

WILEY



'Metayage' in Western France

Author(s): Henry Higgs

Source: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 13 (Mar., 1894), pp. 1-13

Published by: [Wiley](#) on behalf of the [Royal Economic Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2955863>

Accessed: 01-03-2015 17:28 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Wiley and Royal Economic Society are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Economic Journal*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE ECONOMIC JOURNAL

MARCH, 1894

‘METAYAGE’ IN WESTERN FRANCE.

IN these days when, according to the admirable programme of the French comedian, ‘more should be expected from the Treasury and less from the tax-payers,’ it is an increasing luxury of the private citizen to advise a Government Office how to do its business; and it would not be surprising to learn that suggestions had been made to the Board of Agriculture to bring up to date the private work of its progenitor, Arthur Young, by sending an agronomic official through France on horseback to describe its stock and crops, its roads and farms, and true rural condition. Arthur Young was severe upon ‘those whose political reveries are spun by their firesides, or caught flying as they are whirled through Europe in post-chaises.’ Yet even the traveller hurried along by a French express train can, if his eyes are open, see something of economic interest. He cannot fail to notice the variety of culture in different districts, the orchards and the cattle of Normandy with its fine pastures and comfortable farm-houses, the English-looking North with its corn, hops, and sugar-beet and centres of industry, the maize, tobacco, and flax of Burgundy, the woods of Gascony, the olive and the mulberry of the South and South-East, and the ubiquitous monotonous vine everywhere south of Paris. If he comes from England he will probably be struck by the absence of hedges between different crops and by the intermixture of strips, eloquent, to the economic historian, of the open field system of the earliest times.¹ Or the evidences of small farming may remind him of the charges made

¹ See Dr. Seeböhm’s article in vol. i. No. 1 of this *Journal*.

against the *Code Napoléon* of bringing about a 'pulverisation' of the soil. But he will hardly venture to rival the experts of a century ago who, notwithstanding the diversity of crops, professed to know from the aspect of a farm by what tenure it was held—the lowest depths of bad farming infallibly indicating the *métayer*, who undertakes to discharge his debts to his landlord by payment of an aliquot part of his produce. 'I groan,' says the Abbé Teissier, 'to see this kind of tenure in favour in a large part of France to the detriment of morality and the public welfare.'¹ Arthur Young's usual emphasis does not fail him here: 'This subject may be easily despatched; for there is not one word to be said in favour of the practice, and a thousand arguments that might be used against it.'² 'A miserable system, that perpetuates poverty and excludes instruction.'³ The Marquis of Mirabeau, commenting on the *Tableau Économique*, is equally emphatic and more picturesque: 'At the least calamity the master must feed his *métayer*, or the latter puts his key under the door [*i.e.* quits the farm]. But this deplorable method of cultivation, the daughter of necessity and the mother of misery, has nothing in common with the good farming established in certain districts.'⁴ Turgot, too, disliked the system. And even after the *produit net* and the *grande culture* had lost some of their hold over the minds of economists, and the French Revolution had changed many things in the tenure of land, *métayage* found little support from men of theory. Hippolyte Passy, McCulloch, and Jones, dwell rather upon its defects than its advantages. J. S. Mill, indeed, influenced in its favour by Sismondi, declares that 'the unmeasured vituperation lavished upon the system by English writers, is grounded on an extremely narrow view of the subject.'⁵ But his qualified approval of *métayage* is mainly due to a belief that it is more likely than farming at a money-rent to be found associated with small families. Oddly enough the arguments now current in France among those who are in favour of *métayage* are as directly opposed to this belief as they are to the opinions of the adverse writers already mentioned.

At the present time the suggestion is again made that some kind of produce-rents might be advantageous to agriculture in the United Kingdom; and it seems not inopportune to briefly examine the nature of *métayage*, its advantages and drawbacks in

¹ *Encyclopédie méthodique*, 1823, s.v. *Métairie*.

² *Travels in France*, 1792, i. 399.

⁴ *L'Ami des Hommes*, 1758, vi. 139.

³ *Id.* i. 12.

⁵ *Pol. Econ.* book ii. chap. 8, § 4.

the country nearest home, in the hope that some light may thus be thrown upon the question whether anything would be gained by transplanting it to these islands. According to Thorold Rogers, this would not be its first appearance in England. Writing of *métayage* he says: 'the tenant pays a fixed quantity in money or produce for the use of his farm, generally using the landlord's stock and seed. This kind of tenancy is called *métayer* in France . . . Such a tenancy prevailed in England for about 60 years.'¹ But Rogers' conception of *métayage* is hardly to be defended. It is not a fixed *quantity* either of money or produce which is paid by the tenant, but a fixed *quotity* of produce, or its equivalent in money if so agreed. And the essence of the contract lies rather in joint enterprise than in joint capital. If agricultural contracts of this kind have never been known in England we can understand why Adam Smith was unable to find an English name for them,² though he has a strong faith that they must have existed here as elsewhere, being a step in the 'natural' development of agricultural economy. By a loose extension of popular language in France a small farm is still sometimes called a *métairie*, even though the tenant uses no movable capital other than his own and his rent is fixed on the English system. This use of the term is easily understood when it is remembered that before the Revolution farmers were nearly synonymous with *métayers*,—five-sixths of the whole land of the kingdom, according to Turgot,³ seven-eighths according to Arthur Young,⁴ being held under *métayage*.

Whether *métayage* survived from the Romans is a subject of historical controversy very similar to that which the origins of guilds and of open fields have had to undergo. What is less doubtful is that the revival of the study of Roman law gave a powerful impetus to this mode of tenure, the lawyer reading the texts of the Pandects into the contracts which he found around him, and this in part explains its prevalence rather in Latin than in Teutonic countries. From the thirteenth century, at any rate, the system continued in France with great persistence until the end of the last century. The Revolution, by

¹ *Pol. Econ.*, p. 166. Professor Nicholson, following Rogers, calls the stock-and-land lease a species of *métairie* (*Principles*, i. 203, 303). Professor Marshall clearly distinguishes between the two (*Principles*, 1st. ed., i. 683).

² *Wealth of Nations*, book iii. chap. 2.

³ *Œuvres*, t. iv.—*De la grande et de la petite culture*. Adam Smith accepted this estimate without naming its author. *Wealth of Nations*, *loc. cit.*

⁴ *Op. cit.* i. 398. He states, however, a few pages later, that one-third of the land of the kingdom is in the hands of peasant proprietors (p. 407).

confiscating the land of the clergy and selling the estates of those who had been driven out of the country or out of the world (*les émigrés, les déportés et les condamnés révolutionnairement*), brought about a large immediate increase of small proprietors and a diminution in the number of *métayers*; ¹ but a reaction has set in during the present generation, and in spite of some checks *métayage* is believed to be now gaining in favour. The latest official statistics (*Statistique agricole de la France*, published in 1886) give the following figures relative to land under cultivation in 1882:—

	Hectares.	Hectares.
4,324,917 holdings averaging 4·48	=	19,380,089 cultivated by their owners.
347,858 <i>métairies</i>	„ 13·04	= 4,539,322
749,559 farms on lease	„ 11·94	= 8,953,118
Total... <u>5,422,334</u> holdings.		<u>32,872,529</u>

It would thus appear ² that in 1882 the land held by *métayers* was less than one-seventh of the land cultivated in France, and little more than one-third of the land not directly cultivated by owners, while the *métairie*, properly so called, was on the average the largest form of holding for cultivation in the country. The analysis of distribution by departments shows that this last feature is pretty general. Out of the 87 departments of France the Parisian department of the Seine is alone innocent of *métayage*; but it counts only 266 farms against 12,030 properties in the hands of their owners. *Métayage* predominates especially in the centre and south of France, and in Mayenne in the west, where during the agricultural crisis farmers have become *métayers* almost without exception. Broadly speaking, the *métayer* provides the labour and implements, the landlord the immovables (land, buildings, &c.), and both parties share equally in the provision of stock and the partition of the produce, while the responsibility of management is mutual—the discretion of the landlord, in case of conflict, being exercised in some matters, and that of the *métayer* in others. On a few farms of superior quality the landlord's share is higher (*e.g.* two-thirds), while on some inferior farms he receives only one-third. But we may exclude from consideration these exceptional instances. The details of each contract of *métayage* vary

¹ In 1832 M. de Gasparin estimated that more than half the soil was under *métayage*. In 1842 M. de Chateaufieux estimated the fraction at one-third. In 1860 M. de Lavergne thought the number of *métayers* about equal to that of the farmers.

² But large farms, sublet to *métayers*, seem to have been reckoned as single farms instead of *métairies*.

considerably from district to district, being regulated for the most part by local custom as minutely codified in a *Recueil des Usages ruraux de l'Arrondissement*. This little code, set forth by authority, is to be bought for a few sous in the local shops, and its contents are accurately known by the *métayers* themselves. They provide for almost every conceivable question which can arise affecting the joint or several liability of the parties, prescribe certain limits to the mode of cultivation, fix the approximate dates of successive agricultural operations, the rotation of crops, the proportion of manures, &c., and assume throughout the active co-operation of intelligence and goodwill on both sides. A lease, after the usual recitals, embodies any special stipulation which is agreed upon and refers for the rest to the customs as defined in the *Recueil*. The little pamphlet of thirty-two pages duodecimo, now in use at Laval, was drawn up in 1858 by a commission appointed by the prefect of Mayenne in 1855. The commission was aided by the agricultural society of Laval, the justices of the peace, notaries, solicitors, and experts; and its labours are little more than a restatement of customs already of hoary antiquity, applicable as well to farms at money-rents as to *métayer*-farms. The *Recueil* is judicially recognised as an accurate statement of local custom, but it has no binding force so far as the lease expressly provides to the contrary. Where no special provision is made, the parties are presumed to have agreed to be bound by custom.

Thus far as to the nature of *métayage*. It will be seen that it is, in effect, an agricultural partnership. Gaius long ago stated this view very clearly: *Partiarius colonus, quasi societatis jure, et lucrum et damnum cum domino fundi partitur*.¹ The fact that it is, on occasion, a loss-sharing as well as a profit-sharing enterprise relieves it of one criticism frequently directed against this form of co-operation. In other respects it may claim the merits, and is open to the objections, common to profit-sharing in general. One argument, used by Adam Smith and most of those who have followed him, deserves mention. It could never be the interest of *métayers*, thought Adam Smith, to put their own capital into the land ‘because the landlord, who laid out nothing, was to get one half of whatever it produced. The tithe, which is but a tenth of the produce, is found to be a very great hindrance to improvement. A tax, therefore, which amounted to one half, must have been an effectual bar to it.’ But Adam Smith expressly states that he is referring to a *métayer* who, ‘having

¹ *Dig.* xix. 2, 6, 25.

no stock of his own,' cultivated 'only by means of what the landlord advanced to him.' Such an argument has no bearing upon tenures which require the parties to advance capital in equal shares. In the present temper of affairs the *métayer* has no difficulty in persuading his landlord to share in the purchase of additional stock. The *métayer*, less able to sustain a loss, is the more cautious of the two; and when he has persuaded himself that such an outlay would be remunerative, there is rarely any need for the landlord to hesitate about embarking capital with his own little venture. On the other hand the *métayer* is said to be more open to the adoption of improvements than the ordinary farmer. The example of a landlord farming his own land has comparatively little local influence. He is credited with ability to indulge his fancy in experiments, and his neighbours have little opportunity of judging whether or not his 'improvements' pay. But if he lets his land to a *métayer*, any reclamation of the soil, draining, levelling, &c., must still be done at his own charges under the eyes of his tenant; and he is often spirited enough to introduce improvements in cattle, manures, &c., by the persuasion of experiment at his own expense when he is not otherwise able to convince the tenant of their advantages. M. Le Breton, a young senator of great agricultural authority, attributes the gradual extension of the use of lime, and the crossing of cattle with Durhams, in the department of Mayenne to the example of the *métayers*, influenced by the precepts and experiments of their landlords, and followed slowly by farmers at money-rents when the success of the changes had been established beyond a doubt.¹ Since the Republic, the public service has to a great extent been a closed career to the old aristocracy, which has taken refuge in its landed property and brought to the service of *métayers* a knowledge of agricultural chemistry and scientific farming of the greatest value. The necessity of keeping accounts, on both sides, is a happy one for intelligent exploitation, and amply repays the trouble which it involves; while the *métayer* is fortunate in having at hand a moneyed partner without whose help certain improvements are strangled.² The honesty of the *métayers* is admitted to be irreproachable. Probity is, indeed, part of their capital, and any breach of it would be fatal to their position and

¹ *Étude sur le Métayage dans la Mayenne*, Paris, 1881.

² Cf. Rogers, *Economic Interpretation of History*, p. 171. 'When landlord cultivation ceased, marling was abandoned; it was too costly for the risk, and sheep-breeding suffered at least some deterioration.'

to their prospects of finding another farm. The statement of the Abbé Teissier, quoted above, that *métayage* is detrimental to public morality would probably not now find a single supporter. It is sometimes said that, having regard to the *métayer's* personal consumption and to the payment of half his produce in kind, his margin of saleable produce is so small that he cannot gain much by a rise of prices, and is likely to become an indifferent and sleepy cultivator. There is no danger of this kind where prices are stationary or declining; and even when prices rise an increase in the product is almost entirely pure profit, of which a half is a sufficiently powerful inducement to vigorous industry, while the farmer is liable to have his rent raised and thus gains little more (perhaps even less) than the *métayer*. One of the reasons why bimetallism, though endorsed by the Central Chamber of Agriculture in England, the Agrarian party in Germany, and the Farmers' Alliance in America, has little support among the agricultural classes in France, will be seen from the Appendix, which shows the relatively small portion of the *métayer's* share of produce finding its way into the market.¹ So far as this small portion is concerned he loses by a fall in its price; but the loss of the farmer is so much greater that the *métayer* is almost consoled by comparison, and excites in the farmer a feeling of envy which has turned many of the farmers in Mayenne into *métayers*. It remains to be seen whether a period of rising prices would have the contrary effect.

Compared with the farmer, then, the *métayer* has more stability of income, and is better able to weather such a currency crisis as that of the last quarter of the present century. He profits by the intelligence and resources of his landlord, with whom his personal relations generally put him on excellent terms; and these aids to his small capital allow of higher farming than is possible to the farmer or the peasant proprietor who has no such collaborator. He is, it is true, less independent than either the farmer or the peasant proprietor; but he is generally more comfortable than the little owner, who is liable to succumb to a narrow and sordid parsimony under the temptation of rounding off his plot of ground, to stunt the physical, mental, and moral development of his child or his few children, and even to starve such land as he has in the endeavour to buy more. The peasant proprietor's passion for possession is often as prejudicial to increased production as to increased population. The *métayer*,

¹ This applies, of course, with still greater force to the much larger class of small proprietors.

however, is glad to cultivate his holding with the aid of his children rather than hired labourers—his contract requiring him to supply a sufficient number of hands—and he is under no fears about the future division of the farm which is not his to divide, but has often been held by a direct line of his ancestors for several generations, and is almost certain to be occupied by one of his children after him. Those who are uneasy lest the population of France should fail to grow show themselves tender to *métayage* on this account. In fine, *métayage* in France is neither ‘detrimental to morality and the public interest,’ nor does it ‘perpetuate poverty and exclude instruction,’ nor has it the effect of repressing an increase of population. It may be ‘the daughter of necessity,’ but is certainly not ‘the mother of misery.’

Whether, however, *métayage* might be profitably introduced into this country is more doubtful. We are accustomed to larger farms and to tenants of larger capital, and with these a landlord-partner may be a source of more irritation than advantage. An absentee landlord, too, is a delinquent to his *métayer*, who is entitled to his counsel and personal interest; and where the French landlords have neglected to supply these, and have left the collection of their dues to less flexible stewards and agents, *métayage* has often proved unequal to the strain, recriminations and legal proceedings have supervened, and the landlord has been reduced to the employment of a bailiff or the search for a tenant on the English system. Perhaps neither the English owner nor the English farmer would take kindly to *métayage*; the first would dislike the bother of supervision and the uncertainty of his income,¹ the second would resent ‘interference’ in his management of the farm. Possibly, too, the English soil and climate might oppose difficulties unknown to the cultivators of France and Italy; while, finally, the social constitution of our country may be a further obstacle. The French law of succession, which has accustomed peasants to divide property frequently among themselves, smooths the way to the division of their produce with the landlord, an operation which might not be so easily effected where it is less familiar. If, however, the farmers of England continue to suffer as heavily as they have done for the last few years, and the owners of land, failing tenants, employ bailiffs and stimulate their interests by making their remuneration vary with the profits, we shall not be far removed from the contract of *métayage*. Produce-rents would be another step in the same direction; and

¹ Uncertainty, however, is equally bad for the farmer, and there seems no reason why the landlord should not take at least part of it expressly and directly.

one of these alternatives may prove inevitable unless the currency problem is speedily solved. Rigid as *métayer* tenure may at first sight seem to be, it is susceptible of considerable elasticity.¹ The *usages ruraux* of Laval differ in several respects from those of its adjoining *arrondissement* of Château-Gontier; the landlord may at each new contract adjust such details as who is to pay the taxes, or may vary the size of the farm, the amount and the shares of capital supplied, or the quantity of labour required. Prof. Marshall has set in a clear light the fact that this may result, under given circumstances, ‘ in the cultivation being carried just about as far and affording the landlord the same income as he would have on the English plan for equally fertile and well situated land equipped with the same capital, and in a place in which the normal ability and enterprise of candidates for farms is the same.’² Add to this the more friendly social relations which exist with *métayage* and there seems to be a clear balance of advantage in its favour, so far as small farms and small capitals are concerned. It is indeed conceivable, though nothing points to such a course as probable, that *métayage* might supply a bridge between the tenants of small holdings and a new class of yeomen in this country.

HENRY HIGGS

APPENDIX.

MONOGRAPH OF A MÉTAYER FARM NEAR LAVAL, FRANCE,³

COMPILED ON THE SPOT IN NOVEMBER, 1892, BY HENRY HIGGS AND MONSIEUR
ROGER LAMBELIN.

The farm is situated about 5 miles from Laval, in a commune of about 9 sq. miles, containing, in 1892, 840 inhabitants, of whom 180 live in a village half a mile from the farm; the remainder are wholly engaged in agriculture. The population of the commune has fallen from 1400 since 1830, owing to the decline of hand-weaving in the home, consequent upon the establishment of factories at Laval. Families with 7 or 8 acres of land were supported by two or three looms earning about 15 francs apiece per week; but the few looms which now survive earn only about 1 franc apiece from sunrise to sunset. On the decay of this bye industry the small holdings disappeared, and the young people of the parish went to work in factories at Laval, in lime-kilns at Louverné (a few miles distant), in the Western of France

¹ The announcements that a great landlord has remitted 20, 30, or 40 per cent., as the case may be, of all his rents, indicate arrangements in some respects rougher and less discriminating than *métayage* itself.

² i. 685.

³ The owner of this farm considers it to be a fairly typical one. The *curé* of the parish, however, regards it as somewhat better than the average, and, so far as I have been able to judge, I share his opinion.—H. H.

Railway, and into domestic service at Laval and Paris. The population is now stationary. After serving in the army those of the youths who are not needed at home place themselves in the towns: the 'surplus' girls go into service: the proportion of unmarried is considerable.

The standard of morality is high, and a sentiment of religion is generally diffused. The very few cases of illegitimacy which exist are viewed with reprobation. Thirty-two per cent. of the inhabitants are illiterate. School attendance is compulsory for a time, but children quit school at 12 or 13, and several forget what they have been taught. The girls' school, taught by the Sisters of Hebron, is about to be laicised, to the sorrow of the locality.

The farm consists of 87 acres, of which 12 are underwood. About a quarter of this underwood is cut by the proprietor every eight or nine years. The *métayer's* only advantage from these woods is permission to take the ferns for bedding for cattle when straw is scarce. The farm is on sandy soil, well watered, with convenient roads and good buildings. The farmhouse is comfortable and roomy, built of stone and roofed and paved with slate. The garden has an area of 1 rood.

The farm acreage is thus divided—22 acres meadow, 53 arable (in eight fields). The crops sown in winter are barley, followed after harvest by trefoil, or wheat followed by beetroot, potatoes, cabbages, or peas. Spring oats sometimes precede barley (sown in August). In 1892 the seed corn was 90 bushels of wheat, 50 barley, and 10 oats.

The live stock upon the farm (November, 1892) consisted of 5 horses (1750 frs.), 2 colts (160 frs.), 17 store bullocks (3400 frs.), 11 cows (1430 frs.), 5 calves (175 frs.), 1 bull (600 frs.), and 2 goats (10 frs.). Altogether a value of 7525 frs., or £300.

The landlord's receipts and expenses for the last 5 years left him the following net revenue from the farm:—in 1888, 3,144 frs.; 1889, 2,590 frs.; 1890, 3,071 frs. 1891, 3,305 frs.; 1892, 2,458 frs. Total 14,568: average for the 5 years 2,913 frs. a year.

The details for 1892 are as follows:—

OWNER'S RECEIPTS.			
		Francs.	Francs.
Corn sold: 606 bushels of barley	1212	$\frac{1}{2}$	= 606
588 „ wheat (1st quality)	1591·20	$\frac{1}{2}$	= 795·60
192 „ „ (2nd quality)	480	$\frac{1}{2}$	= 240
Animals sold: 1 old mare	120	$\frac{1}{2}$	= 60
3 bullocks	831·70	$\frac{1}{2}$	= 415·85
1 cow	80	$\frac{1}{2}$	= 40
6 calves	251·20	$\frac{1}{2}$	= 125·60
1 sow	110	$\frac{1}{2}$	= 55
2 pigs	258·50	$\frac{1}{2}$	= 129·25
8 farrows	195	$\frac{1}{2}$	= 97·50
Received in kind: 9 geese, 51·40; eggs 10... ..			= 61·40
Apples 149, and cider 16; pears 46, and perry 16... ..			= 227
Total receipts			<u>2853·20</u>

OWNER'S EXPENSES.

	Francs.	Francs.
Hay seed	155.44	$\frac{1}{2}$ = 77.22
Seed corn	130	$\frac{1}{2}$ = 65
„ „ (winter)	42	$\frac{1}{2}$ = 21
Lime	186	$\frac{1}{2}$ = 93
Maize	15	$\frac{1}{2}$ = 7.50
Peas	13.50	$\frac{1}{2}$ = 6.75
Cabbages (2000)... ..	7	$\frac{1}{2}$ = 3.50
Bran	70	$\frac{1}{2}$ = 35
Veterinary's bill	38	$\frac{1}{2}$ = 19
Stallion (3 mares)	30	$\frac{1}{2}$ = 15
Boar (3 sows)	7.50	$\frac{1}{2}$ = 3.75
Total expenses		346.72
Excess of receipts over expenses		2506.50
		<u>2853.22</u>

A normal year, it is considered, should yield 20 per cent. more; a good year 30 per cent. The land is valued at 87,500 frs. The landlord paid 5,000 frs. for his share of the stock in 1880, and has sunk 2,000 frs. in improvements. His capital of 94,500 frs. thus yielded him nearly 2½ per cent. in 1892; a return of 3½ would satisfy him.

Turning to the *métayer*, we find that his household is thus composed: the farmer (aged 58), and his wife (55), who have been married for 32 years; 4 sons, aged 30, 21, 20, and 14, a daughter of 15, and a shepherd boy of 13, whose wages are 70 frs. a year with food and lodging. All these work upon the farm. Another daughter is married to a shopkeeper a few miles distant.

In harvest an extra man is hired for two months at 2 frs. a day with food. A few hands are hired for odd days in the year amounting to about twenty at the same rate of wages. At harvest the work begins at sunrise, and coffee is taken in the course of the day as a stimulant. It is not consumed on any other occasion. The meals of the family are four daily: at 8.30 a.m., soup with bread and butter; at noon, soup; at 4 p.m., a *rôtie de cidre* (bread soaked in hot cider); at 9 p.m., soup, and sometimes bread and butter. The soup is generally made of salt pork or lard with vegetables grown on the farm. On Fridays the soup is made entirely of vegetables (*e.g.* gourds). The monotony of the diet is shown by certain locutions, such as the recurrent phrase in the *Usages locaux*, that it is the *métayer's*, and not his landlord's, duty to *tremper la soupe* [*i.e.* give facilities for preparing their food] to day labourers.

A statement of the *métayer's* receipts and expenses will best exhibit the family standard of comfort:—

MÉTAYER'S RECEIPTS IN 1892.

	Francs.
Half produce as landlord above	2853.20
* Wood	200
* Rent (of farmhouse and garden)	100
* Butter	93.60
* Chestnuts	30
* Potatoes, 3.45; * other vegetables, 78	81.45
Total receipts	<u>3358.25</u>

* In kind.

MÉTAYER'S EXPENSES.

	Francs.	Francs.
* Bread 6006 livres at 15 c.	= 900·90	
* Butter 78 „ 1 fr. 20	= 93·60	
* Potatoes 104 „ 1 fr. per 30 livres	= 3·45	
* Chestnuts 200 „ 15 c.	= 30	
* Eggs 12 doz. „ 85 c. per doz.	= 10·20	
* Vegetables: cabbages, carrots, onions, turnips ...	= 78	
* Pork and lard of 2 pigs, 250 kilos at 80 c.	= 200	
Salt, 300 livres, 8 frs. 50 per 100 livres	= 25·50	
Pepper, 1 livre, 2 frs. 80; vinegar 30 litres, 15 frs..	= 17·80	
Salad oil, 12 bottles at 1 fr. 10	= 13·20	
Coffee, 1 livre, 3 frs.; sugar, 1 livre, 60 c.	= 3·60	
* Cider, 6 barrels at 27 frs. 50	= 165	
Total for food and drink		1541·25
Clothing—		
Estd. per year 530 frs.; linen, 58 frs.;		
Sabots, 14 pairs at 1·50 = 21 fr....		609
Cleaning—		
Blacking, 12 boxes, 3 fr. 60 c.; sandpaper 30 c. =	3·90	
Wax and polish, 12 boxes, 4 frs. 20 c.; soap,		
30 frs.	= 34·20	
Soda, 20 livres, 66 c.; starch, 4 livres, 2 frs. 20 c. =	2·86	
Total for cleaning		40·96
* Rent... ..		100
Fuel and light—		
* Wood, 1000 faggots, 200 frs.; oil, 28 frs. 60 c. =	228·60	
Candles for market cart, 1 fr. 70 c.; matches,		
1 fr. 20 c.	= 2·90	
Total for fuel and light... ..		231·50
Taxes—		
<i>Impôt direct</i> , paid in 2 instalments, (4 allowed)	219	
Dog tax, <i>chien de service</i> , 1 fr. 50 c.; (a <i>chien</i>		
<i>de luxe</i> pays 10 frs.)... ..	1·50	
	—	220·50
Insurance—		
House and buildings	24·20	
Furniture, crops, and cattle	14·45	
	—	38·65
Furniture—Upkeep of household goods, say		50
Tobacco—(the two eldest sons have two sous apiece		
every Sunday after Mass)		10·40
Postage stamps		50
Newspaper—The <i>Courrier de Maine</i> , 5 c. a week		2·60
Religion—		
Four seats in church	22·25	
<i>Confrérie de la Sainte Enfance</i> , a children's gild	1·20	
Offertories	5	
	—	28·45
* In kind.		

Expenses of Industry—

Half expenses as landlord above	346·72
Wages of shepherd boy	70
„ casual men... ..	40
Blacksmith	240
Wheelwright and carpenter	80
Saddler	97
* Farrier and butcher (2 bushels corn)	7·80
* Molecatcher (1 bushel corn)	3·90
<hr/>	
Total expenses of industry... ..	882·42
<hr/>	
Total expenses for year	3759·23
Excess expenses over receipts	400·98
<hr/>	
	3358·25
<hr/>	

* In kind.

The bread has been valued at the local price, on the following basis: 6 bushels of corn (= 130 livres) are sent to the mill every 10 days; 1 lb. of flour makes $1\frac{1}{2}$ lb. of bread. The cost of grinding is 3 sous a bushel; and if the cost of the bread be taken at the value of the corn plus the cost of grinding, the excess of expenses will be reduced to about 70 frs. The cash expenses on the farm by the *métayer* amount to 1132 frs. 87 c. (expenses of industry, taxes, and insurance). His receipts from all sources amount to 3358 frs. 25 c., leaving 2225 frs. 38 c. as earnings of management and of labour for his family and himself, and interest on his part of the stock. This *métayer* borrowed 1000 frs. at 4 per cent. in 1883, when he entered the farm, to enable him to purchase the stock. He paid off 500 frs. in 1890, and still owes 500 frs. His stock is valued at 14,000 frs. (5000 cattle, and 9000 implements, &c.). The implements are mainly of wood—even the roller is a tree trunk, and the harrow has wooden teeth. The family has a good supply of furniture; also of clothes and linen for use on special occasions. In November, 1892, the *métayer* was wearing sabots without stockings while at work.

The family is thrifty, frugal, honest and industrious. The girls of the parish marry without dowry. Only three farmers in the whole commune have dowered their daughters, with sums ranging from 2000 to 5000 frs. A girl's parents supply her trousseau and household linen, sometimes a little furniture and always the wedding feast, which is a considerable burden when the relatives are numerous.

The lease of the farm differs little from the local *Recueil des Usages*. The owner has the right to 5000 livres of straw yearly, but does not enforce this right in bad years.