

purposes which the same specified amount of gold or silver *would* answer, *could* gold or silver be commanded or obtained. What more than this would any country want?

If, then, these bits of paper are, by the law of the colony, sanctioned as *money*, and by common consent admitted, received and used, as such—or as the representatives of that which the colony has not got, *SPECIE*,—and if their purchasing power be, as it is, equal to that of hard money—why restrict their useful power by a tariff? The value and use of money (or bank bills, if you please) is in every country incalculable; and yet in this colony its operations are checked—its valuable influence limited and controlled by enactments of by-gone days, sustained and continued by the prejudice of the present day!

It is not in the power of any man to assign an indisputable reason why money ought not to be at the discretion and free disposal of its legal owner, as much as a horse or a cow; nor is it in the power of any man to disprove that *Usury* existed in the days of Scripture. What a farce, then, to make a sin of it in the present day, when men are, by law, allowed to contract debts, liabilities and obligations, and if sued for recovery, are allowed also the additional privilege of pleading *nulla bona*.

All laws ought to be based on a principle of equity; not however, on the equity of “share and share alike,” because in that case some would get more than their deserts by escaping what must be name-