question,—what must be the principles of the new party organization? He answers—THE ANTIPODES OF THE PRINCIPLE OF THE POLITICAL ECONOMIST OR MONEY POWER. He advises the Social Economist not to let the question of popularity be "protection or no protection to native industry;" but (while in no way concealing their denial that our present system is what it has been called, FREE TRADE, and their conviction that *bona fide* free trade is required for the protection of native industry), to ask for the confidence of the working classes by DECLARING THEMSELVES READY TO SUBMIT TO WHATEVER IS THE DECISION OF THE NATIONAL MIND, AS EXPRESSED BY UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

My own effort in politics (adds Mr Buchanan), now brought to a termination quite satisfactory to me, has always been an humble one, or one at all events very simple, definite and quite free from all personal or party objects or ambition. I HAVE, IN A WORD, HAD IT AS MY OBJECT TO ASSIST IN REMOVING A POPULAR DELUSION, WHICH ONE WOULD THINK A SINGLE LOOK AT PROTECTIONIST AMERICA MIGHT DISPEL—VIZ., THE VERY GENERAL NOTION THAT A PERSON WHO ADVOCATES PROTECTION TO NATIVE INDUSTRY MUST NECESSARILY BE A CHURCH TORY, THE ENEMY OF AN ENLARGED POLITICAL FRANCHISE, OR THE ADVOCATE OF MONOPOLY IN SOME OTHER SHAPE. I saw this to be a great object in our circumstances. In 1840 I saw that Sir Robert Peel's assertion of the Omnipotence of Parliament over principle must lead to the responsibility of our legislation being transferred to the entire people, because omnipotence may become tyranny, which, if exercised at all, should be the act of principals. My words were, "Peel's assertion of the Omnipotence of Parliament, in the room of the Omnipotence of Principle, moral and constitutional, must—if we would prevent unfortunate legislation becoming a cause of revolution, precipitate UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE; democratic legislation, however, as being synonimous with shielding the labour and fixed property of the country from the foreign trade alien money-power, is the best or only permanent security for monarchy in the executive, in these days of revolution." Such a change in the constitution of Parliament must, I saw clearly, be the necessary result of the money-power in Parliament having degraded the questions of labour, or THE EMPLOYMENT OF OUR OWN PEOPLE, from being a constitutional question (and the greatest of all those constitutional questions on which members of Parliament are only delegates) to being a mere fiscal question! I saw that there was no longer any guarantee to this country for the permanency to its best secured and most valued institutions (nor even of the crown itself), although no voice may have been lifted at the hustings against any of these; and I knew that the *ex post facto* assent of the constituencies did not make the proceeding right, but only included *them* in its guilt. The permanently important point was not whether the new policy of 1816 was right or wrong, but the result of this policy had an immediate importance; for great danger to the public peace must flow from any reduction of employment in this country, especially when the unfortunate legislation was not the act of the whole people, nor even of the existing parliamentary constituencies. The difficulty of our national position was and is the greater, from the public mind in this country having been so drugged by COBDEN AND THE FOREIGN INTEREST, who have deluded the people by calling themselves free traders, while their system is one only of free imports. What then were the working classes to do as a first step? I answered—Let them refuse their confidence to every man who refuses his confidence to them, let them refuse to listen to the details of any man who is not their political friend in the sense of going with them for their political enfranchisement—in a word, for the principle of Universal Suffrage;" which I firmly believe to be—in the true or patriotic, and not the party sense of Conservative—the most conservative measure that can be proposed this day in Great Britain, Ireland, and the Colonies, as sure to lead to our foreign trade being made reciprocal instead of one sided; *the foreigner who is admitted to provide food for a portion of our people being driven to provide them with employment by taking British goods in return; while a just protection to highly taxed British agriculture would be had in the fact, that in the price of the British goods taken by the foreigner, is included our heavy national taxation.* I had always seen that the only means of attaining this great end was a COMPLETE ALTERATION OF THE CURRENCY. Our monetary system must be set free from its present dishonest and absurd basis, the foreign exchanges, and our prices made to represent a high British, not a low foreign or untaxed standard of value. Thus and thus alone, I still firmly believe, can the property of this country meet the interest of the national debt, and thus alone can we protect British industry, vindicating the rights of fixed property and labour against that usurpation of the money power which has existed since 1819, and rescuing this country from the social confusion which must be the ultimate effect of the jarring principles of Peel's legislation of 1819 and 1846.

THE REMEDY OF THE SOCIAL ECONOMISTS.

Some hard, but always successful battles, in support of Government and order (continues Mr Buchanan), have brought under my notice how little talent is required to be a good fault-finder, and how much easier it is to object to an existing system than to propose a better: so that, for myself, I never would have written a line against Peel's measures, although my personal opinion was that they are outrageous, till I felt that there was at hand an easy and effectual remedy against their extreme consequences. Without supposing that no more is required to promote British Industry, I have always seen that the mere preservation of the peace of the country would be effectually secured by simply changing Peel's Bank Bills of 1844 and 1845, so as to admit of New Banks, under the same restrictions as the present ones, and by SETTING ASIDE THE PRINCIPLE (fixed gold standard) OF THE BILL OF 1819; the Bank of England's notes being a legal tender at its own counter except when it has over twenty millions of specie, and even then the payment to be at the market price of the gold or silver; all banks to issue one pound notes; the capital of the Bank of England to be doubled; and the Bank of England to be bound never to have less than fourteen millions specie in its vaults. In a word, as to the bills 1844 and 1845, *on which our banking is based*, I would only amend them by inserting a clause to permit the establishment of new Banks of Issue, thus doing away with the monopoly of the present Banks; and as to the bill of 1819, *which dictates what shall be the money or legal tender*, I would amend it, so as to make the foreigner who will not take goods *take gold at a British price* (as this may be indicated by the law of supply and demand in this country), and this amendment need be no more than making Bank of England notes also a legal tender to the extent of the Government debt to the Bank, fourteen millions, and the amount of specie in its vaults. As social economists, in a word, *we are economists of labour, but not of price.* We wish to reduce, not to raise, the amount of labour the poor man has to give for a shilling; and we aver that with high prices* (as measured in the precious metals) there will be increased employment. We, in fact, hold that increased remuneration to labour can only arise from increased employment; and that so certainly must high prices flow from increased employment that if the Peel, or irreciprocal, free trade could possibly fulfil the false promises its advocates have made, the necessary consequence would just be the blowing to the winds of their unpatriotic and inhuman theory of "cheapness!" As social economists, we say that what is true economy, to those who have money to dispose of, is the very reverse to those who have labour to dispose of. We hold the reply of the economical school to be most fallacious and Jesuitical, that "if the poor man is to give his productions at a low price, he gets what he consumes at an equal reduction in price; so that the question of price is not one of any importance to the poor man." We know, of course, that the question of less or more employment is the vital question for the labourer and mechanic; but we equally well know (as has been shown above) that increased employment gives higher wages—the price of labour, like everything else, being regulated by the law of supply and demand; and I shall show below, in the next paragraph, that diminished wages are brought about by a diminishing of employment, the direct consequences of our low fixed price of gold (more especially when this leads to its exportation in such quantity as to upset the country's circulation and Bank facilities.) We would, however, call to the irreciprocal free-traders' memory how the anti-corn-law league humbugged the population, and convinced our artizans of the contrary doctrine, boldly asserting that low prices of food were synonymous with prosperity, although in Ireland, and the other countries of Europe, where food was cheapest, we had always seen the greatest misery because the least employment; and we would remind him, that instead of the working man being interested in his labour being at a low price, he is directly interested in its being at a high price; FOR IT IS EVIDENT THAT CAPITAL ONLY REMAINS IN CO-OPERATION WITH LABOUR ON CONDITION OF THIS BEING PROFITABLE, OR, OTHERWISE, BECAUSE THE LABOURER PRODUCES MORE THAN HE CONSUMES; AND THUS WE SEE THAT AN EQUALLY LOW PRICE OF WHAT HE CONSUMES WILL NOT ALTOGETHER MAKE UP TO THE LABOURER FOR A REDUCTION OF THE PRICE OF HIS LABOUR, WHICH IS THE GREATER QUANTITY. The economy of the political economists consists in getting more labour for less money; but the economy of the social economists consists in the true philanthropy of making labour bear as high a price as possible. The social economists do not deny the doctrine of the eminent bullionist writers, that the price of labour and commodities is chiefly affected directly by the amount of the circulation, rather than by the price at which we fix our precious metals by legislation. I shall, however, show below, as I have promised, that the circulation and consequently the price of labour and commodities is diminished by Peel's having fixed the commodity gold, (for though a money to us, it is a commodity to the foreigner), at a low foreign price. Under Peel's bill of 1819, our bankers dare not expand the circulation, as this precipitates a panic. Under Peel's legislation, in a word, prosperity is the mother of distress, because the rise in price of labour (prosperity) caused by money being plentiful, causes a diminution of the exportation of our manufactures, because they are dearer than gold at our *fixed* raw material price.

A fixed price for gold is a fixed injustice to our native industry, (*for the use of which the currency exists!*) as keeping down prices