

which no one will knowingly employ a man who has not been regularly taught; and the remark of Chancellor OXENSTERN to his son, "*quam parva sapientia regitur mundus*," must be understood to apply not only to what is, but what ought to be the state of things.

"Many of you, probably have met with the story of some gentleman, (I suppose it is usually fathered on a native of a neighbouring island,) who, on being asked whether he could play on the violin, made answer that he really did not know whether he could or not because he had never tried. There is at least, more modesty in this expression of doubt than those show, who, having never tried to learn the very rudiments of Political Economy, are yet quite sure of their competence to discuss its most difficult questions.

You perhaps wonder how it is that men should conceal from themselves and from each other so glaring an absurdity. I believe it is generally in this way; they profess and intend to keep clear of all questions of Political Economy, and imagine themselves to have done so, by having kept clear of the *name*. The subjects of which constitute the proper and sole province of the science, they do not scruple to submit to extemporaneous discussion, provided they but avoid the tide by which that science is commonly designated. This is as if the gentleman in the story just alluded to, had declared his inability to play on the violin, at the same time expressing his confidence that he could play on the *fiddle*."

"There is in fact no way of keeping clear of Political Economy, however we may avoid the *name* but by keeping clear of the subjects of it, and if it be felt as inconsistent with the character of a well educated man to have nothing to say, and to show no interest on those subjects, you may easily make it clear to any man of ingenious mind, that he ought to be still more inwardly ashamed, (though he may not be put to shame openly) at discussing them, without having taken due pains to understand them. Specious and shallow declamation may, indeed, for a time he even more favourably received by the unthinking, than sound reasoning based on sound knowledge, but this latter must have a tendency to prevail ultimately."

4. The last reason which I shal lurge for making Political Economy a branch of public education is, that some acquaintance with it is requisite to a just estimate of the value of the different kinds of labour, and a right appreciation of the several employments and professions which are essential to the production of wealth and the progress of civilization in any country. That able political economist, Mr. S. SENIOR, has well defined labour to be "the voluntary exertion of our bodily and mental faculties for the purpose of production." Very little observation and reflection are sufficient to inform us that there is *rude, simple, or uneducated* labour, and *educated* labour—that there is *physical or bodily* and *mental or intellectual* labour, and, as is commonly the case, both of these united—that these several kinds of labour enter into the production of almost every article of wealth; and finally, that their productiveness greatly depends upon the intelligence and moral habits of labourers themselves of all classes, and upon the character and institutions of society at large. In the production of nearly every article of wealth, there is a three-fold process, namely—the *theory*, the *application*, the *execution*,—comprehending, as it has been well expressed by Dr. WAYLAND, in his lucid and comprehensive exposition of the elements of Political Economy, "*Industry of discovery, or investigation; industry of application or invention; and industry of operation*." In the first place, then, we have the *philosopher or man of science*, investigating discovering, and unfolding the laws of nature; secondly, we have the *inventor*, applying those laws in the several departments of practical life; thirdly we have the *operative* labourer, giving effect to all useful discoveries and inventions; and I may add, lastly in word, but first in order and importance, we have the teacher of religion and morals, to regulate the conduct of man in all his pursuits and relations;—we have the instructor in letters and arts, to train the mental and corporeal faculties of man for all the employments of human skill and labour; we have the surgeon and physician, to repair and mitigate bodily misfortunes, to alleviate suffering, and to restore the wasted strength and prolong the life of man for his wonted labours; we have the lawyer and jurist to secure the fruits of industry; we have the civil ruler, the legislator, the departmental, and various subordinate officers of government, for the protection of life, liberty and property, and the numerous vital interests of man as a social being.

Now each link in this vast chain of human labour, is connected

with every other link of an order of Providence stamped upon the condition, the nature, and the destinies of man, and each particle or kind of labour possesses a value according to its cost and its tendency to promote the great objects of human industry. That there is a difference in the value of different kinds of labour, is clearly the common sense of mankind, as is evinced by the occurrences of every day life. No man thinks of placing the same value upon the labour of a gate keeper and of a master farmer in agriculture; or the labour of a hod man and master-builder in architecture; or of a messenger and manager in a mercantile establishment; or of a monitor and head manager of a school, or of a cryer and judge of a court; and similar distinctions in the comparative value of different kinds of labour suggest themselves in a thousand examples that might be adduced. To explain the philosophy of this distinction, the principles on which they are founded, and the extent to which they may be justly and beneficially applied—in the distribution of the fruits of human labour, or the payment of wages, falls within the province of political economy. And from ignorance on this important subject, the most absurd and injurious errors prevail and are every day propagated. It is, indeed, admitted that the value of two pieces of cloth is not the same, if the more labour has been bestowed upon the one than the other—that an ounce of gold and of silver is not of equal value, since the former has cost sixteen times more labour than the latter—that each farmer, tradesman, or merchant, should be compensated for the capital he invests, the expense he has incurred, the risk he runs, as well as for the personal labour he performs in business; yet how has this obvious principle of justice between man and man, this obvious principle of prudence in the social progress of any people, been discarded and outraged in the discussion of economical questions in this country. It has been attempted to reduce all kinds of labour to about the same value—to place educated labour on a par with uneducated labour;—contending that the Lawyer or Physician who has invested the capital of the many hundreds of pounds, and many years of labour to qualify himself for his work, is entitled no more for a day's labour than the man who has not spent ten pounds or a year's time in preparation for his work—that the teacher of youth who has spent years and means to fit himself for the duties of his office, is entitled to no higher remuneration than the day labourer who has never spent a penny or a day except in productive employment—that the wages of the Judges of the land and of the chief officers of state, imparting the result of long and expensive labour, of rare attainment and talent, should be less than the receipts of many an ordinary tradesman. In as far as this spirit prevails in any community, society will not advance beyond a certain point—educated labour, and especially the higher branches of it, being inadequately compensated, will be abandoned for more remunerative pursuits, and mediocrity materialism, littleness and meanness will ultimately become the characteristics of the rulers and institutions, the sentiments and feelings of a people. In the application of the true principles of political economy to the support of civil government, Dr. WAYLAND, the able American author already quoted, remarks as follows; and his remarks are equally appropriate to every situation requiring the best qualifications, from those of the humble country school master to the President of a University, or the head of a Government.

"Economy requires, that precisely such talent should be employed, in various offices of civil government, as may be necessary to insure the discharge of the duties of each office, in the best possible manner. Many of these offices, can only be discharged successfully, by the first order of human talent, cultivated by learning and discipline, and directly by incorruptible integrity. Now it is certainly bad economy, to employ inferior talent to do badly, that which can only be of any service when it is done well.

"Hence, the salaries of judicial, legislative, and executive officers, should be such as will command the services of such talent as the duties of each office require. It is most unwise parsimony, to give to a judge such a salary as will command the services of nothing more than a third rate lawyer; and it is mean to ask an individual to do a service for the *community*, at a lower rate than that at which he would do it for an individual.

"In answer to this, it may be said, that by bestowing large salaries upon the officers of the Government, we present temptations to avarice. But, I reply the reduction of salaries, by no means diminishes the evil. Were emolument to be reduced, there would always be a contest for office. The only question then is, whether