

advantages being extended to British subjects in their particular countries; and that, while every one shall be tolerated and protected in his religious worship, no man, even if born in this country, shall be allowed other than as an alien or suffered to interfere in violating our laws, who owes any foreign allegiance or submission whatsoever, civil, ecclesiastical, or spiritual, on earth, beyond the boundaries of this empire, or beyond the controul and authority of these laws; the Catholics, however, who will adopt a British or Irish Pope, or other head of their Church amenable to British laws, to be put exactly on the same footing, as to endowments, as the present Established Churches, or as any other considerable sect (say that pays a hundred thousand pounds per annum to Public Education, per the Franchise Register of the three Kingdoms, as will hereafter be explained, professing to be a Christian Church)—unless the endowments are given over to the Education of the people.

There seems to me no small likelihood that in *Glasgow* will be found the school of politics (whether called Chartists or Socialists or Economists) which will be the instrument of preventing an actual revolution, by securing the country a legal or social one. To see this we have only to consider that it is not in London but in these provinces that great social movements are originated, and then to review the position and circumstances of the various other great head-quarters of manufactures and commerce—Manchester, Liverpool, and Birmingham.

Manchester has already moved, and, unfortunately for the working classes, gone too far, in the theory of political economy, or, in other words, "cheapness;" while its press and leading men, by strongly advocating an adherence to *fixed standard* bullionism, as the country's monetary principle, are threatening the working classes with the second of the two necessary effects of Sir R. Peel's legislation—"diminished employment," the first having been, "reduced wages," the necessary consequence of the foreigner having it in his power to take gold at a low fixed price unless he gets British goods equally low. The safety of the country, and the saving from starvation of our working classes, is one and the same thing; and Manchester—as unable to feed the people—would only upset society itself, if permitted. We would not be understood as objecting to the *principle* of free trade, or the *mutual interchange* of commodities, but to the *Manchester commercial* alchemy of free imports without any reciprocity.

Birmingham, too, like Manchester, has carried its principle—**PAPER MONEY**—too far, and has thus, almost fatally, injured a principle which must be the regenerator of this country. We agree with the Birmingham school that we cannot *banko money* too cheap, but we hold that it must ever *be* *banko money* *veritable*. We agree with the Birmingham school that gold and silver should only be convertible into the British or market price of these, as compared to other commodities in this country. With Birmingham we have denounced the suicide committed by our working classes in tolerating Sir R. Peel's Money Bill of 1810. We, however, wish to see a bullion basis to the circulation, holding that a bank note may depreciate from the public's estimate of its insecurity, but that it is not really non convertible into the currency of commodities—although we will never be behind in proving that all the other apparent *d depreciations* are in reality only the natural and proper *appreciation* of gold, arising from its becoming scarce, which tends to appreciate all other commodities as compared to the bank note. We, therefore, are not the school which holds that gold at its market price, and at market value, repudiates the Birmingham school. As Mr. Canning described them, *"the school of paper based upon nothing."* Who we ask—supposes that Birmingham can ever originate a great practical party, or organise an executive which will be able to feed the masses?

organise an executive which would control the public opinion of Liverpool is not now the least in the control of the men who gloried in such representations as Canning and Huskisson, because *its* views in the present day go only to starve a few superannuated pensioners of the country, and do not rise to the generous attempt to feed the country's millions. We would not be understood as under-rating the importance of practicable national retrenchment, but we would suggest to expect any great immediate alleviation from this source is to deceive ourselves and our country; and we, therefore, object distinctly to the assumption of our Liverpool friends that in "the present pining" is to be found the immediate cure of the overwhelming national evils under which this country now suffers, and the greater calamities we have in prospect. Its financial associations or leagues show us that Liverpool's views extend not to *principles* of money but only to *sums* of money. We must suppose that in the present passive position of politics Mr. Gladstone has had influence enough to get a bill passed about national retrenchment raised, and that he will cover his retreat, or to divert the public in his own and his patron's fundamental error in national policy or principle; but this would only be to prove still more the utter inability of Liverpool as the great national regenerator at the present moment.

We may be asked how the Glasgow school can take a more noble stand than Liverpool at the present crisis. No answer,

But it may be asked, how cannot the money-law be changed, and the rights of labour asserted, with Parliament constituted as at present? We answer that it cannot, so long as the political economists were seated in Parliament by the friends of the working-classes, and even if the theories of anasthetic political economy were to break down (as no doubt they will) from sheer inherent weakness, the friends of the people will still be divided by the *question* of the Church. Lord Stanley would not support a ministry composed of Dissenters, as he would not support a ministry of degeneration of having anæsthetic Church. The Dissenters, on the other hand, would not trust Lord Stanley with power, because he would perpetuate the Church, which, as a system of legalised priestcraft, they hold to be our greatest weakness. All, therefore, must see that if Universal Suffrage is the only way of forming an opinion, to avoid revolution, even although no disloyalty rendering it possible for the Government to resist, the person of the Sovereign exists in this country. Such is the result of the divorce of the Church from native industry effected by Bishops and other Churchmen in 1846, misjudged by Sir Robert Peel—*not the patriotic father of the people*—as he was then called,—"Perfidus (said Kobensperger) tes Cæsaribus (unprincipled) though disloyal to the people." But, says also, says Paine's *enemy* of 1818 and 1846, the British labourer rather than that the amputant and money-grubber should not buy at the cheapest market. Perish the patriotism that has hitherto returned (in *price*) the taxes of the British production-

Glasgow may grapple with the philosophy as well as the details of the country's finance. GLASGOW MAY SET AN EXAMPLE TO THE REST OF THE KINGDOM BY THE WORKING CLASSES FROM THE DUREN THE NATIONAL DEBT—A SOURCE OF WHITE SLAVERY WORSE THAN THAT FROM WHICH WE RELIEVED OUR AFRICAN FELLOW-SUBJECTS. GLASGOW MAY TAKE UP THE TRUE GROUND THAT IT IS THE PROPERTY OF THE COUNTRY THAT IS BOUND TO DEFEND THE COUNTRY—AS IS SHOWN IN ALL TITLES TO LAND FROM THE CROWN BEING FOR SERVICES TO THE COUNTRY—AND THAT THE PRESENT AND ALL FUTURE NATIONAL DEBTS MUST BE VIEWED TO BE A CLAIM ONLY ON THE REALISED PROPERTY OF THE COUNTRY, LANDED AND PERSONAL. WE MAY INSIST THAT THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER SHALL GIVE OVER THE PROVIDING FOR THE INTEREST OF THE NATIONAL DEBT TO NATIONAL COMMISSIONERS OF THE DEBT, THE EXCHEQUER HAVING HEREAFTER NO MORE TO DO WITH THE DEBT, EXCEPT THAT IT WILL PAY OVER TO THE NATIONAL DEBT COMMISSIONERS ITS SURPLUS EAGLES—TO BE DEDUCTED FROM THE ASSESSMENTS ON PROPERTY OF THE FOLLOWING YEAR—THIS BEING VIEWED TO BE THE INSURE OF PROTECTION TO NATIONAL INDUSTRY ACCORDING TO THE PROPERTY OF THE COUNTRY. We should like to see Glasgow vow declared to be that for one year a half per cent. be raised from the whole property of Great Britain, leaving the assessment next year to be reduced to the extent of the balance during the first year of the REVENUE FROM TRADE ABOVE TO ABOVE. The property of Great Britain is estimated above five thousand millions of pounds sterling, and one-half per cent on this would about pay the whole interest of the national debt. But under a resuscitated state of prosperity in the country we would calculate that one-eighth per cent. per annum would be more than enough in times of peace.

We may be asked how Glasgow can make a more practical effort than has been attempted at the present crisis. We need only refer to our views on the United States. Glasgow may, in its monetary reforms, combine the bullionist basis for the legal tender paper with the total eradication of the hard money monopoly—which is the object of the Birmingham school, although to attain it *they* would involve us in an evil only less fatal, *depreciation from insecurity*. Glasgow, in a word, may hold to the simple cure of making the slate of the foreign exchanges, or the export of gold, be indicated in a rise in the *commodity gold* instead of in the *commodity money*, the bank note being only representative of gold at the market price of gold in the London market, and the Bank of England being entitled to have notes out to the full London market value of the gold in its vaults—besides the fourteen millions—the bank thus being made interested in supplying any vacuum of circulation through the exportation of gold by an increased issue of paper up to the increased market value of the gold in its vaults.

WE MAY BE ASKED HOW THE GLASGOW SCHOOLS HAS VIEWS SUPERIOR TO THOSE OF THE MANCHESTER SCHOOL. WE ANSWER THAT WE GO THE LENGTH OF SOCIAL ECONOMY, NOT STOPPING SHORT AT POLITICAL ECONOMY. OUR VIEWS ARE PATRIOTIC—OR HAVE REFERENCE TO OUR OWN COUNTRY; for we do not expect to get credit for our good intentions towards the world, till after we have practically illustrated them in our own families; in a word, we must (to use the words of Burns) "be loved at home" before we can be "reversed abroad":—

"From scenes like these old Scotia's grandeur springs,
That makes her loved at home, rever'd abroad."

THE MANCHESTER VIEWS ARE COSMOPOLITE—FORGETTING THAT NATIONALITY SHOULD NOT END AT HOME IT SHOULD BEGIN THERE. Glasgow, in fact, may go for reciprocal free trade, as opposed to the Manchester commercial atheism of irreciprocal free trade; or, in other words, we may hold that the MAIN QUESTION IS EMPLOYMENT, which may be regulated by British laws, and not price, which we can never control by British legislation, except that by framing our laws so as to give to our own people, and to those who will reciprocate with us, a *preference* of our national employment—at home, at sea, and in the colonies—we may gradually increase the bidders for the poor man's labour, and thus increase the value of his wages. We must deny that in addition to circumstances like ours, the existence of free trade in the colonies is a disadvantage, and the stock of food the means of purchasing it—employment—is the first necessary of existence to our masses. THE GREATEST EMPLOYMENT OF OUR WORKING CLASSES, IRRESPECTIVE OF PRICE, MUST BE THE GLASGOW PRINCIPLE. While acknowledging price to be an important element of consideration, we must see EMPLOYMENT to be the vital question. We of course hold that the principle of free trade would, if attainable in practice, be the best for *more* country, because we have more capital, more industry, and more economy than any other country; and none could object more than ourselves to the protection, *for its own sake*, of any class interest in this community. We, however, have always seen that free trade must be, at least to a great extent, a *protection* to the poor, and we need not the colour of poverty of our currency—the life's blood of all interests—being protected from luvation at the will of our foreign opponents, by their draining us of the precious metal which our circulation depends; And I now give our sketch of A FREE AND RECIPROCAL LEAGUE.—[see page 28.]