

less; but upon that system by which enactments shall not oppress one party and favor another, but which in their origin, progress and end, shall contribute to yield and produce "the greatest happiness to the greatest number"—which is the golden rule for legislation, and cannot be too extensively practised in this or in any country. Laws thus constituted are not likely to be infringed or violated, which is every day the case with the laws against Usury. And now let me ask the question, what *is* Usury? The answer to the inquiry is plain. It is money paid and received for the *USE* of money lent. In this respect it differs nothing from *profit*: for what is profit? The answer is equally intelligible. It is money obtained over and above the capital employed or invested in any pursuit or undertaking. Where then is the difference between Usury and Profit, since the latter is clearly *gain* made by the *USE* of money? But refined morality may say "Usury is forbidden by law." So would *profit* be forbidden by law, if there happened to be a law to forbid it, or legislators could be found sufficiently stupid to pass such a law. But where is the legislator who would have the folly to stand up in his place and advocate the absurd doctrine that property and commodities are not, and ought not to be, bought and sold at whatever price the market for the same will admit, and the seller and purchaser are willing to give and take?

Then if this be law as regards property and commodities generally, why is it not so as regards money?