A true estimate of the value of leasehold estates, and of annuities and reversions for lives and years. In answer to a pamphlet, intitled, Sir Isaac Newton's Tables for renewing and purchasing leases. &c.; and to a letter added to it intitled, The value of church and college leases considered, &c.;

#### **Publication/Creation**

London : Printed for J. Roberts ..., 1731.

#### **Persistent URL**

https://wellcomecollection.org/works/uwkwbc99

#### License and attribution

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection 183 Euston Road London NW1 2BE UK T +44 (0)20 7611 8722 E library@wellcomecollection.org https://wellcomecollection.org

# ESTIMATE

52101 / (P/

8765

Of the VALUE of

## Leasehold Estates,

#### AND OF

## Annuities and Reversions

FOR

## Lives and Years.

#### IN

Answer to a Pamphlet, intitled, Sir Ifaac Newton's TABLES for Renewing and Purchasing Leases, &c. and to a Letter added to it, intitled, The Value of Church and College Leases consider'd, &c.

Quod cuique obtigit, id quisque teneat. Eo si quis plus appetet violabit jus Humanæ Societatis. TULL. de Offic.

#### LONDON:

Printed for J. ROBERTS, at the Oxford-Arms in Warwick-Lane. M. DCC. XXXI.





#### THE

## PREFACE.



HERE have been feveral Treatiles wrote of late Years, to shew the particular Values of Leasehold Estates for Lives and Years, and the Renewals of them. Some of

these have been very Curious and Elaborate; but the Authors not having sufficient or proper Materials to found their Calculations on, and designing to raife the Value of these Estates, in the Opinion of the World, beyond the common and received Estimation, they have been obliged to require such Postulata as could not be justly granted them; by which means their Calculations, though never so ingenious and useful on other Occasions; are, on this, to be considered but as meer Speculation. Others seem to have A

been calculated on purpose to promote the profitable Scheme of raising Fines on Renevals, and being very partial and unfair in their Computations and Reasonings, were of dangerous Consequence to the Proprietors of Leasehold Estates: Among these, the chief was the Pamphlet intitled, Sir Ifaac Newton's Tables for renewing Church and College Leafes, Sc. this having been made great Use of in profecuting the Design of raising Fines, the Performance highly applauded, and the World defied and challenged to Answer it, I thought it necessary (as No-body had hitherto attempted it) to undertake this Task, and give a particular Answer to both Parts of that Pamphlet : This I have done in the following Pages, in the Course of which I have attempted establishing what, I imagine, a just and practical Method of estimating the Values of these Estates, from Principles and Confiderations different from what have been hitherto advanced.

The Reader will observe, that in the Computation I make of the Value of a Life, I reckon it equal to fourteen Years: This, to some, may, perhaps, seem too little, because, as it is common, now Interest of Money is low, to give twelve Years Purchase for a Life, it will be said, that the Life purchased ought to be reckoned equal to more than fourteen Years. But it must in this Case be considered, that the Value of Annuities for Life, are not only advanced in proportion as Interest of Money sinks,

finks, but by many People, purchafing Annuities for Life as a Provision for themselves, their Wives or Children, often giving more than they are really worth, and than they wou'd give for the Lives of other Persons. Besides which, the Price of these Annuities, like many other Things, is pretty much advanced by the Disproportion in the Number of Buyers and Sellers, which does not at all alter the Value of them, but a Life remains still equal to the same Number of Years.

As to the Anfwer I have given to the first Part of this Pamphlet, intitled, The Tables, Sc. the Reader will see that I have not made use of any intricate Process of Calculation, but have endeavoured to set what I have advanced in as clear a Light as the Nature of the Subject would admit, designing it rather for Use and Practice, than Speculation only; after answering the first Part, I have given a particular Answer to the last, intitled, The Value of Church and College Leafes confidered, &c. In this it may be thought by some that I have treated the Author's Performance with a little too much Freedom. However that may be imagined, as I have no Knowledge of, nor have so much as heard who the Author was, I can't be justly suspected of any Design of treating him in the least unhandsomely, but I have been unavoidably led into this Way of an/wering him, from his manner of treating the Subject, and confidering him (as he really

A 2

15

is to me) an anonymous Author, I have anfwered him as I judged the Work deferved; and here, I think, it will not be improper to make fome Obfervations on the raifing these Fines, as practifed fince the first publishing the Pamphiet I have here answered, and of the Confequence of it to the Proprietors of these Estates.

It must be allowed, that if the Estimates and Reasonings in this Treatise had been just, the raising Fines on these Estates would have feemed just and reasonable, but wou'd not have been so in reality; for as certain Rules and Methods of taking Fines on Renevals have been established by the long and continual Pra-Efice of Corporate Bodies, and those Rules were in the Nature of 'em just and reasonable; they have by Length of Time justly obtained the Force of Customs; as such, have established a Right of Renewal in the Tenants, and ought therefore, as other legal Customs, to be duly observ'd. In this manner it seems likewise to have been confider'd by Corporate Bodies themselves, who as Leases have been run out, have usually leased those Estates again at a Value proportionable to the customary Price of Renewals.

This Cuftom having fettled a particular Value on Leafehold Eftates, they have constantly fold at the Value fo fixed on them by this Practice of Renewing; from whence it appears

appears, that the immediate raising of Fines on Renewals, is very injurious to the Tenants, as it necessarily finks the Value of the Estates in their Hands below the Prices they purchased them at. Besides which, these Estates being confidered as established in Value by the regular Price of Renewals, they have been Mortgaged, settled on Marriages, and limited on Trusts, &c. as Estates of Inheritance have been, and many Tenants have, at great Expence, made Improvements on their Estates, by Building and otherwise, which they can't have a reasonable Advantage of in the remaining Part of their Term; from all which it's plain, that by raising these Fines the Tenants Estates are not only injuriously sunk in their Value, but a very unjust Advantage is taken of those Tenants who have laid out Money in improving their Estates, and of all those who have mortgaged, settled, or limited their Estates on Trusts, or hold them as Guardians to Orphans, &c. who, by their Covenants, and other Circumstances of their Estates, are under a Necessity of renewing their Leafes. All these may be moderately computed at two Thirds of the whole Number of Tenants, and from the Necessity these Tenants are under of Renewing almost on any Terms, Examples have been set for others, and Renewals refused them, unless they wou'd comply with the same Terms these have been obliged to accept.

I have shew'd in the following Pages, that notwithstanding Interest of Money is lower than it

it was some Years ago, that will not warrant the raising Fines on the Generality of Leases: But if we suppose it wou'd justify such a Pra-Etice, I should think however, that, in Justice and Equity, when such a thing is intended, the Tenants ought to have a previous Notice given them, that when the Number of Years to come in their Leases is expired, they would be raifed in their Fines, and that, till then, they should be at Liberty to renew on the usual Terms. By this means the Injustice of linking the Value of their Estates, and all the Hardships on Estates under Mortgages, Settlements, Trusts, Guardiansbips, &c. would be justly avoided. But as this Method seems to answer chiefly for the Benefit of Successions, it probably would not weigh so much as the Prospect of immediate Advantage to the present Posses, which has so much prevailed in this Affair, that some of these Bodies inveighing much against the Injustice of raising Fines above one Year's Value, have, notwithstanding, taken a more specious Method by estimating the annual Value of their Estates considerably above the Rack-Rent, and then assuring their Tenants they use them extreamly kind in taking but a Year's Value for a Renewal, by which means they answer the End of raising their Tenants without the feeming Imputation of Injustice.

To all this I expect it will be objected, that Churches and Colleges are under no Obligations of Renewing, and therefore have the fame Liberty

berty private People have to make the most of their Estates; In Answer to which, I allow, that they are not usually under any Covenants to renew with their Tenants, nor would fuch Covenants bind their Successors; but the' neither Themselves or Successors are bound by Covenant, they are notwithstanding, in Justice and Equity, bound by the customary Practice of Renewing to accept the Fine usually paid: And whoever is acquainted with the true Nature of these Estates, and confiders rightly what I have before observed, will plainly see that if these Bodies were not obliged to renew on the usual Terms, but were at liberty to raife their Tenant's Fines; it would not, however, in the Nature of the thing, be just and reasonable so to do; or if it were, at least, not before the Years to come in their Leases are expired: And if the Courts of Westminster-Hall have not thought proper to interpose on these Occasions in favour of the Tenants; or if any Doubts remain on this Subject, as it is of great Importance to the People of England, and the quieting the Pof-Selfions, and improving great Part of the Estates of the Kingdom, depend on this Point; it will, no doubt, very justly deferve the Consideration of Parliament, to settle and ascertain these Fines, as has been formerly done in several particular Instances, where Corporate Bodies have attempted to raise their Tenants.

I am far from being against Corporate Bodies making the most of their Estates, by all reasonable

reafonable means, as well as private Perfons: But if this Practice of raifing Fines in general be not strictly just, they will certainly find in the Course of a few Years, that it is not their true Interest to continue it, whatever immediate Profit may accrue to the present Bodies.

#### ERRATA.

Page 5. line 25. read 9, 8, and 7, or 12, 11, and 10. Page 24. line 24. read Lives at given Ages, may be estimated. Page 37. line 24. after the Words 21 Years, infert, any Part of bis Estate lie unoccupied, or.



A

[I]

## ESTIMATE

#### Of the VALUE of

#### Leafehold Estates, &c.



HE raifing Fines on the Renewals of Church Leafes, having been fome Years ago particularly recommended to all Deans and Chapters, and a Refolution taken

by fome of 'em for that Purpofe, a Pamphlet was publish'd about the Year 1720. intitled, Tables for renewing and purchasing the Leases of Cathedral Churches and Colleges: To which was added, a Piece, intitled, The Value of Church and College Leases considered, and the Advantage of the Lesses made very apparent.

B

Thefe

These Pieces appearing (not only from their Contents, but by the industrious Ufe made of them) to have been published with an intire View of promoting and facilitating the Defign of raifing Fines, by giving Churchmen, as well as their Tenants, a very extravagant Notion of the Value of these Leasehold Estates; I had a Design, fome time ago, of anfwering the whole Pamphlet; but it being given up by many understanding Men of the Church, as falling fhort of the Defign, I fuspended my Intention, believing that fome of those Bodies, who had attempted to raife their Tenants, from the Reafons and Motives contained in it, would foon find their Error, and go on again in the old Way: But finding my Miftake, and that feveral Editions were published, under the Title of, Sir Ifaac Newton's Tables for renewing and purchasing Leafes, by which the Readers were to believe that Performance Sir I/aac's, or at leaft that he had calculated these Tables for shewing the Value of Church Leafes, I thought it time to undeceive the World in that Particular, and to shew the Artifices and Fallacies used to support and carry on this Defign, which feems to have been calculated only to enrich Churches and Colleges, by a Method very injurious to their Tenants. It's a great Injustice to the Character of Sir Isaac Newton, to form Tables from Calculations approved by him, and make a wrong

or

or even any Application of 'em under the Sanction of his Name. It appears plain from his Approbation in the Title Page of this Pamphlet, that it was only the Method of Calculation, by which those Tables were formed, that he approved, and not the Author's way of Reafoning and Application of 'em to Church Leafes ; and therefore, as I shall shew his Application of 'em to be intirely Groundlefs and Wrong, that alone will be fufficient to convince the World, that Sir Ifaac Newton had no Concern in it, and that his Name ought not to have been made use of to patronize that Performance. These Tables, to which Sir Ifaac Newton's Approbation is prefixed, dated in 1685. feem to have been first published in King James II's. Reign, and to have been intended for fupporting a Scheme the Churchmen of that Time were carrying on of raifing their Tenants Fines. As the fame Tables, in the Drefs they now appear, with the other Piece added to it, were first published about the Year 1720. with the fame View; I might here make feveral Obfervations from the Circumstances of the Times thefe Pieces were published in, and the Reafons and Motives on which this Scheme was attempted to be put in Practice : But as the Truth of the Effimates contained in 'em depends on the real and intrinfick Value of Leasehold Estates, I shall chiefly apply myfelf to the Confideration of that Particular. One Thing I cannot but remark by the way,

B 2

which

which is, that Churchmen and Fellows of Colleges, before the Revolution, had much better Pretence to raife their Tenants Fines, than those of the present Times have, there being then no Tax on Land, which (as will appear hereafter) lessens the Value of these Estates more than is equivalent to the Difference of Interest, which at that time was but One per Cent. more than it is now.

The first Part of this Pamphlet, called the Tables, &c. confifts of a Medley of Preface, Tables, Advertisements, Contents, Constructions of Tables, &c. wherein the Author is very kind and condefcending to his courteous Reader, by inftructing him, not only in the first Rudiments of Arithmetick, and the Ufe of his Tables, but in all other Knowledge that may give him fuch a Notion of the Value of these Leasehold Eftates, as was most agreeable to his Purpofe. I shall not enter into an Examination of all the Particulars, or controvert the Juffice of the Calculations in most of those Tables, as not being at all neceffary to my Purpose, but shall allow them to be fufficiently exact, and that they are grounded on Calculations approved by Sir Ifaac Newton, and, if this Author pleafes, even that these Tables were calculated by him; but I fhall evidently fhew, that as they are here made use of, they are not at all applicable to the purchasing and renewing these kind of Leases, and shall endeavour to fettle a more practical Effimate of the Value of

of these Sort of Estates, than has hitherto been made.

But before I confider that Part relating to Leafes for Years, it will be proper to examine our Author's 6th Chapter concerning the purchafing and renewing Leafes for Lives, about which, as well as those for Years, I shall widely differ from him in estimating their Values. It feems the Scheme was to raife the Fines on these Leases, as well as on Leases for Years; and therefore he begins this Chapter, by informing the Reader, That ' the common Way of purchasing Lives, was ' to reckon one Life as a Leafe of 7 Years, ' two as 14, and three Lives as 21.' This (which he calls the common way) feeming unequal, he fays there is another way more agreeable to Reafon, and that is, to compute ' the Ift Life as 10 Years, the 2d as 9, and ' the 3d as 8, in all 27 Years.' So that at 7 l. per Cent. according to his Tables, one Life is worth above 7 Years Purchafe, two are worth above 10 Years and a Quarter, and fo in proportion if the Lives are computed at 9, 8 or 7, or 12, 11 or 10.

Now fuppofe, *fays our Author*, one of
thefe Lives fhould die, what muft be given
to make up the Number again? Then (by
way of Anfwer) he fays, one Life which is
dead, was as a Leafe of 10 Years; and therefore to take in a new Life (*i.e.* to add a
Life to commence after the two in being)
I may reckon 10 Years lapfed, and fo take,

on and shews the Value of fuch a Renewal by his Table of Reversions, to be 2 Years and almost a Quarter's Value, and fo in the fame Proportion for two Lives, or at other Rates of Interest. I must confess, this Author feems to me to have appropriated to himfelf a very peculiar Method of Computation. I can't indeed but agree with him. that Leases for 3 Lives have commonly been reckoned equal to about 21 Years. And I muft allow, that the 1st Life in a Leafe for 3 Lives, may be very moderately computed equal to 10 Years, but it's above the Reach of a common Capacity to fee how a 2d Life to commence after the Death of the first, or 10 Years hence (as it is in Effect) should be equal to 9 Years, much lefs, that a 3d Life, to commence 19 Years hence, or after the Death of 2 Lives in being, should be equal to 8 Years. But our Author, not thinking even his decreafing Scheme fufficient to raife the Renewal on a Death to the intended Price. has a very curious way of working it up ftill higher, by confidering a Life to be added, as equal to 10 Years; for, fays he, if one Life dies, to take in a new Life, I may reckon 10 Years of the 27 lapfed, and take a Fine accordingly.

This fure will be thought a very extravagant Method of Computation, to any one who confiders, that 10 Years is, according to our

our Author himfelf, the Value of a prefent Life, and that a Life added on a Renewal, is not to commence till after the Death of the remaining 2 Lives, which, according to his own decreafing Scheme, is valued but as 8 Years lapfed in a Leafe of 27, and according to mine (reckoning a Life, as he does, at 10 Years) is but as 4 Years in a Leafe of 21, with the Addition of fuch farther Confideration as may be reafonable, if the Lives in *effe* are grown old or bad Lives, as will be feen hereafter.

These Leases for 3 Lives having been commonly computed equal to 21 Years, it must have been in a very different manner from this Author's, viz. The Ift Life equal to 10 Years, the 2d to 7, and the 3d to 4, not as he pretends it to have been computed at 7 Years for each Life, and that plainly appears from the Value of a Life having ufually been computed at 7 Years Purchafe, which could not have been reckoned at fo much, if one Life was computed but equal to 7 Years, a Leafe of 7 Years being not worth near 7 Years Purchase in ready Money. This Computation of 10 Years the 1st Life, 7 the Second, and 4 the Third, appears likewife, from the Nature of the Thing, to be more just than 7 for each Life, or than our Author's at 10, 9 and 8.

For if the 1st Life be computed equal to 10 Years, the 2d Life (which is to commence after that, as it is in Effect) can't be com-

computed at fo much as 9, becaufe the 2d Life being then 10 Years older than at the Commencement of the Leafe, his Life must in that 10 Years be diminished in Value more than one Year by the Difference of Age, befides the Hazard of his dying or contracting ill Health in the 10 Years Continuance of the first Life; for if we allow but one Year's Decrease for every 10 Years Advance in Age, we shall by that Method extend Life much beyond its common Duration. For Instance, let us suppose a Life of 20 or 30 Years old, and equal to 10 Years, fuch a Life therefore will not, by this Rule, expire till 120 or 130 Years of Age, which plainly fhews that our Author's Decrease of one Year for 10 Years Advance in Age, is not fufficient, but there ought to be fuch a Decrease, that a Life may expire between 70 and 80, which is a more proper Limit for the Extent of old Age. The manner, therefore, I confider it in, is this; It's generally allowed that a healthy Man of about 30 Years of Age is the beft Life; and as the Decrease of Life, from about that Age to the Extremity of old Age, is nearly in Arithmetick Progression, I begin from the Age of 30, and make no Alteration in the Decrease, but by decreasing 2 Years for every 10 Years Advance in a Man's Age, I form a general Rule for effimating the Value of a Life at the different Ages thus; A healthy Man at 30 Years of Age equal to 10 Years, at 40 Years of Age equal to 8 Years, at 50 to 6 Years,

Years, at 60 to 4 Years, and at 70 to 2 Years. This, I believe, (computing a Life, according to our Author, at 10 Years) will be found as near the Matter as any general Rule can be formed ; the Allowance of I Year only for every 10 Years Advance in Age, appearing by what has been before observed, to be too little. Let us therefore suppose a Leafe for the Lives of A, B, and C, who are now each of them 30 Years old, fuch being the beft Lives. The Life of A therefore, being equal to 10 Years, B will be 40 Years old when his Life commences; and his Life, if he be then in Health, will, by the precedent Rule, be equal to 8 Years; and C being 48 Years old when his Life commences, viz. after the Death of A and B, his Life therefore will be fomething more than equal to 6 Years; by which the whole Leafe would be fomething above 24 Years, viz. 10 the 1ft Life, 8 the 2d, and about 6 the 3d Life; but then it's to be confidered, that the Life of B, the 2d Life, is purchased 10 Years before it's fupposed to commence; and as the Chance of his out-living A is allow'd for in effimating his Life at 8 Years after the Death of A, fo the Chance of his dying in the Life-time of A, ought to be allowed for out of that 8 Years. The Rifque therefore of B's dying or contracting an ill State of Health during that 10 Years of A's Life, if computed equal but to 1 Year, B's Life in the Leafe will be equal at most but to 7 Years; and, by the fame Reafon,

fon, the Life of C being purchased 17 Years before it's fuppofed to commence, the Chance of his dying or contracting an ill State of Health in 17 Years, being computed equal but to 2 Years, will reduce his Life in the Leafe as equal to about 4 Years, and then the Estimate of the 3 Lives will stand thus, viz. 10 the 1st, 7 the 2d, and 4 the 3d, in all equal to 21 Years. The 3 Lives therefore being nearer equal to 10, 7 and 4, than any other Computation our Author has made, let us now put the Question with him, If one of thefe Lives dye, what is it worth to add another Life to this Leafe; The common way, before our Author's new Difcovery, was to take I Year's Value, as was ufual, for renewing 7 Years in a Leafe of 21; and, I believe, on a fair Confideration of the Affair, and as a general Rule, that will appear to be much nearer the Matter than any other he has advanced; for if I Life dyes, and another is to be added to the Leafe, (i. e. to the two remaining Lives) the Life to be added is not to be confidered as the first Life, according to our Author, or as 10 Years, but is the 3d, and in Reversion to commence after the Death of the 2 remaining Lives, and is therefore not to be confidered as 10 Years expired in a Lease of 27, but as 4 expired in a Lease of 21. But then, if the Life that is dead, lived any confiderable Time after the Commencement of the Leafe, or if the remaining Lives are old or infirm, those remaining Lives ought then

then not to be computed at 17 Years, as the 2 firft Lives were before computed, but at a Medium, we'll fuppofe at 14 or 15 Years, and then the Life to be added ought to be computed as 6 or 7 Years lapfed in a Leafe of 21; the Renewal of which will, by our Author's Tables, be found far fhort of what he effimates it at, and if fairly computed as an Eftate, and not as a clear Annuity, it will not be above 1 Year's Value, as will appear hereafter when I confider Leafes for Years.

This decreasing Scheme of our Author's at 10, 9 and 8, and his Tables formed on it, will further appear to be wrong, on confidering the Effimate from thence of the Value of a greater Number of Lives, for, according to his Tables, a 4th Life, which is to commence after 3 in being, or 27 Years hence, (notwithstanding the Hazard of the 4th Life dying or contracting bad Health in that 27 Years) he computes equal to 7 Years. A 5th to commence after 4 Lives, or 34 Years, (tho' liable to the fame Hazard) is equal to 6 Years. A 6th after 5 Lives, or 40 Years, will be equal to 5 Years. A 7th after 6 Lives, or 45 Years, equal to 4 Years. An 8th Life, 49 Years hence, equal to 3 Years. And a 9th to commence after 8 Lives, or 52 Years, will be equal to 2 Years, notwithftanding the Hazard of fuch 9th Life dying or contracting bad Health in that 52 Years Continuance of the 8 precedent Lives. This decreasing Scheme, and the Table founded

C 2

on

on it, is fufficiently anfwered by what has been before obferved, altho', I think, on a fair View, it appears too extravagant to need any Confutation; nor would it anfwer our Author's Purpofe of raifing Fines on Renewals, if his decreafing Scheme fhould be

allow'd juft. For if we decrease one Year (according to our Author) or two Years, on each of the two last Lives, as 10, 9 and 8, or 10, 8 and 6, we may by that Method compute the Leafe equal to 24 or 27 Years, which would make the Value of the whole Leafe half a Year, or three Quarters of a Year's Purchafe, more than a Leafe of 21 Years; but yet, where-ever one Life, as here, is valued at 10 Years, the Renewal will be the fame, whatever Decrease is made on the two last Lives. Suppose A, B, and C are the three Lives, now in either of these Cases, computing the Lives at 10, 9 and 8, or 10, 8 and 6, the Life of A, the first Life, being allowed equal to 10 Years, we must suppose he lives that Time; (the Chance of his living longer being fuppoied equal to the Chance of his dying before) if therefore B and C are living at the Death of A, they being then each of them 10 Years older than at the Commencement of the Leafe, their Lives, at the Time of A's Death, will, by the precedent Rule, be equal but to 8 Years each; but then C's Life being in the Leafe not to commence till after B's Death, befide the Hazard of his dying

1.1.6

dying in the mean Time, his Life will be equal to about 6 Years. The two remaining Lives B and C being then equal to about 14 Years, the Value of a Renewal, in either of these Cases, will be according to what a Life, now equal to 10 Years, is worth to commence 14 Years hence; to compute which it must be confidered, that the Life to be added will be 14 Years older when his Life commences, than at the Time of the Renewal, which, with the Hazard of his dying during that 14 Years, will be equal to at least 3 Years; fo that in all these Cases, where the first Life is valued at 10 Years, whatever the two last Lives are valued at, the Renewal of a Life will be the fame, and equal at utmost but to 7 Years in a Leafe of 21: Nor would it materially alter the Cafe if a Life be computed at 12 Years, for altho' that adds about one Year's Purchase to the Value of a fingle Life, yet it advances the Value of a Leafe for three Lives but about half a Year's Purchafe; and in fuch Cafe, the Value of a Life added on a Renewal, would be ftill the lefs, because on the Death of a Life, the remaining two will be equal to a greater Number of Years than in any of the Cafes before-mentioned, as will be eafily feen, by allowing 2 Years and a half for every 10 Years Advance in Age, from the Age of 30 to between 70 and 80, and applying the Method of Calculation before used to this Case.

I have hitherto confidered the Value of Lives, with particular View to answering our Author's Chapter on that Head; and having (as I imagine) fully answered what he has there advanced, I should now have quitted the Subject, but finding that fome Obfervations, made on Bills of Mortality abroad, have been apply'd to the making very extravagant Estimates of the Value of Lives; and that very curious and elaborate Calculations, confirming fuch Eftimates, have been made from those Bills, which could by no means warrant any Effimate at all of that Kind, I thought, as my own differ'd from those, it would be neceffary to fhew more particularly on what Principles it was founded. By fome of these Estimates it's computed, that a Life of 20 Years is equal to 33 Years, and a Life of 30 to 28. That of 1000 Children, not exceeding I Year old, but half of them dye in 34 Years, and that every 7th Child of them live to 70 Years of Age. These Computations must appear fo very extravagant to the most flight and common Observer, that I think it cannot need a formal Confutation.

It's a common Obfervation that Death makes very great Alterations among the Inhabitants of every Place in the Courfe of 20 Years. And every Obfervation on the Mortality of 20 Years in any little Place, where the Inhabitants are particularly known, will fuggeft the Value of a Life to be much under 20 Years, confiderably above half the Inhabitants bitants of every Place dying in that Time. And it is well known, that but a few Years ago, great Effates have been got by granting Annuities for Lives, when Money was at 6 per. Cent. and a Life fold but at 7 or 8 Years Purchafe. It is likewife to be observ'd by the Bills of Mortality of Breflaw, Leipfig, Nuremburgh, publish'd of late Years, that half the Children born, are buried in about 10 Years, and according to all those of London, in much lefs Time; and that not above one in about 22 arrives at the Age of 70 Years. It must indeed be allowed, that the best way of effimating the Value of Lives is from Bills of Mortality; but it must be equally allowed, that hitherto we have had none fufficiently exact, from which any just Estimates could be made. In order to that, it would be neceffary, that the particular Number of Inhabitants should be known, and the exact Ages at which they dye: That the Inhabitants fhould be nearly the fame during the Time the Bills are kept : That it fhould be for a Number of Years: That the Years of the Plague, Small-Pox, and other unhealthy Years, as well as the healthy, may be included in the Account: That they fhould not be of a particular healthy Place beyond-Sea or in England, but from Places in England only, and fuch as are neither remarkably healthy or unhealthy.

As these Particulars, necessary in fuch Bills of Mortality, from whence Lives might be exactly

I think, they can't hereafter, with fufficient Exactness, be inferted in the Bills of any populous, trading City, where the Number of Inhabitants is fo very uncertain, and always changing; and where, in fo great a Number of Parishes, it can't be supposed the Registers are all exactly kept. But the Bills of Mortality that would best answer this Purpose, fhould be formed from Registers truly kept for 40 Years or more, in little Country Parifhes, where the Inhabitants all depending on Husbandry, are feldom changed, and the Number of them eafily known; and from a Number of these Registers, kept at different Parts of England, and duly compared, a much more exact Estimate of Lives might be made than has been hitherto. On these Confiderations, and with this View, I have examined the Registers of two fuch Parishes which have been regularly and well kept for near 40 Years last past; and this Examination having confirmed me in the Observations I had before made on the Value of Lives, by former Examinations of Registers, and Observations on the Mortality of Parishes, where the Inhabitants were pretty well known to me, I shall give some Account of it, that the Reader may fee my Estimate of the Value of a Life is not meerly Conjecture, and that those made by others, valuing a Life at 28 or 30 Years, are without just Foundation. These Registers (as most kept in Country Parifhes)

Parishes) do not mention the particular Ages at which Perfons dye, and therefore the exact Value of Lives, at the different Ages, can't be calculated from them; but, I think, they may very well be applied to the making a good general Estimate of the Value of a Life. The first of them is of a small Country Town, confifting, by exact Computation, of 948 Inhabitants, including all the Children. It appears by this Register, that taking the last 20 Years together, 45 Perfons, including Children, have been buried annually : That in the fame Number of Years 36 have been chriften'd annually : And that 13 are annually buried under 2 Years old; from whence I make the following Computation.

From the Number buried in a Year --- 45 I take the Number buried in a Year ( 13 under 2 Years old — - -Number of Inhabitants dying annually above 2 Years old -----From the whole Number of Inhabitants 948

I deduct the Children christen'd in 26 Years \_\_\_\_\_ Number of Inhabitants above 2 Years? 876

Then dividing the Number 876 by 32, it appears the whole Number of Inhabitants above 2 Years old are buried in 27 Years.

The other Parish confists of 127 Inhabitants, including Children; and from a strict Exami-D

#### [ 18 ]

Examination of the Register for 40 Years, the following Computation is made.

From the Number buried in a Year --- 6 Take the Number buried in a Year under 2 Years old \_\_\_\_\_ I  $\frac{1}{2}$ Number of Inhabitants dying annually  $\frac{1}{4}$   $\frac{1}{2}$ 

From the whole Number of Inhabitants 127 Deduct the Children chrieftn'd in 2 Years \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 8 Number of Inhabitants above 2 Years 119

Then dividing the Number 119 by  $4\frac{1}{2}$ , it appears the whole Number of Inhabitants are buried in 26 Years.

It appears by these Registers, that there is not, in these Places, so many christen'd as buried, contrary to what is observ'd in the Bills of Mortality of London, and fome other Places; but tho' this does not appear by these Registers of Christenings, there is, notwithftanding, as many born in these Places annually as dye; and the Reafon of the Difference is, that in fome of the Foreign Bills of Mortality we have an Account of all that are born, whether christen'd or not, and even of the Still-born; and in London Children are ufually christen'd at Home foon after they are born; but in these Country Places, being chriften'd only at Church, it is not ufually till 3 Weeks or a Month, and fometimes longer,

longer, after their Birth, fo that Children Still-born, or that dye within a Month, which are a pretty many, are not inferted in the Register. And this likewife is the Reason why, by these Registers, it appears that not near so many of the Children christened dye within 2 Years, as by the common Bills of London.

By these Registers the whole Number of Inhabitants above 2 Years old are buried in fomething above 26 Years, from whence a Life will appear to be equal to little more than 13 Years. But then, as there is fomething greater Mortality among Children from 2 Years old, till about 10, than afterwards; and as from the Age of 10 upwards, the Decrease of Life is nearly in Arithmetick Progreffion, there must be an Allowance in the Value of a Life for the extraordinary Mortality from the Age of 2 to about 10 Years; to anfwer which I add another Year, and compute a Life equal to 14 Years. This, I believe, must be allowed to be the full Value of the best Life, if it be confidered, that there is not included in these Registers any fatal Year of Plague, Small-Pox, or Epidemical Fevers, which commonly happening once in 50 or 60 Years, ought either to be included in Bills of Mortality, from which Lives are estimated, or allowed for in the Computation of a Life. The best Life being therefore equal to 14 Years, I form from thence a Scale for the Decrease of Life as follows.

A

[ 20 ] 

To this Scale I expect it will be objected first, that a Life under 30 is the best Life, and therefore the Decreafe should commence from a younger Age: And fecond, that 72 is not a proper Period for the Extremity of old Age, many People living beyond that Time. As to the first, it has been commonly reckoned that a Life of 30 Years is the best Life, and I take the Reason of it to have been from a Confideration of the Hazards young People are more particularly fubject to, than those of a more advanced Age, from Plagues, Small-Pox, Meazles, epidemick or peftilential Fevers, and from the Danger of impairing their Healths or Conftitutions by the Follies and Extravagancies incident to Youth, befides those that Women are more particularly fubject to under that Age. These kind of Confiderations, I fhould think, would induce any one to chuse a Life of 30 Years rather than a younger, fuch being less liable to Accidents, and being more fixed and fettled in their Conflitutions and way of Living than younger Perfons, may be better depended on for long Life.

As to the fecond; the Perfons that exceed the Age of 72 are fo few, and their Lives are are then of fo fmall Value, that it can have very little Weight in any Effimate of the Value of Lives; for it appears by moft of the Bills of Mortality publish'd of late Years, that about one in 22 only arrive at 70 Years, and not above one in 40 arrive at 80. And in one of the Parishes, of which I have examin'd the Register where the Inhabitants have many Years been well known to me, out of 125 buried in 20 Years last past, including Children, but 3 have arrived at 70 Years, and 2 at 80, which is one in 41 to 70 and upwards, and one in 62 to 80 and upwards.

A Life being then equal to 14 Years, what will be the Value of 3 fuch Lives. To an-fwer this Question, it must be confidered, That the 1st Life being equal to 14 Years, the Chance of his living above that time, is equal to the Chance of his dying fooner; and that the 2d Life being likewife equal to 14 Years, the Chance of his living longer than the 1ft Life, or 14 Years, will likewife be equal to the Chance of his dying before the first Life. The Chance therefore of the 2d Life furviving the first, being an equal Chance, the prefent Value of it will be half the Value of his Life, or 7 Years: So the prefent Value of the 3d Life, at the Death of the first, or 14 Years hence, being (as the 2d then is) equal to 7 Years, the Chance of his furviving the 2d Life will be equal to the Chance of his dying before him, the prefent Value of which equal Chance, will be half the Value

of

of his Life, or 3 Years and  $\frac{1}{2}$ . The Effimate therefore of the 3 equal Lives will be 14 Years for the firft, 7 the fecond, and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  the third, in all equal to 24 Years and  $\frac{1}{2}$ . And by the fame Method, the Value of 4 or more equal Lives may be effimated. From the Principles on which this Computation is founded, I deduce general Rules for the effimating any Number of Lives, whether equal or unequal, as follows:

1/t. If one Life be added to one in being, from the Value of the Life added (*i.e.* the Years that Life is equal to) fubtract half the Value of the precedent Life, and the Remainder is the Value of the Life added.

2d. If a third or fourth Life is to be added, from the Value of the Life added (or Years that Life is equal to) fubtract half the Value of all the precedent Lives, and the Remainder will be the Value of the Life added. That these Rules may be the better underftood, I will explain them by the Scale before-mentioned, which exhibits the Values of Lives at different Ages, and shew more plainly the Method of calculating the Value of any Number of equal or unequal Lives, and of renewing or adding a Life of any Age, to any Number of Lives in being, of any given Age.

A Life of 30, 40, 50, 60, 70 Years of Age, Equal to 14, 11, 8, 5, 2 Years. By what has been before obferved, the Value of 3 Lives, each equal to 14 Years, is 14 the first, 7 the second, and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  the third, in all equal to  $24\frac{1}{2}$  Years. Suppose therefore it be demanded what is the Value of 3 unequal Lives, whereof the first is 50 Years old, the second 30, and the third 40?

To determine this, I place the Lives fucceffively according to their Ages, beginning with the oldeft first, as 50, 40, and 30. Then I fee by the Scale, a Life of 50 is equal to 8 Years, which I fet down for the Value of the first Life. The fecond then being by the Scale equal to 11 Years, if by the Rule before laid down, we deduct from that II Years half the Value of the first Life, which is 4 Years, the fecond Life will remain equal to 7 Years. In the fame manner, the third Life being by the Scale equal to 14 Years, if we deduct from that Term half the Value of the two preceding Lives, which is 7 Years and  $\frac{1}{2}$ , the third Life will remain equal to 6 Years and 1, and the whole 3 Lives will be 8, 7, and  $6\frac{1}{2}$ , in all equal to 21 Years and  $\frac{1}{2}$ , which in Figures may be more clearly exhibited to View, thus;

Three Lives of<br/>Transposed to50, 30, & 40 Yrs. old,Transposed to<br/>Separately equal to<br/>as by the Scale,50, 40, & 30,

are all together equal to 8, 7, &  $6\frac{1}{2}$ , or 21 Years and .

As any Number of Lives, at given Ages, may be effimated by this Method, the next Confideration is, how Renewals on these Leafes are to be valued. To determine this, the following Method, deducible from the Principles before laid down, is to be observed. When one Life drops, it must be first confidered what the Ages of the two remaining Lives are : For Inftance, Suppose 40 and 50, then (as before) I place that of 50 first, which by the Table I find equal to 8 Years. The Life therefore of 40 (equal by the Scale to II Years) to commence after a Life equal to 8 Years, being by the precedent Rule equal to 7 Years, the two Lives in being will be equal to 15 Years. If therefore a Life of 30, equal by the Scale to 14 Years, be added to these two in being, it will by the aforefaid Rule be equal to  $6\frac{1}{2}$ , and the 3 Lives in the Leafe will be 8, 7, 6 1, or 21 Years and -

By the fame Method, the adding of 1, 2, or more Lives of any Age, to any Number of Lives given, Ages may be effimated.

So likewife all Reverfions for Lives, after any Number of Lives in being, or after any Term of Years, may be truly calculated on thefe Principles, and by this Method. But there being fome little Difference in the Effimate of Leafes for Lives and Reverfions, I shall here state that Difference, by the Observation of which, the Reader will eafily apply the precedent Rules equally just, either to

to Leafes for Lives or Reversions. If A be 30 Years old, and B 40, and a Reversion be granted to B for his Life, to commence after the Death of A; the Life of A being, by the aforefaid Scale, equal to 14 Years, the Life of B in this Reversion is, by the precedent Rule, equal but to 4 Years, because the Life of B, the oldeft Life, could not commence till the Death of A, which was the youngeft, and equal to 14 Years. But if a Leafe had been made for the fame Lives of A and B, and the Life of the Survivor, in the usual manner, the Life to be confidered as Reversionary, would have been of more Value, becaufe fuch Leafe not expiring till the Death of the Survivor, the way of eftimating this Leafe will be by confidering Bthe oldeft Life, as a Life in Effe, and confidering the Life of A the youngest Life (tho' the first in the Lease) as a Reversion commencing after the Death of B the oldeft Life. On this account it is, that, in my Computation before of unequal Lives, I transpose them, and confider the younger Lives as Reverfions commencing after the older. And, with this Obfervation on the Difference, the Method I have used may be applied equally to Leafes for Lives, and to Reverfions, obferving only, that in calculating the Value of Lives in Effe, which are unequal, the oldeft Life must be placed first, and the rest in Succession, by which means the youngest will be estimated

as
as a Reversion commencing on the Death of the precedent Lives.

I am aware that many Objections may be made to my Computations of the Value of these Leases, as, that a Life is equal to above 14 Years; that one of 30 Years of Age is not the best Life; and that 72 Years is not a sufficient Period for the Extremity of old Age.

These Objections have indeed been anfwered already in the Courfe of this Treatife, and therefore need no further Anfwer here; but I will fuppose they are all allow'd to be just, and a Life is computed equal to 16 or 18 Years, a Life of 20 the best Life, and the Extremity of old Age extended to 80 Years, altho' by that means the Value of one Life may be advanced: yet as the Decreafe for the Intervals of Age from 20 Years to 80, must then be greater than in my Scale, the Truth of these Objections will make very little Alteration in the Value of a Leafe for 3 or more Lives, and the adding a Life on a Renewal will be ftill of lefs Value than in my. Estimate, because on a Death of one of the Lives, the remaining 2 will be equal to a greater Number of Years than in my Computation, as will eafily be feen by any one who will take the pains to calculate it.

I shall therefore, notwithstanding these fort of Objections, conclude from what has been before observ'd, that a Life of 30 Years, being being the beft Life, is equal to 14 Years; and that a Leafe for 3 fuch Lives is equal to a Leafe for 24 Years and  $\frac{1}{2}$ , and the Renewal of a Life not ufually more worth than the adding 7 Years to a Leafe of 21. The exact Values of all which may be particularly calculated by the Rules before laid down, and the Tables at the End of this Treatife.



### CHAP. II.

## Of Leafes for Years.



D'YTOIOT

AVING confidered what our Author has advanced on the Subject of Leafes for Lives, and fhewn the Errors on which he founds his Calculations of their

Values, I shall now confider what he has faid on the Subject of Leases for Years, and shew the general Mistakes on which his Scheme for raising the Fines on these Leases is erected; and shall make it appear, that these Mistakes have run this Author, and the Author of the Letter added to the Tables, into great Errors in their Computations of the Values of these fort of Estates.

The

The first general Mistake, which runs thro' both Parts of this Book, is the putting Leafehold Estates and Annuities on the same foot, and calculating the Value of Leaseholds as if they were Annuities, clear of all Deductions.

The fecond is in making no Difference between Leafeholds and Effates of Inheritance, but confidering a Leafe as an abfolute Sale for the Term contained in it, and the Tenant as having the fame abfolute Property, during his Term, as the Proprietor of an Effate of Inheritance has in his Effate.

As to the first, that Leafes of Estates and Annuities are confidered by these Authors as on the fame foot, I think appears very plain from his Tables of Renewals themfelves, (they being, according to his own Account, all formed from a Table of Reversions, which is calculated only for clear Annuities in Reverfion) and likewife from the Titles and Conftructions of all his Tables, and the Obfervations made on them. It appears likewife to be fo confidered in the Letter added to them, intitled, The Value of Church and College Leafes confidered, Fol. 6. There it's afferted from these Tables, that one Year's Rent (deducting the referv'd Rent) is not half the just Value of a Renewal of 7 Years lapfed in a Leafe of 21. From whence it's plain that this Author, deducting nothing but the referv'd Rent, and computing the Renewal of 7 Years at 2 Years and a half Value, confiders the annual Rent, after the referv'd

referv'd Rent deducted, as a clear Annuity. And by Fol. 10. of that Letter it appears beyond Difpute, that he there confiders it fo, for being apprehensive that fome Difficulties or Objections might arife from his confidering Leafes in that manner, and making no Allowances for Taxes, Repairs, and other Incumbrances; he (with a plaufible fort of Dexterity) gets rid of all those kind of Difficulties, by foftly fliding them over, and informing the Reader that as to Taxes, Repairs, and other Accidents, those are not peculiar to Church Eftates, but Eftates of Inheritance are equally liable to the fame Inconveniences; by which is artfully infinuated, that Taxes, Repairs, &c. are not real Incumbrances, fuch as Tenants of these Estates ought to have any Allowance or Confideration for; but when foftned with gentler Terms, they become, it feems, only accidental Inconveniences that all Effates are equally liable to.

As to the 2d Error into which these Authors run, by not making a Difference between Leaseholds and Estates of Inheritance, but confidering a Lease as an absolute Sale for the Term, that seems evident not only from what is before observed of their putting these Estates on the same foot with clear Annuities, and from the Nature of the Tables and Constructions of them; but from Page 18 and 19 of *Church and College Leases confidered*, where that Author says, that Churches and Colleges ought to confider that their letting Leases, Leafes, is felling their Eftate for a Time, and therefore, in order to do right to themfelves, as well as others, they should have regard to the Prices that Land is generally fold for in the Countries where their Eftates lie. What Effect this way, or the other of putting them on the fame foot of Annuities, will have in raifing the Estimates beyond the real Value, will best appear by examining into the Nature of these fort of Estates, and fettling a just Method of estimating their Values.

I know it has been a common Notion among others, as well as with these Authors, that the letting Leafes in the manner practifed by Churches and Colleges, is felling the Eftates for a Time, and the Purchasers or Leffees do commonly confider the taking thefe Leafes as Purchafes, by which they are often led into mistaken Notions of the Nature of their Eftates, and of their Right and Intereft in them, and confequently in their Computations of their true Values. The Selling an Eftate must, in common Underftanding, fignify the transferring to the Purchafer an abfolute Property in the Eftate fold, either in Fee-fimple, or for fome limited Time; for if the Eftate fold is not to remain an absolute Property in the Purchaser, but is laid under any Restraints, Conditions, or Refervations, it will not come under the Denomination of a Sale, but must be either in the Nature of a Lease or a Mortgage. As therefore,

fore, in thefe fort of Eftates, the Purchafer is laid under Reftraints from committing Wafte, Refervations of Rent, Conditions of Entry for Non-payment of Rent, and under other Covenants and Obligations, as in common Leafes or Mortgages, the letting thefe Eftates can't be confidered as felling them for a Time, but they muft undoubtedly ftand on the fame foot with Leafes or Mortgages; in both which Views I fhall examine them, and fhew, that in neither Cafe this Author has taken in the proper Confiderations neceffary to determine their real Values.

The Refervations in these fort of Leafes, which are now commonly about one third Part of the Value, were formerly near, or altogether, the full Value of the Effate : But in Process of Time, as the Value of Money grew lefs, and Husbandry improved, thefe Eftates growing of greater Value, and Churchmen being willing rather to enjoy the Benefit of the improved Value themfelves, than leave it for the Benefit of the Succeffors, they took Fines as Confiderations for the improved Value, and continued referving the old Rents; at which their Succeffors being incenfed, frequently entred upon their Tenants, and (as the Preamble of Stat. 32. H.S C. 28. expresses it) the Fermors, who had paid great Fines for fuch Leafes, and had laid out great Sums of Money in repairing, building, and improving their Eftates, were, after the Deaths or Refignations of their Leffors,

fors, daily expulsed with great Cruelty, and put out of their Ferms by the Succeffors of their Leffors; for which Reafon that Statute was made, to prevent those Inconveniencies for the future, and to bind the Succeffors in all those Cases where Leases for 3 Lives or 21 Years had been made by their Predeceffors, provided fuch Leafes were of Lands that had been ufually letten, and the accuftomed Rent was referv'd ; but that Statute did not extend to hinder them taking Fines as they had done before, fo that the usual Rent was but referv'd, the Reafon of which probably might be from the King's having before pretty well ftript them of their Poffeffions, he was willing to keep his Ecclefiafticks in Temper, by leaving them still fome means of acquiring Wealth.

This Statute of H. 8. nor the fubfequent Statute of 13 Eliz. reftraining them from taking Fines, that Practice has continued ever fince, and tho', no doubt, it's now become a lawful Practice, it's however, in the Nature of it, no other than a Method of anticipating their Revenues by a Sort of Mortgage; the Money paid by a Tenant for his Leafe, being only a Confideration for having a Leafe on a lefs Rent than the annual Value of the Eftate, and being only a Sum charged on it to be paid again by the Tenants enjoying the Estate for a Term of Years. It is therefore not unlike the Cafe of Money lent on a Mortgage, for in the Cafe of a Mortgage, the Perfon

Perfon who lends the Money has a large Term of Years granted him at a minute Rent, and redeemable by Payment of the Money lent and Interest, and in these Leafes the Tenant who pays the Fine, has a Term of Years granted him at a larger Rent, which is not made redeemable by paying the Money advanced for the Fine and Intereft, but the Term is made abfolute for 21 Years, with fuch Refervations of Rent, and under fuch Covenants, that the clear Profits of the Estate may in the 21 Years pay the Tenant his Money again with compound Intereft; from whence it appears, that thefe Leafes are not to be confidered on the foot of Purchases, but as Mortgages, and the Tenants as Perfons in Poffeffion on a Mortgage. If we confider it therefore on this foot, it must be allowed, that the Money paid for the Leafe, ought to bear fuch Proportion with the clear Value of the Term, that the Tenant may at the End of his Leafe, be paid, by the clear Profits of the Eftate, the Money which he paid for it with Intereft. And this is the very Principle upon which our Author himfelf forms his Table of Reversions, as appears by his Construction and Use of it, set forth in his Preface Fol. 6, 7, 8 and 9, from which all his Tables for Renewals are formed. I'll therefore confider the Value of thefe Eftates on the foot he has here put it, and fhew that his Effimates are not warranted on that which is undoubtedly the true Foundation.

F

It

It must therefore be allow'd me as a first Principle, that the clear Profit of a Leafehold Eftate, with compound Interest during the Term, ought to be equal to the Sum paid for the Leafe, with compound Interest during the Term; from whence it will follow (as in the Cafe of him who is in Poffeffion on a Mortgage) that all Charges and Incumbrances on the Effate, during the Continuance of the Leafe, are to be allowed for and deducted. I'll therefore put the most common Cafe of a Leafehold Eftate, and examining it on this Principle, fhew how it agrees with our Author's Effimates. The most common Cafe of a Leasehold Estate, is that of a Rectory or Parfonage, there being one in every Parish : This Rectory I'll suppose fituate in one of the Neighbouring Counties to London, and to confift of a Parfonage Houfe, with a Barn-yard, a Stable, 2 Barns, a Chancel in the Church, fome Glebe, and the great Tythes of the Parish, all which I'll fuppose to be of the annual Value of 150%. and leafed for 21 Years, referving 50 l. per An. Rent, which being one third of the whole Value, is about the Proportion of what is most commonly referv'd on these Leafes: This Lease, therefore, being 100%. per An. besides the referv'd Rent, is, according to our Author, worth 1200% computing Intereft at between 5 and 6 per Cent. Now the Principle on which our Author's Table of Reversions, and all his other Tables, are founded, founded, being, as is before obferved, that the Profit of the Eftate, with Intereft during the Term, fhould be equivalent to the Money paid for the Leafe, with Intereft during that Time: If therefore the Profit of this Eftate be not 100 *l. per Ann.* the Fine for this Leafe is not worth 1200 *l.* becaufe the clear Profit of the Eftate will not be equivalent to that Sum with Intereft, but it will be worth fo much only, as, with compound Intereft for the 21 Years, is equivalent to the clear Profit arifing from the Leafe.

Let us therefore examine what the clear annual Value of this Eftate is, and by that we fhall judge, according to our Author's Tables, what fuch a Leafe is worth. In order to this, we muft make an Allowance for all Charges and Incumbrances the Church's Tenant is fubject to, in refpect of his Eftate. The first Allowance to be made out of the full Rent of 150*l. per Ann.* is the referv'd Rent, which is 50*l.* 

Next to that is the King's Tax, which for 21 Years laft paft has not been, and, according to the Situation of the Publick Affairs, we can't expect will in the Courfe of 21 Years to come, be under 2 s. and fometimes 3 and 4 s. per Pound: I'll therefore compute it, one Year with another, to amount to 3 s. in the Pound; and as Eftates are high Taxed in all the Neighbouring Counties, it may be reafonably fuppofed, that this Eftate is Taxed at 140 l. per Ann. Eftates in great Part of F 2 those those Counties being Taxed within 51. in the Hundred; the King's Tax will therefore be 21 l. per Ann. The annual Repairs (confidering that the House, Stable, 2 Barns, and the Chancel, must want intire new Covering once in the 21 Years, and the 2 Barns new Floors, with a new Pale-Fence to the Yard) may be very moderately computed at 20%. per Ann. Besides which, there are feveral Imall Articles, fuch as the Charges of Leafes on every Renewal, Procurations, Penfions, Acquittances, Sc. that may be all computed at about 21. per Ann. I omit here the making any Allowance for extraordinary Incumbrances, that Eftates in particular Places are liable to, as Sea-Walling, Affefiments to Ferries, Wallfcots, Re-affeiments to the King's Tax, &c. Nor have I made any Allowance for accidental Loffes by Tenants, or by Fire, Storms, Tempests, Inundations, Sc. which on many Eftates are very confiderable in the Courfe of 21 Years. The Account, with the Allowances made, ftands thus:

Full annual Rent — J	50
Referv'd Rent	50
King's Tax at 1401. per An. 3s. per. l.	21
Annual Repairs	20
The other Incidents	2
Total Charge	93
Total clear Value	57

The

1.

The Renewal therefore of this Leafe of 150%. per Ann. according to our Author's own Effimate at 2 Years and a half's Value, and computing Intereft between 5 and 61. per Cent. would be but 142 l. without allowing any Interest for the Money the Tenant expends on Account of the referv'd Rent and other Incidents for 7 Years. But it is to be observ'd, that our Author, in his Effimate of 12 Years Purchase, computes Interest of Money between 5 and 61. per Cent. which is too low a Rate: That indeed feems to be a proper Intereft, as it's between the loweft and higheft Rates; but it's to be confidered, the Fine a Tenant pays for his Leafe, being to be paid him again by the Profits of the Estate, his Leafe is but as a Mortgage or Security for the repaying him his Money, and if thefe Fines should be calculated at such a Rate of Intereft that the Tenant is but just paid at the End of his Leafe, his Security would be but a very bare Security, and what he would run a confiderable Rifque of lofing by; for if he should have, during the 21 Years, any Lofs by his under Tenants not paying their Rents, or by any Accidents of extraordinary Repairs from Storms, Tempests, Fire, Inundations, or Decay of Buildings, or if a Building by these, or any other means, falls, or by Age and Decay requires new Building, he is obliged to build it, and is not intitled to (nor have fuch Tenants ufually) any Allowance on any of these Accounts, even of Timber

ber to do the neceffary Repairs, but whatever Accidents of that Kind happen, it's an intire Loss to the Tenant, for which Hazards, as he has no other Confideration, he ought to have an Allowance by the Fine he pays for his Leafe, being computed at a higher Rate than that of the legal Intereft. So likewife the Tenant is liable to fuffer, if his Eftate by any Accident should fink in Value, and this all Eftates are liable to, efpecially fuch as thefe, where the Tenants have no Encouragement to make Improvements, and where the principal Value confifts of Tythes, which are in their Nature uncertain, and depend on the Husbandry of other People, and not of the Tenant himfelf.

To this it may indeed be objected, that the Chance the Tenant has for its improving in Value, is equal to the Rifque of its Sinking. But in Anfwer to that, it's to be confidered, that the Tenants of fuch Leafes have it not in their Power to Improve their Eftates, fome Part confifting in Tythes, and depending on the Husbandry of other People, and in the other Part they are debarred from it by the Leafes themfelves: As to any Improvements by Building, they can't come into the Account, becaufe the Builder feldom gets even the Interest of his Money again; and the Leafes prohibiting Wafte, the Tenant can have no Advantage from Timber growing, even for doing the neceffary Repairs,

If there was a Mine of any Kind, he could have no Benefit of it; nor can he dig for Chalk, Loam, Sand, Gravel, &c. or plow up any Meadow Ground; he can't pull down any Buildings, and yet if he builds, he is obliged to keep up his Buildings; he can't difplant any Orchard, Hop-Ground, or other Plantation; and if he plants a new one, he is in strictness obliged to keep it up. These, and fuch like, being Wafte from which Tenants are debarred, it's a great Hindrance to improving their Eftates; and therefore (all thefe things confidered) the Chance of their Eftate's increasing in Value, is by no means equal to the Hazard of its Sinking. Another thing to be confidered is, that the Church Tenant pays a large Sum of Money together for his Leafe, which he receives again in the Profits of the Eftate but in fmall Sums, which must often lie dead in his Hands some Time; and befides the Hazard of lofing by his under Tenants, it will generally happen they will have a Year's Rent in their Hands; for though Churches and Colleges require their Rents paid half-yearly, their Tenants feldom have their Rents fo paid them; from all which it's plain, that the Church Tenant does not in proportion make fo much Interest of the Money arifing from the Eftate, as the Church or College may do of the Money they receive for the Fine. From the feveral Confiderations before-mentioned it appears, that the Church Tenants lie under fo many Hazards

Hazards and Difadvantages in thefe Securities, more than in others, for which they have no Confideration or Allowance, that their Fines ought to be calculated confiderably above common Intereft, to allow for all those Risques, otherwise these Tenants, who have but a bare Security, and fubject to fo many Loffes and Accidents, will not make common Interest of their Money. It's to be observed, that in Mortgages the Security or Term granted, is of much greater Value than the Money lent, and therefore the Perfon who takes fuch Security, runs no Rifque of any Part of his Principal or Intereft; but thefe Leafes being in the whole but just equivalent in Value to the Money paid for them, the Purchafer runs great Hazards of lofing by them, as is before observed. Confidering therefore the feveral Rifques and Difadvantages on the Tenant's Side, and that his Profit ought to be in proportion with his Hazard, his Fine ought to be calculated at the Rate of 7 or 81. per Cent. especially where there are Houfes or Buildings on the Effate or Land fubject to Repairs of Sea-Walls, or other Charges, by which the Tenants are at greater Hazards of lofing than common. And this feems to be reasonable, not only from the Nature of these Estates, but it has always been fo confidered, and the Fines on thefe Leafes have been calculated at an Intereft confiderably above the common Rate. Æcroid's Tables, which have ufually been followed

followed by all Churches and Colleges, were calculated almost 2 per Cent. above the common Rate of Intereft at that Time.

Our Author likewife, in his Tables Fol. 17. Chap. 7. lays it down as a Rule: " That " in purchasing Freehold Land 51. per Cent. " may be enough, but for Copyhold or " Leafes of Land 61. per Cent. for Leafes of " Land and good Houses 81. per Cent. and " for Leases of ordinary Houses 10 or 12% " per Cent." This Rule feems to have been formed from a Confideration of the Nature of the Estates, and of the Hazards and Difadvantages incident to them, and, according to this Rule of our Author's, the Fine for the Leafe before-mentioned ought to be calculated at 7 or 81. per Cent. If this Effate therefore of 1501. per Ann. referving 501. Rent, which our Author estimates at 1200%. and the Renewal of 7 Years at 2501. be calculated, (after the proper Allowances before made, and according to our Author's Tables, at 81. per Cent.) it will be worth 570 l. and the Renewal of 7 Years 99 l. 15s. and out of which deducting 17 l. for the Compound Interest of the Money paid 7 Years for Taxes and Repairs of the referved Rent, and the other Incidents, the Renewal will be worth but 82 l. 15 s. which is greatly fhort of our Author's of 1200% and 250% for a Renewal of 7 Years, and not fo much as Æcroid's of I Year's Value, deducting the referv'd Rent. The only Objection to this Calculation G

tion is, that I suppose this Estate of 150%. per Ann. to lie in a Country where Taxes are high, and fuppofe likewife a referved Rent of one third Part of the whole Value; and as to that, I must admit, that where there's a less referved Rent, few or no Buildings to fupport, and Taxes are not fo high, thefe Leafes may be more worth, in Proportion as they are lefs worth where the referv'd Rent is greater, or the Taxes and Repairs more confiderable; the Allowances for which the Reader will eafily make according to the Method of Computation I have before observed, but the Rule of Judging must still be the fame. There are many Leafes where there is a much greater Refervation than one third Part of the Value, and fome where it is lefs; but as this Cafe of a Rectory or Parsonage, with the Refervation of about one third Part, is the most general Cafe that, I think, can be put, there being a Parsonage in every Parish, if any one general Rule is observed (as commonly is by all Bodies) it ought to be from fuch a Cafe; and as in this Cafe the Renewal computed, according to our Author, at 81. per. Cent. is worth but 821. 15s. what I before advanced will be found true, viz. that the Calculations of Æcroid's of I Year's Value, deducting the referved Rent, is at this Time the full Value of a Renewal of 7 Years, and fo it will be if the referved Rent was confiderably lefs than a third Part, and Taxes not fo high, from whence it will appear

pear that Æ croid's Rule of one Year's Value, deducting the referved Rent, is as near the Matter as any one general Rule can be formed for the Renewals at this Time; and altho' his Tables were made when Intereft of Money was high, yet this Affertion will not feem at all ftrange, if it be confidered that the Fine ought to be calculated at a Rate confiderably above the common Rate of Intereft, and that the Charge of Repairs is much greater than in Acroid's Time, and the King's Tax, which Tenants are always fubjected to, is a very confiderable Article, and an Incumbrance on these Estates that is intirely new, and has happened long fince his Calculation. The Confideration of which has been probably the Reason, and, I think, a very just one, why Fines have not been raifed fince the Intereft of Money has been lower.

If the Purchafes of thefe Eftates are confidered on the foot of Leafes, the Value of them will ftill be found the fame: The Fine received by the Church or College moft ftill be confidered as an Anticipation of that Revenue which fhould be received annually by a Rent equal to the full Value; in Confideration of which Fine the Refervations are made fo much the lefs, that the Tenant may by the clear Profits of his Eftate, during the Leafe, be paid his Fine again wi h I tereft, otherwite he must be a Lofer by his Leafe; from whence it's plain, that the Tenant ought, either in his Fine or Rent, to

have

have an Allowance for Taxes, Repairs, and all other Incumbrances that leffen the Value of the Eftate in his Hands; for fuppofe a Lease for 21 Years of 1501. per Ann. referving 50 l. Rent as before; if the Tenant gives 1200%. for this Leafe, which is the full Value of 100%. per Ann. clear Annuity for that Term, whatever Charges of Taxes, Repairs, and other Incumbrances the whole 1 50 l. per Ann. is fubject to during the 21 Years, the Tenant will intirely lofe, and thefe Incumbrances being, according to the Computation before, fo great, that the clear Value will be but 61 l. per Ann. the 1200 l. given for this Term of 21 Years will be near as much as the Inheritance itfelf is worth ...

To this the Objections feem to be what was before obferved in *The Value of Church* and College Leafes confidered, Fol. 10. viz. first, that as for Taxes, Repairs, and other Accidents, those are not peculiar to Church or College Estates, but Estates of Inheritance are equally liable to the fame Inconveniencies. And fecondly, what is commonly objected to Tenants when they come to renew, that having covenanted to pay all Sorts of Taxes, and do all Repairs, they ought not to difpute performing Covenants, nor expect Abatement in their Renewal on those Accounts.

In Anfwer to which, it must be allow'd, that Taxes, Repairs, and other Accidents, are what Estates of Inheritance are equally liable liable to; but the Queffion here is, On whom those Incumbrances properly fall?

[ 45 ]

Our Author, by this Passage, seems himfelf to take it for granted, that the Tenants ought to have no Allowance on this account, which Notion he runs into from what he advances Fol. 19. that the letting thefe Leafes is felling the Eftates for a Time; by which is artfully infinuated, that the Tenant is a Purchafer, and flanding in the Place of a Landlord, is fubject himfelf to all these Incumbrances, without any Confideration for it. But as to this Notion of the Tenant's being confidered as a Purchafer, and liable to thefe Charges on that Account; I have fufficiently fhewn before, that he is not to be confidered on that foot, but as one in Poffeffion by a Mortgage, and, as fuch, is not liable to thefe Incumbrances; and, if it be rightly confidered, it will eafily appear, that, as a common Tenant, he is not liable to them.

It's well known, that the King's Taxes and Repairs are a Charge that of Courfe fall on the Landlord, and that if an Effate was let out by Leafe, and no mention made who fhould pay the King's Taxes, and do the Repairs, both thefe Incumbrances are of courfe a Charge on the Landlord; and therefore, where the Tenant by Covenant takes any of those Charges and Incumbrances on himself, which properly, and of courfe, would fall on the Landlord, he is intitled to (and usually has) an Allowance proportionable in his Rent. The Cafe is the fame in a Church or College Leafe, the King's Taxes and Repairs are there, as in other Cafes, a Charge of courfe on the Church as Landlord, and therefore if the Tenant is by Covenant fubjected to those Incumbrances, or if he lies under any other Hazards or Difadvantages, he ought to have a Confideration for it in his Fine and Renewal, or in his Rent.



[ 47 ]

### AN

# ANSWER

#### To the VALUE of

## Church and College Leafes confidered, &c.



Have in the former Part of this Treatife confidered the Nature of Church and College Leafes for Lives and Years, and fhewed that the Author of the Tables

has made but a very partial and unfair Effimate of the Values of these Kind of Effates, I should not therefore have added any thing further on this Subject, but that the Author of the Piece, intitled, The Value of Church and College Leases confidered, &c. having not only

only purfued the fame Method of Computation and Reafoning, but carried it much further, and prov'd his Points (as he thinks) beyond all Poffibility of Doubt; I can't quit this Subject without examining what he has advanced in his Part of the Performance, by which it will further appear with what Juflice this favourite Scheme of raifing Fines can be supported or carried on. This Author, in his Advertisement to the Reader, is very defirous he fhould take Notice his Letter was wrote before the South-Sea Scheme in the Year 1720. was known, and that therefore his Propofal of advancing Fines was not influenced by the extravagant Price given for Land at that Time. For my Part, I can't fee, admitting this to be true, what Use the Author would make of it, or which way it will turn to his Account. I fhould have thought he did not, in his own Opinion, stand in need of any Apology for his Scheme, or if he did, that he could never imagine this would answer his Purpose, for if his Propofal of raifing Fines could be juftified or fupported before the South-Sea Time, fure it must be equally justifiable then, for the Extravagance of that Time could not be thought, by any body, to leffen the Value of these Leases, and if his Scheme wou'd have been unjuftifiable in the Year 1720, it will be but an indifferent Apology for this Author to fay, he proposed it in the Year 1718, and was not influenced by the Extravagance

of

of the Year 1720, for if it would have been unjust in the Year 1720, it must have been equally fo in the Year 1718, there having been no real Difference in the Value of Church Leafes in those two Years. Our Author having in his Advertisement both apologized for, and juftified his Propofals of advancing Fines, proceeds with great Affurance of Succefs, thro' many Pages of his Letter, giving his undeniable Anfwers to every Objection he imagines can be made to him. And having prov'd his Point very much to his own Satisfaction, weary'd with Exultation and Triumph, he falls at last into a more gloomy and melancholly Reflection, and spends fome Pages in forrowful Lamentations for the Poverty and Oppreffions of the Clergy, which being a moving Subject, will no doubt captivate the Compassion of honest, well-meaning People, who abounding in Zeal rather than Knowledge, are always ready to bewail the imaginary Calamities of the Church; but if this Author's Scheme be not in itself justifiable, fuch miferable Lamentations, nor his fquinting with Envy on the Riches, Coaches and Six, Sc. of the Laity, will, on this Occafion, be of little Service to his Caufe.

I cannot help obferving here, that the laudable and honeft Views of every Author should be the Discovery or Support of Truth, and a ready Submission to the Force of it, and not to countenance, much less to propagate, Error and Falsehood, tho' it should answer H fome fome profitable Intentions. When an Au-thor writes in this laft way, and makes Ufe of his Learning or Knowledge to deceive Mankind, either in propagating or fupporting Falschood, or by difguifing or concealing Truth, fuch Writing is not only of pernicious Confequence in the World, but is very immoral in the Author, who will be more or lefs blameable as the Rights or Properties of Mankind are affected in a greater or lefs Degree. I shall not take the Liberty of charging this Author with writing in fo partial and unfair a way as I have just now mentioned, but I will examine fuch of his Arguments as are not already answered in the former Part of this Treatife, and leave it afterwards to the Reader to judge whether he has treated his Subject in a candid and impartial manner, equal to what he appears capable of, or like one who writes for the real Difcovery of Truth, or the Information and Good of Mankind; and if upon the Examination, it fhall appear that he has confidered this Subject partially, and with particular View only to ferve the purpose of raising Fines, he must excufe me, as well as the reft of the World, from treating his Performance with the Regard that is due to the Writings of one who appears to have wrote with the laudable View of promoting Truth and Juffice.

Our Author, in this Letter, is very careful to avoid the Imputation of having any Concern in, or being privy to the Defign of raifing Fines Fines on Church Leafes, and flates the Cafe of his imaginary Correspondent, as Tenant of a College, rather than a Church Leafe. He denies indeed that he knows of any Church intending to raife their Fines; but, as he argues all along on a Supposition of raifing them to a Year and a half, or two Year's Value, and strenuoufly justifies fuch an Advance, however his Sincerity may stand unaffected, he will, at least, be thought to have been very prophetick in this Affair, the Event happening soon after his Letter, and in pursuance of a Design carried on some time before it.

This imaginary College Tenant, after having been reprefented by our Author as very ignorant, is fuppos'd to complain, that the College had inquired into the Value of their Estate, and had made him pay for a Renewal of 7 Years more than their Predeceffors had done, viz. fomething above one Year's Value, deducting the referv'd Rent: To which our Author answers, That it was probably but one Year's Rent according to their Information. This will be thought a very fufficient Answer, no Doubt, to fuch an unreasonable Complaint. But left his Correspondent (Silly as he makes him) should be too Wife to take this for an Answer, he undertakes to prove, past all Denial, that they took but half what that Term was worth, and but half as much as Laymen ufually take of one another. Let us therefore examine how he proves these two Points.

H 2

As

As to the first of them, he fays, That, according to the nicest Calculation, the Rule for renewing 7 Years lapsed in a Lease of 21, is near 2 Years and a half's Value, computing Interest at 61. per Cent. which, he fays, may be seen in his Tables, *i. e.* the Renewal of 7 Years, in a Leasehold Essate, is worth 2 Years and a half's Value, because by his Table (which is calculated for Annuities only) it appears, a clear Annuity is so valued.

This has been fufficiently anfwered in the former Part of this Treatife, and is too obvious a Fallacy to deferve any further Confideration here: A Man muft know very little of the Nature of these Estates, and the Incumbrances and Hazards incident to them, that does not readily fee they ought not (deducting the referv'd Rent only) to be eftimated as clear Annuities; and therefore I shall not need to take Notice of what follows for feveral Pages, but shall leave this Author in the perfect Enjoyment of his judicious Arguments and fhrewd Obfervations, grounded on fo notorious a Fallacy. One thing I muft here observe to him, which is, that his Table which was calculated for Annuities before the Revolution, when they were fubject to no Incumbrance of Taxes, can't now be used for calculating Annuities, unless they are referv'd clear of Taxes, because these Tables are calculated for clear annual Payments only, and all Annuities are now fubject to the Land-Tax, unless exempted from it

it by the Grant or Refervation of them. And this Obfervation likewife fhews, that as Annuities can't be now calculated by this Table but where they are referv'd clear of Taxes, fo the Value of a Leafehold Eftate can't be calculated by it, unlefs Taxes (as well as other Incumbrances) are allowed for.

As to the 2d Point our Author undertook to prove paft all Denial, viz. that above one Year's Value, deducting the referv'd Rent, is but half as much as Laymen take of one another; I don't fee he has given any fort of Proof of it, but his own gratis dictum: He fays, indeed, Fol. 8. that the Tenants of thefe Estates ordinarily sell a Lease of 21 Years for 12 Years Purchase, the Renewal of which must proportionably be worth 2 Years and a half's Purchafe. I don't know what particular Leafes this Author may have in View; but as his Proof of this is only his own Affertion, I shall, in Answer, venture to affert, (what is well known to be Fact) that where there is a referv'd Rent of a half, a third, or a fourth Part of the Value, which are by much the most common Cases of these Leases, they are not ufually fold but from about 4 to 8 or 10 Years Purchase.

Our Author, however, having, with a high Hand, eftablifhed his two Cardinal Points, viz. that a Renewal is worth 2 Years and a half's Value, and that Laymen commonly take fo of one another, proceeds, on this miftaken Foundation, to erect his airy Fabrick, Fabrick, and, taking it for granted (inftead of proving) that a Renewal is worth 2 Years and a half Value, afferts, that if the Church fhould take after that Rate, yet ftill it would be better Husbandry to buy Church and College Leafes at 12 Years Purchafe, than to give 20 or 21 Years Purchafe for Lands of Inheritance: But becaufe the Ignorance of Church Tenants is fuch, that they cannot, or, thro' Obftinacy, will not, attend to our Author's nice Calculations, he gracioufly condefcends to their inferior Capacities, and undertakes to make it evident by a plain, familiar Inftance, and a Demonftration fuited to every Man's Capacity.

I will therefore examine his pretended Demonstration, and fee how far he proves his Point : We will fuppose, fays he, the Estate to be purchased 1001. per Ann. besides the referv'd Rent. Now if a Man gives 12001. for a Lease of 21 Years of this Estate, 'tis 800 or 900 l. lefs than he must give for an Eftate in Fee, and confequently he has at least 8001. to improve, the' he has the same Income as if he had laid out 2000 l. upon another Estate. Now the Interest of 800 l. in 7 Years at 51. per Cent. comes to 2801. and if the Church or College take 2501. which is two Years and a half's Value, that is still 30%. less than the Simple Interest amounts to, but then the Improvement of the Interest in 21 Years Time, will amount to a confiderable Sum: But now whilft a Church or College takes

takes but 100*l*. or one Year's Value for their Fine, it is lefs by 150*l*. than the Simple Intereft of the 800*l*. comes to. The Reader will plainly fee, that this fpecious and plaufible Demonstration depends intirely on our Author's Affertion, that the Purchafer of a Leafe of 100*l*. per Ann. deducting the referv'd Rent, has the fame Income as if he had laid out 2000*l*. on a Fee-fimple Eftate; I fhall therefore, in answer to him, prove, both from the Nature of these Eftates, and from the Author himself, that this Affertion of his, on which his Demonstration depends, is absolutely Wrong, and without Foundation.

This I shall do, by shewing that there are feveral Incumbrances and Hazards Leasehold Estates are subject to more than Fee-simples, which lessen the annual Value of these fort of Estates, and will prove that the Tenant of this Leasehold has not the same annual Income, as he would have had from an Estate of Inheritance of the same annual Rent.

It's well known that, on the Generality of these Leases, there is a referv'd Rent of about one third Part of the whole Value, and that the Tenant pays the King's-Tax not only for his own Part, but for the Part referv'd in Rent: So likewise he does the whole Repairs, not only for that Part which he has the Profit of, but for that faid Part which is referv'd, besides paying other minute Sums for Procurations, Pensions, Leases on Renewals, [ 56 ]

not fubject to with Compound Intereft during the Term, very much leffen the annual Income of fuch an Eftate : Befides which, thefe Tenants have no Right to Timber growing on the Eftate, or to any Mines or other Advantages from digging up the Soil, or the Advantages of any Improvements by Building, Planting, Sc. as Purchasers of Estates of Inheritance have; from all which, and the other Incumbrances and Difadvantages peculiarly incident to these Leasehold Estates, I have shewn in the former Part of this Treatife, that where a Leafehold Eftate is 1,50%. per Ann. referving 50 l. Rent, the annual Income will be but 641. and fo in proportion where the referv'd Rent is more or lefs.

Thefe Leafehold Effates being, therefore, fubject to all the feveral Incumbrances and Difadvantages before-mentioned, which fo much leffen the annual Income of them, and which Eftates of Inheritance are not fubject to, it appears plain to a Demonstration, that the Tenant of fuch a Leafehold has not near the fame annual Income, as if he had purchased 100 l. per Ann. in Lands of Inheritance; and this being the fingle Point on which our Author's triumphant and wonderful Demonstration depends, I shall not need to give any further Anfwer to it, or any thing he has built on fo airy a Foundation.

He feems, indeed, himfelf to have been aware of the Difficulties his Demonstration would lie under from these Kind of Incumbrances, and therefore, with great Caution, foftens the Matter, and gives it this artful Turn, " That as for Taxes, Repairs, and " other Accidents, those are not peculiar to " Church or College Eftates, but Eftates of " Inheritance are equally liable to the fame " Inconveniencies." Our Author here touches this Affair very gently, as a Point too tender to bear handling; but altho' he did not think this a proper Place for admitting any thing to the Difadvantage of a Demonstration fo much for his purpose, he is so good afterwards to admit p. 19. that as Church Tenants generally pay the King's-Tax for the referv'd Rent, as well as for that Part they purchase, there ought to be a Confideration and Allowance for it; and this gracious Conceffion of our Author's (altho' he mentions none of the other Incumbrances peculiar to these Leaseholds) is likewise itself a sufficient Anfwer to his mighty Demonstration, as well as his fubsequent Observations on it: He thinks the Generality of the World very unreasonable in expecting to make 5 or 6 per Cent. of their Money laid out on these Leases, over and above all the natural or accidental Charges that may happen, when, if they give but 20 Years Purchace for another Eftate, he fays, they feldom make above 3 and a half per Cent. and therefore thinks his

I

Rea-

Reafonings and Calculations are fufficiently justified, if Men make a greater Return for their Money by buying Church Leafes, than by purchasing other Estates. This Reasoning, at first View, seems very plausible, but if this Author will pleafe to confider the Difference I have just now shewn between Leasehold and Fee-fimple Eftates, and what has been faid in the former Part of this Treatife, he'll fee that they ought not to be compared together, or put on the fame Foot: He may likewife there fee, that these Leafes are not absolute Sales for the Term, but are in the Nature of Mortgages; the whole Term being but a Security for repaying the Tenant the Money paid for his Fine, and being calculated fo as to be in the whole but just fufficient for that purpose; they are but a bare Security, on which the Tenant runs greater Hazards than on a Mortgage, where the Security is ufually large to allow for Accidents; and therefore this Author, inftead of allowing the Tenant to make a greater Intereft of his Money than on a Fee-fimple Effate, fhould have allowed him to make more than on a Mortgage, and even 5 or 6 per Cent. over and above all natural or accidental Incumbrances; a further Proof of which the Reader will fee in the former Part of this Treatife.

From the eleventh to the feventeenth Page of this Piece, we have no Attempt at Proof or Argument; the Author has, indeed, by raifing Pity and Compaffion in charitable and welldifpofed difposed People, endeavoured to foften and reconcile them to his darling Scheme, and having bestowed a little of his Varnish to glofs it over, and make it appear plaufible, he enforces it with all his perfuafive Eloquence, by the prevailing Motives of Charity, and regard to the Clergy. But left, thro' the Degeneracy and Irreligion of the prefent Times, People fhould not be influenced by a due Compassion for the Clergy, we are given to understand p. 14 and 15. that the Cathedral and Collegiate Churches themfelves are in Danger, and must go to Decay, if this Scheme of raifing Fines be not carried on. This our Author proves, by afferting (what, I believe, very few imagined) that the Revenues of feveral Cathedrals are not fufficient to fupport them; and by informing the Reader that the Price of Labour and Materials, both Timber and Stone, are very much increased of late Years, from whence he takes occasion to lament the great Damage done to the Dean and Chapters Eftates in the Civil Wars, by the great Havock made of their Timber, which Damage, tho' done about 100 Years fince, I suppose he imagines is not yet recovered, becaufe he not only lays Claim to the Confideration of the Publick on that Account, but intimates, that they ought to take this Course of raising Fines to prevent things from growing worle and worfe. Our Author having declaimed on the two moving Topicks of the Sufferings

12

of

of the Clergy, and the Danger of Cathedral and Collegiate Churches decaying, unlefs this Meafure be taken, thinks, no doubt, he has fufficiently captivated the favourable Opinion of his Readers, and by that means facilitated the Execution of his beloved Scheme.

I should not have thought the Task at all difficult to have effectually answered all the Particulars he has infifted on in this Part of his Performance, but, as that might lead me to the mention of what would, perhaps, be neither agreeable to me or the Reader, the Juffice of raifing Fines not at all depending on what he has here advanced, I chofe rather to omit giving it a more particular Anfwer: I can't, however, but observe, that this Method of Address to the Paffions, is a very unfair Way of Reafoning, and by no means adapted to the difcovering Truth, as it must necessarily preposses the Mind of the Reader on one fide the Queftion. Our Author, taking it now for granted, that he has eftablifhed his Point, talks fmoothly and plaufibly of the Churches raifing their Fines, as being only taking their just Dues, and what they have a strict Right to; But fure, if he was really convinced of what he afferts, and thought he had prov'd his Point, fo fair a Reasoner as he affects to appear, would rather have relied on the Force of his Arguments, than labour to convince People, by moving their Paffions, and giving them Prejudices, on a Point where they had fo much better better means of Conviction; neither can Truth ftand in need of any fuch Affiftance, as it is always capable of fupporting it felf by its own native Force: And now, to fhew the World what fort of People his Adverfaries are, and that he may treat them with fufficient Contempt, in Page 17, he gives us an Inftance of a Church Tenant, who was fo Wife as to expect an Abatement in his Fine, becaufe he had a hard Bargain in the Purchace: For my part, I can't fee what Ufe he would make of this filly Fellow, unless to fhew the World what fort of People his Reafonings are calculated for, or to fet him up in a ridiculous Light, that he may have the Pleafure of laughing at him: But it feems there are more Fools in the World than one, for in the next Paragraph he informs us, that Leffees are apt to be fo unreasonable (he might have faid foolish) to expect Churches should abate in their Fines for the Damages their Tenants have received from their Parents and Truftees, Gc. But our Author, who is ever too hard for these unreasonable fort of People, attacks them with fo much Vigour, that he foon carries his Point, and demolifhes all fuch unreafonable Expectations. He fays, "'Tis in-" deed confessed, that if Purchasers could be " affured that Churchmen would always take " but one Year's Value for a Renewal of 7, " they might well afford to give 15 or 16 " Years Purchase for a Lease of 21 Years, " and the Money would be well laid out." Our
Our Author, indeed, does not here tell us by whom, or what fort of People, they are that make this kind Confession; but the Confeilion it felf fufficiently fhews, that (if they had not been Creatures of his own Imagination) they could have been none but fuch fort of People as he had been just before reafoning with. In p. 18 and 19, he thinks it fit to observe, that " letting these Leases is " felling the Eftates for a Time, and there-" fore Churchmen, in order to do Right to " themfelves, as well as others, should have " regard to the Prices that Land is gene-" rally fold at in the Countries where their " Eftates lie, which, he fays, always follows " the Intereft of Money, and is not regulated " only by the yearly Rent the Land is let " for ". As to the letting thefe Leafes being felling the Eftate for a Time, I have before fhewn they are not to be fo confidered, but are in the Nature of a Mortgage, and that the Values of them chiefly depend on the Quantity of the referv'd Rent, and of the Taxes and Repairs, and not on what Land is generally fold for. In effimating the Value of Fee-fimple Eftates, the annual Profit of the Effate ought to be equivalent to the Intereft of the Purchase Money, and if it is not by reason of Taxes, Repairs, Gc. which are uncertain and annual Incumbrances; yet the Purchafer has the Benefit of Improvements, and many other Advantages, as I have shewn before, that Tenants of Leaseholds have not, which

which may make Amends for it; befides, Estates of Inheritance, being on many Accounts the most defirable, there is more Purchafers for them than other Eftates, and it is the Proportion of the Number of Purchafers to the Eftates to be fold, that does in that, as in Annuities for Life, and other things, often run the Price beyond the intrinfick Value; but fuch imaginary Value of other Eftates can't inhance the real Value of these Leases, which are no more than Land Securities. If Leafehold Eftates are confidered on any other Foot, it's plain they can't rife in Value by the Intereft of Money finking in Proportion as Feefimple does; for the finking Intereft 1 per Cent. raises Fee-fimple 5 Years Purchace; whereas, according to our Author's own Tables, it raifes a Lease of 21 Years, no more than one Year's Purchace, and therefore Churchmen ought not . (as this Author infifts) to fell their Leafes in Proportion to the prefent Value of Fee-fimples.

Our Author having gone through his Demonftrations, and the other Proofs and Arguments he thinks neceffary for eftablifhing his Scheme, begins now to confider what Objections may be made to him, and upon the Whole, conceives but one thing that can be objected to his Computations, which is, that the Tenants pay the Taxes for the referv'd Rent, as well as for that Part they purchafe. To which he anfwers, that " when " the referv'd Rent is but a 9th or 10th, or " lefs Part of the Whole, as often happens, " he

" he thinks it not worth mentioning, (fuch " Lands being feldom rated to the extended " Value) but where it's a 4th or 3d Part, he " fays, there ought to be an Allowance for " it; and he hopes, and believes, that the " Equity of fuch a Cafe, when it does hap-" pen, is confidered by the Churches when-" ever Leafes are renew'd." 'The Reader will here observe, that our Author, finding himfelf under great Difficulty from the Incumbrances on the referv'd Rent, is forced to have Recourfe to meer Artifice and Chicane, and to suppose, instead of proving, every thing neceffary to extricate himfelf; for firft, he fuppofes the referv'd Rent to be but a 9th or 10th, or a lefs Part of the Whole, that (as he fays) being often the Cafe, by which he feems to infinuate, that the most common Cafe, by which we are to judge, (for otherwife it's nothing to his Purpose) is, where there is but a oth, 10th, or lefs Rent referv'd; whereas, in fact, it's notorious, that the most common Cafes are where a 4th, 3d, or greater Part is referved : but a 9th or 10th Part being often the Cafe, he fays it's not worth mentioning. And why? For this notable Reafon, That fuch Lands are feldom rated to the extended Value, by which he would likewife intimate, that these kind of Estates are more favoured in the Taxes than others, altho' it's well known, that they are usually charged in the fame Proportion with other Lands, and in most of the Neighbouring Counties to London,

don, within 5 in the 100 of the Rack-Rents. Indeed the fmall Tythes, and the great Tythes, when in the Hands of Clergymen, are generally favoured in Taxes of all forts, and that, I suppose, may have occasioned our Author's Mistake in this Point : But fuppofing these Estates were something fayoured in the Tax, that furely can't be a Reafon why the Taxes on the referv'd Rent, when it's a 9th or 10th Part only, should not be worth mentioning, for, fuppofe the Effate 100%. per Ann. the referv'd Rent 10% and the Tax at 3 s. per Pound, certainly this Tax on the reserv'd Rent at near 30s. per Ann. for 7 Years, is worth mentioning on a Renewal, tho' it may not be much to our Author's Purpose. But he, confidering that a 4th or 3d Part of the Whole may possibly be referv'd, is fo kind to hope and believe that the Equity of fuch a Cafe, when it does happen, is confidered by the Church; how well his Hope or Faith in this Matter is grounded, I'll leave to the Church Tenants to judge, who have had the Experience of it; but I have met with none who have ever had any Confideration or Allowance on that Account.

It's observable here, that our Author, by his artful way of expressing it, would have it thought, that fo much as a 4th or 3d Part is feldom referv'd, and that a oth, 10th, or leis, is the common Cafe; but I must beg leave to infift on the contrary, and that K the

the most common Cafe, and the only one, from which a general Rule can be formed, is where a 3d or 4th Part of the Whole is referv'd, as I have observed in the former Part of this Treatife; for the Truth of which, I do appeal to the Knowledge of every one, who is acquainted with thefe fort of Estates. However, I can't but observe here, that if there were as many Leafes, where a oth or 10th Part only is referved, as where it's only a 3d or 4th, that would by no means anfwer our Author's Purpofe, but would only fhew, that inftead of one general Rule in Renewals, there ought to be two, one for Cafes where a 3d or 4th, and another where a 9th or 10th Part is referved.

But as the Generality of Cafes will be found to be where it's a 3d or 4th Part, I will, as before, fuppofe a Leafe of 150l. per Ann. Value, referving 50l. Rent, and examining it on the foot our Author has put it in this Place, fee what the Renewal will be worth on his Principles. He allows, p. 19, that the Tax paid by the Tenant for the referv'd Rent fhould be allow'd for: To this I'll take the Liberty of adding the Charge of Repairs for the referv'd Rent, which, on his own Principle, ought equally to be allow'd for, becaufe the Tenant does the Repairs for the Part referved, as well as he pays the Taxes for it.

The Account therefore, according to the former Part of this Treatife, will stand thus; The

the 3d Part of the Taxes and Repairs will be 131. per Ann. other minute Charges, as Leases, Procurations, Acquittances, &c. about 21. in all 151. per Ann. which for 7 Years, with Compound Interest, amounts to about 1231. Now the Value of this Renewal, according to our Author's Effimate, and by the Tables at upwards of 51. per Cent. being 2501. if we deduct this 1231. the Value of the Renewal will then, according to his own Principles, be but 127 l. computing Intereft at upwards of 51. per Cent. But if this Fine be calculated at 81. per Cent. as I have before shewn it ought to be, and as the Author of the Tables (Chap. 7.) admits; the Renewal then, by our Author's own Table, and on his own Principles, will be but about 821. which is very fhort of his Estimate of 250%. and even of one Year's Value, deducting the referv'd Rent; and where the referv'd Rent is but one 4th Part of the whole Value, the Renewal of 7 Years will not, on the fame Principle, be worth above one Year's Value, deducting the referv'd Rent, which is the principal Point I undertook to prove.

Having therefore fhewn the Miftakes and Fallacies on which the Author has founded this favourite Scheme of raifing Fines, I shall not need to take Notice of the practical Inferences he has fo profoundly drawn, Page 20, from his Imagination of having compleatly established his Doctrine; but our Author, having relapsed into his old way of harangueing

K 2

ing on the imaginary Misfortunes of the Clergy, and the Difficulties and Difcouragements he thinks they lie under, and endeavoured to foften and reconcile the Minds of People to his Scheme, by raifing in them a compaffionate Regard for the Clergy, from very wrong Motives, and fuch, as in great meafure, reflect on the Laity; I fhall therefore, in their behalf, fay fomething in Anfwer to what, I think, he has unjuftly alledged on this Head, and then leave the Author to triumph in the full Enjoyment of his imaginary Victory.

From Page 20 to 24, he is full of thefe fort of Complaints, and feems, in my Opinion, to look with a little too much Envy on the Riches and Profperity of the Laity, and their enjoying a greater Share of Wealth than the Clergy; at the fame Time he admits, that " to be Great and Rich in this " World, and to build up Families, neither " is, nor ought to be, their Aim." And yet, in the next Paragraph, he again complains, (tho' without the leaft Ground) that " Clergymen lie under feveral Difficulties and " Difcouragements in improving their In-" come, which other Men do not."

To make good this Charge, he tells us, that "Clergymen are rated to the publick "Taxes for their Revenues, when other "Men are not taxed for the Gains of their "Professions," Our Author is very ready at complaining, and not only willing himfelf to think the Clergy hardly ufed on all Accounts, but very defirous the reft of the World fhould likewife think fo, tho' without the leaft Foundation in Reafon, for I will venture, on this Occafion, to affirm, that the Clergy of the Church of England, are not liable to pay more Taxes of any fort, than they ought in Juffice to pay, as well as others who are equally fubject to them, and that they in fact pay lefs Taxes, in proportion, than any other of the English Subjects.

The common Taxes to which Eftates are liable, are the King's Tax, and the Church and Poor Affeffments. There is no Part of the Revenues of the Clergy charged to any of thefe Taxes, except the Glebe and Tythes belonging to their Benefices.

None of the Revenues of Bifhops, Deans, Arch-Deacons, Prebends, Canons, Rural Deans, Mafters and Fellows of Colleges, Profeffors, Sea Chaplains, Chaplains of Regiments, Lecturers, Curates; nor are Augmentations of Livings, Compositions, Surplice Fees, or any other Revenues of Clergymen charged with any fort of Taxes.

The Glebe and Tythes belonging to Benefices, therefore, being the only Revenues of the Clergy that are fubject to any Tax, if we examine how that Cafe ftands, we fhall fee that they pay much lefs than their Proportion, and than what they are juftly liable to.

As

As to Affeffments to the Church, they pay none. When they are charged to the Poor's Affeffment, it is feldom above the half Part in Proportion with what others pay: But most commonly they are intirely excused, in Confideration of their burying, and doing other Offices for the Poor, without being paid for it by the Parish; and when they are charged to the Poor's Affeffment, they are usually paid by the Parish for the Offices done for the Poor. But to this Tax for the Poor, our Author, to be fure, will have no Objection, fince (as he fays) the Clergy give more in Charity and Alms, than Laymen of greater Abilities.

The only Tax therefore, on which all this imaginary Hardship must be charged, is the King's Tax. This Tax on Land was originally, and is still, granted to enable the Crown to protect us in our religious, as well as civil Rights; to preferve us in the Enjoyment of our Properties and the Protestant Religion, in Opposition to fuch as would effectually deftroy both. This fure is the Concern of the Clergy, as well as of the Laity; they, as Subjects and Members of the fame Society, have equal Benefit from the Protection of the Government, and ought therefore in Juffice to contribute towards this Tax; and if this Author pleafes to look back, he will find that the Clergy of England, as well as chose of other Countries, have at all Times, and upon all Emergencies,

gencies, been taxed, as well as the Laity, towards the Support of the Government under which they had their Protection.

I know, indeed, it's thought by many, that Tythes are of a Spiritual Nature, and that the Clergy, having a kind of Divine Right to them, they ought not to be fubject to the Impositions of human Laws : But if the Clergy of the Church of England were to rely on that Title only, I believe, their Benefices would be found to be but of very fmall Value; for the most valuable Part of their Tythes, are what they have acquired by the Favour of Parliaments, and the Conftructions and favourable Determinations of the Courts in Westminster-Hall; and if the Clergy accept and enjoy the most valuable Part of their Revenues, and even the very Benefices themfelves, by the Laws of their Country, they ought undoubtedly to enjoy them with fuch Reftrictions and Impositions as the Law lays them under.

Another Difcouragement our Author fays they lie under, is in being tyed down to their own Bufinefs, and debarred from engaging in any gainful Employment: I fhould not have thought this wou'd have been reckoned a Hardfhip on the Clergy; but if he will pleafe to inform himfelf, he will find Laymen are as much tyed down from following Profeffions they have not been brought up to, as the Clergy, and, confidering their Numbers, I believe, as feldom do follow

follow any : He may likewife confider, that the Clergy have often more than one Benefice, fometimes a Bishoprick, Deanry, Arch-Deaconry, Prebendary, or other Ecclefiaftical Preferment, with their Benefice, and are not debarred from any thing confiftent with their Cures: They have the Liberty of being Curates, Lecturers, of getting Money by Learned Writings, may be Mafters or Fellows of Colleges, Profeffors, Tutors, Schoolmafters, Chaplains of Regiments, Sea Chaplains, Chaplains to Factories, Embassies, Sc. and many other beneficial Preferments, and even Places under the Government, belides their Benefices, and if with fuch valuable Incomes as many of them enjoy, they have not the Faculty of faving Eftates, I hope this Author does not expect Laymen should be answerable for it: Nor do I think it would, in general, be any Service to the Clergy, if they might turn Farmers, Merchants, &c. which is fo much out of their way, and the Nature of which they are fo much unacquainted with.

As for the parochial Clergy, our Author fays they are far from being Objects of Envy to the meaneft of the Laity. "How few, "fays he, are there can make a Figure equal "to a Country Attorney or a Subftantial "Tradefman, and tho' the Attornies are not "fo numerous, (the Clergy being Ten thou-"fand) yet there is five fmall Effates gained "by them, for one gained by the Clergy." I muft confefs (if I had not been better informed)

formed) I should have thought that this Difference in their Numbers might have been a confiderable Reafon, if not the only one, why the Attornies get more Eftates than the Clergy: And I should have thought likewife, that if the Clergy of England are particularly Poor, it's owing not only to their Number, but to a great Inequality in fpiritual Preferments, and a very unequal Diftribution of them, which are no way proportioned to the Neceffities or Merits of the Perfons; and which, if allotted with any fort of proportion, are sufficient for, at least, as many Clergymen as are neceffary for the Service of Religion : But if Preferments are unequally distributed, and if People, without regard to their Circumstances, or any Profpect of Preferment, will fend their Children to the University, there let them be educated in a low, fervile Way, and get them into Orders, as is too common, for the fake of a present, tho' poor, Maintenance, and becaufe they can't themfelves fupport them as Scholars and Gentlemen.

When the Clergy grow too numerous from thefe and fuch like Caufes, it will be no Wonder if they grow Poor, and even Contemptible in the World : But they will have no more Reafon to complain of their Poverty, when it proceeds from fuch Caufes, than those of other Professions, who are all fo much over-flock'd, that great Numbers are in fuch low Circumstances, as brings little L RepuReputation to their Profeffions; and therefore, if this Author (on behalf of the Clergy) would expect the Compaffion and Confideration of the Publick, it fhould be to leffen their Numbers, inftead of increafing their Revenues: That might prevent their Poverty, but increafing the Revenues in general, would, in my Opinion, fo little anfwer the Purpofe, that it would add to their Poverty, by ftill greatly increafing their Number.

I would not be thought, by what I have faid, to intend any Reflexion on the English Clergy, who, I believe, are in general a more worthy Set of Men, than those of any other Religion, and I am fenfible that a great many Clergymen, after the most inferior Education of the Univerfities, have taken Orders, and notwithstanding all the Difadvantages of fuch an Education, have become great and worthy Men; but as that is not the natural Confequence of fuch an Education, it must be allow'd, it's not a proper way of educating Clergymen, and is a Method that has, or probably will, increase the Number, perhaps, beyond what the Ecclefiaftical Preferments of the Kingdom are a fufficient Provision for. I am as much for supporting the Dignity of the Profession, and the Clergy's Improving their Revenues by all just and reafonable Ways, as this Author can be; and I should be fincerely glad, if any Expedient could be found to augment all fmall Benefices, that the inferior Clergy might have

have a reafonable and fufficient Competency, without being obliged to live in fo low a way, as degrades their Profeffion : But I don't fee how this Scheme tends to remedy the Inconvenience, or which way this Author's Haranguing on the Misfortunes of the inferior and poorer Sort of the Clergy can be any fupport to a Scheme calculated unjuftly to enrich only thofe who were before the richeft of the Profeffion.

In the three laft Pages, this Author is very partial to Churches and Colleges, and very unjuft in his Imputations on the Laity, but as I have given an Anfwer to every thing he has advanced, that can be thought to deferve it; I fhall not take Notice of the plaufible Arguments he has made Ufe of in thefe laft Pages, but will leave him in the pleafing Imagination that he has effectually effablifh'd his Scheme, having before fufficiently proved what I undertook, viz. that one Year's Value, deducting the referv'd Rent, is at this Time as near the Value of a Renewal of 7 Years, in a Leafe of 21, as any one general Rule can be formed.

L 2

A

A TABLE, by which the Value of a Renewal of any Number of Years lapfed in a Leafe of 21 may be known, by deducting Taxes, Repairs, and other Incidents, according to the foregoing Treatife, and reducing 'em to Annuities or clear annual Sums.

Vears Monu Quar Vears Vears Vears Vears Vears	er Months. Quarters.	HUecl. Parts
ars ars ars	Months. Quarters	Dect. Par
Parts. hs. ters. Parts. Parts. Parts. ters. pfed.		ts.
101130105002401	OII	6
	IQ	4
	1 2	3
4 1 2 0 5 1 1 0 4 0 3 1 7 0	2 1	5
	30	8
	0101	4
	IOI	3
	2 0	5
	3 1	0
	OI	8
	2 0	0
	3 1	6
13 6 I I 2 5 2 0 6 4 I 0 2 3	IO	7
	3 0	8
IS 7 2 2 8 6 3 I I 5 I I 7 4	IOI	4
	3 1	2
17 9 1 0 2 8 1 0 5 6 2 2 4 5	1 2	7
	OI	8
1910324932180286	3 1	9
20 11 3 1 3 10 3 0 8 9 0 1 1 7	2 2	8
21 12 3 0 8 11 3 0 1 10 0 0 2 8	2 11	7

A TA-

A TABLE, by which the Value of any Annuity for Years, or for Lives reduced into Years, may be known, according to different Interefts.

ī	NR	51.	per	· Ce	nt.	61. per Cent.				71.	71. per Cent.				8 l. per Cent.				10 per Cent.			
	Nº of Y's tobe pur-	Years.	Quarters.	Months.	Deci, Parts.	Years.	Quarters.	Months.	Decl. Parts.	Years.	Quarters.	Months.	Decl. Parts.	Years.	Quarters.	Months.	Deci. Parts.	Years.	Quarters.	Months.	Decl. Parts.	and the second designed to the second designed to the second designed as the second designe
	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 1 1 2 1 3 1 4 5 6 1 7 8 1 9 0 2 1 2 2 3 2 4 2 5	0 1 2 3 4 5 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 12 13 13 14 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	3322103102131313120130130	2 I 2 0 J 0 0 2 I 2 0 I I I I I 0 2 I 2 0 I 2 0 I	4365094536747750220589851	0 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 8 9 9 10 10 11 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	33210320313131201301301230	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 0	30 1 6 50 0 56 36 6 2 5 5 2 7 9 9 6 1 4 6 5 3	e 1 2 3 4 4 5 5 6 6 7 7 8 8 8 9 9 9 9 10 10 10 11 11	33110113131301301130113012300	201102011110101222221102	2633759697129241689737011	012334556677788899999000000	3 3 4 H 3 4 0 3 H 4 0 4 3 0 4 3 0 H 4 8 0 H 4 4 4	200021200210120111002102	14978 5400 56 48 97 2 55 28 244 31	01233445566677778888888888	3 2 I 0 3 I 3 I 3 0 H 3 0 H 2 30 0 I 2 2 3 3 30 0	1 2 2 2 0 1 1 1 0 1 2 0 1 1 1 0 0 2 1 0 1 0	9880 5240 1 7972428243172589	
	26	14	1 2 1	II	47	13	00	0 11 .	0 50	II	I	0 12	96	10	330	0 12 0	7 2 4	99	0 0	2 2 0	0 8	
N. La	28 29	14	30	I	76	13	12	I	8	II	1 12	1	2 7	II	0	I	69	99	II	0 I	63	
-	30	15	1	1	3	13	3	0	I	II	3	I	0	11	I	0	I	19	I	2	0	

By the Help of this Table Leafes for Lives may be valued, by first reducing of 'em to Years, and then deducting Taxes, Repairs, and other Incidents, according to the foregoing Treatife, to reduce 'em to Annuities.

FINIS.

[ 77 ]

