or produced; but not the value itself. No one wants money to consume; it is preferred only because it will command any commodity required. Its value, therefore which depends upon its quantity, should neither be increased nor diminished. If the public measures of length or capacity were continually varied, they could be no standard by which the people could buy or sell. Money in addition to its character as a representative of value, is also a measure by which commodities are exchanged; and it can only be a just or correct measure, so long as its relative quantity remains equal to that of commodities to be exchanged. For any other purpose, as far as the community is concerned, than as a mere medium of exchange, and a measure, or scale, by which the difference of values is ascertained, money is perfectly useless. Mr. Mill, speaking on this subject, makes use of the following language: "There cannot, in short, be intrinsically a more insignificent thing in the economy of society than money, except in the character of a contrivance for sparing time and labor. It is a machine for doing quickly what would have been done, though less quickly and commodiously than without it, and like many other kinds of machinery, it only exerts a distinct and independent influence of its own when it gets out of order." These deductions of Mr. Mill are, no doubt, perfectly correct; all that society is interested in, so far as money is concerned, is that it should cost as little expense as possible, and that its value should be steadfast and unchangeable.

Notwithstanding the writings of Ricardo, Chalmers and Mill have been extant for so many years on this important subject; even statesmen appear still to be as ignorant of it as ever. Governments still go on borrowing, creating debt, and an excess of money; and licensing others to do so as though the practice were beneficial, and its equity and utility had never been questioned. The only difference between borrowing and creating an excess of money, is, that in the first case is, that in addition to its utter folly as a financial measure, there is a perpetual interest to pay, unless at some future time the debt should happen to be discharged through the creation of another twice as large. In the second instance, the same burthen of high prices would have to be borne by the consumer, but in neither case, as we have explained before, would the government gain anything by the operation, as the high prices, or the cheapness of money would have reduced the value of the already existing income, so that what was gained in one way, would be lost in another. A notorious case in point of the injurious operation of an excess of money has lately occurred, which ought to be sufficient to convince all unprejudiced persons of the truth of our reasoning.

Immediately after the close of the late German and French war, the Germans received an indemnity of one thousand millions of dollars, or two hundred and twenty millions of pounds sterling. And what was the result? Let us turn to a speech in which the subject was incidentally mentioned some time after by Dr. Julius Faucher, Editor of the *Quarterly Review of Political Economy* at Berlin, speaking at the Cobden Club, July, 1875, said: "This influx of specie caused a general