

monies. By such payments the difficulty of discharging old debts from the alleged scarcity of gold & silver would have been obviated. Your Petitioner having (as he thinks) clearly proved that Debtors would not be obliged to sell their lands & effects for gold & silver to pay their debts, the Resolution of the House not to repeal the law founded on that supposition & reason cannot be supported.

As to the third assertion in the Resolve viz, that a repeal of the tender law would be highly injurious to the cause of America, and destructive to public Credit, your Petitioner hopes he may without offence to the House advance what they know & must admit, viz, that the most positive assertions tho' coming from the respectable authority of the Peoples Delegates, cannot constitute a proof. Nothing but your Petitioner's respect for those Delegates, induces him to treat this assertion seriously, it is contradicted by the stubborn evidence of facts. Have the payments made by debtors kept up the Credit of the currencies, can any advantages to the cause of America be pointed out justly imputable to those payments, and the tender law authorizing them? If notwithstanding those payments the currencies have greatly & rapidly depreciated since the passage of the tender law; if no benefit accruing to the Public from those fraudulent payments can be pointed out; can it be supposed a continuance of the law will procure any advantages to America, or bring the currencies back to their Original & intended value? If these things cannot be proved, the assertion must be deemed to be unsupported by reason, and consequently an improper foundation for the Resolve. No man of probity and integrity will dare to avow the flagitious sentiment, that the affairs of America cannot prosper but by the commission of private injustice and by exempting debtors from the payment of their debts, or that Creditors ought to be stripped of their property to promote the public prosperity, and to keep up the credit of the currencies. The Resolve indeed does not expressly say, but clearly implies as much, for it endeavours to vindicate a law which in fact nearly exempts