various times, and aspirants to sovereignty, proclaimed a free trade to all nations that would come and trade with Scotland. Eminent among these was Sir William Wallace; but Scotland was an ill-furnished shop, and had so little to sell, shopkeepers quarrelling and warring so often, that few traders found it to their advantage to go

there, until Scotland was stocked with manufactures ; then she made a trade which has grown and is growing every year.

The union with England, effected in 1707, was, up to about the beginning of Scottish prosperity, (the accession of George III.,) a subject of deep grievance in Scotland. As the Irish have continued to do since the union of Ireland to England in 1800, fold their arms, mourn the loss of their legislature, and decline to do any good until it is restored to them, so did Scotland for fifty years. She thought better of the alliance in time, wiped her eyes, rose from her idleness, tucked up her sleeves, and began her work. Witness the results this day.

Fletcher of Saltoun was the leading Scottish opponent of the union. In his nature he was intensely Scottish, in his politics eloquently patriotic ; he was not likely to depict the virtues of his country unfavourably. But its inhabitants being only about one million at the time of the union, he has drawn such a picture of poverty and depravity as abounding among them, that if not corroborated by other authors and by tradition, might well be pronounced a calumny on "poor Scotland." Here is the picture (from a *Discourse concerning the Affairs of Scotland*, published 1698.)

"There are at this day in Scotland (besides a great many poor families very meanly provided for by the church boxes, with others who, *by living on bad food*, fall into various diseases) *two hundred thousand people begging from door to door*. These are not only no way advantageous, but a very grievous burden to so poor a country, and though the number of them be, perhaps, double to what it was formerly, by reason of this present great distress," (the period from 1693 to 1700 was long known in Scotland as the "seven ill-years,") "yet in all times there have been about one hundred thousand of those vagabonds, who have lived without any regard or subjection either to the laws of the land or even those of God or nature." (He goes on to name incestuous and other horrible crimes as common among them.) "No magistrate could ever discover or be informed which way one in a hundred of those wretches died, or that ever they were baptized. Many murders have been discovered among them ; and they are not only a most unspeakable oppression to poor tenants, (who, if they give not bread or some kind of provision to perhaps forty such villains in one day, are sure to be insulted by them,) but they rob many poor people who live in houses distant from any neighbourhood. In years of plenty, many thousands of them meet together in the mountains, where they feast and riot for many days ; and at country weddings, markets, burials, and other

like public occasions, they are to be seen, both men and women, perpetually drunk, cursing, blaspheming, and fighting together."

At those times, and sixty years afterwards, the best land in the now celebrated agricultural counties of East and Mid Lothian, Berwickshire, and Roxburghshire, was held by rundale; that is, a number of people rented the land in common, one having a ridge here, another a ridge there, and all the ground lying waste as soon as the summer corn crops were removed. In the management of land, its misculture and waste, and in the social disorder of the poorest of the people, Ireland has nothing worse to allege against her union with England than that which Scotland had to allege and did allege against her union with England for nearly, if not quite, half a century. It was not the union, but an indisposition to take advantage of the benefits which the union conferred on the national resources of the country, which kept Scotland so long poor and disorderly.

In time there arose thinking and persevering practical men to direct the industrial energies of the Scottish peasantry who submitted to be directed by such men. Mr Dawson, a Berwickshire farmer, introduced the turnip husbandry, and for a time was looked upon as an idle experimenter. He borrowed it from Norfolk, where it had been successfully introduced by Lord Townshend, brother-in-law, and for many years colleague, of Sir Robert Walpole. James Small, a Berwickshire cartwright, brought the model of a new plough from Rotherham, in Yorkshire, improved upon it, and introduced it to the use of the border counties. He had prejudice and ignorance to contend against, but the cultivators of land soon saw its advantages. (See section 52, David Hume.)

Lord Kames, an eminent lawyer, and also an agricultural improver, drew out an improved form of lease for tenant farmers, which, like the plough, was opposed by the old rundale tenantry; but it was at last adopted, is used to this day, and Scottish corn and cattle grow and feed to the highest excellence, where thistles, bogs, beggary, and pestilence prevailed before.

Next there arose in Scotland political economists; the first of whom was

SIR JAMES STEWART OF COLTNESS.

This gentleman was born on the 10th of October 1713. He was the son of Sir James Stewart, Baronet, Solicitor-general for Scotland, (under Queen Anne and George I.,) by Anne, daughter of Sir Hugh Dalrymple, president of the Court of

Session. The father of the Solicitor-general was Sir James Stewart, Lord-advocate under William III., whose father was Sir James Stewart, provost of Edinburgh from 1648 to 1660, a descendant of the Banhill branch of the family of Stewarts.

The subject of this memoir spent his earliest years at Goodtrees, now Moredun, a seat of his father, near Edinburgh. At the school of North Berwick he received the elementary part of his education, and it was afterwards completed at the University of Edinburgh, whither he went at the age of fourteen. At that institution, after going through a complete course of languages and sciences, he studied the civil law, with the occasional assistance of Mr Hercules Lindsay, an eminent civilian, and subsequently professor of that department in the University of Glasgow. From his earliest years his abilities appeared rather of a solid and permanent than of a dazzling nature. At the early age just mentioned he succeeded his father in the baronetcy and the estates connected with it, which were of moderate extent and value.

On the completion of his legal studies at the University of Edinburgh, Sir James went to the bar, (1734,) but without any intention of prosecuting the law as a profession. He soon after set out upon a tour of the continent, where he formed an acquaintance with the Duke of Ormond, the Earl Marischal, and other exiled Jacobite chiefs. The family from which he descended had been conspicuous for its attachment to the popular cause for a century; but Sir James appears to have been converted by these nobles from his original Whig principles. Having permitted himself to be introduced by them to Prince Charles Stewart at Rome, he received such civilities from that scion of expatriated royalty, as had a material effect upon the tenor of his future life. He returned to his native country in 1740, with many accomplishments, which added brilliancy to his character, but an unsettled tone of mind, which he afterwards greatly regretted.

Among the intimate friends of Sir James at this period of his life was Mr Alexander Trotter, the father of one of the present land-proprietors of Mid-Lothian. Mr Trotter was cut off in early life; and, during his last illness, made a promise to Sir James, that, if possible, he would come to him after his death, in an enclosure near the house of Coltness, which in summer had been frequently their place of study. It was agreed, in order to prevent mistake or misapprehension, that the hour of meeting should be noon; that Mr Trotter should appear in the dress he usually wore, and that every other circumstance should be exactly conformable to what had commonly happened when they met together. Sir James laid

greater stress on this engagement than sound reason will warrant. Both before and after his exile, he never failed, when it was in his power, to attend at the place of appointment, even when the debility arising from gout rendered him hardly able to walk. Every day at noon, while residing at Coltness, he went to challenge the promise of Mr Trotter, and always returned extremely disappointed that his expectation of his friend's appearance had not been gratified. When rallied on the subject, he always observed seriously, that we do not know enough of "the other world" to entitle us to assume that such an event as the reappearance of Mr Trotter was impossible. We fear, however, that the most of those who peruse this narrative will be inclined to class this anecdote with the "follies of the wise."

In the course of his travels, Sir James had formed an intimacy with Lord Elcho, who, conceiving in the warmth of youthful friendship that the young baronet would be able to gain the affections of his sister, Lady Frances Wemyss, carried him to Cedar Hall, in the north of Scotland, where that young lady was residing with the Countess of Sutherland.

As Elcho expected, Sir James gained the heart of Lady Frances; and, after some scruples on the part of her relations had been overcome, they were married in October 1743, at Dunrobin Castle, the lady bringing her husband what was then considered a very handsome fortune, namely, six thousand pounds. A pair more elegant, more amiable, and more accomplished, is rarely seen. Their union was blessed in August 1744 by the birth of their son, the late Sir James Stewart, who was for many years the principal object of their care.

The subject of our memoir had joined the opposition party, and in the year last named he had an unpleasant collision with the family of Dundas, which was then beginning to take a leading part in Scottish politics. A claim preferred by him to be enrolled amongst the freeholders of Mid-Lothian was refused, and for this he raised an action against Dundas of Arniston, then one of the senators of the College of Justice. In the course of the judicial proceedings, Sir James pleaded his cause in so masterly a manner, that Lord Arniston descended from the bench and defended himself at the bar. The cause was given against the young advocate; and this, no doubt, conspired, with other circumstances, to prepare him for the step he took in the subsequent year.

Sir James was residing in Edinburgh, in attendance upon Lady Frances, who was then in a state of ill health, when Prince Charles, at the head of his Highland army, took pos-

session of the city. Among the principal adherents of the young adventurer was Lord Elcho, the brother-in-law and bosom friend of Sir James Stewart, the latter, with the Earl of Buchan, who had married one of his sisters, formed the wish of being introduced to Prince Charles, but without pledging themselves to join his standard. They, therefore, induced Lord Elcho to seize them at the cross of Edinburgh, and conduct them, apparently as prisoners, into the presence of the Prince. Being brought into an ante-chamber in Holyrood House, their friends proceeded to inform his Royal Highness of their arrival, and of the circumstances under which they approached him, when Charles, with great dignity, refused to see them in any other character than as avowed adherents of his cause; when Elcho returned with this intelligence, the Earl of Buchan took his leave, while Sir James, a man infinitely excelling that nobleman in intellect, proceeded to offer his services to the young Chevalier. He was fortunately saved from the ultimate perils of the campaign by being immediately despatched on a mission to the French court, where he was at the time of the Battle of Culloden. The penalty of his rashness was an exile of nearly twenty years, being, though not attained, among the exceptions from the act of indemnity.

Till the year 1763, when George III. permitted him to return home, Sir James Stewart resided abroad with his family, employing his leisure in those studies which he afterwards embodied in his works. He spent the greater part of the period of his exile in the town of Angouleme, where he became intimately acquainted with the French finance system, through a body of counsellors of the parliament of Paris, who were banished to that town for nearly the space of two years. Sir James also spent some time at Frankfort, at Spa, at Venice, and at Padua. When in Germany, he and his lady were received with extraordinary marks of favour at the court of Wirtemberg, Baden, Dourlach, and Hohenzollern. At Venice, in 1758, he and Lady Frances had the good fortune to form a friendship with the celebrated Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, who, till the end of her life, corresponded frequently with both, and gave them and their son many proofs of her affection: a series of her Ladyship's letters to Sir James and Lady Frances were printed at Greenock, under the care of the present Sir James, in 1818. Though exiled from Britain on account of disloyalty to the Hanover dynasty, Sir James Stewart never entertained a disloyal feeling towards his country. On the contrary, the enthusiasm with which he rejoiced in the successes of the British arms during the seven years' war, led to his falling under the suspicion of the

French court; and, while residing at Spa, in a neutral territory, a large body of troops was sent to apprehend him and convey him to prison, in the duchy of Luxemburg. It was not for many months that he succeeded in convincing the French government of its error or regained his liberty.

The first work published by Sir James was a volume which appeared at Frankfort sur le Main in 1758, under the title of "Apologie du Sentiment de Monsieur le Chevalier Newton, sur l'ancienne Chronologie des Grecs, contenant des reponses a toutes les objections qui y ont été faites jusqu' a présent." In the same year, while settled at Tübingen, in Germany, he produced his "Treatise on German Coin," in the German language. It was followed, in 1761, by 'A Dissertation on the Doctrine and Principles of Money, as applied to the German Coin;' and, in the same year, he so far made his peace with the British government, as to obtain a cornetcy in the Royal or 1st regiment of Dragoons. At the peace of Paris, 1763, he was tacitly permitted to return home and resume possession of his estates. It was in retirement at Coltness that he probably put the last hand to his "Inquiry into the Principles of Political Economy," which was published in 1767, in two volumes quarto. Messrs Miller and Cadell gave five hundred pounds for the copyright of this work, the merits of which were at the time a subject of considerable dispute. It has, at least, the merit of having been the first considerable work on this subject published in Britain, being about nine years antecedent to the work of Dr Smith in 1769. Sir James published, under the assumed name of Robert Frame, "Considerations on the Interests of the County of Lanark." By the interest of his friends he now obtained a full pardon, which passed the great seal in 1771; and in the year following he printed "The Principles of Money applied to the present state of the Coin of Bengal." He also wrote "A Plan for introducing an Uniformity of Weights and Measures," which was published after his death. He afterwards published "Observations on Beattie's Essay on Truth;" "Critical Remarks on the Atheistical Falsehoods of Mirabaud's System of Nature;" and "A Dissertation concerning the Motives of Obedience to the Law of God." It is supposed that the ardour and assiduity with which he pursued his studies proved detrimental to his health. An inflammation, commencing with a toe-nail too nearly cut, put an end to his valuable life on the 26th of November 1780. His remains were interred in the family vault at Cambusnethan Church, and a monument has been erected to his memory in Westminster Abbey. Sir James Stewart was a man of extensive and varied powers of mind; cheerful and animated

in conversation ; amiable in all the domestic relations of life ; and, unlike several other eminent men of that age, was able to prosecute philosophical inquiries without abandoning the faith of a Christian. His works were published, with a memoir, by his son, in 1806, occupying six volumes.—(*Chambers' Lives of Eminent Scotchmen.*)

SECT. LII.—DAVID HUME.

In the middle of the 19th century we cannot correctly estimate the effect of the political and commercial essays of David Hume, as no change of legislative policy indicates that they took effect. They were published at a time when any act of outrage upon the commerce of countries with which England was at war was popular with the English nation, and when it must have been hazardous for a literary politician to give an opinion in favour of free trade with France. Nevertheless, the ablest of Hume's essays are devoted to the advocacy of free intercourse with France, and to the exposition of our bad bargain with Portugal, which bound us not to trade with our nearest and richest neighbours. Hume's authority as a historian on matters of trade, and as a sound political thinker, was quoted by Adam Smith. He was the first historian who traced the facts and brought them before the public view prominently, that as manufactures and commerce increased in all countries so did the comforts and contentedness of the people, and so also did popular freedom and good government. He was unkind to the Whigs who had so long governed the country, made and unmade its sovereigns, declared wars, taxed the people, and divided enormous public spoil among themselves in the name of upholding civil and religious liberty, and he was by them unkindly treated and evil spoken of in return.

"Our jealousy and hatred of France," he says, in his "*Essay on the Balance of Trade*," "are without bounds. These passions have occasioned innumerable barriers and obstructions on commerce where we are commonly accused of being the aggressors. But what have we gained by the bargain? We lost the French market for our woollen manufactures, and transferred the commerce of wine to Spain and Portugal, where we buy much worse liquor at a much higher price. There are few Englishmen who would not think their country absolutely ruined were French wines sold in England so cheap, and in such abundance, as to supplant ale and other home-brewed liquors. But, could we lay aside prejudice, it

would not be difficult to prove that nothing could be more innocent, perhaps more advantageous. Each new acre of vineyard planted in France in order to supply England with wine would make it necessary for the French to take an equivalent in English goods, by the sale of which we should be equally benefited."

David Hume was a younger son of the Humes of Ninewells, in Berwickshire, Scotland, and was born at Edinburgh in 1711. At an early age he was sent to Bristol with some undefined purpose of being connected with commerce. Having a small allowance from the family property, which, with frugality, was enough to keep him in a condition of existence suited to austere philosophy, he proceeded to France with it, ate and drank sparingly and philosophized deeply—too deeply for the limited range of the human understanding it is to be feared. He seems, however, to have rendered his metaphysics agreeable, if not intelligible, to himself, which is probably as much as most other metaphysicians have done. He thought fit to publish, but the world did not think fit to read what he published. This was in 1738. He says in his autobiography, "I immediately went down" (from London) "to my mother and my brother, who lived at his country house, and was employing himself very judiciously and successfully in the improvement of his fortune." In other words, the brother was, to his own benefit, the benefit of Berwickshire, and the honour of agriculture in Scotland, reclaiming the estate of Ninewells from bog, thistles, occupation by rundale, and all the other ills which Scottish land was covered with, and its owners were heirs to, in the first half of the 18th century. In David's day, when he had become famous and rich by his writings and other windfalls, and was writing his autobiography, it was unfashionable, and long after continued so to be, for country gentlemen to devote their time to the business of digging, ditching, fencing, and draining the acres of wilderness bequeathed by their mail-clad forefathers. David seems to have been ashamed to say broadly what he found his brother doing when he went down to see him just after the first attempt at improving his own fortune. David, to make a book that would sell and bring him a profit, took the mysteries of our spiritual nature, turned them upside down, dug, ditched, trenched, fenced, furrowed up, and sowed his seed—the whole work a sterile idealism; and he left the ground as he found it, barren, thistly, mirey—mirey as the lower lands of Ninewells, thistly and stoney and barren as the higher were. David gave the world nothing in his metaphysics which it did not possess before, and it gave him nothing for his metaphysics in return.

But his brother, to make a farm that would bring forth corn, and have fat woolly sheep upon it, and give him a profit in rent, dug into the mire, turned the earth upside down, and gave fertility, greenness, bloom, ripeness, and beauty to the blank cold clay. All the ideal philosophy of all speculating metaphysicians who existed before David's time or since, including his own, never elicited so much truth, developed so many of the divine laws of nature, exalted man so high in being, duty, and destiny, as that single performance of David's brother; covering as it did the waste with growing wheat and bleating sheep, lowing cows, singing maidens, with larks above their heads, clover beneath their feet, and sookisoos on the clover, and gowans on the green, where no green was before; rearing the hedgerows as it did, where bleakness and unpeopled bogs were, high and thick, to keep the flocks within and the storms without in winter, leafy and bloomy for birds' nests and the whispers of shepherds' love in summer; filling the barnyards as it did with large, round, bountiful stacks; giving in the barn as it did the kerne of merry music, dancing feet and happy voices; yielding as it did from the oaten crops, (reaped where hungry herons not long before fished for frogs, and where ague and hunger contended against the lives of men) the generous melder of brose-meal, that hinds and shepherds might be reverent in grace over well-filled bickers and well read Bibles. Such was the work performed on the Ninewells estate by David's brother to "improve his fortune;" while poor David tried to improve mankind and his fortune by treading, and digging, and sinking in metaphysical bogs, bringing forth no element of life, no fertility, greenness, or bloom; no sentiment for human sympathy.

David proceeded from the literature of mystery to the literature of fact and of things familiar. He published "Political Discourses," as he tells us, in Edinburgh, in 1752, and they sold successfully. In time he proceeded to history, treated men and men's actions of the past as his brother did his share of the boggy Merse; and laid the rank weeds, political adventure and chicanery, in their proper places, the bottom of the trench. In 1745 he attended the young Marquis of Annandale as friend and tutor. This added something to his fortune. "I then," he says, "received an invitation from General St Clair to attend him as secretary to his expedition which was at first meant against Canada, but ended in an incursion on the coast of France."

An incursion on the coast of France. As usual, this incursion ended in more debt to England, more exasperation on the part of France for its ships destroyed, houses burned, vine-

yards laid waste ; and in more hatred on the part of England towards France for that exasperation, for the debt incurred, with no other returns. It is probable that it was then, 1746, that Hume began that philosophy of common sense which in his political discourses he laid before the world in 1752, which common sense, as regards the relationship of England and France, we have briefly quoted.

In 1747 he proceeded with General St Clair, as secretary, on a military embassy to the court of Turin, and wore the uniform of an officer. " My appointments, with my frugality, had made me reach a fortune which I called independent, though most of my friends were inclined to smile when I said so." Hume's *History of England* was published at various times, the concluding volume in 1759. The profits of his works now, he says, rendered him not only " independent but opulent." In 1763 he accompanied the Earl of Hertford's embassy to Paris, and received much attention there, not only for his literary fame, but for the generous sentiments which he had expressed for the French people and French interests in his writings. Had his enlightened sentiments been reciprocated in both countries, what treasure, what human life might have been saved, what happiness promoted ! what crimes prevented ! On the departure of the Earl of Hertford to assume the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland in 1766, Mr Hume remained in Paris as *Charge d'Affaires* until the arrival of the Duke of Richmond, the new ambassador. In 1767 he was appointed an under secretary of state. But he retired to Edinburgh in 1769, where he remained, and lived in the society of the learned and the philosophic luminaries of that period until his death, which occurred on the 25th of August 1776. He was attended in his last moments by his constant friend, Dr Adam Smith, whose *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* was published about the same time. Adam Smith must have derived an advantage from his friendly intercourse, long existing, with David Hume.

SECT. LIII.—THE REV. JOSIAH TUCKER OF BRISTOL.

This eminent divine and political essayist wrote both before the publication of Smith's *Wealth of Nations* and after. A bold and original thinker, he ventured to declare the theory which in our day we have seen verified in practice, namely, that our trade, our profits, and our friendship, have increased with the American people since they ceased to be our colonists.

Josiah Tucker was born at Laugharn in Carmarthenshire in 1712. His father was a farmer, and having a small estate left him near Aberystwith in Cardiganshire, he removed thither, and perceiving that his son had a turn for learning, he sent him to Ruthin school in Denbighshire, where he made so great progress in the classics that he obtained an exhibition at St John's College, Oxford. At the age of twenty-three he entered into holy orders, and served a curacy for some time in Gloucestershire. About 1737 he became curate of St Stephen's Church, Bristol, and was appointed minor canon in the cathedral of that city. Here he attracted the notice of Dr Joseph Butler, then bishop of Bristol and afterwards of Durham, who appointed Tucker his domestic chaplain. By the interest of this prelate he also obtained a prebendal stall in the cathedral of Bristol; and, on the death of Mr Catcott—well known by his treatise on the deluge—he became rector of St Stephen's. The inhabitants of that parish consist chiefly of merchants and tradesmen—a circumstance which greatly aided his natural inclination for commercial and political studies.

When the famous bill was brought into the House of Commons, for the naturalization of the Jews, Tucker took a decided part in favour of the measure, and was indeed its most able advocate; but for this he was severely attacked in pamphlets, newspapers, and magazines; and the people of Bristol burned his effigy, together with his letters on behalf of naturalization. But Mr Seward says, his being burned in effigy was occasioned by an essay he wrote in support of the Hessians who came to settle in England. In 1753 he published an able pamphlet on the Turkey trade, in which he demonstrates the evils that result to trade in general from chartered companies. At this period Lord Clare, afterwards Earl Nugent, was returned to parliament for Bristol, an honour he obtained chiefly through the strenuous exertions of Mr Tucker, whose influence in his large and wealthy parish was almost decisive on such an occasion. In return for this favour, the Earl procured for him the deanery of Gloucester, in 1758, at which time he took his degree of D.D. So great was the reputation he had now acquired for commercial knowledge, that Dr Thomas Hayter, afterwards bishop of London, who was then tutor to George III., applied to Tucker to draw up a dissertation on this subject for the perusal of his royal pupil. It was accordingly done, and gave great satisfaction. This work, under the title of "The Elements of Commerce," was printed in quarto, but never published. Dr Warburton, however, who, after having been member of the same chapter with the dean at Bristol, became bishop of Gloucester, thought very

differently from the rest of mankind in respect of his talents and favourite pursuits, and said once, in his coarse manner, that "his dean's trade was religion, and religion his trade." The dean once remarked, in allusion to the coolness which subsisted between him and Warburton, "The bishop affects to consider me with contempt; to which I replied nothing. He has said that religion is my trade, and trade is my religion. Commerce and its connections have, it is true, been favourite objects of my attention, and where is the crime? And as for religion, I have attended carefully to the duties of my parish; nor have I neglected my cathedral. The world knows something of me as a writer on religious subjects; and I will add, which the world does not know, that I have written near three hundred sermons, and preached them all, again and again. My heart is at ease on that score, and my conscience, thank God, does not accuse me."

In 1771, when a strong attempt was made to procure an abolition of subscriptions to the thirty-nine articles, Dr Tucker came forward as an advocate for them; he admitted, however, that some reformation of the liturgy was wanted, and instanced particularly the Athanasian creed, which he considered as too scholastic and refined for a popular confession of faith. About this time he published "Directions for Travellers," in which he lays down excellent rules, by which gentlemen who visit foreign countries may not only improve their minds, but turn their observations to the benefit of their own native country. This has become extremely scarce, but there is a part of it reprinted in Berchald's "Essay to Direct the Inquiries of Travellers."

In 1772, the dean printed a small volume of sermons, in which he explains his views of the doctrines of election and justification, in reference to a very violent dispute then carried on between the Calvinistic and the Arminian Methodists, the former headed by Messrs Toplady and Hill, and the latter by the Messrs Wesleys and Fletcher. The year following, he published "Letters to the Rev. Dr Kippis, wherein the claim of the Church of England to an authority in matters of faith, and to a power of decreeing rites and ceremonies, is discussed and ascertained," &c.

When the dispute arose between Great Britain and the American colonies, the dean was an attentive observer of the contest, examining the affair with a very different eye from that of a party man or an interested merchant, and discovered, as he conceived, that both sides would be benefited by an absolute separation. The more he thought on this subject, the more he was persuaded that extensive colonies were an evil

rather than an advantage to any commercial nation. On this principle, therefore, he published his "Thoughts upon the Dispute between the Mother Country and America." He demonstrated that the latter could not be conquered, and that, if it could, the purchase would be dearly bought. He warned this country against commencing a war with the colonies, and advised that they should be left to themselves. This advice startled all parties, and the dean was generally considered as a sort of madman, who had rambled out of his proper line of profession to commence political quack. Our author, however, went on vindicating and enforcing his favourite system, in spite of all the obloquy with which it was treated, both in the senate and from the press. As the war proceeded, some intelligent persons began to see more truth and reason in his sentiments, and time demonstrated that he was right. He printed several essays in the newspapers, under the title of Cassandra.

When the terrors of an invasion were very prevalent in 1779, the dean circulated, in a variety of periodical publications, some sensible observations in order to quiet the fears of the people. He states, at length, and with great accuracy, the numerous difficulties that must attend the attempt to invade this country, and the still greater ones that must be encountered by the invaders after their landing. Those observations were reprinted, with good effect, in the course of the late war. In 1781, he published, what he had printed long before, "A Treatise on Civil Government," in which his principal design is to counteract the doctrines of the celebrated Locke and his followers. This book made a considerable noise, and was attacked by several of the best writers on the democratic side of the question. The year following, he closed his political career with a pamphlet entitled "Cui Bono?" in which he balances the profits and loss of each of the belligerent powers, and recapitulates all his former positions on the subject of war and colonial possessions. His publications after this period consist of some tracts on the commercial regulations of Ireland, on the exportation of woollens, and on the iron trade.

In 1777, he published seventeen practical sermons, in one vol. 8vo. After he resigned his rectory in Bristol, he resided mostly in Gloucester. He died of the gradual decays of age, November 4th, 1799, and was interred in the south transept of Gloucester Cathedral, where a monument has been erected to his memory. It should be recorded to his praise, that though enjoying but a very moderate preferment—for, to a man of no paternal estate, or other ecclesiastical dignity, the deanery of Gloucester is no very advantageous situation—he

was, notwithstanding, a liberal benefactor to several public institutions, and a distinguished patron of merit. About 1790 he thought of resigning his rectory in Bristol, and, without communicating his design to any other person, he applied to the chancellor, in whose gift it is, for leave to quit it in favour of his curate, a most deserving man with a large family. His Lordship was willing enough that he should give up the living, but refused him the liberty of nominating his successor. On this the dean resolved to hold the living himself, till he could find a fit opportunity to succeed in his object. After weighing the matter more deliberately, he communicated his wish to his parishioners, and advised them to draw up a petition to the chancellor in favour of the curate. This was accordingly done, and signed by all of them, without any exception either on the part of the dissenters or others. The chancellor, touched with this testimony of love between a clergyman and his people, yielded at last to the application : in consequence of which the dean cheerfully resigned the living to a successor well qualified to tread in his steps.

The following extracts will testify to the quality of Dean Tucker's politics and philosophy. They are from a work published in 1774.

"A war," says he, "whether crowned with victory or branded with defeats, can never prevent another nation from being more industrious than you are ; and if they are more industrious, they will sell cheaper, and consequently your former customers will forsake your shop and go to theirs, though you covered the ocean with fleets and the land with armies. In short, the soldier may lay waste, the privateer, whether successful or unsuccessful, will make poor ; but it is the eternal law of Providence, that the *hand of the diligent alone can make rich*.

"The greater industry of different nations enables them to be so much the better customers, to improve in a friendly intercourse, and to be a mutual benefit to each other. A private shopkeeper would certainly wish that his customers did improve in their circumstances rather than go behind hand, because every such improvement would probably redound to his advantage. Where then can be the wisdom in the public shopkeeper, or trading people, to endeavour to make the neighbouring states and nations, that are his customers, so very poor as not to be able to trade with him ?"

SECT. LIV.—THE ECONOMISTS OF FRANCE AND ITALY BEFORE
ADAM SMITH.

Previous to the time of Adam Smith, the languages of France and Italy had become the language of political economy; but, except in theoretical philosophy, the economical doctrines were not recognised. The economists were not agreed in theory. Statistics which have since solved so many doubtful problems were at that time the most uncertain of all the facts. In proceeding to enumerate the writers on political economy who, out of Britain, preceded Adam Smith, we may cite a definition of the science itself.

“The word economy, applied to domestic concerns, means the art of well administering the private affairs of a family, of regulating its expenditure according to its income, and providing for the wants of the members of the household. By analogy, political or ‘public’ economy has been considered by many as conversant about the principles of administering the wealth of a country with a view to its increase, regulating the expenditure, providing for the wants of the people, and endeavouring to maintain and increase their comforts. But by taking such an extensive view of the subject, most writers, and especially continental writers, have considered it necessary to investigate all the causes of the prosperity of nations, and have involved themselves in multifarious discussions on the various forms of government and of civil institutions which are supposed to affect the economical condition of a people. By so doing they have encroached upon the science of general politics and legislation, and have brought forward their own theories of laws, ethics, and administration, with the view of shewing their influence on the social state. But it is evident that such a vast field of inquiry must exceed the powers of any single writer, and that the attempt to embrace so many difficult and various subjects under one division of knowledge, tends to confuse rather than to elucidate. Modern writers, especially in England, have therefore limited their inquiries to the principles which govern the production and accumulation of wealth, and its distribution and consumption. The ‘Wealth of Nations’ was the title which Adam Smith gave to his work. In this consists the main difference between the modern English and the Italian and French economists. The latter maintain that the political economist is concerned not only with the aggregate production of wealth, but with its most beneficial distribution among individuals, not only with wealth, in short, but with happiness also. The modern English writ-

ers, on the contrary, say that the appropriate subject of the political economist is not happiness, but wealth; that wealth is confined to material objects, the produce of land and of industry; that the political economist who assumes to explain the phenomena of the production of wealth ought to lay down the general principles on which wealth is produced, as they are deducible from actual facts; it is the business of the statesman, the philosopher, or the politician, to say what he thinks best for the general prosperity of society, after he has examined the evidence of the political economist, which is an essential part of the evidence, but not the sole evidence to be attended to in the conduct of a nation's affairs. But here the English economists also seem to be divided among themselves. Some appear to think that the principles of political economy, as the term is understood by them, may be deduced with the certainty of mathematical demonstration, whilst others assert that there are many important propositions in political economy which require limitations and exceptions. 'The desire to simplify and generalize has occasioned an unwillingness to acknowledge the operation of more causes than one in the production of particular effects; and if one cause would account for a considerable portion of a certain class of phenomena, the whole has been ascribed to it without sufficient attention to the facts which would not admit of being so solved.'

"Malthus quotes the controversy on the bullion question as an instance of this kind of error. He afterwards goes on to say, 'Adam Smith has stated that capitals are increased by parsimony, that every frugal man is a public benefactor, (*Wealth of Nations*, b. ii., c. 3.) and that the increase of wealth depends upon the balance of produce above consumption, (b. iv., c. 3.) That these propositions are true to a great extent is perfectly unquestionable. No considerable and continued increase of wealth could possibly take place without that degree of frugality which occasions annually the conversion of some revenue into capital, and creates a balance of produce above consumption; but it is quite obvious that they are not true to an indefinite extent, and that the principle of saving, pushed to excess, would destroy the motive to production. If every person was satisfied with the simplest food, the poorest clothing, and the meanest house, it is certain that no other sort of food, clothing, and lodging would be in existence; and as there would be no adequate motive to the proprietors of land to cultivate well, not only the wealth derived from conveniences and luxuries would be quite at an end, but, if the same division of land continued, the production of food would be prematurely checked, and population would come to a stand long

before the soil had been well cultivated. If consumption exceed production, the capital of the country must be diminished, and its wealth must be gradually destroyed, from its want of power to produce; if production be in a great excess above consumption, the motive to accumulate and produce must cease from a want of will to consume. The two extremes are obvious; and it follows that there must be some intermediate point, though the resources of political economy may not be able to ascertain it, whereby, taking into consideration both the power to produce and the will to consume, the encouragement to the increase of wealth is the greatest. The division of landed property presents another obvious instance of the same kind. No person has ever for a moment doubted that the division of such immense tracts of land as were formerly in possession of the great feudal proprietors must be favourable to industry and production. It is equally difficult to doubt that a division of landed property may be carried to such an extent as to destroy all the benefits to be derived from the accumulation of capital and the division of labour, and to occasion the most extended poverty. There is here then a point, as well as in the other instance, though we may not know how to place it, where the division of property is best suited to the actual circumstances of the society, and calculated to give the best stimulus to production and to the increase of wealth and population.' (Malthus, *Introduction*.)

"We cannot enter into a full examination of the principles of political economy; but we shall state a few general propositions which are universally acknowledged as true:—1. Every man desires to obtain additional wealth with as little trouble to himself as possible. 2. The increase of population is limited either by physical or moral evil, or by prudential motives. 3. The powers of labour, and of the other instruments which produce wealth, may be indefinitely increased by using their products as the means of further production. 4. Agricultural produce is not susceptible of the same unlimited increase as manufactures. The principal topics discussed by political economists are:—1, the definition of wealth; 2, of productive and unproductive labour; 3, on the nature and measures of value; 4, on the rent of land; 5, the wages of labour; 6, the profits of capital; 7, the results of machinery; 8, the circulating medium or currency; 9, the nature and conditions of commerce, or exchange of commodities.

"The earlier Italian writers on commerce treat exclusively of money, its standard, and the evils of tampering with it. Gasparo Scaruffi of Reggio, near Modena, wrote, in 1579, '*Discorso sopra le Monete, e della vera proporzione fra l'oro e l'ar-*

gento.' In 1588, Bernardo Davanzati of Florence wrote a short treatise, 'Sulle Monete,' and another 'Sui Cambj,' or 'The Exchanges.' Antonio Serra, a native of Cozensa in Calabria, published, in 1613, 'Breve Trattato delle Cause che possono far abbondare i Regni d'Oro e d'Argento.' Looking upon gold and silver as constituting the wealth of a state, Serra investigates the means of making them flow abundantly into a country. Among these means he reckons manufactures, 'which afford a much greater return than agriculture;' and maritime commerce. But 'these means,' adds Serra, are of no avail without fixed laws, order, and security for persons and property; for there can be no prosperity where there are continual changes of dynasties and laws.' This shews that Serra, considering the age and country in which he lived, had formed some correct and extended notions of political economy. His book, however, remained unnoticed, and the author, being implicated, as it seems, in some conspiracy against the Spanish rulers of Naples, was imprisoned for ten years, and underwent the torture seven times. It is not known when and where he died. Turbolo of Naples wrote several treatises on the coinage and the state of money in the kingdom of Naples: 'Discorsi e Relazione sulle Monete del Regno di Napoli,' 1616, 1618, 1623, and 1629. Geminiano Montanari of Modena, published, in 1680, 'Trattato Mercantile delle Monete,' and afterwards, 'Trattato del Valore delle Monete in tutti gli Stati,' in which he lays down sound principles for regulating the coinage.

"In France, the minister Colbert was a great promoter of the mercantile system in all its exclusiveness, and the principles of that system continued to prevail in France after his death till the time of Quesnay. Pierre le Pesant, Seigneur de Bois Guibert, published, in 1695, his 'Detail sur la France,' in which he treated both of commerce and money, but the author was banished because some of his propositions reflected upon feudal rights and ecclesiastical privileges. Twelve years later Vauban published his 'Dixme Royale,' in which he proposed a new plan of taxation.

"A change of opinion was in the meantime taking place on the continent with respect to the so-called 'mercantile system.' François Quesnay, born in 1694, a medical man by profession, and surgeon to Louis XV., being struck by the distressed condition of the French peasantry, endeavoured to draw the attention of the government towards relieving that numerous and ill-used class of people. He proposed the abolition of custom-houses between province and province, the free circulation of corn throughout the kingdom, the suppression of the

corvées, and other similar reforms, which were effected after his death by Turgot. Quesnay went further: he assumed as a principle, that the earth, or, in other words, agriculture, was the only source of wealth, in opposition to Colbert's mercantile system, which fixed that source exclusively in trade. Quesnay allowed that manufacturers and merchants were highly useful, but he contended that as they realized no net surplus in the shape of rent, they did not add any greater value to the raw material of the commodities which they manufactured or carried from place to place than was just equivalent to the value of the capital or stock consumed by them during the time that they were engaged in those operations. He divided society into three classes:—1, A productive class, consisting of farmers and agricultural labourers, who subsist on a portion of the produce of the land reserved to them as wages of labour and as a reasonable profit on their capital; 2, A proprietary class, namely, those who live on the rent of the land, or the net surplus produce raised by the cultivators, after the necessary expenses have been deducted; 3, An unproductive class, consisting of manufacturers, merchants, servants, and handicraftsmen, 'whose labour, though useful, adds nothing to the national wealth, and who subsist entirely on the wages paid to them by the other two classes.' (Quesnay, *Physiocratie, ou Constitution Naturelle des Gouvernemens*, 1768.) As a corollary to these positions, Quesnay and his disciples concluded that all taxes ought to fall upon the land.

"Quesnay is considered as the head of the school called the school of the 'Economistes,' which reckoned amongst its members the Marquis de Mirabeau, father of the celebrated Mirabeau, Mercier de la Rivière, Dupont de Némours, Condorcet, Raynal, Turgot, Necker, and other distinguished men.

"Quesnay's principal work on political economy is the 'Physiocrate' already mentioned; but he published other tracts, especially an article, 'Sur les Grains,' which was inserted in the 'Encyclopédie,' and in which he advocates the same principles. Though Quesnay considered agriculture as the only source of wealth, he did not advocate any exclusive protection for it, but rather a principle of freedom in all branches of trade. The 'Economistes' originated the 'Cadastre,' which was a survey and valuation of all real property, made by order of the government, for the purpose of assessing the 'contribution foncière,' or property tax, which they considered as the only legitimate tax. And this principle has prevailed in France and other continental countries, where even now the tax on land and houses forms the main source of the public revenue, being from 20 to 30 per cent. on the rent.

"In Italy, Antonio Bandini of Siena had asserted the fundamental principle of the 'Economistes,' long before Quesnay, in a work which, however, was not published till 1775. Bandini wrote his '*Discorso Economico*' in 1737, with a view of drawing the attention of the Tuscan government to the desolate condition of that vast tract of country called the Maremma of Siena. Bandini advocated freedom of trade in agricultural produce, and recommended the removal of all restrictions upon importation and exportation; he urged the expediency of giving to the cultivators of the soil an interest in the land, by the grant of long leases; and lastly he recommended the removal of the numerous vexatious taxes, and the substitution of a single tax upon land, not excepting ecclesiastical and other privileged property. A MS. copy of Bandini's book was presented to the grand-duke Francis of Lorraine, who, however, being soon after elected Emperor of Germany, and having removed to Vienna, could not attend to the affairs of the Maremma. But his son Leopold, on coming to the government of Tuscany, consulted Bandini's work, and put into execution the plan therein proposed. The Maremma of Siena assumed a new life, and its population has nearly trebled in the course of half a century.

"Antonio Broggia of Naples, a merchant by profession, wrote a treatise on taxation, '*Sul Tributi*,' in which he admits that there are three sources of wealth—agriculture, handicraft or manufactures, and commerce. He does not consider the tax on land as the only legitimate tax, but proposes three sorts of taxation, land-tax, customs, and gabelle or excise. He says that in a great commercial country the customs and excise, or indirect tax, ought to be preferred, but in an agricultural country like Naples the tax on land must be the principal source of revenue. He condemns taxes on capital and persons, licenses and patents, horses and agricultural implements, as detrimental to industry, as well as the government monopolies of salt, tobacco, &c. The author, who belonged to the mercantile school, falls into the error of that school, in wishing to sell as much as possible to foreigners, and buy as little as possible from them.

"Ferdinand Galiani, also of Naples, ranks among the most distinguished writers on political economy in the last century. While at Paris, he wrote in French a book on the corn-trade, '*Dialogues sur le Commerce des Bles*,' in which he took a middle course between those who advocated an unrestricted trade in corn and those who wished it to be subject to permanent restrictions. Galiani contends that no universal system can be established on that important subject, and

that the laws concerning the trade in corn must vary according to the situation of individual states, the nature and cultivation of their respective soils, and also their political institutions and relations to other countries. Galiani also wrote, in Italian, a work on money, '*Della Moneta*,' published in 1750, which is reckoned one of the best on this subject. Taking an enlarged view, he investigated the nature of the value of things, which he said was the result of various circumstances, namely, their scarcity, utility, the quantity and quality of the labour required for their production, and also the time. He extends his investigations to the value of men's abilities, which are to be estimated not only according to their rarity, but also according to the time required for their coming to maturity, and the difficulties encountered before they can attain a station favourable to their development. This is a position analogous to that afterwards stated by Adam Smith, (b. i. ch. 10.) 'that the wages of labour vary with the easiness and cheapness or the difficulty and expense of learning a business.' It requires more time and expense to form a physician, or a statesman, or a divine, than a common labourer, and therefore the latter has less value than the former. Galiani combats the received opinion of his time, that high prices were a sign of distress. He also contended that the precious metals were to be considered as merchandise. Galiani may be considered as a reformer of the old mercantile system.

"Gian Francesco Pagnini, born at Volterra, 1715, published in 1751 a dissertation, '*Sopra il giusto Pregio delle Cose*,' or the just value of things, and in 1764 a '*History of the Commerce of Florence*,' with a digression on the value of gold and silver, and its proportion to the prices of other things in the 14th and 15th centuries, compared with those in the 18th century. Both works contain sound opinions and interesting facts. Pompeo Neri of Florence wrote, in 1751, '*Osservazioni sopra il Prezzo legale delle Monete*,' a work of considerable merit.

"Gian Rinaldo Carli, born at Capo d'Istria in 1720, ranks with Galiani as one of the most distinguished Italian political economists. He wrote an elaborate work on coin and currency, and on the mints of Italy: '*Delle Monete e della Istituzione delli Zecche d'Italia*,' 3 vols. 4to, 1754-60, in which he completely exhausted the subject. Carli also wrote '*Ragionamento sopra i Bilanci Economici delle Nazioni*,' in which he combated the fallacy prevalent in his time about the balance of trade. He also discussed the subject of the corn-trade in a letter addressed to Pompeo Neri, in 1771, '*Sul Libero Commercio de Grani*,' in which he agreed with Galiani in denying

the wisdom of a general principle of unrestricted freedom of trade in corn, which he thought ought to be modified according to local circumstances, because he considered the supply of corn as a subject deeply connected with administrative policy, and not a mere commercial question. Carli had a powerful mind, uninfluenced by popular opinions or prevalent systems. Other particulars concerning this distinguished writer are given under.

“Antonio Genovesi, born in 1712, at Castiglione, near Salerno, became professor of the new chair ‘of commerce and mechanics,’ founded at Naples in 1755, by Bartolommeo Intiesi, a wealthy Florentine merchant of that city. Genovesi published his lectures under the title of ‘Lezioni de Economia Civile’ in 1768. Genovesi took a middle course between the mercantile system and that of the ‘Economistes.’ He reckoned three sources of wealth, agriculture, arts, and commerce. He extols agriculture as an ample and perennial spring of public wealth, but he also appreciates commerce and manufactures as the causes of an increase of production. With regard to commerce, he adopts the restrictive system of the mercantile school as to foreign goods, whilst he agrees with the ‘Economistes’ as to the freedom of trade in corn, and of internal trade in general, as well as with respect to the interest of money. He inculcates the principle that labour constitutes the capital of nations as well as of families. But he did not fall into the vulgar error of considering whole classes of society as unproductive because they are not employed in manual labour, such as men of science, scholars, lawyers, soldiers, magistrates, and others. Genovesi wrote also other treatises on political economy, which he succeeded in rendering popular in his own country.

“The other Italian political economists of the 18th century are:—1, Francesco Algarotti of Venice, born in 1712, who wrote ‘Saggio sul Commercio,’ in which he extols commerce as the source of wealth and power, and he quotes the example of England. He also wrote a few short suggestions on the advantages which might be derived from Africa, in a commercial point of view, by the nations of Europe: ‘Sulla Preferenza dell’ Africa in confronto dell’ Asia e dell’ America, rapporto all’ Industria e dal Commercio degli Europei.’ 2, Antonio Zanon of Udine in the Venetian territory, born in 1696, a merchant by profession, wrote letters on agriculture, commerce, and manufactures, which he encouraged also by his exertions. He was a man of a liberal mind and a true philanthropist. 3, Cesare Beccaria of Milan wrote lectures on political economy, in which he expounded, among other things, the advantages of the division of labour, and he investigated the relations of wages and labour, and the nature of produc-

tive capitals. With regard to the corn trade, he agreed with Carli and Galiani in not advising any general system. He considered large masses of property as more advantageous to a country than small subdivisions. In general, Beccaria may be considered as belonging to the school of the 'Economistes.' 4, Pietro Verri, born at Milan in 1727, the intimate friend of Beccaria, although he differed from him on several points of political economy, wrote '*Memorie sull' Economia Pubblica dello Stato di Milano*,' in which he shews the decline of that country during the two centuries of Spanish dominion, and ascribes it to the ignorance of its rulers and the absurdity of the laws. He wrote also '*Riflessioni sulle Leggi Vincolanti, principal mentesul Commercio dei Grani*,' in which he advocated the principle of absolute liberty. Lastly, he wrote '*Meditazioni sull' Economia Politica*,' which were published in 1771, and have been translated into several languages. It is an elementary but useful book. 5, Ferdinando Paoletti, born in 1717, near Florence, wrote, in 1769, '*Pensieri sopra l'Agricoltura*,' and, in 1772, '*Veri Mezzi di rendere felici le Societa*,' in which he advocated freedom of trade. 6, Gian Battista Vasco, born at Mondovi in Piedmont, in 1733, wrote '*Saggio Politico sulla Moneta*,' 1772, in which he treats of various questions of political economy. He afterwards wrote, in French, '*Memoire sur les Causes de la Mendicite et sur les Moyens de la supprimer*,' which he sent to the Academy of Valence in Dauphine, in 1788. His other works were, '*Sulla Felicità Publica considerata nei Coltivatori di Terre proprie*;' and '*L'Usura libera*.'

"7, Giammaria Orles, born at Venice in 1713, wrote a work entitled '*Dell' Economia Nazionale libri sei*,' 1774, which, however, remained unknown except to a few friends of the author, until Custodi inserted it in his great collection of the Italian economists. His views were original, and he belonged to none of the schools already established. He lays it down as a fundamental principle that the capital of a nation is always in proportion to the population, and that the only difference is in its distribution. If a portion of the population becomes richer, it can only be by impoverishing the rest. As a consequence of this principle, he asserts that all endeavours to increase industry with a view to increase the national wealth are futile. But he supports also the principle of freedom of trade between nations, because, he says, every nation has its own capital, which cannot be diminished nor increased by exchange. Ortes wrote also '*Riflessioni sulla Popolazione per rapporto all' Economia Nazionale*,' 1790, in which he stated several positions which have been since developed by Malthus, such as, that population increases in proportion to the increase of pro-

duction; that population does not always increase with the increase of marriages, &c.

"8, Filippo Briganti, a native of Naples, published, in 1780, 'Esame Economico del Sistema Civile,' in which he refutes the theories of Mably, Rousseau, and Linguet, who asserted that the state of society and civilization, commerce and wealth, were the origin of all the evils with which man is afflicted. 9, Gaetano Filangieri, born at Naples in 1752, is known by his work on legislation, the second volume of which treats of political economy. He belonged to the school of the French economists, but he was not a servile follower of that school. He was a supporter of the freedom of trade; he had no prejudices against luxury, but he advocated direct taxation, or the tax on land, and he maintained that large cities were injurious to the prosperity of a country.

"10, The Marquis Caraccioli, while he was viceroy of Sicily, wrote 'Riflessioni sull' Economia e l'Estrazione dei Frumenti della Sicilia fatte ad occasione della Carestia del 1784 ed 1785.' The author, being struck with the fact that Sicily, once the granary of Rome, should be so frequently afflicted with scarcity and famine, sought to investigate the causes of this great change. He recommended freedom of internal trade, but with regard to the exportation of corn, he thought it might be suspended at times by an act of government from prudential motives. 11, Saverio Scrofani, on the contrary, in a 'Memoria sulla Liberta del Commercio dei Grani della Sicilia,' published in 1795, advocated an entire and permanent freedom in the corn-trade, quoting the example of Tuscany, where that system had been in practice since 1767, and had been attended with the best results. 12, Maurizio Solera, a native of Piedmont, wrote in French, 'Essai sur les Valeurs,' which he presented in 1786 to King Victor. He proposed an agricultural bank in order to make up for the scarcity of bullion. But his project was not carried into effect.

"13, Lodovico Ricci, a native of Modena, was named, by the Duke Ercole III., member of a commission appointed to inquire into the charitable institutions of the town of Modena. Ricci was the reporter of the commission, and his report was published and dedicated to the Duke: 'Riforma degli Istituti Pii della Citta di Modena,' 1787. He was one of the first in Italy (Ortes and Genovesi had already expressed opinions similar to his) who censured indiscriminate charity as encouraging idleness and improvidence, and thus creating pauperism. Italy abounded at that time, more perhaps than any country in Europe, with charitable institutions. In Modena, which had in the time of Ricci a population of 40,000 inhabit-

ants, there were 7000 destitute persons. Ricci demonstrated from historical facts that pauperism increases in proportion to the facility of obtaining relief. He censured legacies for portioning poor girls, and other premiums on marriage, and said that the increase of population should only be the result of labour and frugality, by which the means of subsistence are increased. He proposed that charitable institutions should be supported by private charity, and not by the government, which should not do more than establish workhouses to give employment to paupers and vagrants, instruct the poor classes, and endeavour to raise their moral condition. The advice of Ricci was acted upon by the government of Modena.

"14, Giuseppe Palmieri, born in 1721, in the province of Lecce, in the kingdom of Naples, filled several offices in the administration of his country, and wrote observations on the tariff and on national wealth: 'Osservazioni sulle Tariffe con applicazione al Regno di Napoli,' and 'Sulla Ricchezza Nazionale.' In speaking of commerce, he says that a full and universal liberty would be the best system, but as this liberty is not admitted by any nation, the nation that should alone put it in practice might find it turn to its disadvantage, and its condition would be that of a lamb among wolves. He therefore advises not the prohibitive but the restrictive system, or, in other words, a system of custom-house duties on the principle of reciprocity.

"15, Count Mengotti of Feltra, in the Venetian state, wrote, in 1791, a book against the exclusive mercantile system, which he styled 'Il Colbertismo,' from the name of Colbert, the great patronizer of that system. This work was written in reply to a query proposed by the Economical Society of Florence, which was put in the following words: 'Whether in a state which, by its locality and the nature of its soil, is susceptible of increase of produce and population, it be most advisable to favour manufactures by certain restrictions on the exportation of the raw materials, or to leave it at entire freedom?' Mengotti recommended perfect freedom of trade, and his book obtained the prize. It is one of the best written works of the Italian political economists. Mengotti, Beccaria, and Galiani, are three writers who, by their style, have succeeded in enlivening an abstruse subject and making their dissertations entertaining as well as instructive. Mengotti wrote also a memoir, 'Sul Commercio dei Romani,' which obtained, in 1787, the prize from the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres of Paris. Mengotti maintained that, until the first Punic war, the Romans had no commerce in an extended sense; that from the first Punic war to the Battle of Actium their

commerce consisted in carrying home the spoils of other nations; that from Augustus to Constantine their trade was mainly passive and ruinous; they produced nothing, and bought foreign luxuries and even the necessaries of life with the money they extorted from the subject provinces, and at last they fell gradually again into poverty and barbarism.

The above are the principal Italian political economists of the 18th century. The complete collection of all the Italian writers on political economy was edited by Custodi, in 50 volumes 8vo. Melzi, the vice-president of the Italian republic, supplied the author with the necessary funds for the undertaking. Custodi was afterwards made by Napoleon councillor of state of the kingdom of Italy, baron, knight of the iron crown, and secretary of finance.

SECOND DIVISION.

FROM THE ADVENT OF ADAM SMITH TO THE PASSING OF THE CORN-LAW IN 1815.

SECT. I.—ADAM SMITH.

Adam Smith, Doctor of Laws and Fellow of the Royal Society, was born at the town of Kirkaldy, in Scotland, on the 5th of June 1723. He was the only child of Adam Smith, comptroller of the customs at Kirkaldy, and Margaret Douglas, daughter of Mr Douglas of Strathenry. His father having died some months before his birth, the duty of superintending his early education devolved upon his mother.

A singular accident happened to him when he was about three years of age. As he was amusing himself one day at the door of his uncle, Mr Douglas' house at Strathenry, he was carried off by a party of gypsies. The vagrants, however, being pursued by Mr Douglas, were overtaken in Leslie Wood, and his uncle, as Mr Stewart remarks, was thus the happy instrument of preserving to the world a genius which was destined not only to extend the boundaries of science, but to enlighten and reform the commercial policy of Europe.

The constitution of Dr Smith, during infancy, was infirm and sickly, and required all the delicate attentions of his surviving parent. Though she treated him with the utmost indulgence, this did not produce any unfavourable effect, either

on his dispositions or temper, and he repaid her affectionate solicitude by every attention that filial gratitude could dictate during the long period of sixty years.

He received the first rudiments of his education at the Grammar School of Kirkaldy, which was then taught by Mr David Miller, a teacher, in his day, of considerable reputation. He soon attracted notice by his passion for books, and the extraordinary powers of his memory. Even at this early period, too, he seems to have contracted those habits of speaking to himself, and of absence in company, for which, through life, he was so remarkable. The weakness of Dr Smith's constitution prevented him from engaging in the sports and pastimes of his school companions, yet he was much beloved by them on account of his friendly and generous disposition.

Having remained at Kirkaldy till he had completed his fourteenth year, he was sent in 1737 to the University of Glasgow, where he prosecuted his studies during three years. Mr Stewart mentions, on the authority of one of Mr Smith's fellow students, Dr Maclaine of the Hague, that his favourite pursuits while attending that university were mathematics and natural philosophy. He attended, however, during his residence in Glasgow, the lectures of the celebrated Dr Hutcheson on moral philosophy; and it is probable that they had a considerable effect in afterwards directing his attention to those branches of science in which he became so distinguished.

Dr Smith's friends having directed his views towards the English Church, he went, in 1740, to Balliol College, Oxford, as an exhibitor on Snell's foundation, where he remained seven years. At this celebrated seat of classical learning he cultivated, with the greatest assiduity and success, the study both of the ancient and modern languages, and became intimately acquainted with the works of the Roman, Greek, French, and Italian poets, as well as with those of his own country. With the view of improving his style, he used frequently to employ himself in the practice of translation, particularly from the French, as he was of opinion that such exercises were extremely useful to those who wished to cultivate the art of composition. But Dr Smith's obligations to the University of Oxford seem to be confined to his proficiency in classical learning and a critical acquaintance with the niceties and delicacies of the English tongue. Very little could be learned from the public lectures of philosophy, the logic of Aristotle still maintaining its influence in both the English universities; a circumstance, however, which, upon good authority, is related to have occurred during his residence in Oxford, shews that in his private studies Dr Smith did not confine his read-

ing in philosophy to the works of Aristotle and the schoolmen. Something having excited the suspicion of his superiors with regard to the nature of his studies in private, the heads of his college entered his apartment one day without any previous notice, and unluckily found the young philosopher engaged in reading Hume's *Treatise of Human Nature*. The offender was of course severely reprimanded, and the objectionable work seized and carried off.

Dr Smith, having found that the ecclesiastical profession was not suitable to his taste, resolved at last to renounce every prospect of rising to eminence by church preferment. He accordingly returned in 1747, against the wishes of his friends, to Kirkaldy, and, without having determined on any fixed plan of life, resided there nearly two years with his mother. In the end of the year 1748, he fixed his residence in Edinburgh, and, under the patronage of Lord Kames, delivered lectures during three years on rhetoric and belles lettres. These lectures were never published, but it appears that the substance of them was communicated to Dr Blair, who began his celebrated course on the same subject in 1755, and that gentleman had a high opinion of their merits. In a note to his eighteenth lecture, Dr Blair thus notices them: "On this head, of the general character of style, particularly the plain and the simple, and the characters of those English authors who are classed under them, in this and the following lectures, several ideas have been taken from a manuscript treatise on Rhetoric, part of which was shewn to me many years ago, by the learned and ingenious author, Dr Adam Smith; and which, it is hoped, will be given by him to the public."

It appears to have been during the residence of Adam Smith at this time in Edinburgh that his acquaintance with David Hume commenced, which lasted, without the slightest interruption, till the death of the latter in 1776. It was a friendship, Mr Stewart remarks, on both sides, founded on the admiration of genius and the love of simplicity; and which forms an interesting circumstance in the history of each of these eminent men, from the ambition which both have shewn to record it to posterity.

The literary reputation of Dr Smith being now well established, he was elected, in 1751, Professor of Logic in the University of Glasgow, and in the year following he was removed to the chair of moral philosophy in the same university, vacant by the death of Mr Thomas Craigie, who was the immediate successor of Dr Hutcheson. In this situation he remained during thirteen years, a period which he used to consider as

the happiest of his life, the studies and inquiries in which his academical duties led him to engage being those which were most agreeable to his taste. It is highly probable that his appointment to the professorship of moral philosophy was the means of inducing him to mature his speculations in ethics and political economy, and to undertake those great works which have immortalized his name in the literature of Scotland.

No part of the lectures which Dr Smith delivered, either as professor of logic or of moral philosophy, has been preserved, except what has been published in the "Theory of Moral Sentiments" and the "Wealth of Nations." The following account of them, however, has been given by Mr Miller, the celebrated author of the "Historical View of the English Government," and professor of law in the University of Glasgow, who had the advantage of being one of Mr Smith's pupils.

"In the professorship of logic, to which Mr Smith was appointed on his first introduction into this university, he soon saw the necessity of departing widely from the plan that had been followed by his predecessors, and of directing the attention of his pupils to studies of a more interesting and useful nature than the logic and metaphysics of the schools. Accordingly, after exhibiting a general view of the powers of the mind, and explaining as much of the ancient logic as was requisite to gratify curiosity with respect to an artificial method of reasoning, which had once occupied the universal attention of the learned, he dedicated all the rest of his time to the delivering of a system of rhetoric and belles lettres. Was elected to the chair of moral philosophy. His course of lectures on this subject was divided into four parts. The first contained natural theology; in which he considered the proofs of the being and attributes of God, and those principles of the human mind upon which religion is founded. The second comprehended ethics, strictly so called, and consisted chiefly of the doctrines which he afterwards published in his 'Theory of Moral Sentiments.' In the third part he treated at more length of that branch of morality which relates to *justice*, and which, being susceptible of precise and accurate rules, is for that reason capable of a full and particular explanation.

"Upon this subject he followed the plan that seems to be suggested by Montesquieu, endeavouring to trace the gradual progress of jurisprudence, both public and private, from the rudest to the most refined ages, and to point out the effects of those arts which contribute to subsistence and to the accumulation of property, in producing correspondent

improvements or alterations in law and government. This important branch of his labours he also intended to give to the public; but this intention, which is mentioned in the conclusion of the 'Theory of Moral Sentiments,' he did not live to fulfil.

"In the last part of his lectures he examined those political regulations which are founded, not upon the principle of *justice*, but that of *expediency*, and which are calculated to increase the riches, the power, and the prosperity of a state. Under this view he considered the political institutions relating to commerce, to finances, to ecclesiastical and military establishments. What he delivered on these subjects contained the substance of the work he afterwards published under the title of 'An Inquiry into the Nature and Sources of the Wealth of Nations.'

"There was no situation in which the abilities of Mr Smith appeared to greater advantage than as a professor. In delivering his lectures, he trusted almost entirely to extemporary elocution. His manner, though not graceful, was plain and unaffected; and, as he seems to be always interested in the subject, he never failed to interest his hearers. Each discourse consisted commonly of several distinct propositions, which he successively endeavoured to prove and illustrate. These propositions, when announced in general terms, had, from their extent, not unfrequently something of the air of a paradox. In his attempts to explain them, he often appeared at first not to be sufficiently possessed of the subject, and spoke with some hesitation. As he advanced, however, the matter seemed to crowd upon him; his manner became warm and animated, and his expression easy and fluent. In points susceptible of controversy, you could easily discern that he secretly conceived an opposition to his opinions, and that he was led upon this account to support them with greater energy and vehemence. By the fulness and variety of his illustrations, the subject gradually swelled in his hands, and acquired a dimension which, without a tedious repetition of the same views, was calculated to seize the attention of his audience, and to afford them pleasure as well as instruction. Following the same subject through all the diversity of shades and aspects in which it was presented, and afterwards in tracing it backwards to that original proposition, or general truth, from which this beautiful train of speculation had proceeded.

"His reputation as a professor was accordingly raised very high; and a multitude of students from a great distance resorted to the university merely upon his account. Those

branches of the science which he taught became fashionable at this place, and his opinions were the chief topics of discussion in clubs and literary societies. Even the small peculiarities in his pronunciation or manner of speaking became frequently the object of imitation."

The first publications of Mr Smith, it is understood, were two articles which he contributed anonymously to a work called the "Edinburgh Review," begun in 1765, by some literary gentlemen, but of which only two numbers ever appeared. The first of these articles was a Review of Dr Johnson's Dictionary of the English Language, which displays considerable acuteness, and the other contained some general observations on the state of literature in the different countries of Europe.

In 1759, his great ethical work, entitled "Theory of Moral Sentiments, or an Essay towards an Analysis of the Principles by which Men naturally Judge concerning the Conduct and Character, first of their Neighbours, and afterwards of Themselves," made its appearance. This work contributed greatly to extend the fame and reputation of the author; and is unquestionably entitled to a place in the very first rank in the science of morals. Dr Brown, in his eighteenth lecture, thus speaks of it:—"Profound in thought, it exhibits, even when it is most profound, an example of the graces with which a sage imagination knows how to adorn the simple and majestic form of science; that it is severe and cold only to those who are themselves cold and severe, as in those very graces it exhibits, in like manner, an example of the reciprocal embellishments which imagination receives from the sober dignity of truth. In its minor details and illustrations, indeed, it may be considered as presenting a model of philosophic beauty, of which all must acknowledge the power who are not disqualified by their very nature for the admiration and enjoyment of intellectual excellence; so dull of understanding as to shrink with a painful consciousness of incapacity at the very appearance of refined analysis, or so dull and cold of heart as to feel no charm in the delightful varieties of an eloquence that, in the illustration and embellishment of the noblest truths, seems itself to live and harmonize with those noble sentiments which it adorns."

Dr Smith's "Dissertation on the Origin of Languages," which is now generally bound up with the "Theory of Moral Sentiments," made its first appearance with the second edition of that work. In this ingenious and beautiful tract, the author gives a theoretical history of the formation of lan-

guages, in which he endeavours to ascertain the different steps by which they would gradually arrive at their present so artificial and complicated state.

As the "Theory of Moral Sentiments" contains the most important part of Dr Smith's ethical doctrines, he was enabled, after the publication of that work, to devote a larger part of his course of lectures than he had previously done to the elucidation of the principles of jurisprudence and political economy. From a statement which he drew up in 1755, in order to vindicate his claim to certain political and literary opinions, it appears that from the time when he obtained a chair in the University of Glasgow, and even while he was delivering private lectures in Edinburgh, he had been in the habit of teaching the same liberal system of policy with respect to the freedom of trade which he afterwards published in the "Wealth of Nations." His residence in one of the largest commercial towns in the island must have been of considerable advantage to him, by enabling him to acquire correct practical information on many points connected with the subject of his favourite studies; and Mr Stewart states, as a circumstance very honourable to the liberality of the merchants of Glasgow, that, notwithstanding the reluctance so common among men of business to listen to the conclusions of mere speculation, and the direct opposition of Dr Smith's leading principles to all the old maxims of trade, he was able, before leaving the university, to rank some of the most eminent merchants of the city among the number of his proselytes.

The publication of the "Theory of Moral Sentiments" served greatly to increase the reputation of its author. In 1762, the *Senatus Academicus* of the University of Glasgow unanimously conferred on him the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws, in testimony, as expressed in the minutes of the meeting, of their respect for his universally acknowledged talents, and of the advantage that had resulted to the university, from the ability with which he had, for many years, expounded the principles of jurisprudence.

Towards the end of 1763, an important event occurred in Dr Smith's life. Having received an invitation from Mr Charles Townsend, husband of the Duchess of Buccleuch, to accompany the young Duke, her grace's son, on his travels, he was induced, from the liberal terms in which the proposal was made, and the strong desire he entertained of visiting the Continent, to resign his chair at Glasgow and accept of the offer. "With the connection which he was led to form in consequence of this change in his situation," Mr Stewart

remarks, "he had reason to be satisfied in an uncommon degree, and he always spoke of it with pleasure and gratitude. To the public, it was not, perhaps, a change equally fortunate, as it interrupted that studious leisure for which nature seems to have destined him, and in which alone he could have hoped to accomplish those literary projects which had flattered the ambition of his youthful genius."

Dr Smith having joined the Duke of Buccleuch at London, in the early part of the year 1764, they set out for the Continent in the month of March. After remaining only ten or twelve days in the capital of France, they proceeded to Toulouse, where they resided during eighteen months. Toulouse was at that time the seat of a parliament; and the intimacy in which he lived with some of its principal members, afforded him an opportunity of acquiring the most correct information in regard to the internal policy of France.

After leaving Toulouse, they proceeded through the southern provinces to Geneva, and, having spent two months in that city, returned to Paris about Christmas 1765, where they remained nearly a year. During their abode in Paris, Dr Smith, through the recommendation of Mr Hume, and his own celebrity, lived on the most intimate terms with the best society in the city. Turgot, (afterwards comptroller-general of finances,) Quesnay, Necker, D'Alembert, Helvetius, Marmontel, the Duc de la Rochefoucault, and Madame Riccaboni, were among the number of his acquaintances; and some of them he continued ever afterwards to reckon among his friends. It is highly probable that he derived considerable advantage from his intercourse with Quesnay, the celebrated founder of the sect of Economists. Of this profound and ingenious man, Dr Smith entertained the highest opinion, and he has pronounced his work upon political economy, with all its imperfections, to be the nearest approximation to the truth that had then been published on the principles of that very important science. Dr Smith intended to have dedicated to Quesnay the "Wealth of Nations," but was prevented by his death.

Although Dr Smith had made some very severe remarks in his "Theory of Moral Sentiments" on the celebrated maxims of the Duke of Rochefoucault, this did not prevent him from receiving the utmost kindness and attention from the author's grandson. A short time before Dr Smith left Paris, he received a flattering letter from the Duke of Rochefoucault, with a copy of a new edition of the *Maxims* of his grandfather; and informing Dr Smith, at the same time, that he

had been prevented from finishing a translation of his "Theory of Morals" into French, only by the knowledge of having been anticipated in the design.

Dr Smith returned with his pupil to London in October 1766, and soon after took up his residence with his mother at Kirkaldy, where, with the exception of a few occasional visits to London and Edinburgh, he resided constantly during the next ten years, engaged in intense study. Mr Hume, who considered the town as the proper scene for a man of letters, made many ineffectual attempts to prevail upon him to leave his retirement. During this residence of Dr Smith in Kirkaldy, he was engaged chiefly in maturing his speculations upon economical science. At length, in 1776, the "Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations" made its appearance, a work which holds nearly the same rank in political economy that Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding does in the philosophy of the mind, or the Principia of Newton in astronomy.

Our limits prevent us from giving anything like a particular analysis of this great work, but we shall endeavour to give some brief account of it. We shall notice very shortly the state of the science at the time when Dr Smith wrote the different leading principles which the illustrious author endeavours to establish, and the principal merits and defects of the works.

The object of political economy is to point out the means by which the industry of man may be rendered most productive of the necessities, conveniences, and luxuries of life, and to ascertain the laws which regulate the distribution of the various products which constitute wealth among the different classes of society. Though these inquiries be in the highest degree interesting and important, the science of political economy is comparatively of recent origin. It was not to be expected that, among the Greeks and Romans, who considered it degrading to be engaged in manufactures or commerce, and among whom such employments were left to slaves, where moralists considered the indulgence of luxury to be an evil of the first magnitude, that the science, which treats of the best methods of acquiring wealth should be much attended to. At the revival of letters, these ancient prejudices still maintained a powerful influence, and, combined with other causes, long prevented philosophers from turning their attention to the subject.

The first inquirers in political economy were led away by a prejudice which is perhaps one of the most deeply rooted in the human mind, namely, that wealth consists solely in gold

and silver. From this mistake grew up that system of commercial policy which has been denominated the mercantile system, according to the principles laid down in which the commerce of Europe was, in a great measure, regulated at the time when Dr Smith's work appeared. The leading doctrine of the commercial system was, that the policy of a country should be directed solely to the multiplication of the precious metals. Hence the internal commerce of a nation came to be entirely overlooked, or viewed only as subsidiary to the foreign; and the advantage derived from foreign trade was estimated by the excess of the value of the goods exported above that of those which were imported, it being supposed that the balance must be brought to the country in specie. To the radical mistake upon which the mercantile system was founded may be traced those restrictions upon the importation, and the encouragement given to the exportation of manufactures, which, till lately, distinguished the commercial policy of all the nations in Europe. It was imagined that, by such regulations, the excess of the value of exports over imports to be paid in gold would be increased.

During the 17th, and the earlier part of the 18th century, various works had appeared, in which some of the principles of political economy were distinctly enough laid down, and which had a tendency to shew the futility of the mercantile theory. For a particular account of these publications, and their various merits, we refer to the First Division of this work and to Mr M'Culloch's able Introductory Discourse to the "Wealth of Nations." We shall here only remark that, though several of these treatises contain the germs of some of the truths to be found in the "Wealth of Nations," yet the principles laid down in them are often stated only in a cursory and incidental manner. Their authors frequently appear not to be aware of the importance of the truths which they have discovered; and in none of them is anything like a connected view of political economy to be found.

The only work that was given to the world before the "Wealth of Nations," in which an attempt was made to expound the principles of political economy in a logical and systematic manner, was the Economical Table of the celebrated Quesnay, a French physician, which was published in 1758; but the theory of this distinguished economist is very erroneous. Having been educated in the country, he naturally inclined to regard agriculture with partiality, and he had come to the conclusion that it was the only species of industry which could possibly contribute to increase the wealth of a nation. Everything which ministers to the wants of man

must be originally derived from the earth ; and the earth, therefore, Quesnay contended, must be the only source of wealth. As manufacturers and merchants do not realize any surplus in the shape of rent, he conceived that their operations, though highly useful, could not add any greater value to commodities than the value of the capital consumed by them. Into this erroneous theory he seems to have been led from being unable to explain the nature of rent, and from being unacquainted with that fundamental principle in political economy, that labour is the cause of exchangeable value.

But though Quesnay conceived agriculture to be the only source of wealth, the principles of his system fortunately did not lead him to solicit for it any exclusive protection ; on the contrary, he contended that the interest of all the different classes of society would be best promoted by the establishment of a system of perfect freedom. It must, he conceived, be advantageous to the cultivators of the soil that the industry of manufacturers and merchants should not be fettered ; for the more liberty they enjoyed the greater would be their competition, and, in consequence, the cheaper would their services be rendered to the agriculturists. On the other hand, it was the interest of the manufacturers that the cultivators of the soil should also have perfect freedom, for the greater liberty they enjoyed the more would their industry increase that surplus fund from which, according to his theory, the whole national revenue was ultimately derived.

It was in the work of Dr Smith that the sources of the wealth and prosperity of nations were first fully and correctly explored, and, in a systematic manner, distinctly explained, and that the advantages to be derived from commercial freedom were first satisfactorily established. In opposition to the principles of the commercial system, Dr Smith shewed that wealth does not consist in gold and silver, but in the abundance of the various necessities, conveniences, and luxuries of life, and labour is the only source of wealth ; and, in opposition to the French economists, that labour is productive when employed in manufactures and commerce as well as in agriculture. He has investigated the various causes by which labour may be rendered most productive ; and has shewn how immensely its powers are increased by being divided among different individuals or nations. He has proved, with great power of reasoning, that all restrictions upon either the internal or external commerce of a country are, in the highest degree, absurd and pernicious ; and that the progress of real opulence will be most rapidly accelerated when the industry of every individual and nation is employed in the

production of those articles for which, either from natural or artificial causes, they are best adapted, and when the most unlimited freedom of making exchanges is everywhere allowed. "It is the maxim of every prudent master of a family," he remarks, b. iv. c. 2, "never to attempt to make at home what it will cost him more to make than to buy. The tailor does not attempt to make his own shoes, but buys them of the shoemaker; the shoemaker does not attempt to make his own clothes, but employs a tailor. The farmer attempts to make neither the one nor the other, but employs those different artificers; all of them find it for their interest to employ their whole industry in a way in which they have some advantage over their neighbours, and to purchase with a part of its produce whatever else they have occasion for."

"What is prudence in the conduct of any private family, can scarce be folly in that of a great kingdom. If a foreign country can supply us with a commodity cheaper than we ourselves can make it, better buy it of them with some part of the produce of our own industry, employed in a way in which we have some advantage." "The natural advantages which one country has over another in producing particular commodities are sometimes so great, that it is acknowledged by all the world to be in vain to struggle with them. By means of glasses, hot-beds, and hot-walls, very good grapes can be raised in Scotland, and very good wine can be made from them, at about thirty times the expense for which at least equally good can be brought from foreign countries. Would it be a reasonable law to prohibit the importation of all foreign wines, merely to encourage the making of claret and burgundy in Scotland? But if there would be a manifest absurdity in turning towards any employment thirty times more of the capital and industry of the country than would be necessary to purchase from foreign countries an equal quantity of the commodities wanted, there must be an absurdity, though not altogether so glaring, yet exactly of the same kind, in turning towards any such employment a thirtieth, or even a three-hundredth part more of either."

But though Dr Smith contended upon correct principles for unlimited freedom of trade and commerce, and conceived that all the different branches of industry must be advantageous to society, he was of opinion that all were not *equally* advantageous. Agriculture he conceived to be the most productive employment in which capital could be engaged; the home trade to be more productive than the foreign; and the foreign than the carrying trade. But these distinctions are evidently erroneous. The self-interest of individuals will al-

ways prevent them from employing their capital in manufactures or commerce, unless they yield as large profits as they would have done if they had been employed in agriculture; and a state being only a collection of individuals, whatever is most beneficial to them must also be most advantageous to the society. Dr Smith has made another mistake in regard to the productiveness of labour. He divides all labourers into two classes, the productive and the unproductive; and he limits the class of productive labourers to those whose labour is immediately fixed and realized in some vendible commodity. But certainly all labour ought to be reckoned productive which either directly or *indirectly* contributes to augment the wealth of a society. It is impossible to hold that the labour of an Arkwright or a Watt was unproductive.

Few chapters in the "Wealth of Nations" are more valuable than that in which the illustrious author explains the causes of the apparent inequality in the wages and profits derived from different employments. He has shewn in the fullest and most satisfactory manner, that when allowance is made for all the advantages and disadvantages attending the different employments of labour and stock, wages and profits must, in the same neighbourhood, be either perfectly equal, or continually tending to equality. The circumstances which he enumerates as making up for a low state of wages in some employments, and counterbalancing a high one in others, are five in number. First, the agreeableness or disagreeableness of the employments themselves; secondly, the easiness and cheapness, or the difficulty and expense of learning them; thirdly, the constancy or inconstancy of employment in them; fourthly, the small or great trust which must be reposed in those who exercise them; and fifthly, the probability or improbability of success in their differences in the rate of profit, seem to be occasioned chiefly from the risk to which capital is exposed being greater in some employments than in others.

"One of the most important inquiries," says Mr Macculloch, "is the investigation of the laws which regulate the exchangeable value of the different productions of industry; and the disquisitions of Dr Smith on this subject are extremely valuable. He has shewn, in opposition to the opinion commonly before entertained on the subject, that the price of commodities, the quantity of which may be indefinitely increased, does not depend upon their scarcity or abundance, but upon the cost of their production; that although variations in the supply of any article, or in the demand for it, may occasion temporary variations in its exchangeable value, the market price is per-

manently regulated by the natural price, and on an average corresponds with it. In estimating the elements, however, which form the necessary price of commodities, he has fallen into some very important errors, particularly with regard to rent, which, from being unacquainted with the causes that produce it, he considered to be one of the component parts of price. It was subsequently suggested by Dr Anderson, and more specifically laid down by Ricardo and others, that rent is the difference between the product of the fruitful soil of a country (in comparison with the amount of labour and capital expended on it) and the product of such less fruitful soil as the pressure of population renders it necessary to bring into cultivation; and that rent being the difference between returns from an equal amount of capital applied to superior soils, and to that which is the most unproductive, is the effect, and not the cause, of the dearness of agricultural products; and cannot, therefore, form an element in their natural price.

"The error which Dr Smith has fallen into with regard to rent is certainly the most important mistake in the 'Wealth of Nations,' and has vitiated a considerable part of the work. Among other mistakes it has led him into error in regard to the ultimate incidence of different taxes, and the circumstances which determined the rate of wages and profits. Had the illustrious author, too, been acquainted with the true theory of rent he would not have contended that corn, upon an average, was the most invariable of all commodities in its value."—(*See the Sections on the Theory of Rent.*)

Many other important subjects, besides those we have briefly noticed, are discussed by Dr Smith; but we cannot farther extend our remarks. Though it has defects, the "Wealth of Nations" will ever remain a great standard work in the science of political economy, and an illustrious monument of the genius and talents of its author. The publication raised him to the highest rank in the literary world; and he enjoyed, during fifteen years, the fame which he had so justly acquired. His work, soon after published, was translated into all the languages of Europe, his opinions were referred to in the House of Commons, and he himself consulted by the minister. Before his death, too, he had the satisfaction of seeing that the principles of commercial freedom which he had so ably advocated were beginning to influence the councils of Great Britain and other European states.

A few months after the publication of the "Wealth of Nations," Dr Smith lost his highly esteemed friend, Mr Hume, who died upon the 25th of August 1776. Dr Smith was most assiduous in his attentions during the last illness

of this illustrious man; and gives an interesting account in a letter to Mr Strachan of London, of the circumstances attending his death, and a eulogium upon his character. To those acquainted with Mr Hume's religious opinions, some part of this eulogium must certainly appear too high; and the author was accordingly attacked on the subject by Dr Horne, Bishop of Norwich, who rashly ascribed to him, without any evidence, the same sceptical opinions which had been entertained by his illustrious friend.

Dr Smith resided chiefly in London for about two years after his great work had been given to the public, during which time his society was courted by the most distinguished persons in the metropolis. In 1778 he was appointed one of the Commissioners of Customs in Scotland, through the unsolicited application of his friend and former pupil the Duke of Buccleuch. Upon attaining his appointment, he removed to Edinburgh, where he spent the remaining years of his life, enjoying comparative affluence, and the society of his earliest and most esteemed friends. His mother, who was then in extreme old age, accompanied him to town; and his cousin, Miss Jane Douglas, who had formerly been a member of his family in Glasgow, undertook the superintendence of his domestic arrangements.

The accession to his income which he had now obtained, enabled him to gratify, to a much greater extent than formerly, the natural generosity of his disposition. "The state of his funds at the time of his death," Mr Stewart remarks, "compared with his very moderate establishment, confirmed, beyond a doubt, what his intimate acquaintances had often suspected, that a large proportion of his savings was allotted to offices of secret charity."

In 1787, Dr Smith was elected Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow. A letter addressed to the principal of the university on the occasion shews the high sense he felt of this honour. "No preferment," he writes, "could have given me so much satisfaction. No man can owe greater obligations to a society than I do to the University of Glasgow. They educated me; they sent me to Oxford. Soon after my return to Scotland, they elected me one of their own members; and afterwards preferred me to another office, to which the abilities and virtues of the never-to-be-forgotten Dr Hutcheson had given a superior degree of illustration. The period of thirteen years, which I spent as a member of that society, I remember as by far the most useful, and therefore as by far the happiest and most honourable, period of my life; and now, after three-and-twenty years' absence, to be remembered in

so very agreeable a manner by my old protectors, gives me a heartfelt joy, which I cannot easily express to you."

During the last residence of Dr Smith in Edinburgh, his studies appear to have been almost entirely suspended. The petty routine of his office, though requiring a little exertion of thought, was sufficient to occupy a considerable portion of his time and attention; and it is deeply to be regretted that, in all probability, these duties alone prevented him from giving that "account of the general principles of law and government, and of the different revolutions they have undergone in the different ages and periods of society," which he had stated in the concluding paragraph of the "Theory of Moral Sentiments" it was his intention to do.

In 1784 Dr Smith lost his mother, to whom he had been most tenderly attached; and her death was followed, four years afterwards, by that of Miss Douglas. These domestic afflictions contributed to hasten the decline of his health. His constitution had never been robust, and began early to give way. His last illness, which arose from a chronic obstruction of the bowels, was lingering and painful. He had the consolation, however, of receiving the tenderest sympathy of his friends; and he bore his afflictions with the most perfect resignation. His death took place in July 1790.

A few days before his death, when Dr Smith found his end rapidly approaching, he caused all his manuscripts to be destroyed, excepting a few essays, which he entrusted to the care of his executors, Dr Black and Dr Hutton. The intention of destroying all those of his manuscripts which he did not think worthy of publication, he had long entertained, and seems to have proceeded from a laudable anxiety in regard to his literary reputation. It is not exactly known what were the contents of the manuscripts which were destroyed, but there is every reason to believe that they consisted in part of the lectures on rhetoric and belles lettres which he had delivered at Edinburgh in 1748, and of the lectures on natural religion and jurisprudence, which form an important part of the course he had delivered at Glasgow. Of the essays which were left to the care of his friends, six were published a few years after his death by his illustrious executors. Three of them are fragments of a great work, which he at one time intended to write on the principles which lead and direct philosophical inquiries, but which he had long abandoned as far too extensive. The first contains the history of astronomy, which seems to be the most complete of the three; the second contains the history of ancient physics; and the third gives the history of the ancient logics and metaphysics. To these

essays, which are all written upon the plan of his essay on the formation of the languages, are subjoined other three, which treat, 1st, Of the nature of that imitation which takes place in what are called the Imitative Arts. 2d, Of the affinity between certain English and Italian verses; and, 3d, Of the external senses. As to the merits of these essays, the distinguished editors express their hopes "that thereader would find in them that happy connexion, that full and accurate expression, and that clear illustration, which are conspicuous in the rest of the author's works, and that though it is difficult to add much to the great fame he so justly acquired by his other writings, these would be read with satisfaction and pleasure." The library which Dr Smith collected during his life, though small, was valuable. The books were well selected, and he was particularly careful that the bijoux which he admitted into his collection should be in excellent order. Mr Smellie, in his life of Dr Smith says, "The first time I happened to be in his library, observing me looking at the books with some degree of curiosity and perhaps surprise, for most of the volumes were elegantly, and some of them superbly bound, 'You must have remarked,' said he, 'that I am a beau in nothing but my books.'" This valuable library, together with the rest of his property, Dr Smith bequeathed to Mr David Douglas, advocate, his cousin.

We shall close this sketch of Dr Smith's life with a few observations on his habits and private character, extracted from the valuable account of his life and writings given by Professor Dugald Stewart.

"To his private worth, the most certain of all, testimonies may be found in that confidence, respect, and attachment which followed him through all the various relations of life; the serenity and gaiety he enjoyed under the pressure of his growing infirmities, and the warm interest he felt to the last in everything connected with the welfare of his friends, will belong remembered by a small circle, with whom, as long as his strength permitted, he regularly spent an evening in the week; and to whom the recollection of his worth still forms a pleasing though melancholy bond of union.

"The more delicate and characteristic features of his mind it is perhaps impossible so trace. That there were many peculiarities both in his manners and in his intellectual habits was manifest to the most superficial observer; but although, to those who knew him, these peculiarities detracted nothing from the respect which his abilities commanded, and although to his intimate friends they added an inexpressible charm to his conversation, while they displayed in the most interesting light

the artless simplicity of his heart, yet it would require a very skilful pencil to present them to the public. He was certainly not fitted for the general commerce of the world, or for the business of active life. The comprehensive speculations with which he had been occupied from his youth, and the variety of materials which his own invention continually supplied to his thoughts, rendered him habitually inattentive to familiar objects and to common occurrences ; and he frequently exhibited instances of absence which have scarcely been surpassed by the fancy of La Bruyere. Even in company he was apt to be engrossed with his studies ; and appeared, at times, by the motion of his lips, as well as by his looks and gestures, to be in the fervour of composition. I have often, however, been struck, at the distance of years, with his accurate memory of the most trifling particulars, and am inclined to believe, from this and some other circumstances, that he possessed a power, not perhaps uncommon among absent men, of recollecting, in consequence of subsequent efforts of reflection, many occurrences which at the time when they happened did not seem to have sensibly attracted his notice.

“ To the defect now mentioned it was probably owing that he did not fall in easily with the common dialogue of conversation, and that he was somewhat apt to convey his own ideas in the form of a lecture. When he did so, however, it never proceeded from a wish to engross the discourse or to gratify his vanity. His own inclinations disposed him so strongly to enjoy in silence the gaiety of those around him, that his friends were often led to concert little schemes in order to engage him in the discussions most likely to interest him. Nor do I think I shall be accused of going too far when I say that he was scarcely ever known to start a new topic himself, or to appear unprepared upon those topics that were introduced by others ; indeed his conversation was never more amusing than when he gave a loose to his genius upon the very few branches of knowledge of which he only possessed the outlines.

“ The opinions he formed of men, upon a slight acquaintance, were frequently erroneous ; but the tendency of his nature inclined him much more to blind partiality than to ill-founded prejudices. The enlarged views of human affairs on which his mind habitually dwelt, left him neither time nor inclination to study in detail the uninteresting peculiarities of ordinary characters, and accordingly, though intimately acquainted with the capacities of the intellect and the working of the heart, and accustomed in his theories to mark with the most delicate hand the nicest shades both of genius and of the

passions ; yet, in judging of individuals, it sometimes happened that his estimates were in a surprising degree wide of the truth.

“The opinions to which, in the thoughtlessness and confidence of his social hours, he was accustomed to hazard on books and on questions of speculation, were not uniformly such as might have been expected from the superiority of his understanding and the singular consistency of his philosophical principles. They were liable to be influenced by accidental circumstances and by the humour of the moment ; and when retailed by those who only saw him occasionally, suggested false and contradictory ideas of his real sentiments. On these, however, as on most other occasions, there was always much truth, as well as ingenuity, in his remarks ; and if the different opinions which at different times he pronounced upon the same subject had been all combined together, so as to modify and limit each other, they would probably have afforded materials for a decision equally comprehensive and just. But, in the society of his friends, he had no disposition to form those qualified conclusions that we admire in his writings ; and he generally contented himself with a bold and masterly sketch of the object from the first point of view in which his temper or his fancy presented it. Something of the same kind might be remarked when he attempted, in the flow of his spirits, to delineate those characters which, from long intimacy, he might have been disposed to understand thoroughly. The picture was always lively and expressive, and commonly bore a strong and amusing resemblance to the original, when viewed under one particular aspect ; but seldom, perhaps, conveyed a just and complete conception of it in all its dimensions and proportions. In a word, it was a fault of his unpremeditated judgment to be systematical and too much in extremes.

“But, in whatever way these trifling peculiarities in his manners may be explained, there can be no doubt that they were intimately connected with the genuine artlessness of his mind. In this amiable quality he often recalled to his friends the accounts that are given of good La Fontaine, a quality which in him derived a peculiar grace from the singularities of its combination with those powers of reason and of eloquence which in his political and moral writings have long engaged the admiration of Europe.

“In his external form and appearance there was nothing uncommon. When perfectly at ease, and when warmed with conversation, his gestures were animated, and not ungraceful ; and, in the society of those he loved, his features were often brightened with a smile of inexpressible benignity. In the

company of strangers his tendency to absence, and perhaps, still more, his consciousness of this tendency, rendered his manner somewhat embarrassed—an effect which was probably not a little heightened by those speculative ideas of propriety which his recluse habits tended at once to perfect in his conception and to diminish his power of realizing. He never sat for his picture; but the medallion of Tassie conveys an exact idea of his profile, and of the general expression of his countenance.”

Of the many commentaries on *The Wealth of Nations*, that by Mr J. R. Macculloch is the most elaborate and the best known. But it is doubtful if any commentator has simplified the perspicuity or widened the comprehensiveness of the original. Mr Macculloch has contributed an historical sketch of political economy as an introduction to Adam Smith's work, and has added a useful index. He has also appended notes, which occasionally extend the ideas expressed in the text. But his notes have the demerit of attempting to correct Adam Smith where he is not in error. On the principles which govern rent—following an ingenious but mystic theory, propounded, while Adam Smith was alive, by Dr James Anderson of Scotland, and amplified and rendered more mysterious by the mathematical speculations of a far more eminent author, David Ricardo—Mr Macculloch charges the practical simplicity of the *Wealth of Nations* with error, and leaves the student of that work, who knows the simple causes which practically regulate rent, to look on in wonder at the learned and laboured mystery.

It is no part of our purpose in this biographic history to enter the lists of controversy. We only select those personages to people our pages who have contributed to the development of principles about which the great majority of mankind (at least British mankind) are now agreed. The questions raised by Mr Macculloch's corrective commentaries on *The Wealth of Nations* must be an exception. David Ricardo stands so high as a philosopher in economical science, on most subjects treated by him, as to be separated from Adam Smith, in point of merit and world-wide service, by no other author except Colonel Perronet Thompson. For which high service it would be to the dignity of these pages to assign to Mr Ricardo a distinguished and liberal place among those contemporaries who surrounded him some thirty or forty years after the death of the author of *The Wealth of Nations*. But as it would be then necessary to guard the economist student against the rent theory, it is better to strip that theory of its errors here while we have Adam Smith immediately before

our eyes, and Dr James Anderson at no great distance behind us. Around Mr Macculloch's commentary on *The Wealth of Nations* let us assemble them.

SECT. II.—DR JAMES ANDERSON.

It seems probable that this writer produced his theory (that which has been since amplified into *the theory*) of rent in an attempt to propound a system of corn-laws to be peculiarly the corn-laws of Scotland. Holding him to have been unsound on corn-laws and on rent, it may be asked, Why place him here? His title to a place here consists in this, that he was a practical writer on agriculture, on trade, and the principles of economy, sometimes right, though as often wrong; and that his opinions, both the right and the wrong, have had followers. It is no small distinction to some of his errors that they have been followed by such writers as Ricardo and Macculloch, and their followers.

James Anderson was born about the year 1739, at the village of Hermiston, six miles from Edinburgh, of parents who succeeded their forefathers for several generations in cultivating the same land. They were a family of respectable farmers, and their son may be said to have inhaled with his first breath that spirit of agricultural knowledge for which he became so distinguished. Having been deprived of both his parents while yet very young, it was the wish of his guardian that he should occupy the paternal farm when old enough to undertake such a charge; and as much learning was not thought necessary for a farmer, he was discouraged by his friends from prosecuting his studies beyond a common school education; but that decision and firmness which were throughout his life the most conspicuous features of his character, now began to appear, and he displayed a resolution to judge and act for himself.

He informs us that, having read Home's Essay on Agriculture, and finding that he could not understand the reasoning for want of chemical knowledge, he immediately resolved to attend Cullen's lectures on that science. Being very young, and unaided by the countenance of any friend who could give him advice or introduce him to the world, he waited on Dr Cullen, and explained his views and intentions. The Doctor, considering it as a boyish whim which might lead him away from his necessary pursuits, at first endeavoured to dissuade him from the undertaking; but finding that he had fully reflected on the subject, and adopted his resolution with a fixed determination to persevere in it, he assented to the design;

and as the penetration of that celebrated man soon discovered the capacity and steadiness of his young pupil's mind, he not only encouraged his present object, but became his sincere friend, and carefully directed his future studies. Among the first things he did upon his farm was to introduce for the first time the small two-horse plough, now in universal use over the greater part of Scotland. After having occupied Hermiston for a few years, he quitted it as a place that did not possess a sufficient field for his enterprising mind, and took a long lease of a large farm in the wilds of Aberdeenshire, consisting of about 1300 acres of land almost in a state of nature. This vast undertaking was entered upon before he was of age, the execution of the lease having been deferred till that period arrived. In the midst of the difficulties he had to contend with in bringing this tract into cultivation, which were very great—arising chiefly from the badness or total want of roads, the remote distance from markets, and the precariousness of the climate—he began his career as an author with his essays on planting, &c. first printed in the year 1771, in the "*Edinburgh Weekly Magazine*," under the signature of Agricola, and again published separately in 1777. The first edition of his essays on agriculture, observations on national industry, and several others of his early writings, were composed during a residence of more than twenty years at Monkshill, the name of the above-mentioned farm. In the year 1780, the honorary degrees of A.M. and LL.D. were conferred upon him by the University of Aberdeen.

In 1783, having previously arranged matters for the conducting of his farm, he removed to the neighbourhood of Edinburgh, principally with a view to the education of his increasing family, and influenced, no doubt, by a desire to live where he could enjoy more of literary society than was to be had in so remote a part of the country. Previous to his departure from Aberdeenshire, he was actively employed in promoting measures for alleviating the distresses of the poorer classes in that country, owing to the failure of the crops in 1782. About the same year he printed and circulated among his friends a proposal for establishing the Northern British Fisheries. This tract was never published, but the attention of the government being drawn to the subject by it, he was applied to by the treasury to undertake a survey of the western coasts of Scotland, for the purpose of obtaining information on this important subject. This public-spirited inquiry he undertook and accomplished in 1784, having a revenue cutter to convey him round the coast.

We next find him engaged in preparing for the publication

of the "Bee." This was a project he had long contemplated, namely, a weekly periodical work, designed for the dissemination of useful knowledge, which by its cheapness should be calculated for all ranks of people, while sufficient attention was paid to its various literary departments to render it acceptable in the highest circles.

His name was now so highly established, that the encouragement given by the public to this performance was wonderful, and nothing but great mismanagement in conducting the commercial part of the work could have caused it to fail in being a very profitable concern to him. His own writings form a conspicuous part of this book, under the names of Senex, Timothy Hairbrain, Alcibiades, and the greater part of the matter without signature

Having removed to the vicinity of London about the year 1797, he once more engaged in the service of the public, and produced, in April 1799, the first number of his "Recreations," a miscellaneous monthly publication, having for its principal objects agriculture and natural history. Although the work contains a number of communications from others, yet the greater part of it is written by himself. It met with the greatest encouragement from the public; but complaining of the irregularity of his printers and booksellers as being intolerable, he dropt it at the end of the sixth volume. The thirty-seventh number of his "Recreations" is his last publication, in March 1802, after which he consigned himself to quiet retirement, at a time when he foresaw the decline of his own powers approaching; these were hastened to decay by being overworked. He died on the 15th October 1808.

As a practical farmer, it is acknowledged by all who knew him that he not only understood how to turn the modes of culture usually followed by others to the greatest advantage, by judiciously selecting and applying them according to the circumstances of the case, but also that he had powerful resources within his own mind in the invention of new practices, many of which, and of those followed in distant countries, he introduced with the greatest success. Failings of a nature which too often accompany genius, however, deprived him of most of the benefits of his labours. He was deficient in that plodding perseverance which was necessary to mature the works he had begun; and he often neglected one object to adopt another. But, above all, his utter negligence of pecuniary matters brought him into difficulties which embittered the best of his days. In his younger days he was handsome in his person, of middle stature, and robust constitution. Extremely moderate in his living, the country exercise anima-

ted his countenance with the glow of health ; but the overstrained exertion of his mental powers afterwards impaired his health, ultimately wasted his faculties, and brought on premature old age.

Dr Anderson was the author of several articles for the "Encyclopedia Britannica." He contributed numerous essays, under a variety of signatures, in the early part of the "Edinburgh Weekly Magazine," the principal of which were, Agricola ; Timoleon ; Germanicus ; Simon ; Scoto-Britannus ; E. Aberdeen ; Henry Plain ; Impartial ; A Scot. He also reviewed the subject of agriculture for the "Monthly Review," for several years.

In his *Inquiry into the Nature of the Corn-laws*, published in Edinburgh in 1777, he descants on rent, as we see in the next section.

SECT. III.—ANDERSON'S THEORY OF RENT.

"I foresee here a popular objection : It will be said that the price to the farmer is so high only on account of the high rents and avaricious extortions of the proprietors. 'Lower,' say they, 'your rents, and the farmer will be able to afford his grain cheaper to the consumer.' But if the avarice alone of the proprietors was the cause of the dearth of corn, whence comes it, I may ask, that the price of grain is always higher on the west than on the east coast of Scotland ? Are the proprietors in the Lothians more tender-hearted and less avaricious than those of Clydesdale ? The truth is, nothing can be more groundless than these clamours against men of landed property. There is no doubt that they, as well as every other class of men, will be willing to augment their revenue, as much as they can, and therefore will always accept of as high a rent for their land as is offered to them. Would merchants or manufacturers do otherwise ? Would either the one or the other of these refuse, for the goods he offers to sale in a fair open way, as high a price as the purchaser is inclined to give ? If they would not, it is surely with a bad grace that they blame gentlemen for accepting such a rent for their land as farmers, who are supposed always to understand the value of it, shall choose to offer them.

"It is not, however, the rent of the land that determines the price of its produce, but it is the price of that produce which determines the rent of the land, although the price of that produce is often highest in those countries where the rent of land is lowest. This seems to be a paradox that deserves to be explained.

“ In every country there is a variety of soils, differing considerably from one another in point of fertility. These we shall at present suppose arranged into different classes, which we shall denote by the letters A, B, C, D, E, F, &c., the class A comprehending the soils of the greatest fertility, and the other letters expressing different classes of soils, gradually decreasing in fertility as you recede from the first. Now, as the expense of cultivating the least fertile soil is as great or greater than that of the most fertile field, it necessarily follows that, if an equal quantity of corn, the produce of each field, can be sold at the same price, the profit on cultivating the most fertile soil must be much greater than that of cultivating the others; and as this continues to decrease as the sterility increases, it must at length happen that the expense of cultivating some of the inferior classes will equal the value of the whole produce.

“ This being premised, let us suppose that the class F includes all those fields whose produce in oatmeal, if sold at 14s. per boll, would be just sufficient to pay the expense of cultivating them, without affording any rent at all; that the class E comprehended those fields whose produce, if sold at 13s. per boll, would free the charges without affording any rent; and that, in like manner, the classes D, C, B, and A, consisted of fields whose produce, if sold respectively at 12s., 11s., 10s., and 9s. per boll, would exactly pay the charge of culture without any rent.

“ Let us now suppose that all the inhabitants of the country where such fields are placed could be sustained by the produce of the first four classes, viz. A, B, C, and D. It is plain that if the average selling price of oatmeal in that country was 12s. per boll, those who possessed the fields D could just afford to cultivate them without paying any rent at all; so that if there were no other produce of the fields that could be reared at a smaller expense than corn, the farmer could afford no rent whatever to the proprietor for them; and if so, no rents could be afforded for the fields E and F, nor could the utmost avarice of the proprietor in this case extort a rent for them. In these circumstances, however, it is obvious that the farmer who possessed the fields in the class C could pay the expense of cultivating them, and also afford to the proprietor a rent equal to 1s. for every boll of their produce; and, in like manner, the possessors of the fields B and A could afford a rent equal to 2s. or 3s. per boll of their produce respectively. Nor would the proprietors of these fields find any difficulty in obtaining these rents; because farmers, finding they could live equally well upon such soils, though pay-

ing these rents, as they could do upon the field D, without any rent at all, would be equally willing to take the one as the other.

“ But let us again suppose that the whole produce of the fields A, B, C, and D, was *not* sufficient to maintain the whole of the inhabitants. If the average selling price should continue at 12s. per boll, as none of the fields E or F could admit of being cultivated, the inhabitants would be under the necessity of bringing grain from some other country to supply their wants; but if it should be found that grain could not be brought from that other country, at an average, under 13s. per boll, the price in the home market would rise to that rate, so that the fields E could then be brought into culture, and those of the class D could afford a rent to the proprietor equal to what was formerly yielded by C, and so on of others, the rents of every class rising in the same proportion. If these fields were sufficient to maintain the whole of the inhabitants, the price would remain permanently at 13s.; but if there was still a deficiency, and if that could not be made up for less than 14s. per boll, the price would rise in the market to that rate, in which case the fields F might also be brought into culture, and the rents of all the others would rise in proportion.

“ To apply this reasoning to the present case, it appears that the people in the Lothians can be maintained by the produce of the fields A, B, C, D, and E, but the inhabitants of Clydesdale require also the produce of the fields F; so that the one is under the necessity of giving, at an average, 1s. per boll more for meal than the other.

“ Let us now suppose that the gentlemen of Clydesdale, from an extraordinary exertion of patriotism, and an inordinate desire to encourage manufactures, should resolve to lower their rents so as to demand nothing from those who possessed the fields E, as well as those of the class F, and should allow the rents of all the others to sink in proportion; would the prices of grain fall in consequence of this? By no means. The inhabitants are still in need of the whole produce of the fields F as before, and are under the necessity of paying the farmer of these fields such a price as to enable him to cultivate them. He must, therefore, still receive 14s. per boll as formerly; and as the grain from the fields E, D, C, B, and A, is at least equally good, the occupiers of each of these fields would receive the same price for their produce. The only consequence, then, that would result from this Quixotic scheme, would be the enriching one class of farmers at the expense of their proprietors, without producing the smallest benefit to the consumers of grain—perhaps the reverse, as the industry of these farmers might be slackened by this measure.”

SECT. IV.—RICARDO AND MACCULLOCH'S THEORY OF RENT.

“On the first settling of a country, in which there is an abundance of rich and fertile land, a very small proportion of which is required to be cultivated for the support of the actual population, or indeed can be cultivated with the capital which the population can command, there will be no rent; for no one would pay for the use of land when there was an abundant quantity not yet appropriated, and, therefore, at the disposal of whosoever might choose to cultivate it.

“On the common principles of supply and demand, no rent could be paid for such land, for the reason stated why nothing is given for the use of air and water, or for any other of the gifts of nature which exist in boundless quantity. With a given quantity of materials, and with the assistance of the pressure of the atmosphere, and the elasticity of steam, engines may perform work, and abridge human labour to a very great extent; but no charge is made for the use of these natural aids, because they are inexhaustible, and at every man's disposal. In the same manner, the brewer, the distiller, the dyer, make incessant use of the air and water for the production of their commodities; but as the supply is boundless, they bear no price. If all land had the same properties, if it were unlimited in quantity and uniform in quality, no charge could be made for its use, unless where it possessed peculiar advantages of situation. It is only, then, because land is not unlimited 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 is ever paid for the use of it. When, in the progress of society, land of the second degree of fertility is taken into cultivation, rent immediately commences on that of the first quality, and the amount of that rent will depend on the difference in the quality of these two portions of land.

“When land of the third quality is taken into cultivation, rent immediately commences on the second, and it is regulated as before, by the difference in their productive powers. At the same time, the rent of the first quality will rise, for that must always be above the rent of the second, by the difference between the produce which they yield with a given quantity of capital and labour. With every step in the progress of population, which shall oblige a country to have recourse to land of a worse quality, to enable it to raise its supply of food, rent, on all the more fertile land, will rise.

“Thus, suppose land Nos. 1, 2, 3, to yield, with an equal

employment of capital and labour, a net produce of 100, 90, and 80 quarters of corn. In a new country, where there is an abundance of fertile land compared with the population, and where therefore it is only necessary to cultivate No. 1, the whole net produce will belong to the cultivator, and will be the profits of the stock which he advances. As soon as population had so far increased 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; for either there must be two rates of profit on agricultural capital, or ten quarters, or the value of ten quarters, must be withdrawn from the produce of No. 1 for some other purpose. Whether the proprietor of the land, or any other person, cultivated No. 1, these ten quarters would equally constitute rent; for the cultivator of No. 2 would get the same result with his capital, whether he cultivated No. 1, paying ten quarters for rent, or continued to cultivate No. 2, paying no rent. In the same manner it might be shewn that when No. 3 is brought into cultivation, the rent of No. 2 must be ten quarters, or the value of ten quarters, whilst the rent No. 1 would rise to twenty quarters; for the cultivator of No. 3 would have the same profits, whether he paid twenty quarters for the rent of No. 1, ten quarters for the rent of No. 2, or cultivated No. 3 free of all rent.

"It often, and, indeed, commonly happens, that before Nos. 2, 3, 4, or 5, or the inferior lands, are cultivated, capital can be employed more productively on those lands which are already in cultivation. It may perhaps be found that, by doubling the original capital employed on No. 1, though the production will not be doubled, will not be increased by 100 quarters, it may be increased by eighty-five quarters, and that this quantity exceeds what could be obtained by employing the same capital on land No. 3.

"In such case capital will be preferably employed on the old land, and will equally create a rent; for rent is always the difference between the produce obtained by the employment of two equal quantities of capital and labour. If with a capital of L.1000 a tenant obtain 100 quarters of wheat from his land, and by the employment of a second capital of L.1000 he obtain a further return of eighty-five, his landlord would have the power, at the expiration of his lease, of obliging him to pay fifteen quarters, or an equivalent value for additional rent; for there cannot be two rates of profit. If he is satisfied with a diminution of fifteen quarters in the return for his second L.1000, it is because no employment more profitable can be found for it. The common rate of profit would be in

that proportion, and if the original tenant refused, some other person would be found willing to give all which exceeded that rate of profit to the owner of the land from which he derived it.

“ In this case, as well as in the other, the capital last employed pays no rent. For the greater productive powers of the first L.1000, fifteen quarters are paid for rent; for the employment of the second L.1000 no rent whatever is paid. If a third L.1000 be employed on the same land, with a return of seventy-five quarters, rent will then be paid for the second L.1000, and will be equal to the difference between the produce of these two or ten quarters; and at the same time the rent of the first L.1000 will rise from fifteen to twenty-five quarters; while the last L.1000 will pay no rent whatever.

“ If, then, good land existed in a quantity much more abundant than the production of food for an increasing population required, or if capital could be indefinitely employed without a diminished return on the old land, there could be no rise of rent; for rent invariably proceeds from the employment of an additional quantity of labour with a proportionally less return.

“ The most fertile and most favourably situated land will be first cultivated, and the exchangeable value of its produce will be adjusted in the same manner as the exchangeable value of all other commodities, by the total quantity of labour necessary in various forms, from first to last, to produce it and bring it to market. When land of an inferior quality is taken into cultivation, the exchangeable value of raw produce will rise, because more labour is required to produce it.

“ The exchangeable value of all commodities, whether they be manufactured, or the produce of the mines, or the produce of land, is always regulated, not by the less quantity of labour that will suffice for their production under circumstances highly favourable, and exclusively enjoyed by those who have peculiar facilities of production; but by the greater quantity of labour necessarily bestowed on their production by those who have no such facilities; by those who continue to produce them under the most unfavourable circumstances; meaning, by the most unfavourable circumstances, the most unfavourable under which the quantity of produce required renders it necessary to carry on the production.

“ Thus, in a charitable institution, where the poor are set to work with the funds of benefactors, the general prices of the commodities, which are the produce of such work, will not be governed by the peculiar facilities afforded to these workmen, but by the common, usual, and natural difficulties, which every other manufacturer will have to encounter. The

manufacturer enjoying none of these facilities might, indeed, be driven altogether from the market, if the supply afforded by these favoured workmen were equal to all the wants of the community; but, if he continued the trade, it would be only on condition that he should derive from it the usual and general rate of profits on stock; and that could only happen when his commodity sold for a price proportioned to the quantity of labour bestowed on its production.

“It is true that, on the best land the same produce would still be obtained with the same labour as before, but its value would be enhanced in consequence of the diminished returns obtained by those who employed fresh labour and stock on the less fertile land. Notwithstanding, then, that the advantages of fertile over inferior lands are in no case lost, but only transferred from the cultivator or consumer to the landlord, yet, since more labour is required on the inferior lands, and since it is from such land only that we are enabled to furnish ourselves with the additional supply of raw produce, the comparative value of that produce will continue permanently above its former level, and make it exchange for more hats, cloth, shoes, &c., &c., in the production of which no such additional quantity of labour is required.

“The reason then, why raw produce rises in comparative value, is because more labour is employed in the production of the last portion obtained, and not because a rent is paid to the landlord. The value of corn is regulated by the quantity of labour bestowed on its production on 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; and it has been justly observed that no reduction would take place in the price of corn, although landlords should forego the whole of their rent. Such a measure would only enable some farmers to live like gentlemen, but would not diminish the quantity of labour necessary to raise raw produce on the least productive land in cultivation.

“Nothing is more common than to hear of the advantages which the land possesses over every other source of useful produce, on account of the surplus which it yields in the form of rent. Yet when land is most abundant, when most productive, and most fertile, it yields no rent; and it is only when its powers decay, and less is yielded in return for labour, that a share of the original produce of the more fertile portions is set apart for rent. It is singular that this quality in the land, which should have been noticed as an imperfection, compared with the natural agents by which manufacturers are assisted, should have been pointed out as constituting its peculiar pre-eminence. If air, water, the elasticity of steam,

and the pressure of the atmosphere, were of various qualities if they could be appropriated, and each quality existed only in moderate abundance, they, as well as the land, would afford a rent, as the successive qualities were brought into use. With every worse quality employed, the value of the commodities in the manufacture of which they were used would rise, because equal quantities of labour would be less productive. Man would do more by the sweat of his brow, and nature perform less; and the land would be no longer pre-eminent for its limited powers.

“If the surplus produce which land affords in the form of rent be an advantage, it is desirable that, every year, the machinery newly constructed should be less efficient than the old, as that would undoubtedly give a greater exchangeable value to the goods manufactured, not only by that machinery, but by all the other machinery in the kingdom; and a rent would be paid to all those who possessed the most productive machinery.

“The rise of rent is always the effect of the increasing wealth of the country, and of the difficulty of providing food for its augmented population. It is a symptom, but it is never a cause, of wealth; for wealth often increases most rapidly while rent is either stationary or even falling. Rent increases most rapidly as the disposable land decreases in its productive powers. Wealth increases most rapidly in those countries where the disposable land is most fertile, where importation is least restricted, and where, through agricultural improvements, productions can be multiplied without any increase in the proportional quantity of labour, and where consequently the progress of rent is slow.

“If the high price of corn were the effect and not the cause of rent, prices would be proportionally influenced as rents were high or low, and rent would be a component part of price. But that corn which is produced by the greatest quantity of labour is the regulator of the price of corn; and rent does not and cannot enter in the least degree as a component part of its price. Adam Smith, therefore, cannot be correct in supposing that the original rule which regulated the exchangeable value of commodities, namely, the comparative quantity of labour by which they were produced, can be at all altered by the appropriation of land and the payment of rent. Raw material enters into the composition of most commodities, but the value of that raw material, as well as corn, is regulated by the productiveness of the portion of capital last employed on the land, and paying no rent; and

therefore, rent is not a component part of the price of commodities.

“We have been hitherto considering the effects of the natural progress of wealth and population on rent, in a country in which the land is of variously productive powers; and we have seen that, with every portion of additional capital which it becomes necessary to employ on the land with a less productive return, rent would rise. It follows, from the same principles, that any circumstances in society which should make it unnecessary to employ the same amount of capital on the land, and which should therefore make the portion last employed more productive, would lower rent. Any great reduction in the capital of a country, which should materially diminish the funds destined for the maintenance of labour, would naturally have this effect. Population regulates itself by the funds which are to employ it, and therefore always increases or diminishes with the increase or diminution of capital. Every reduction of capital is therefore necessarily followed by a less effective demand for corn, by a fall of price, and by diminished cultivation. In the reverse order to that in which the accumulation of capital raises rent will the diminution of it lower rent. Land of a less unproductive quality will be in succession relinquished, the exchangeable value of produce will fall, and land of a superior quality will be the land last cultivated, and that which will then pay no rent.

“The same effects may, however, be produced when the wealth and population of a country are increased, if that increase is accompanied by such marked improvements in agriculture as shall have the same effect of diminishing the necessity of cultivating the poorer lands, or of expending the same amount of capital on the cultivation of the more fertile portions.

“If a million of quarters of corn be necessary for the support of a given population, and if it be raised on land of the qualities of Nos. 1, 2, 3; and if an improvement be afterwards discovered by which it can be raised on Nos. 1 and 2, without employing No. 3, it is evident that the immediate effect must be a fall of rent; for No. 2, instead of No. 3, will then be cultivated without paying any rent; and the rent of No. 1, instead of being the difference between the produce of No. 3 and No. 1, will be the difference only between Nos. 2 and 1. With the same population, and no more, there can be no demand for any additional quantity of corn; the capital and labour employed on No. 3 will be de-

voted to the production of other commodities desirable to the community, and can have no effect in raising rent, unless the raw material from which they are made cannot be obtained without employing capital less advantageously on the land, in which case No. 3 must again be cultivated.

"It is undoubtedly true that the fall in the relative price of raw produce, in consequence of the improvement in agriculture, or rather in consequence of less labour being bestowed on its production, would naturally lead to increased accumulation; for the profits of stock would be greatly augmented. This accumulation would lead to an increased demand for labour, to higher wages, to an increased population, to a farther demand for raw produce, and to an increased cultivation. It is only, however, after the increase in the population that rent would be as high as before; that is to say, after No. 3 was taken into cultivation, a considerable period would have elapsed, attended with a positive diminution of rent.

"But improvements in agriculture are of two kinds; those which increase the productive powers of the land and those which enable us, by improving our machinery, to obtain its produce with less labour. They both lead to a fall in the price of raw produce; they both affect rent, but they do not affect it equally. If they did not occasion a fall in the price of raw produce, they would not be improvements; for it is the essential quality of an improvement to diminish the quantity of labour before required to produce a commodity; and this diminution cannot take place without a fall of its price or relative value.

The improvements which increase the productive powers of the land are such as the more skilful rotation of crops or the better choice of manure. These improvements absolutely enable us to obtain the same produce from a smaller quantity of land. If, by the introduction of a course of turnips, I can feed my sheep besides raising my corn, the land on which the sheep were before fed becomes unnecessary, and the same quantity of raw produce is raised by the employment of a less quantity of land. If I discover a manure which will enable me to make a piece of land produce twenty per cent. more corn, I may withdraw at least a portion of my capital from the most unproductive part of my farm. But, as I before observed, it is not necessary that land should be thrown out of cultivation in order to reduce rent; to produce this effect it is sufficient that successive portions of capital are employed on the same land with different results, and that the portion which gives the least result should be withdrawn. If, by the introduction of the turnip husbandry, or by the use of a more invigorating

manure, I can obtain the same produce with less capital, and without disturbing the difference between the productive powers of the successive portions of capital, I shall lower rent; for a different and more productive portion will be that which will form the standard from which every other will be reckoned. If, for example, the successive portions of capital yielded 100, 90, 80, 70, whilst I employed these four portions my rent would be 60, or the difference between

$$\left. \begin{array}{r} 70 \text{ and } 100 = 30 \\ 70 \text{ and } 90 = 20 \\ 70 \text{ and } 80 = 10 \\ \hline 60 \end{array} \right\} \text{whilst the produce would be 340, } \left\{ \begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 90 \\ 80 \\ 70 \\ \hline 340 \end{array} \right.$$

and while I employed these portions, the rent would remain the same, although the produce of each should have an equal augmentation. If, instead of 100, 90, 80, 70, the produce should be increased to 125, 115, 105, 95, the rent would still be 60, or the difference between

$$\left. \begin{array}{r} 95 \text{ and } 125 = 30 \\ 95 \text{ and } 115 = 20 \\ 95 \text{ and } 105 = 10 \\ \hline 60 \end{array} \right\} \text{whilst the produce would be} \left\{ \begin{array}{r} 125 \\ 115 \\ 105 \\ 95 \\ \hline 440 \end{array} \right.$$

increased to 440,

But with such an increase of produce, without an increase of demand, there could be no motive for employing so much capital on the land; one portion would be withdrawn, and consequently the last portion of capital would yield 105 instead of 95, and rent would fall to 30, or the difference between

$$\left. \begin{array}{r} 105 \text{ and } 125 = 20 \\ 105 \text{ and } 115 = 10 \\ \hline 30 \end{array} \right\} \text{whilst the produce will still be adequate} \left\{ \begin{array}{r} 125 \\ 115 \\ 105 \\ \hline 345 \end{array} \right.$$

to the wants of the population, for it
would be 345 quarters, or

the demand being only for 340 quarters. But there are improvements which may lower the relative value of produce without lowering the corn rent, though they will lower the money rent of land. Such improvements do not increase the productive powers of the land; but they enable us to obtain its produce with less labour. They are rather directed to the formation of the capital applied to land than to the cultivation of the land itself. Improvements in agricultural implements, such as the plough and the thrashing machine, economy in the use of horses employed in husbandry, and a better knowledge of the veterinary art, are of this nature.

Less capital, which is the same thing as less labour, will be employed on the land ; but, to obtain the same produce, less land cannot be cultivated. Whether improvements of this kind, however, affect corn rent, must depend on the question, whether the difference between the produce obtained by the employment of different portions of capital be increased, stationary, or diminished. If four portions of capital, 50, 60, 70, 80, be employed on the land, giving each the same results, and any improvement in the formation of such capital should enable me to withdraw 5 from each, so that they should be 45, 55, 65, and 75, no alteration would take place in the corn rent ; but if the improvements were such as to enable me to make the whole saving on that portion of capital which is least productively employed, corn rent would immediately fall, because the difference between the capital most productive and the capital least productive would be diminished ; and it is this difference which constitutes rent.

“ Without multiplying instances, I hope enough has been said to shew that, whatever diminishes the inequality in the produce obtained from successive portions of capital employed on the same or new land tends to lower rent ; and that whatever increases that inequality necessarily produces an opposite effect, and tends to raise it.

“ In speaking of the rent of the landlord, we have rather considered it as the proportion of the produce obtained with a given capital on any given farm, without any reference to its exchangeable value ; but since the same cause, the difficulty of production, raises the exchangeable value of raw produce, and raises also the proportion of raw produce paid to the landlord for rent, it is obvious that the landlord is doubly benefited by difficulty of production ; first, he obtains a greater share ; and, secondly, the commodity in which he is paid is of greater value.”

As Mr Macculloch adopts the foregoing theory, and delivers it, in his *Notes on the Wealth of Nations*, in language only slightly different from this, we need not lengthen our quotations by inserting his theory here. Some of his points are quoted by Colonel Thompson in the next section.

SECT. V.—ADAM SMITH AND COLONEL PERRONET THOMPSON'S
THEORY OF RENT.

In the *Wealth of Nations*, book i., chapter ii., Smith says—“ Rent, considered as the price paid for the use of land, is naturally the highest which the tenant can afford to pay in the actual circumstances of the land. In adjusting the terms of the lease, the landlord endeavours to leave him no greater

share of the produce than what is sufficient to keep up the stock from which he furnishes the seed, pays the labour, and purchases and maintains the cattle and other instruments of husbandry, together with the ordinary profits of farming stock in the neighbourhood. This is evidently the smallest share with which the tenant can content himself without being a loser, and the landlord seldom means to leave him any more."

In these plain words, brief, and easily understood, we have not only the theory of rent, but its universal practice. It is not a charge of rapacity against the landowners, as Dr Anderson treats it, to say that they take all the profits of the land which the tenants can afford to pay as rent. It is the same with the shopkeepers, the manufacturers, and the merchants, in regard of prices, as with the landowners and their rents; and the same with the houseowners and their rents.

It is no more necessary that there should be different qualities of land to constitute rent per acre, than that there should be different qualities of cloth to constitute price per yard. The best land is not rented the highest, if it be situated disadvantageously for markets. It is not true, as Mr Ricardo and Mr Maculloch allege, that in newly settled countries the best land is all occupied first, and that therefore no rent is paid until land of the second quality is occupied. The first colonists in a new country plant themselves beside some natural harbour, natural fortress, and, if possible, naturally good land. They are bound by forests and the want of roads, or by some other obstacle, and impelled by convenience, to occupy land of *all qualities*, where they first settle, before going farther into the wilderness to reclaim.

Mr Ricardo says, "Rent is that portion of the produce of the earth which is paid to the landlord for the use of the indestructible powers of the soil," and not for the buildings, he proceeds to say, nor the drainage, nor other improvements.

Mr Maculloch says, "The rent of land properly so called, is the sums paid for the *natural and inherent powers of the soil*, and is entirely distinct from the sums paid for buildings, roads, fences, or other improvements effected upon it. The latter is plainly the profit on, or return for, the capital laid out on the land. Practically these sums are uniformly almost confounded, as they have been in this instance by Dr Smith, under the general term rent. But they are essentially distinct; and should be so considered in every inquiry of this sort."

They are as distinct as the cost of the wool or the cotton is from the price of the blanket or the calico. It is necessary in

all inquiries into the natural and acquired value of any commodity, to observe what part is the price of raw material, what the price of labour, what the fair return for capital invested, and what the excess or deficit of profit arising from full demand and deficient supply, or from deficient demand and over-supply. But care must be taken not to assert fallacies as facts. The greatest conflict of principles in modern times has been the conflict of the Free Trade with the monopolist principle. The monopolist principle had its stronghold in the corn-laws. The corn-laws were defended on the ground that the lowest quality of land then in cultivation would be discultured if the trade in corn became free; and if the lowest quality of land was discultured, the rent of all other lands would be reduced in amount. This allegation was chiefly founded on the rent theory of Anderson, which is amplified as we have seen by Ricardo and adopted by Macculloch. The monopolists having authors of such high reputation as political economists to appeal to, were proportionately formidable to the Free Traders. A theory more visionary and unrelated to practice never was propounded. Seldom has there been one on economical subjects so mischievous.

Colonel Thompson, in reviewing Mr Macculloch's corrections of Adam Smith, says, in vindication of Smith and correction of Macculloch, "Rent is *not* a consequence of the decreasing productiveness of the soils successively brought into cultivation. It exists in Egypt, where a man may stand with one foot in the rich arable soil, and the other in the dominions of Typhon, as some have construed him, or sand; and it clearly would exist in the island in the South Sea, if such there were, where every inch of soil, down to the sea beach, should be of the same uniform quality as a citizen's cabbage garden at Peckham, *from the moment the population began to press against the produce.* 'It is never heard of in newly settled countries—in New Holland, Illinois, or Indiana, or in any country where none but the best of the good soils are cultivated;' (*Macculloch.*) Nor would it be heard of in the South Sea island, while the land was newly settled, or, *till the population began to press against the produce.* If there be inferior land in existence, then, as population begins to press, this inferior land will successively be taken into cultivation, in the South Sea island, or anywhere else. But why will this particular school of political economists persist in mystifying their fellow creatures, by putting the cart before the horse, and declaring to be the general cause what is only an accidental consequence, arising out of foreign circumstances, which may exist or may not? Could the art of man have invented a more likely

way to go wrong? They admit that there is high rent because prices are high; but what makes prices high? Answer; because there is inferior land; for they say there would be no rent unless the lands 'under cultivation be of different powers,' and, 'unless inferior lands are taken into tillage;' *Ergo*, the existence of inferior lands is the cause of rent; also rent, they say, is not the cause but the effect of high prices; *Ergo*, the existence of inferior land must cause rent by previously causing high prices—there is no other way of piecing the two into a whole. If, then, the inferior land were sunk into the sea, would there cease to be high prices? According to their reasoning there ought. Yet it will be very difficult to persuade the world that prices would not be *higher* from such a circumstance, or that the effect of the rise upon the lucky owners of the good land left would not be to raise their rents."—(*Westminster Review*, 1st October 1832.)

SECT. VI.—GRANVILLE SHARP.

In the slave nations of olden times; in the serfdom days of England; in the nations whose industry is still the work of the bondman, commerce, as a wealth-giving, man-elevating institution, never existed and cannot exist: commerce shrinks from the foul bargain of man's flesh, and languishes in those lands, be they ever so fertile, ever so favoured for trade by nature, where the moral pestilence of slavery consumes human energies. We cannot in the moderate compass of this history of the emancipation of trade render full homage, nor perform full biographic service, to all the emancipators of men. Yet to omit them would be to leave biographic blanks, which duty to the pioneers of personal and commercial freedom does not permit us to pass over. In the spirit of that dutiful homage, let us write the name and life of Granville Sharp, who at his own cost laid an adamant stone in the British constitution, in its lowest foundation, to remain for ever, and reared upon it one of the noblest dignities of the British nation, to last through all time in the eyes of all the world; who at his own cost established by law the legal axiom that "the moment the foot of a slave touches the soil of Britain that slave is a free man." The opponents and subduers of the most damnable of monopolies—the man-monopoly—cannot be passed over.

Granville Sharp was born at Durham on the 21st of November 1735. He was the ninth son of Dr Thomas Sharp, and grandson of Archbishop Sharp. In the spring of the year 1750 he left Durham, and in May was bound apprentice in London to a linen-draper. At the expiration of his appren-

ticeship he quitted his situation, and engaged himself in the service of another linen factory, which he had reason to suppose established on a large foundation; but finding the concern far more contracted than he had imagined, he soon relinquished his engagement.

In this period he made his first advances in learning. A series of controversies with an inmate of his master's house, who happened to be a Unitarian, first exited him to the study of the Greek tongue. They disputed concerning the Trinity and the atonement of Christ; on these topics the Unitarian declared that Granville was mistaken in the opinions which he uttered, and that his misconception arose from his want of acquaintance with the Greek language, "in which," he asserted, "the subjects of their dispute did not suffer the interpretation which he put on them, and he therefore referred him to the New Testament in its original text." He learned Hebrew nearly at the same time, and from a cause exactly similar. A Jew, who appears to have resided also in his master's house, frequently contested with him the truths of the Christian religion, and, when hard pressed by his earnest reasonings, constantly declared that he misinterpreted the prophecies from ignorance of the language in which they were written; referring him to the Hebrew Bible, in the same manner as the Unitarian had done to the Greek Testament.

In 1765 his attention was first directed towards slavery. Pain and disease, the consequence of severe blows and hardships, led a miserable sufferer named Strong to seek the aid of Mr William Sharp, Granville's brother; and it was in one of his morning visits to the surgery in Mincing Lane that he was met by Granville, as he approached the door of the house, ready to faint through extreme weakness. On inquiry it was found that he had been a slave of Mr David Lisle, a lawyer of Barbadoes, whose barbarous treatment had by degrees reduced him to a state of weakness, and who had then turned him adrift in the streets. This happened in 1765. By the united care of the two brothers, into whose hands Strong had providentially fallen, he was restored to health, and placed in the service of a respectable apothecary in Fenchurch Street. In this comfortable situation he remained for two years, when, as he was one day attending his mistress behind a hackney coach, he was seen, and quickly recognised, by the lawyer to whom he had been a slave; and who, conceiving from his appearance that he must have regained his strength sufficiently for useful labour, formed a design to recover possession of him. He followed the coach for the means of obtaining intelligence of his abode, and laid a plan to entrap him.

"Some days afterwards, he (David Lisle) employed two of the Lord Mayor's officers to attend him to a public house, from whence he sent a messenger to acquaint Jonathan Strong that a person wanted to speak with him. Jonathan of course came, and was shocked to find that it was his old master who had sent for him, and who now immediately delivered him into the custody of the two officers. Jonathan, however, sent for his present master, Mr Brown, who likewise came, but being violently threatened by the lawyer, on a charge of having detained *his property*—as he called Strong—he was intimidated, and left him in Lisle's hands. After this Mr Sharp received a letter from the Poultry Compter, signed Jonathan Strong, a name which he did not at first recollect; he sent, however, a messenger to the compter to inquire about him, but the keeper denied that he had any such person committed to his charge." This refusal was sufficient to rouse the suspicion and call forth the active benevolence of Mr Sharp. He went himself to the compter, inquired for the master of the prison, and insisted on seeing Jonathan Strong. He was then called, and was immediately recollected by Granville Sharp, who charged the master of the prison, at his own peril not to deliver him up to any person whatever who might claim him, until he had been carried before the Lord Mayor—Sir Robert Kite—to whom Granville Sharp immediately went, and gave information that one Jonathan Strong had been confined in prison without any warrant, and requested of his Lordship to summon those persons who had detained him, and to give him notice to attend at the same time. This request was complied with. When the appointed day was come, Sharp attended at the Mansion House, and found Jonathan in presence of the Lord Mayor, and also two persons who claimed him, the one a notary public, who produced a bill of sale from the original master to James Kerr, a Jamaica planter, who had refused to pay the purchase money until the negro should be delivered on board a ship bound to Jamaica, the captain of which vessel, David Lair, was the other person then attending to take him away. The Lord Mayor having heard the claim, said that "the lad had not stolen anything, and was not guilty of any offence, and was therefore at liberty to go away;" whereupon the captain seized him by the arm, and told the Lord Mayor, "he took him as the property of Mr Kerr." Mr Beech, the city coroner, now came behind Sharp and whispered in his ear the words "charge him;" on which Sharp, turning towards the captain, said, "Sir, I charge you for an assault!" On this, Lair quitted his hold of Jonathan's arm, and all came away. A few days after this transaction, Sharp was charged by a

writ, with having robbed the original master, David Lisle, the lawyer, of a negro slave, and also of another slave, &c. &c.

In these charitable exertions Granville appears to have been seconded by his brother James. He alludes to this circumstance, in a letter addressed to the Rev. Dr Muysson, in November 1767, in which he mentions "a law-suit commenced against him and his brother James for having lawfully and openly obtained the liberty of a poor negro before the chief magistrate of the city." But the action at law was not the only weapon employed to alarm him, and to deter him from the prosecution of his humane task. Lisle sought out the negro's *friend* at his brother William's house, and, having announced his name, was admitted. The conversation, on one part at least, was warm; and Lisle, after ineffectual denunciations of revenge in various ways, attempted to intimidate by a challenge. In what manner a defiance of this nature was received by a man of Mr Sharp's character, we learn from his own notes:—"Oct. 1, 1767, David Lisle, Esq., a man of the law, called on me in Mincing Lane, to demand gentleman-like satisfaction, because I had procured the liberty of his slave, Jonathan Strong. I told him that, 'as he had studied the law so many years, he should want no satisfaction that the law could give him.'"

Mr Sharp kept his word faithfully, but in a way little to be expected from a person who, as he himself states, "had never once opened a law book to consult it till on occasion of the present cause." His first step, in order to defend himself from the legal process instituted against him, was to apply to an eminent solicitor in the Lord Mayor's office, and to retain Sir James Eyre, then recorder of the city, and afterward Lord Chief-Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, as his counsel. After some consideration of the case, the solicitor brought him a copy of the iniquitous opinion given in the year 1729, by the attorney and solicitor-general, Yorke and Talbot, that a slave coming from the West Indies to Great Britain or Ireland does not become free, and assured him that they should not be able to defend him against the action, as the Lord Chief-Justice Mansfield was also decidedly of the same opinion.

It appears that he now gave himself up for nearly two years to an intense study of the English laws, on those points particularly which regard the liberty of the person in British subjects. In his difficult task of legal inquiry he had no instructor, no assistant, except his own conscience. During his studies he applied to the celebrated Blackstone, but received little satisfaction from his opinion on the interesting subject in question. He consulted, likewise, several other professional

men of eminence, but could find no one whose opinion was favourable to his undertaking. "Even my own lawyers," he repeats, "were against me." By continued application, however, before the final term when he was to answer the charge against his brother and himself, Granville had added to a thorough investigation of the English laws much extraneous research into those of other nations; and he had compiled in manuscript a tract "On the Injustice and dangerous tendency of tolerating the least claim to private Property in the Persons of Men in England." This tract, when completed, he submitted to the perusal of Blackstone; and then employed his utmost efforts to circulate it, by means of numerous copies, among those on whom he wished to produce a favourable effect. The arguments contained in it were irresistible, and by its success he had the satisfaction of amply fulfilling his promise to his antagonist. "The substance of his tract," he says, "was handed about among the gentlemen of the law, in twenty or more different manuscript copies, for nearly two years, until the lawyers employed against the negro, Jonathan Strong, were intimidated, and the plaintiff was compelled to pay treble costs for not bringing forward the action; after which," he adds, "the tract was printed in 1769."

At length the important case of James Somerset presented itself—a case which is said to have been selected at the mutual desire of Lord Mansfield and Mr Sharp, in order to bring to a final judgment a subject of contest which, from the benevolence of the latter, so frequently occupied, and, from the legal researches and abilities of the former, so much embarrassed, the courts of judicature. Somerset had been brought to England in November 1769, by his master, Charles Stewart, and in process of time left him. Stewart found an opportunity of seizing him unawares; and he was conveyed on board the "*Ann and Mary*," Captain Knowles, in order to be carried to Jamaica, and there to be sold for a slave. The leading counsel was Mr Sergeant Davy, who brought the case into court before Lord Mansfield, on the 24th of January, but professed the cause to be of so high importance, that it might be deferred till another term, in order to give him time to prepare fully for its support. This request Lord Mansfield declined granting, but fixed the hearing for that day fortnight, apprising Sergeant Davy at the same time, that, "if it should come fairly to the general question, whatever the opinion of the court might be, even if they were all agreed on one side or the other, the subject was of so general and extensive concern, that, from the nature of the question, he should certainly take the opinion of all the judges upon it." On the 7th of Febru-

ary the case was again brought before Lord Mansfield, assisted by the three justices, Ashton, Willes, and Ashurst. The cause of liberty was opened by Mr Sergeant Davy, with a vast mass of information on the subject of slavery, prefaced by a declaration of his intention to maintain before the court the proposition, "That no man at this day is or can be a slave in England." Mr Sergeant Glynn followed on the same side, and enforced very powerfully the arguments proposed by the leading counsel. At the conclusion of Mr Sergeant Glynn's speech, Lord Mansfield, after some short questions, added, "This thing seems, by the arguments, probable to go to a great length, and it is the end of the term; so it will hardly be possible to go through it without stopping, therefore, let it stand over to the next term."

On the 9th of May the question was again brought before the court, on the broad and general ground, "Whether a slave, by coming into England, becomes free?" On this second reading, the pleadings in favour of Somerset were resumed by Mr Mansfield, who, in a speech of strong sense and expression, contended that, if the negro Somerset was a man—and he should conclude him one till the court should adjudge otherwise—it was impossible he could be a slave in England, unless by the introduction of some species of property unknown to our constitution. He considered the dispute as between one human creature, the master, and another, the negro, whether the latter should be entitled to the important rights which nature had given him. He was stated by the master to have been a slave in America, but that did not prove him a slave in England, where no such condition of men exists. "From all that can be drawn from the state of Africa or America," said the orator, "the negro may very well answer—'It is true I was a slave, kept as a slave in Africa; I was first put in chains on board a British ship, and carried from Africa to America; I there lived under a master from whose tyranny I could not escape; if I had attempted it I should have exposed myself to the severest punishment; and never, from the first moment of my life to the present time, have I been in a country where I had power to assert the common rights of mankind. I am now in a country where the laws of liberty are known and regarded; and can you tell me the reason why I am not to be protected by those laws, but to be carried away again to be sold?'—To hear a negro state that argument," he continued, "and have it answered, consistently with our laws, seems to me to be impossible; for, on the contrary, he is as fully and clearly entitled to the protection of those laws as every one who now hears me." He concluded by expressing

his conviction that the alteration which had been attempted in the laws of England, by the introduction of a new species of slavery, was so prodigious and important, and would require so many and various regulations, that it would be far beyond the extent of any power that could legally exercise it, except the legislature itself. "But I hope," added he, "such a kind of slavery will never find its way into England; and I apprehend that, by your Lordships' decision, this man will receive his liberty."

At the end of Mr Mansfield's speech it appears that the cause was further adjourned to the 14th of May. The expectation of all parties was now raised to the utmost pitch, when, finally, in Trinity term, on Monday, the 22d of June, "The court proceeded to give judgment in the case of Somerset the negro, then before the court, on the motion of the Habeas Corpus." Lord Mansfield first stated the return, and then spoke to the following purport:—"We pay due attention to the opinions of Sir Philip Yorke and Mr Talbot, taken in the year 1729, whereby they pledge themselves to the West India planters for the legal consequences of slaves coming here, or being baptized. This opinion was solemnly recognised by Lord Hardwicke, sitting as chancellor, June 9, 1749, to this effect—'That there had been a prevailing opinion in the colonies that baptism was an emancipation of a negro slave, and that, in consequence of coming here, such slave became free; but he was satisfied there was no ground for the opinion; and he and Lord Talbot had so expressed themselves upon a cause referred to them for their opinions, when attorney-general and solicitor-general. They had given it all the consideration that the subject could require, and he was satisfied that neither baptism nor coming to England made any alteration in the temporal state of the slave;—that the statute of the 12th of Charles II. chap. 24, had abolished *villeins regardant*; but if a man was *vilain in gross*, he knew of no law which could possibly prevent the operation of such confession. We have likewise paid due regard to the many arguments urged at the bar of inconvenience; but we are all so clearly of one opinion upon the question before us, that there is no necessity to refer it to the twelve judges. The question is, whether the captain has returned a sufficient cause for the detainer of Somerset? The cause returned is, that he had kept him by order of his master, with an intent to send him abroad to Jamaica, there to be sold. So high an act of dominion must derive its force from the law of the country; and if to be justified here, must be justified by the laws of England. Slavery has been different in different ages and states. The

exercise of the power of a master over his slave must be supported by the laws of particular countries; but no foreigner can in England claim a right over a man: such a claim is not known to the laws of England. Immemorial usage preserves a positive law after the occasion or accident which gave rise to it has been forgotten; and, tracing the subject to natural principles, the claim of slavery never can be supported. The power claimed never was in use here, or acknowledged by the law. Upon the whole, we cannot say the cause returned is sufficient by the law; and therefore the man must be discharged." The ever-memorable result of this trial is thus noticed by Mr Sharp:—"The judgment thus pronounced by Lord Mansfield has established the following axiom, as proposed by Mr Sergeant Davy—'As soon as any slave sets his foot on English ground he becomes free.' A sentence to be engraved for ever on our hearts."

On the memorable day which terminated the cause of Somerset, and established the rights of all negroes in England, Mr Sharp received the first offering of a correspondence instituted for the sole object of forwarding the deliverance of African and other slaves, but tending also in its progress to render him a partaker in the great political strife between Great Britain and her colonies. His correspondent was Anthony Benezet, a highly respectable member of the Society of Friends in North America. He had established a free school at Philadelphia for the education of black people, and he took every opportunity which his situation gave him of pleading in their behalf. The tract on the injustice of slavery, and the dispersion of it throughout America by Benezet and other zealous Quakers, during the course of three successive years, from 1769, had already produced the most powerful effects. The house of Burgesses and Virginia sent a petition to the King, dated 1st of April 1772, wherein they implored his majesty's paternal assistance in averting "a calamity of the most alarming nature." "The importation of slaves," they said, "into the colonies from the coast of Africa hath long been considered as a trade of great inhumanity, and, under its present encouragement, we have too much reason to fear will endanger the very existence of your majesty's American dominions." In some other colonial assemblies it had either excited or strengthened an earnest wish to abolish slavery as well as the slave trade.

Granville Sharp was at this time a clerk in the Ordnance Office. That situation he resigned on account of his conscientious objections to the proceedings against the American colonies. This act he thus notices—"July 28, 1775, Board

at Westminster. Account in Gazette of the Battle of Charlestown, near Boston ; and letters with large demands of ordnance stores being received, which were ordered to be got with all expedition ; I thought it right to declare my objections to the being any way concerned in that unnatural business, and was advised by Mr Boddington to ask leave of absence for two months, as the board would take it more kindly than an abrupt resignation. I wrote that day to Sir Charles Cocks, clerk of the Ordnance, and received a very polite answer. Sir Jeffrey Amherst and Mr Langlois were made acquainted with my objections by Mr Boddington, and also with the advice he had given me, and they approved of the manner of my absenting myself.

“ April 10th, 1777.—This morning I called on Sir C. Cocks, and resigned my post in the Ordnance, Mr Boddington having acquainted me that matters were so circumstanced in the office at present, that Sir Charles did not think it prudent to grant me any longer leave of absence. I went on, however, with the current business of the office, excepting what related to preparations against the Americans, until Monday, the 31st of July, when I delivered up my keys to Mr Boddington.”

Granville's situation, after he had resigned his employment in the Ordnance Office, was sufficiently singular. His resignation had in it all that is considered, in a worldly point of view, as an excess of imprudence. He had expended the remains of his paternal inheritance and the fruits of his employment in acts of bounty, and the protector of the helpless stood himself without the means of sustenance. But the cordial attachment of his brothers—all now prosperous—brought them instantly around him. In a family overflowing with mutual love and benevolence, the accession to their household of such a relation as Granville had ever been accounted a treasure, not a burden ; they revered that obedience to conscience which had deprived him of his competency, and they strove to compensate his loss by every act of respect and kindness.

Soon after Mr Sharp's resignation, occurred the case of Millachip, a freeman of the city of London, pressed in the month of March 1777. His cause was instantly taken up by the common council, and an order was given by the Lord Mayor that an application should be made to the Admiralty to obtain his discharge. This application not being successful, a committee of the common council was authorized to proceed in taking such measures as they should think fit for procuring his immediate liberation. A writ of Habeas Corpus was then obtained by the city-solicitor from Lord Mansfield ; and the impressed man having in the meantime been sent down to the

Nore, the city-marshal carried the writ on board the admiral's ship, then lying there, and Millachip was instantly given up, brought back to town, and discharged. But after the short interval of a fortnight Millachip was a second time impressed, and the committee, in consequence, ordered application to be made for another writ of Habeas Corpus, directed to the commander of the receiving vessel. Some objections were made by Judge Aston to the mode of proceeding adopted by the city in procuring the former writ. But Mr Dunning, the counsel, having explained and justified their conduct, the writ was granted, and the cause was brought before Lord Mansfield on the 7th of May 1777. It was finally ordered to stand over, and Millachip, in the meantime, was discharged on the recognizance of the city-solicitor; but the case was never brought to an issue. Although various memorandums demonstrate that Granville took a very active interest in this proceeding, it is difficult to ascertain, at so great a distance of time, in what degree either his communications with the members of the committee, or his example in the conduct of the negro causes might have influenced their measures. A report from the committee on cases of impressment appears among his papers, and there can be little doubt that, agreeably to his former custom, he circulated his own and General Oglethorpe's remarks among all those who were peculiarly concerned in the circumstance. It is not unlikely that the "Remarks on Impressed Seamen," generally attributed to him, were written at this time, though printed long afterwards.

In the course of his exertions concerning impressed seamen, his notes record an interview with Dr Johnson. "May 20th, 1770.—Called on Dr Johnson. Had a long debate with him about the legality of pressing seamen. He said it was a condition necessarily attending that way of life; and when they entered into it, they must take it with all its circumstances; and, knowing this, it must be considered as a voluntary service, like an inn-keeper who knows himself liable to have soldiers quartered upon him."

From the time that he published his tract "On Equitable Representation," he took a very active part in promoting the plan, then in public agitation, of parliamentary reform. He entered into an extensive correspondence with the committees of associations formed in various counties; and shortly afterwards, finding that his ideas of the legal duration of parliament did not coincide with those of several of the committees, he forwarded a printed circular letter to the petitioning counties, cities, and towns, addressed to their respective

general meetings, in which he strenuously maintained the doctrine of "Annual Parliaments, or more often if need be," in opposition to the proposal which had issued from the general meeting of the county of York, under the influence of the Rockingham party, in favour of triennial parliaments. Among his manuscripts appears an "Alphabetical List of Public Meetings for Parliamentary Reformation, to which Books were sent and Letters written to each Committee, by G. S." The list contains the names of forty-one general meetings and their respective chairmen—such was his unrelaxing assiduity in the prosecution of every measure which he conceived to be conducive to public good.

In 1783 Mr Sharp found himself called on for a renewal of his benevolent efforts in behalf of African slaves. The case which presented itself was of the greatest enormity and most atrocious description. The master of a slave-ship, trading from Africa to Jamaica, and having four hundred and forty slaves on board, had thought fit, on a pretext that he might be distressed on his voyage for want of water, to lessen the consumption of it in the vessel by throwing overboard one hundred and thirty-two of the most sickly among the slaves. On his return to England the owners of the ship claimed from the insurers the full value of those drowned slaves, on the ground that there was an absolute necessity for throwing them into the sea, in order to save the remaining crew and the ship itself. The underwriters contested the existence of the alleged necessity; or, if it had existed, attributed it to the ignorance and improper conduct of the master of the vessel. A contest of pecuniary interest then brought to light a scene of horrid brutality.

After numerous and unwearied endeavours on the part of the Quakers in America, and of the zealous Clarkson and Granville Sharp in England, in behalf of the slaves, the time had arrived when it appeared to be within the bounds of hope that an association of benevolent persons, protected by a congenial movement in the British parliament, might lead to a retrieval of the human character from the ignominy of the slave-trade. Endeavours were therefore used to collect, and unite in one body, the various parties who had severally, and almost independently of one another, begun to make exertions of a similar nature; and in the spring of 1787 special meetings were convened of a few men of eminent character, all of whom were friendly to the cause.

On the 22d of May a committee was chosen, consisting of twelve members, whose declared duty and purpose it was to promote, by every means in their power, an abolition of the

traffic in the human race. Granville Sharp was included in the committee. The incipient labours of the association were cheered by an important coincidence which occurred at this time. The efforts of the humane Anthony Benezet and other American Quakers had, by gradual advances, at length effected a general manumission of slaves among the whole body of men of their persuasion; and the year 1787, in which the committee was appointed in England for promoting the abolition of the trade, was distinguished in America by the gratifying circumstance of there not remaining a single slave in the possession of an acknowledged Quaker.

Eleven years had now elapsed since the criminality of the slave-trade was first adverted to in the House of Commons. It was in 1776 that a motion was made by Mr David Hartley, son of the celebrated physician and metaphysician, and member for Hull, the purport of which was, "That the slave-trade was contrary to the laws of God and to the rights of men." The motion was seconded by Sir George Saville. But the proposition failed entirely of support, and its very memory had nearly vanished. It was now resumed with a happier prospect. The trials which had occurred with regard to negroes in this country, had awakened a very general attention to the subject of African slavery; and although prejudice and interest still guarded the ground against the attempts of philanthropists, considerable access to liberal minds had been gained by the assiduous and affecting eloquence of these new pleaders in the cause of humanity. The committee for effecting an abolition of the slave-trade assumed its denomination in June 1787, and immediately dispersed circular letters, giving an account of the institution. These letters soon procured the friendly notice of the Quakers at large. In order to diffuse a more general knowledge of the subject, the committee deemed it right to adopt the publication of a work which Mr Clarkson had presented to them, entitled, "A summary view of the Slave-trade, and of the probable consequences of its Abolition." Numerous copies of this useful tract were dispersed, and the curiosity of the public became every day more excited by the authentic information thus unexpectedly laid before them. The new class of moral revolutionists in France warmly espoused the cause of the abolition. Brissot and Claviere—his friend and afterwards his fellow-sufferer under Robespierre's tyranny—requested to be admitted members of the association.

As Granville had continued unmarried, his brothers' houses were for many years his general residence; and it was not till the beginning of the year 1792 that he took chambers in the

Temple for the purposes of various business that pressed upon him. In the exercise of his religion, he was careful to preserve a behaviour free from ostentation; but it was at the same time firm, and profoundly reverential. As he rose early, his first employment was either reading the Holy Scriptures or chanting a portion of the Hebrew Psalms to his harp. His evenings were closed in the same manner. When in London, he regularly attended the service at St Paul's, and joined in the choral part. In the respective families of his relations he regularly attended, and generally read the morning and evening prayers from the Liturgy. Nothing was more remarkable in Mr Sharp's social intercourse than the firmness with which he delivered his most serious opinions on many ordinary occasions, and the unembarrassed simplicity with which he uttered them, blending religion with almost every topic, both in conversation and in writing. Some of his religious views were singular. The near approach of the millennium was a favourite idea with him; and his belief in Satanic influence was carried to an extraordinary length.

In the month of June 1813, having made an offer of some books to the Temple library, he thought it requisite to attend in person to the delivery of them, and proposed a visit to London for that purpose. Every argument which affection could dictate was urged to dissuade him; but all proved ineffectual. The offer of the family-carriage was then withheld, in the hope that forgetfulness might prevent the apprehended evil; but at breakfast-time the next morning he did not appear as usual, and on inquiry it was found that he was gone to London in the stage-coach. A servant was immediately despatched after him; but he had left his chambers also. He returned with the stage to Fulham in the afternoon; said he had packed and sent his books, but had had no food, and was nearly exhausted. His danger had been imminent. It appeared that the coachman who conveyed him to town, perceiving his altered state, had felt considerable anxiety on his account, and as soon as he had settled the business of the coach, he went in search of him to his chambers, at the door of which he found him, wandering about in a state of incertitude, being unable to guide himself to that part of the town that he designed to reach. He was easily persuaded by the coachman to go back to Fulham, and was thus happily preserved from more distressing accidents. On the day preceding his death, he breakfasted as usual with the family. His weakness was much increased; and he was several times compelled to lie down on his bed during the course of the afternoon. He appeared often to labour for breath. Night

