

reason, tho equally contrary to the principles of right, be obliged to give it
~~value~~ ^{the} for paper money now circulating at the rate of sixty ^{six} and two thirds ~~of~~ ^{it}?

Had the Legislators, who passed the tender act, been guided by the example
 of those who passed ~~our~~ first paper money laws, the tender law would have
 been ^{un}exceptionable. Honesty & justice dictated the latter, that a quantity of
 a new sort of money put into circulation would (as it happened) depreciate
 value; they therefore did not make it a tender for old current or sterling
 Debts; it was in no shape an ex post facto law, men were left to square
 their future dealings according to the fluctuating value of the new
 money. The quantity issued was fixed; so were the funds; the time of
 its redemption was also ascertained. Now compare the two laws, what
 a disparity! the first in every respect consonant to justice; the last
 in every respect flying in the face of it; compare the quantities of
 money circulating under each; 29000 only issued by our first
 paper money law, and even that not made a tender ^{for old debts}, now besides the
 bills of Credit to a very large amount emitted by this State, more than
 90 millions of dollars put into circulation by congress are by our tend-
 er law made a legal tender for old debts; no time fixed, no funds es-
 tablished and appropriated to ^{the} sinking of the immense load of
 public debt, nor the respective quotas thereof, payable by each
 of the 13 United States as yet ascertained.

If the Revolution means to assert that ^{the} quantity of gold & silver
 in the State is not sufficient to discharge the old current (sterling) debts,
 your Petitioner hopes he may without offence ask what foundation
 the House of Delegates had for that assertion, what steps did
 they take to ascertain the fact, did they know the exact amount
 of the gold & silver, and of the old debts, was not that knowledge
 necessary to support the assertion? If proof was wanting to
 support the assertion, can a resolution founded on that assertion be
 justified? But supposing the assertion to be true, it by no means
 justifies the law; it might justify the Legislators in obliging Credit-
 ors to receive the new bills of credit according to their current value
 in the course of exchange, but not in compelling Creditors to take