UNITING
AND
MONOPOLIZING FARMS,
DISADVANTAGEOUS TO
LAND-OWNERS,
AND THE
PUBLIC.

Price 2s.
UNITING
AND
MONOPOLIZING FARMS
PLAINLY PROVED DISADVANTAGEOUS
TO THE LAND-OWNER,
AND HIGHLY PREJUDICIAL
TO THE PUBLIC.
UNITING
AND
MONOPOLIZING FARMS
PLAINLY PROVED
DISADVANTAGEOUS
TO THE
LAND-OWNERS,
AND
HIGHLY PREJUDICIAL
TO THE
PUBLIC:
To which are added several Observations,
SHEWING THE CAUSES OF THE
PRESENT HIGH PRICES
OF ALL KINDS OF
PROVISIONS.

By JOHN LEWIS, of East Bergholt.

THE THIRD EDITION, WITH ADDITIONS.

IPSWICH:
PRINTED BY BURRELL AND BRANSEY,
FOR LONGMAN AND REES, PATERNOSTER-ROW, LONDON; AND SOLD
BY BRANSEY, IPSWICH; AND BY ALL THE BOOKSELLERS IN
SUFFOLK, NORFOLK, AND ESSEX.

Price Two Shillings.
TO

Sir THOMAS CHARLES BUNBURY, Bart.

One of the Knights of the Shire for the County of Suffolk.

Sir Charles,

BEING solicited to prepare for the press a new edition of the following publication, written by a plain and intelligent inhabitant of Suffolk, on a subject which very intimately concerns the interest of this county, as well as, at this time, that of the nation in general; I beg leave humbly to prefix your name to the work, relying on your acknowledged affability and candour for its favourable reception; and presuming, that in your private character, as a land-owner, and in your pub-
lic one, as a legislator, you will promote and support the patriotic principles it inculcates.

That you may long continue the upright representative of this county, in the grand council of the United Kingdom, is the sincere wish of,

Sir Charles,

Your most obedient humble servant,

JOHN BRANSBY.

Ipswich, Feb. 20, 1801.
PREFACE
TO THE
SECOND EDITION.

THE first edition of this work, printed in 1767, was published without my name, which gave me an opportunity of hearing the sentiments of many persons who spoke their thoughts freely upon it. As to the main scope and design, I do not know that any have objected to it with any colour of reason, only some have doubted, whether this practice of uniting and monopolizing farms, was general throughout the kingdom, or only local; and perhaps chiefly so in those parts where I have been most conversant. To this I reply, the chief of my remarks have been drawn from
observations made in the counties of Suffolk and Essex; where I have had the greatest experience: and though I have been in many other parts of the kingdom, and turned my thoughts to these subjects, yet I do not take upon me to assert it positively from my own knowledge in all places, only that like causes will in all places have like effects: and at this time it is much complained of by all ranks of people, and thought to be a matter of great importance. But as a farther proof that the practice is not local, I will produce a foreign evidence from a book lately published, by Richard Price, D. D. F. R. S. entitled “Observations on Reversionary Payments, Annuities, &c.” second edition; in the Supplement to which this ingenious author draws many observations from the works of Mr. Muret, first minister of the town of Vevey, in the province of Bern, in Switzerland; and at page 359 mentions, that “Mr. Muret en-
ters into a general account of the causes which obstruct population in his country. Among these he insists particularly on Luxury, and the Engrossing Farms." And Dr. Price adds, "I wish his observations on these subjects were not applicable to the present state of this kingdom: but perhaps there is no kingdom in the world to which they are so applicable."

Again, "With respect particularly to the custom of engrossing farms, Mr. Muret observes, with the highest reason, that a large tract of land, in the hands of one man, does not yield so great a return, as when in the hands of several, nor does it employ so many people; and as a proof of this, he mentions two parishes in the district of Vaud, one of which (once a little village) having been bought by some rich men, was sunk into a single demesne; and the other
"(once a single demesne) having fallen into the hands of some peasants, was become a little village." And Dr. Price puts this quere: "how many facts of the former kind can this country now furnish?" and soon after adds, "the high price of all the means of subsistence, occasioned certainly by this practice, as well as by the heavy weight of our taxes, has long been the object of universal complaint; and it is growing more so every day, and spreading everywhere; checking marriage, loading our manufactures, and diminishing the number of our people."

I do not remember any other material objection that has been made to the former edition. The great farmers have been a little displeased with me, but having considered those passages, which I apprehend they might dislike, I did not choose to make any great al-
teration in them. My principal charge against the great farmers is, their engrossing so many farms, and reducing them into one occupation; and in that I think the land-owners are most to blame, for they certainly had it in their own power to prevent it; and no good excuse can be made for them, unless they did it ignorantly; for in so doing they acted contrary to their own interest, and much to the prejudice of the whole community; as this practice must depopulate the country, and lessen the quantity of provisions that might be raised from their lands: all which, I presume, will evidently appear in the following sheets. And I hope, that when the evil tendency of this practice is more known, it will not be so general as it now is; which was the sole motive with me for publishing this work.

In this second edition I have made considerable additions, relating to my main subject,
the monopolizing of farms; which, with a few other observations subjoined, clearly shew the principal causes of the present high prices of all kinds of provisions.

The Editor of this edition has made a few verbal corrections, but no where altered the sense; having inserted his own additions at the bottom of the pages in the form of notes.
UNITING
AND
MONOPOLIZING FARMS,
&c.

The present high price of all kinds of provisions, is an evil very grievous to a great part of the inhabitants of this kingdom, which has caused many riots and insurrections in divers parts of it. The parliament has been addressed by some of our principal towns, begging they will take the matter into consideration, in order to give a present relief, and also to prevent any mal-practices among those who either raise or deal in any of the necessaries of life.*

* In Autumn, 1800, it being apprehended that there was a real scarcity of grain, the inhabitants of many parts of the kingdom were much alarmed, and the administration of this country were not behind in such
At this time, much the greater part of all ranks of people seem to agree in a supposition, that our laws relating to the common necessaries of life, are either defective, or not duly executed: for they reason thus:—"that there is not any visible cause which will account for the present scarcity; the last harvest was thought to be rather a plentiful one; the distemper among the horned cattle has so long ceased, that its effects cannot influence the present times; and nothing remarkable has happened likely to occasion this present want." This kind of reasoning creates a suspicion, that the produce of our lands is either exported clandestinely, or else engrossed into a few hands, to be dealt out at an exorbitant price. But whether the present high prices of provisions are owing to a real apprehension. In consequence the Duke of Portland sent letters to several counties, in which it was asserted, as a fact, that there was not nearly enough Wheat in the nation. This confirming the idea before received, a great advance took place in the markets, which have been rising from that period, notwithstanding parliament assembled, Nov. 11, to deliberate on the best means to alleviate the distresses of the people. This is the very effect which their deliberations were expected to have, as it was foreseen from some expressions of Mr. Pitt, in the former session, that they would do nothing to regulate the corn-trade, for fear of injuring the Freedom of Commerce; which freedom ought to extend only, it is presumed, to such articles, as are not the first necessaries of life. Vast quantities of grain have been since imported; much spare made in almost every family, from motives of economy; and it appears, by the report of the house of commons, that Wheat was two-thirds of an average crop, and Barley nearly an average crop; yet wheat, in January, 1801, was sold, in Suffolk, for 16s or 17s, per Quarter!
or an artificial scarcity, will, I hope, plainly appear in the course of this work.

In all diseases of the body politic, as well as the body natural, the first step towards a cure is, to find out the nature and cause of the disease: and though the cause of this scarcity is in general, and with good reason, chiefly attributed to the practice which has of late too, much prevailed—of the uniting and monopolizing of farms; yet it has not, that I know of, been so sufficiently explained as it ought to be: and, for some time past, I have been fully convinced, that this custom of laying small farms together, to make large ones is extremely prejudicial to the owners of such estates; but more particularly attended with bad consequences to the public, especially in farms consisting of arable lands; as it certainly is the cause of a less quantity of provisions being raised from the same lands; and also greatly tends to depopulate the country.

To prove the bad consequences of this practice, I shall lay down this incontestible truth, as the basis on which my whole scheme depends: viz. that large farms, consisting mostly of arable lands, are not usually let at so great a rent, acre for acre, as small farms generally are; and that the greater the difference is in the quantity of land, the greater is
the difference in the rate by the acre. For, in my opinion, were we to compare the rents of lands of this kind, held and used in different quantities; for example, one farm of 50l. a-year, and another of 300l. a-year, both naturally of equal goodness, in most cases it would be found, that the tenant to the farm of 50l. a-year, pays as much rent for three acres of land, as the tenant to the farm of 300l. a-year pays for four acres. Of consequence it follows, that this large farm of 300l. a-year is capable of being divided into eight small farms of 50l. a-year each; and so the rent of the whole, were it divided and used in eight such small farms, would be advanced to 400l. a-year; and the value of the produce raised from these lands, by the eight occupiers, would be advanced in as large a proportion.

As what I have asserted may be doubted, by persons who are not conversant in business of this kind, I will endeavour to explain myself, and give sufficient reasons to convince them, that the rent and produce raised from the same lands, by eight farmers, of the whole, in all probability, would exceed that raised by one occupier of the whole, in as large a proportion as that before-mentioned. For this purpose I will consider these same lands in two different states; that is, first, as if held and used all in one occupation, and then, as if divided and used in
eight different occupations. In both cases, as the lands are supposed to be the same, so the value of the produce raised from them must depend on the labour and manure bestowed on them, and the care and pains taken to turn that produce to the best advantage.

A few years past, before the prices of every article of the produce of a farm rose so high as they now are, it was generally allowed, that in farms consisting mostly of arable lands, unless the occupiers, one year with another, made the value of three years rent from them, they could not live so as to support themselves and families: but the present times are such as sufficiently warrant me to assert, that for some years past the produce of their lands, one year with another, if properly cultivated, amounted to the full value of four years rent, at least. Supposing, therefore, that they all raise from their lands full the value of four years rent; the value of the produce of the whole, as one farm, would be 1200l. a-year: but the value of the whole, as eight farms, would be 1600l. a-year. Thus the increased produce of the whole, as eight farms, would exceed the produce, as one farm, at least 400l. a-year; equal to one whole years rent of the lands in the most improved state: and this 400l. would be an increase of riches to the nation, not like what is
gained in trade among ourselves, by which, if one man gets rich, it is by drawing to himself the profits, which others, in the same way, must be deprived of: so that such a tradesman may fitly be compared to a luxuriant over-growing tree, under the shade of which nothing will thrive. But the good farmer is like a tree, whose shade is friendly; that yields a comfortable support and nourishment to all around it.

It is not necessary now to use any arguments to prove, that good farmers actually raise from their lands, one year with another, the full value of four years rent. I shall therefore take that for granted, and endeavour to prove my main point, viz. that the occupier of small farms raise a greater produce from their lands, and are able to pay a greater rent for them, than is generally given by the occupiers of large farms; and that too, in as large a proportion as before-mentioned.

In small farms the greater part of the business is generally done by the occupier and his family; and no more help is hired than for such work as they cannot find time to do themselves. And thus, great part of the labour being done by them, there is a considerable saving on that account; when, in the large farms, all is to be paid for out of the produce
of the lands: for in these the farmer and his family seldom do more than inspect and direct. But in the small farms, what is thus earned by these families, is not the only advantage, for as they are interested in the success of what they do, so in all probability it will be done in a more careful and frugal manner. Besides, with them all improvements are more minutely attended to, the plough and the spade are carried close to their hedges, and no borders or corners escape them; when in the large farms, it is common to see borders, thickets, and corners uncultivated; and some lands, which lie at a distance, neglected on that account.* As it costs much labour and time to bring the crops from those distant lands, and to carry the manure made at the barns upon them again; so, for that reason, seldom any is laid on them: thus, of course they must become poor, and therefore are laid down, and called off-lands, to run young cattle, &c. upon, but do not turn to that advantage they would have done, if duly

* The author might have added, that many corners and other parts of fields are frequently converted into plantations; these certainly beautify the scene, but perhaps the same spots loaded with corn, and smiling with plenty, would have as many charms as in their present state.

In the diversity of soil which takes place in most parts of the kingdom, within a small extent, places may be always found, which Nature has pointed out as most proper for the different species of trees; here the several kinds ought unquestionably to be planted, and thus a sufficient quantity of timber would be constantly growing, for the purposes of civil and naval architecture, and in part supply the country with fuel.
cultivated. On the contrary, in small farms, the distance of the lands from the barns is not likely to be so great, and therefore they are not so apt to be neglected as in the great ones.

To these articles of saving in the smaller farms, which are the men's part, I shall add what comes under the women's care; which is the dairy, &c. For in small farms of this kind, there are more cows, pigs, and poultry kept on them, in proportion to the quantity of land, than there are on the larger sort; where these articles are seldom carried much farther than just for the use of their own families: when in the small ones, the women take this as their province, and carefully improve it: and out of this they not only supply their families, but sell enough to cloath themselves and children in part, if not altogether, and to provide many other necessaries for the family. By these the neighbourhood is better supplied with butter, cheese, milk, veal, pigs, eggs, and fowls of all sorts, than by large farmers; and tho' much more might be added, yet, to all that are not biassed, this is, I think, sufficient to convince them, that the occupiers of small farms certainly raise more from their lands, in proportion to the quantity; than the occupiers of the larger sort: for the families in the small farms mostly earn more than it costs to maintain them; and if to this we add
their improving more minutely and carefully every part, not only of the land, but of the dairy, &c. I am of opinion, there can be no reason to doubt, but that the tenants to the small farms would be able to pay their rents according to this supposition, full as well as the tenants to the larger farms.

This is not a meer supposition, but a fair representation, in general, of the different economy in farms of such difference in magnitude: and as to the article of cows, I have often observed with concern, in the counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex, that the number of them now kept is much less than used to be kept on the same lands 30 or 40 years ago: all owing to the present custom of monopolizing farms: for those who ingross so many farms into one occupation, seldom keep any cows but on one of them, where they live; and those only to supply their own families, with a small overplus for

* It is to be apprehended, that the number of cows kept in these counties is still continually decreasing in a very considerable degree. In confirmation of which, a correspondent in the Norfolk Chronicle states, that many dairies of cows in that county have recently been annihilated. He instances upwards of 100 cows on 5 farms only, in the vicinity of Fakenham, laments the prevalency of this practice, as a public injury, and recommends to landlords to covenant with their tenants, for the keeping of a certain number of cows upon their respective farms, in proportion to their rent. The most probable cause of this decrease of dairies is, that the business would be too servile or too much, for the modern farmer's wife, elevated above her rank by the uniting system.
their labourers: as for all the other farms, if they have houses left to them, these are generally occupied by their labourers. But when they were in their former state, occupied by the farmers of the lands belonging to them, then there were cows kept on each of them, and mostly in proportion to the quantity of land: and it is certain, that the greater the number of cows which are kept, the greater plenty of butter, cheese, veal, pork, hides, beef, and tallow, are likely to be raised; and the more cattle are kept on the same lands, the greater quantity of manure must be raised for the improvement of them; and consequently they will yield the greater increase. Thus it appears, that almost every circumstance attending this practice of monopolizing farms, must lessen the produce of those lands, and deprive us of that plenty we used to enjoy, and now want.

Having shewn how the occupiers of small farms are able to raise a greater quantity of provisions from, and pay a greater rent for, the same lands, than the large farmers either raise or pay; I will, in the next place endeavour to shew, that uniting small farms together to make large ones, naturally tends to depopulate the country, and to increase the number of poor, and the rates raised for their relief: and for this, I will again consider such a large farm in two different states, as before; and from thence
make estimates, and calculate the number of people likely to be dependent on them, when held and used in such different proportions.

First, I will begin with considering these lands, as if all were in one farmer's occupation; and I will suppose his family to consist of himself, a wife, three children,* and twelve servants; in all seventeen persons. To these we must add the number of the labourers and families depending on this farm: the labourers I suppose to be ten, and each labourer to have a wife and three children: so the number of all the labourers' families together is fifty.

To the number of the farmer's family, } 17
which is --- --- --- --- --- ---
Add the number of ten labourers and } 50
their families --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
And the whole number depending on } 67
all the large farm, while held in
one occupation is --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

* The number of births to every marriage is about four to one, or somewhat more, upon a calculation for all England, one with another. See Derham's Physico Theol. p. 174, seventh edit. And from Dr. Halley's Tables of the Degrees of Mortality of Mankind, it appears, that one child in four dies, before it attains the age of five years. Therefore I cannot think it reasonable to suppose more than three children to a family, one with another. Lewis.
Then, to compute the number of persons likely to be dependent on the same lands contained in this large farm, when divided and occupied according to the foregoing supposition, in eight separate farms of 50l. a-year each.

In each of those eight farms, I will suppose a farmer, his wife, three children, and two servants; that is seven in each family: and that each of these farms should have a labourer to it, with five in each labourer’s family; then the number of persons depending on these lands, when thus divided into eight separate farms, will stand thus:

In each of these farms I suppose a farmer and his family \( \{ \) 7
A labourer and his family \( \{ \) 5

The number of persons depending on each farm is \( \{ \) 12
And that multiplied by the number of farms 8
Gives the number of persons depending on all the eight together \( \{ \) 96
From which subtract the number \( \{ \) 67
And the difference is \( \{ \) 29
Thus it appears, that the number of persons likely to be depending on these lands, while occupied and used as one farm, is but 67; whereas, if they were turned into, and used as eight separate farms, they would be likely to have depending on them 96 persons, which is 29 more than the supposed complement of the same lands, if held and occupied as one farm.

In this manner, and from this cause, the number of our people is diminished, and the nation is deprived of a great part of its strength; as these small farmers are as able-bodied, and hardy a set of people as any of its inhabitants, being constantly enured to labour in the open air, and better fed than the poor, nay perhaps better fed than the rich farmers: fed, I mean, in such a manner as contributes more to their health and strength: for the rich farmers seem to be running apace into the enfeebling luxuries of their wealthy landlords. Likewise our trade must suffer by it; as every individual person, one with another, has been computed to pay 6l. a-year to our rents and manufactures. And, besides these, I apprehend there are other consequences likely to follow from the different classes or ranks of the people, very detrimental to the community: for in the account of the whole, while considered as one farm, the number of the labourers and their families, is
about three times as many as the number of the farmer's family; though indeed if we consider that all the servants in this farmer's family are taken from the labourers' families, the difference will then be still greater, and most likely as great as ten to one. When on the contrary, were the same lands used as eight farms, the number of the farmers' families and those of the labourers, might be considered as equal, or nearly so; by supposing some of their servants taken from their own class, and some from that of the labourers.

These numbers being thus explained, I will next endeavour to shew, which set of people depending on the same lands, i. e. those while used as one farm, or those while used as eight farms, are likely to be most useful to the public.

First, I will suppose it to be used all as one farm; in which case it is computed there would be 67 persons dependent thereon; of which, as we cannot suppose many more than the master, mistress, and three children, but what are taken from the families of the labourers, or the lower class; so it is reasonable to expect there would be at least ten of the lower class to one of the other: and if we rate all the persons in this great farmer's family, and all his labourers, and their families, according to the degree of re-
spect we ought to have for each class, as useful members of the community; in my opinion, all the persons depending on these lands, while used as one farm, cannot be so useful to the public, as those dependent on the same lands, in eight different farms, would be. In the latter case, there would be as many of the farmers' families as of the labourers', and tho' the whole number would be increased as 96 to 67, even then the number of the labourers and their families would be less than when the whole was held as one farm: and these farmers in the less occupations are in general a laborious, honest, frugal set of people, living as they ought to do, in peace and great regularity, or at least more so than either of the other two classes, namely, the families of the great farmers, and the families of the labourers: for the first are thought more apt than the small farmers, to withhold their corn and cattle, in order to advance the price of them, to the oppression of all, and the distress of the indigent; and those who do so cannot stand high in our esteem.* And as to the labourers,

* Though the great farmers often speculate on the markets, and keep back their corn, &c., in expectation of greater prices for them: yet I am inclined to think, that the consequences are not so prejudicial as many are apt to believe. For as the less farmers are most of them under a necessity of selling early in the year, by which the markets are regularly supplied in the first part: and the greater farmers having large quantities of corn, they are not often able to get all out before the latter end of the year; at which time the markets are supplied by them. And whatever their intention may be, if they do not keep it to be wasted or damaged,
they seldom keep their children so regularly employed as the small farmers: not only so, but in many of the labourers' families it is frequent to see them brought up without any sense of religion, or proper notions of right and wrong; and from their infancy accustomed to, and encouraged in little thefts; by which means they become dissolute, and regardless of duty, or any due subordination. But I would have this understood in general, not of all labourers' families; only, that it is often the case with the families of the labourers, than with the families of the small farmers.

(which their own interest will make them careful of) they answer all the purposes of public magazines; and it is better kept by them: for no way, that I know of, for preserving corn sweet, is equal to that of keeping it in the straw. Lewis.

The foregoing note ought to be understood in a sense somewhat restricted. Every principle of justice and humanity revolts at the idea of a rich farmer's keeping his entire stock of grain in the straw, for the space of a year or more, when the price is unreasonably high, in hope of its being still higher. A conscientious and patriotic farmer will not see his neighbours distressed, by paying more than twice a fair price for grain, while he has an abundance, which he can well afford to dispose of at a more reasonable rate. The selfish and avaricious will, perchance, sometimes recollect a passage in an old-fashioned book, where we read "He that withholdeth corn, the people shall curse him; but blessings shall be upon the head of him that selletteth it." It is not to be feared, while all ranks and so great a proportion of their incomes must be appropriated to other purposes besides purchasing corn, that many will make much waste of it, even were the markets well stocked soon after harvest. One object ought at all times to be well attended to; that the substances which properly constitute the food of mankind be not, except in cases of necessity, given to inferior animals.
After having considered these same lands in two different states; first, as if held and used as one farm, and then, as if held and used in eight small ones, it plainly appears to me, that the number of people likely to be dependent on such lands, in such different occupations, is much the greater in the eight different farms; and the increase or difference of 29 persons will be all of the middle class, that is, of the less farmers, which are the most useful subjects of all the three classes. For, it is as evident as any proposition in Euclid, that those who raise the greater quantity of provisions from their lands, are more useful than those who raise less, if in all other respects they are equal.

Besides, when the same lands are supposed to be held in eight different occupations, though the number of the people depending on them is increased much beyond what they are likely to be while used in one occupation; yet the number of the labourers and their families is decreased; so that we may reasonably expect, that by this means the number of poor would be lessened, at the same time that the value of the lands would be advanced. By which, the poor rates would be lessened both ways, that is, by a decrease in the number of the poor, and an increase in the value of the lands.
Thus, after considering this subject attentively, it appears to me, even to a demonstration, that the same lands, while held and used in small farms, are more likely to bear a greater rent, and produce a greater quantity of provisions, than while used in large farms. And also, that the number of the poor, and the rates raised for their relief, would certainly both be less than they will, if held and used in large occupations.  

* After our author's second edition was published, there appeared an anonymous pamphlet entitled "An Enquiry into the Connection between the present Price of Provisions and the size of Farms." In this it is asserted, that the produce of a large farm is greater in proportion than that of a small one; but Mr. Lewis answers this assertion, in Remarks which he afterwards published, by recapitulating what he has so well proved in this book, on Unitig and Monopolizing, and justly lays great stress on the interest which the farmer and his family take in assisting and seeing the work of the farm well done. He particularly instances in harvest time, where he says the farmer and five labourers do more work than seven labourers would do. The manner in which he elucidates this matter being excellent, it is here inserted:—

"With great farmers it is mostly the custom to put out their harvest either by the acre, or at a certain sum of money for the whole, or a part. For instance, I will suppose such a one puts out his wheat to be reaped, to such a number of men as he thinks proper; in such case it rarely happens that more than one-third or one-fourth of the number are able to make good work with great dispatch; and those good hands, willing to make the best of their time, will push on the others faster than they are able to perform it properly; by which the inferior hands will leave and tread down as much corn, as often equals or exceeds the value of the whole work, had it been done in workman-like manner. And not only so, but they will work early and late, and in showery weather, and frequently bind it when not dry, which greatly damages the corn; and thus, indeed, they do dispatch a greater breadth of land than an equal number on less farms, who work by the day, and have the master with them. For in such ease the labourers have no temptation to work too..."
Having discovered where the disease lies, the next thing is to find out a remedy or cure: and this certainly is in the power of the land-owners; but unless I can convince them that it is for their own advantage to redress this grievance, and do that justice which is due to their country, I am afraid it will be to little purpose to inform them of it, with regard to the public good alone. We find that self-interest is much the strongest motive, and though all may seem early or too late, or to go faster than they are able to make good work; and the master being with them keeps them from losing any time, and pushes them on as fast as they are able to gather the corn clean: therefore, though the quantity thus reaped on the less farms is not equal to what the same number of men will dispatch, in the same time, on the great farms, when taken: yet considering the different manner in which the work is performed, the advantage is greatly in favour of the less farmer, whose corn shall be gathered up clean, and not bound but when dry and in good condition. So, in all the other operations of the harvest, the great farmer’s men, if they take it by the acre, or at a certain sum, will not do it with so much attention to their master’s interest as their own; but through haste or want of care, either leave in the fields, scatter, or waste much more than is done on the less farms, where the master is among them; and sometimes put it together so moist, that it heats in the barn, or on the rick, and is greatly damaged.

But persons unacquainted with these operations may say, or think, if this true, as above represented, surely our great farmers, who are many of them active, careful, and understanding men, would not go on this manner: and indeed, I believe they would not, if they knew how to remedy it; but those who raise such large quantities of corn, were they to go on as the less farmers do, would not be able to procure hands enough to get in their crops in due season; as the chief of the hands to be procured above their usual complement are mechanics; therefore they are under a necessity to bear this loss by a hasty dispatch, rather than a greater, which in all probability they would, were they to take so long time about it, by having it to do in short days and bad weather.”
to approve of the thing, when talked of as a public concern; yet, except all were compelled to it by penal laws, the public good alone would have but little influence; as most are apt to excuse themselves in such cases, and think it would be a weakness in them to give up what they believe tends to their own interest, except others would, or were compelled to do the same.

Therefore, I shall recommend it to all landowners, to consider the comparison I have here made, of the lands; first, as if held and used by one tenant, and then as divided and used by eight tenants; where I think it is clearly shewn, that those lands which when held and used as one farm, and fairly worth no more than 300L. a-year, will, if divided, and used by eight tenants, in eight different farms, be as well worth 400L. a-year. And this is more than sufficient to pay the difference of what it would cost to repair the whole in eight separate farms, above what it would cost to repair the whole as one farm. For though it is reasonable to suppose the difference might be considerable, yet I am persuaded it would not much exceed one-fourth part of what the rent would be advanced.

And, to give all the satisfaction, in this case, in my power, I will compare the different expences
likely to arise from keeping up and repairing the buildings proper for these lands in both states, according to the best estimates I am able to make. But in this I would be understood of what is likely to be necessary for 20 or 30 years together, at an average one year with another: supposing the premises were at the beginning in good and tenantable repair, and kept and left so at the end; and that there are no more buildings than what are necessary for the lands in either state.

I will begin with the whole as one farm: in which state I compute it will cost, for all repairs, about eight or nine per cent. of the rent. Suppose nine, then as this rent is 300l. a-year, 27l. a-year is the charge of all repairs for the whole as one farm.

Then, for the whole in eight farms: in this state I compute it will cost about twelve or fourteen per cent. Suppose fourteen, and as the rent is 400l. a-year, 56l. a-year is the charge of repairing the whole in eight farms.

From this charge of repairing the whole in eight farms \{ 56 \}  
Take that for repairing the whole in one farm \{ 27 \}  
And there remains \{ 29 \}
Which sum of 29l. is what it would cost to repair the whole in eight farms, more than it will in one.

And I have before shewn, that the rent of the whole in eight farms will exceed the rent of the whole in one by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then take 29l. the difference for repairs, from 100l. the difference in the rent, and there remains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And this sum of 71l. is what the land-owner would gain by letting the whole in eight farms, more than he would by letting the whole in one; which is 17\(\frac{2}{3}\) per cent. of the improved rent when let as eight farms.

This plainly shews the error which many persons have run into, from a mistaken notion of these things; for they, by pulling down the houses on their little farms, and laying several together to make one large one, deceive themselves, thinking, that by getting rid of the repairs to those houses, they shall be gainers by it; when it plainly appears, that instead of what they aimed at, they are lessening the value of their lands by the acre, and that too so as lose much more by it than they expected to save or gain.
This loss, with regard to the rent, affects the land-owners particularly, tho' perhaps not at the first letting, as I shall shew by and by. But, if we consider this practice with regard to the public, as to the wrong notions of the land-owners, and the rapacity of the large farmers, as it not only lessens the produce of the lands, but also naturally tends to depopulate the country,* it will appear still more prejudicial. For many a worthy couple, who have, by frugality in service, saved what is sufficient to stock a small farm, could they get one, are, from the difficulty of procuring such a one, kept from marrying, and continue servants, waiting in fruitless hopes.§

* The writer of the forementioned Inquiry attacks Mr. Lewis's calculation respecting the difference in population, occasioned by the uniting of farms; but as he introduces an arbitrary number of servants into his large farmer's family, he seems only to have endeavoured to out-number our author: his statement is tediously prolix, and contains no refutation of what Mr. Lewis has written: it is therefore presumed, no objection remains against this part of his observations. Indeed, letting small farm-houses and cottages fall down, as they do in many places, proves that the rural parts of the kingdom are less populous; and if the number of inhabitants in large towns and cities be increased, these situations are not so congenial to the health, happiness, morality, or longevity of mankind.

§ Some persons, disappointed in their expectations of procuring a small farm, or being expelled from such a one, where, by their industry, they have brought up a family, are anxious to take a public house; in which, should they succeed in procuring one, they are habituated to scenes of intemperance, riot, and debauchery; and thus lose what remains of their pristine morality they carried in with them. The writer of this note, very lately, enquiring of a man who had notice to quit his small farm, to accommodate a large farmer, whether there were a public house in the
But, from the causes above-mentioned are frequently disappointed, and the number of inhabitants in the country is thereby lessened.

The effects of which are now evidently to be seen in this respect, by the want of hands in agriculture, as many persons in the country, from the difficulty of getting employments in the way they have been brought up, go to London, to seek employment there; which help to swell that head, already too big for the body: and of those that stay at home, much the greater part must become labourers, and incorporate with the lower class; who, in times of scarcity, will grow uneasy and tumultuous; and so riots, of course, will be the consequence, while things are continued as they are.* For, unless

parish, was answered in the negative. The enquirer said, So much the better; to which the farmer replied, he wished the magistrates would license a house for him, as he should probably have no other mode of getting a livelihood.

* The practice of uniting farms has certainly a great tendency to raise some individuals of the middling rank, and to depress others; and consequently to divide mankind in respect to the possession of property, into two classes only: this must tend to diminish the sum of human happiness, which depends much on the mutual wants and assistances, which are infinitely multiplied and diffused. The happiness of every person is greatly increased by his considering himself as esteemed; able of affording assistance to his neighbours, and being thought worthy the title of friend: these circumstances, which ought by no means to be reckoned trivial, give him an idea of his consequence, and he congratulates himself on being in the class of men. But the unhappy pauper, who, sunk into a state of dependence, unable to assist a friend, or to find a friend to assist him, receives a scanty boon from the sparing hand of pa-
some alteration be made, some way or other, with regard to these things, in my opinion, provisions are not likely to be cheap, except in such years as the crops shall be very plentiful, not only in these kingdoms, but in all the neighbouring states. And the longer they are continued thus, the greater will be the want of the people to do the labour necessary for improving the lands; and thus the scarcity must and will increase, from the want of hands to be employed in cultivating the land. Therefore, these effects flowing from this practice of Uniting and Monopolizing Farms, are of the utmost importance to the nation; for as the ingenious Mr. Hanway has observed in his Earnest Appeal, "the productions of the earth stand first in rank, if we have not the first view to the keeping a sufficient number of hands employed in agriculture, the whole will languish and decay."

rochial charity: and, finding his noble nature subdued, is unfit for any but the meanest office. Such a man, disregarding character, which he finds will not better his condition, becomes, in some measure, a misanthrope; and either wastes his health in sullen sorrow, or levies war on his superiors, whose property perhaps he thinks it no crime to steal, or destroy. His family is instructed by precept and example to imitate the parent; and thus is perpetuated a race of idle and immoral poor, from whom are made frequent and numerous draughts to recruit our armies, and fill our prisons. These very persons, if stimulated by the reasonable hope of a moderate and permanent reward, might have been industrious, moral, and highly useful members of that society, from which they are now, in a degree, banished.
It is not to be supposed, that the land-owners see these consequences when they lay little farms together; nay, they seldom feel the effects of it themselves, for the first time of letting them; not till they are incorporated into one farm, and come to be let together. And even then, there are but few that perceive it. For, as the uniting of farms is often done to avoid an expense of either re-building, or repairing the buildings to the small farms; when another tenant, to whom these lands joined, thinks he can do most of the work with the same horses and servants he then has; and though he may think it dear, yet for the sake of a small advantage, or of being thought more important, he will take it, perhaps, at the old rent, or with a trifling abatement for the house only. And then the land-owner is persuaded he has got rid of an immediate expense, and without any loss to himself, so long as the term of this first let is for; but if he does, yet in most cases he or they that succeed to the estate, when it comes to be incorporated into one farm, and let together will, from the increase of quantity, whether they are sensible of it or not, have the rent lowered by the acre, or else not so much advanced, as it might have been, if held separate. This is matter of fact in all places. I have had opportunities of observing, and I apprehend it must be so, in all parts of Eng-
land; especially where the farms consist mostly of arable lands.

After having discovered the chief cause of these calamities, which are now so alarming, and shewn that it is in the power, and for the interest of the land-owners to remove it; I wish my arguments may be sufficient to convince them, that as members of the community, they ought to do all they can to promote the welfare of it, so as to influence them to take every opportunity, and use their best endeavours to effect it. And to assist such as shall be so inclined, I will give my opinion concerning the quantities of land I would advise them to divide their estates into, to produce these salutary effects.

Though I have shewn that arable lands, held and used in small quantities, tend most to the public good, and also to the advantage of the land-owners; yet I would not be understood to advise laying out such as are now used in large occupations, into very small ones, so that the occupier shall not have enough to employ more than two horses; because in such small ones the buildings to be erected would come to too much for the advance that would be made in the rent. Yet, when they are already built upon, I shall advise to keep up the buildings, and let them separate as they are; for I know that their
rents mostly answer the expence of the repairs. But when lands now held in large occupations are situated conveniently to be divided into parts, so that each part might be sufficient to employ constantly as many horses as would be wanted to draw two or three ploughs, with which the farmer would be able to till his lands, carry out his produce, bring home manure, and do his business regularly: these are the quantities I would prefer before any other, where circumstances would admit of it. But these quantities are not always to be proportioned by the rents; because lands are let at very different prices by the acre; and also, the labour required is much greater in some lands than it is in others: therefore these things ought to be well considered in proportioning the quantities proper to be laid into such farms. And in such cases, where meadows and other grass lands which are not usually ploughed, are convenient to be held with some arable lands, it would then be proper to let as much arable with those grass lands as is sufficient to employ constantly as many horses as will be wanted for two or three ploughs; by which the farm would be much enlarged, and worthy the attention of a substantial farmer: and these grass lands would be a means to improve the arable by the cattle that would be kept on them, and the fodder raised from them. So that what I would principally recommend is, not to let the arable lands to be held and
used in such large quantities, by any one person, as they now are: for it is the arable lands that employ the greatest number of people, and from them the greatest improvements are made. As to grass lands, proper only for fattening cattle, those, I am of opinion, may, without any injury to the public or landowners, be held and used in large quantities. And thus, as there always must and will be different degrees in rank and substance, among farmers, as in all other callings; by these means they might be fitted with occupations of different sizes, in proportion to their abilities.*

* In page 34 of the same Inquiry, the author says, "I am not so absurd as to propose that all England should be divided into large farms." Mr. Lewis, in reply, retorts, "So likewise, neither would I be understood as if I proposed that the whole kingdom should be divided into small ones: for the title to my pamphlet, referred to in this chapter, says no more, than that uniting and monopolizing farms is disadvantageous, as it not only lessens the produce of the lands, as well as the number of the inhabitants; but it prevents those who are brought up in the farming business, and have but small capitals to begin with, being employed properly in their way; who, were they so employed, would be a nursery for farmers: as many of them, by an active and spirited culture of such small farms, are soon enabled to take larger, and so become useful and profitable subjects. Whereas, if they are unable to hire such small ones to begin with, they are deprived of an opportunity to exert themselves in their proper sphere; and compelled to turn into some other way of life, they are not so well qualified for, in which they frequently miscarry, and so involve themselves, and those connected with them, in difficulties, which mostly end in poverty and disgrace.

Nay, my pamphlet, Intituled Unitings and Monopolizing Farms, was not particularly aimed at the large ones, which were originally so; but principally at uniting small ones to make large ones, as has been of late too much practised. For I know instances where six, eight, or ten, are brought into one man's occupation, and the little farmers dispossessed,
In many cases, where farms have been united, the buildings are still standing, and the houses which did belong to the little farms, are let as cottages; there it is very easy to reduce them to their pristine state, and is what every land-owner that has his own interest at heart, I hope will do: and if he has any feeling for his fellow-creatures, he is inexcusable if he neglects it. And where the buildings have been taken down, or in lands that never were divided; even there, would the land-owners but make proper divisions, and build upon them, I am opinion, their estates would be improved in value by the advance of rent, more than equivalent to the expence they would be at in erecting such buildings. And in doing this, they would distinguish themselves as worthy members of the community, as it would certainly tend to the good of every individual in the kingdom: and at the same time promote their own interest.

And few of them able to hire any other. But what I have mentioned in the said pamphlet, of the proper size of farms, which I thought likely to be most advantageous to the community, was chiefly intended for new inclosed lands, as many inclosing bills have lately passed: and in such circumstances, I have no doubt, but it would be most for the good of all, to divide them into such sized farms, rather than large ones; as the lands would much sooner be properly cultivated, and at all times both the produce and rent greater than they would in large farms. And although this was my principal aim, yet it was not all, as I know instances of large farms, which if divided, would yield both a greater produce and greater rent, more than equivalent to the increased expence for buildings and repairs.
Having shewn and explained the bad consequence attending this practice of uniting and monopolizing farms, and given my opinion concerning letting arable lands, with respect to the quantity to be held and used by one farmer; I shall add an observation or two concerning leases, which I think may be of use both to the land-owner and occupier, and likewise to the public. As every thing which is likely to cause our lands to yield a larger quantity of provisions ought carefully to be attended to.

When arable lands are divided into proper quantities to be held and used by one farmer, we are then to consider the proper term to let them for: as in no case where it can be avoided, would I advise letting them so as to be held from year to year, or on very short leases; for when held in that manner, it certainly lessens the quantity of the produce of those lands.

To explain this, suppose a tenant takes a lease of a farm for only seven years; then as he has no assurance of holding it any longer than for that time, all that can reasonably be expected from him in that case is, to till the lands properly, and to lay on them what manure he raises from them, with a little other cheap stuff, purchased and put on them in the first two or three years: all which will be entirely worn
out before the end of seven years, the time his lease was for. And in the last three or four years of a lease, all tenants (except they have an assurance before that time, of another term when the present is expired) will, in their style, drive their lands; i.e. crop them all they can, without either laying them down to feed, or rest, or putting any manure upon them, more than what rises from the lands, and by their leases they are bound to lay on them. Thus, at the end of this seven years' lease, the lands are not likely to be so good as when this tenant took them. And suppose that he, or any other tenant, takes another seven years' lease of the same premises, and goes on in the same manner to the end of this second lease; and then to a third, making together 21 years; always driving his lands at the end of every seven; in this way there is no likelihood of the farm being better while thus used, but great reason to expect it will grow worse; and decline in its produce.

On the contrary, suppose this tenant had at first taken the same farm on a lease of 21 years, in one term; then he, if a good farmer, would have improved his lands at the beginning of his term, with substantial and durable manures, such as he thought most suitable, and most easily procured; altho' expensive: and probably this would have taken some
years before all would have been done. Yet these kinds of manures improve the lands to such a degree, as to leave them better than before, even 15 or 20 years after they have been laid on them; and beside these, during the whole term the tenant would have been constantly returning on them, all the manure he could raise from them; and supposing them to have one driving at last; yet there cannot be any doubt, but that those lands, while thus held in one term for 21 years, would have yielded a greater produce than when held for the same time by three separate leases, of seven years in each. And not only so, but during that time, the tenant would have a much better bargain of them in one lease than in three; and at the end they would have been worth a greater rent to the next succeeding tenant. All which I think so evident to any person in the least conversant in these affairs, that when thus explained, there needs no other reasons to enforce them.

I shall likewise advise all land-owners, not to be too strict in their covenants, to prevent their tenants ploughing up any kind of grass-lands. For tho' in marshes and low meadows they ought to be restrained, yet in upland pastures it is often done with great advantage, and without any damage to the land-owners. For many of those uplands, after having been laid a long time in grass, yield very
slight crops; but were they ploughed a few years, and then laid down again, they would while ploughed, yield large crops of grain, and when laid down again, much larger crops of grass. I have known this practised on lands that a few years before were almost all laid in grass, for keeping cows; but now, having ploughed a great part of them, the farmers, as well as the land-owners, have found their account in it. As on these lands, when first ploughed, after two or three crops of grain, they sow artificial grasses, turnips, &c. by which they are able to keep as many cows as before, and to keep them better; their cows being better fed, they make more of them, and by ploughing more land, they grow more corn, and raise a greater quantity of manure for improving them. Thus a greater quantity of provisions is raised from the same lands, and the tenants are able to pay greater rents for them.*

* What is here said relative to the landlords permitting their tenants to use, in some instances, their own discretion in breaking up some pasture lands, with a view of laying them down again, after a regular series of crops, deserves the attention of both parties. On the one hand, the covenants of the leases ought to lay a proper restraint, to prevent the tenant from converting too much of the land into tillage, and thus exhaust it; but on the other hand, if a land-owner has a good farmer on his estate, who sees the necessity of breaking up, for a time, some parts, with a view more to their improvement, than his own present interest; in such case, he ought not to withhold his consent; which should be always given in writing. A landlord once in this county, was in the habit of visiting his farm, while the tenant was breaking up a piece of interdicted pasture: he acquiesced in the alteration, and remarked to the labourers,
I believe it is now past all doubt with the discerning part of the nation, that the present practice of Uniting and Monopolizing Farms, is attended with bad consequences to the community; and also, that it is the chief cause of the present high prices of all kinds of provisions, yet I would not be understood as if I thought it the only one; for I know there are others that tend to produce the same effect: two of which I shall only mention, they being so evident as not to need any arguments to prove them. And those are, the present general *dissipation* and *extravagance*, in all ranks of people; and the great increase in the number of horses bred and kept. Both these greatly diminish the produce of our lands; and perhaps, may be nearly of the same date; the precise era of them I will not take upon me to determine; but for 20 years past, they, as well as uniting farms, have all been increasing.* So that

that the tenant was making a great improvement, and would make a clever piece of it; yet soon after, wanting to expel the tenant, he brought this very thing forward, as a breach of covenant, in an action at Bury assizes, because the leave was not given in writing.

* The luxury of all ranks of people, has been increasing in a wonderful degree, since the time Mr. Lewis wrote; but if the very heavy taxes and enormous price of provisions continue, very few, besides place-men and farmers, will have it long in their power to indulge in luxuries.

The author has but barely mentioned the consequence of keeping too many horses; but it deserves farther consideration; for it is presumed, that instead of many of the horses now used in agriculture, oxen might be substituted; which after having been worked a few years, might be fattened, and slaughtered. If this practice should be generally introduced,
supposing the produce of our lands 20 years ago were then nearly equal to our consumption, by all these causes operating together, there must now be a deficiency. And if we consider, that during the last 20 years, the prices of almost all kinds of provisions have been increasing; and also, that in the first part of that time the quantity of corn exported did decrease till 1756, and was then stopped, and large quantities were imported for two or three years; and since 1756 all export have been stopped several times, and an import allowed: but the difference between the export and import I am not able to determine (not having seen any account made up so far). But as our present want of corn is evident, whoever considers this impartially, in my opinion, must

much land, now appropriated to the growth of oats, might be sown with wheat, and the quantity of beef would be considerably increased. It is also to be apprehended, that a great many useless horses are kept: the present generation being so much accustomed to travelling on horseback, or in carriages, that very few persons walk even the shortest distances; and it is very seldom that any, except of the very lowest ranks, are seen on foot, in the roads. Above, among other advantages likely to arise from the more universal use of oxen in husbandry, was mentioned an increase in the quantity of beef; this is a serious object, and it is hoped it will be thought no improper digression to hint, that if fewer calves and lambs were killed, the benefit to the country would soon be very obvious. If there could be any liberal mode devised, by which the life of these animals could be preserved till they should arrive at maturity; though the tables of the luxurious rich would not exhibit so great a variety, yet a greater quantity of more substantial animal food would be produced, and consequently a greater number of persons would be able to participate of that food at a more reasonable rate.
be convinced, that these causes have, in a great measure, had this consequence. For I am of opinion, that the stocks of old corn in hand for some years past, at the several times of harvest, have been growing less and less, year after year; altho' much greater quantities have been imported since the year 1756, than were ever known before, in so short a time. And before 1756 I do not find that corn was ever permitted to be imported duty free; but since that great quantities, which evidently shews a deficiency, that must drain the nation of its specie. Now what reflection is a thinking mind likely to make on this? The answer is plain, that for want of due economy we are now deprived of that plenty we used to enjoy.

All those causes abovementioned must occasion a constant diminution, or waste, of the produce of our lands. But the sudden advance of the price of wheat at this time, took its rise from another cause, which is temporary: for tho' that grain has borne a high price for some years before, yet this sudden advance now, seems to me to proceed from a deficiency in quantity, and that more than was expected by most people. However, the cause is evident, and easily to be accounted for, without any imputation of unfair dealings, in either the farmers, or those trades-
men whose business it is to buy or manufacture that commodity.

For the season for sowing wheat in the autumn of the year 1770, was very unfavourable, by reason of the wetness of the weather; in so much, that vast quantities of land, intended by the farmers to have been sown with it at that time, could not be sown in such condition as to give them any reasonable hopes of a crop from them at the succeeding harvest. And though many farmers did sow their lands after Christmas, yet the crops from those lands sown so late, were much inferior to what might have been expected from them, had it been done in proper season: and great quantities of land were not sown at all: so that the produce of wheat at the last harvest was greatly lessened by the wetness of the weather, at the proper season for sowing it. And though that wheat crop was not unfavourable, comparing its produce with other years, by the acre, yet it was not great; and the deficiency in quantity of that grain now wanted (more than might have been expected from the other causes before-mentioned) is for the most part occasioned by that unfavourable season for sowing wheat in the autumn of the year 1770. But this is not all, for that scanty produce of the last harvest was lessened by another circumstance, which tho' it increases our present wants,
yet it must give us good hopes of a greater plenty after the next harvest. And that is the last seed time for sowing wheat was a remarkable good one, and the price being high, a much greater quantity of land was then sown with wheat than is usual in most years; by which the produce of that grain from the last harvest was greatly lessened by a more than ordinary quantity being used to seed the land.*

Thus it appears, as a natural consequence from the two last seasons for sowing wheat, that there must be a deficiency; and that the present scarcity of grain, is not an artificial one.

Many persons of good understanding have entertained extravagant notions, relating to the produce of our corn lands; supposing that the produce of one good year is sufficient for our own consumption, for three, four, or more years. And perhaps this may be true in some particular places; but with respect to the whole kingdom, it is vastly erroneous.

And the best way to estimate this is, to compare the quantity of the whole growth of the kingdom, with the quantity exported, during the time we did

* It is very remarkable, that in most of the reasons here given of the scarcity, there is a very great resemblance between the circumstances at the time this pamphlet was written and the present.
export corn: a particular account of which is found in a pamphlet entitled, Three Tracts on the Corn Trade and Corn Laws, second edit. p. 143, which seems to be computed with great accuracy and precision: The consumption is computed from the number of people, to which is added the quantity exported, and from that sum is taken the quantity imported; the remainder is the quantity of the whole growth. And by this account it appears, that upon an average for 68 years, from 1697 to 1765, the export of wheat for all that time, was not quite one-nineteenth part of the growth. But if we compare the growth of all sorts of corn together, with the export of all sorts for that time (as may be seen in that work, p. 144) it will appear that “the export is barely one thirty-second part of the consumption, one thirty-third part of the growth, one thirty-sixth part of the growth, including the seed, and not near one-third of the seed itself.”

And as the export was all we had above our own consumption, it evidently appears, that upon an average one year with another, for these 68 years, we were ourselves a market for all the produce of our wheat, except one nineteenth part. But comparing the quantity of all sorts of corn together, and the export for that time, it appears, that our own consumption was, for all that time, equal to the whole
produce of our lands, excepting only one thirty-third part thereof. How widely different is this account from what those people above-mentioned are apt to believe? Therefore, as our consumption so nearly equals our whole produce, whenever our old stock of corn in hand at any harvest, is not large, and the crops of that year prove deficient, it must greatly affect the price. And whoever considers the small difference there is between the produce of our lands and our consumption, must be convinced, that every practice or custom likely to lessen the produce of our lands, or to waste it improperly when produced, ought carefully to be guarded against; as it is of the utmost importance to the whole community.*

* As the present is a time of unprecedented pressure, and the price of all kinds of provisions must be severely felt by all ranks of people, especially the middling and lower ranks, with families; everyone who has any plan to suggest, which is likely to alleviate the distress, ought to make his sentiments known, that from perusing and comparing the different views in which the subject appears to different persons, those who are in situations to make or recommend regulations likely to be useful in remedying the evil at present, or in preventing its recurrence in future, may be assisted in their laudable endeavours. Nothing but a persuasion of the obligation at this time of communicating such suggestions, could have forced the writer of these notes to submit the following hints to public consideration, which he does with great deference.

1. A general inclosure of waste and uncultivated lands; this must make a considerable increase in the produce of corn, &c. and employ many hands in preparing them for an arable state, which would not fail of being highly beneficial.

2. A diminution in the breed of horses, and every encouragement given to the breeding and using of oxen. See note, page 45-46.
Having shewn the evil tendency of Uniting and Monopolizing Farms, and given my opinion of the methods most likely to remedy the evil, as well as for letting farms, so that they may yield the greater increase, (all which, I presume, are worthy the attention of the public) and then subjoined a few observations, to shew the principal causes of the present high Prices of Provisions; I shall only add, if we are not wanting in ourselves, we may safely rely

3. Some regulations in the circulation of paper currency; as this puts it in the power of too many to become purchasers and speculators in the first necessaries of life.

4. A restriction as to the number of dealers through whose hands provisions should pass.

5. A maximum price, above which wheat and other grain shall not be sold: if this were set at 80s. per quarter for wheat, and in proportion for other grain, the farmer would have an adequate return for his capital, his expenditure, and labour, even in years as deficient as the last; this being nearly double the average price of two or three years preceding 1800.

6. A distribution of estates into smaller parcels, by which the salutary effects enumerated in this pamphlet, it is hoped, would be experienced; and it is presumed many hints may be derived from what Mr. Lewis has advanced.

There would be difficulties attending the adoption of any of the foregoing plans; but when the evil is of great magnitude, some perseverance ought to be used, and some sacrifices made. There is however every reason to hope, that when this country shall be again blessed with the return of a permanent peace, the bounty of Providence will be sufficient for all our exigencies, and the felicity and strength of the nation manifest in the comfortable circumstances, and increasing numbers of all ranks.

The great consumption and waste of provisions in time of war have undoubtedly a great effect on the price of all kinds of provisions; to which it may be added, that government agents, by being ready on all occasions to buy very great quantities, naturally enhance the markets by their competition with, and preponderancy over, all other purchasers.
upon that power, for our daily bread, who is all sufficient, and has promised, that seed-time and harvest shall never fail. For notwithstanding the uncertainty of the seasons, on which the whole does in appearance so much depend, yet it rarely happens, but that the produce of the earth, one year with another, is sufficient for our support. Therefore, so far as our wants proceed as a natural consequence from our own neglect or mismanagement, we are inexcusable. And though ignorance may be pleaded in extenuation of guilt, for those who knew not the error of their ways, yet certainly those who do know, and still persist in any evil practice, they must be self-condemned.
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