

the engrossed bill No. 30, with the paper bill thereof, which engrossed bill was thus endorsed;

“ By the house of delegates, May 16, 1780: Read and assented to.

F. GREEN, clk.”

“ By order,

Also the journal of accounts, thus endorsed; “ By the house of delegates, May 16, 1780: Read and assented to.

F. GREEN, clk.”

“ By order,

The engrossed bill No. 30 was read and assented to, and the paper bill thereof so endorsed.

The bill, entitled, An act for sinking the quota of this state of the bills of credit emitted by congress, was read the first and second time by especial order, unanimously rejected, and, with the bill, entitled, An act to prevent suits being brought or continued by any person or persons residing in the British dominions, with the following message, sent to the house of delegates by Matthew Tilghman, Esq;

BY THE SENATE, MAY 16, 1780.

GENTLEMEN,

AFTER much time had been spent between the two houses upon your bill for bringing into the treasury the sum of twenty millions five hundred and forty thousand dollars, and sinking the same, according to the requisition of congress, and you declined to answer our reasoning for striking out the two clauses objected to, as being unconstitutionally connected, you called for our assent or dissent to the bill, and not being at liberty to propose amendments, we were forced into a dissent; but considering the extreme urgency of affairs, we thought it proper, at the same time we rejected your bill, to propose, that if you would separate the clauses, we would pass the bill, though we had objections to many other parts, and proposed further to confer with members from your house on the subject of making the new bills a legal tender, upon just and equal principles, provided the same was connected with a revision and proper alteration of the present tender law: to this proposal you acceded, and after what was done in consequence thereof, we are surprised to find, that, with the bill now sent us for sinking the quota of this state of the bills of credit emitted by congress, different from the former bill only in the title, you have again blended the clause for making the new bills of credit a legal tender, and that it was accompanied with a message, only promising to revise the present tender law at the next session of assembly, and engaging not to allow any tender hereafter made, except such as you mention, and others which may merit the attention of the general assembly.

Thus, after spending many days to no purpose, we find ourselves just in the situation we were in at first, except that you have not inserted the clause for pledging the faith of this state for the redemption of the convention bills of credit, and the state loan-office certificates, without abatement or discount, and our objection to your first bill, grounded upon the 11th article of the constitution, is not removed by the present bill: this article secures to the senate the liberty of decision on all bills, and a right to propose amendments, except to money bills, and has wisely provided, “ That the senate may be at full and perfect liberty, to exercise their judgments in passing laws, and they may not be compelled by the house of delegates either to reject a money bill, which the emergency of affairs may require, or to assent to some other act of legislation, in their conscience and judgment injurious to the public welfare, the house of delegates shall not, on any occasion, or under any pretence, annex to or blend with a money bill any matter, clause, or thing, not immediately relating to, and necessary for, the imposing, assessing, levying, or applying, the taxes or supplies to be raised for the support of government, or the current expences of the state.” Most certainly the clause in question is not immediately relating to, and necessary for, the imposing, assessing, levying, or applying, the taxes or supplies to be raised for the support of government, or current expences of the state.

The only reason which you have assigned for tacking this clause to a money bill, does not warrant the proceeding; for even admitting that the making these bills a legal tender would give them credit, yet the giving them credit is not necessary for the imposing, assessing, levying, or applying, the monies intended to be brought in by the bill. Whether making the new bills a legal tender would add to their value, is mere matter of opinion, and we cannot suppress our astonishment, that this should really be yours, after so full an experience of the inefficacy of the present tender law in that respect; a similar law, so far from inducing our people to place a confidence in, and receive the new bills at the value of specie, would, in our opinion, occasion suspicion, that they will not actually be worth as much gold or silver as the face of them may entitle the bearer to receive; if their real should be equal to their nominal value, there will be no necessity to compel persons to receive them at any fixed and determined value; if not, the injustice of forcing them on creditors at a less value than what they circulate at is self evident; indeed such a compulsion, instead of giving credit to a paper currency, will ever depreciate it. Debtors, who in most communities constitute a very considerable part of the people, finding their account in discharging their debts in a depreciated paper currency, will never in line to establish sure funds to raise its value, because the more the currency depreciates, the less property will pay the debts.

The