

occasional references to the testimony on which they rest.

First, then, it appears that the expense of maintaining a man, with his wife and three children, *as paupers*, in a parish in the agricultural districts of England, may be taken, on a general average, at 25*l.* per annum. This estimate, however, supposes them to be supported with the most rigid parsimony. At the rate of wages and allowances lately exacted by the insurgent population in some parishes in Sussex, the maintenance of such a family would amount to 40*l.* 13*s.* per annum. The term "*paupers*" is here used, not in its original sense, as descriptive of persons living altogether on alms, but in that technical sense which the administration of the poor laws has, unhappily, rendered but too familiar. Such a family, therefore, if they remained in England, would, it may be said, replace, by the value of their labour, some part of the cost of their subsistence; and it may be thought that the whole of the 25*l.*, or of the 40*l.* 13*s.* annually expended for their support, could not be correctly represented as an uncompensated loss to society at large. It may be freely admitted, that before we can determine the precise amount of that loss, the value of their labour must be deducted. But that deduction would, in almost all cases, be inconsiderable, and, in very many, utterly insignificant. The value of a pauper's work is generally small,