

Cumberland, endorsed; "By the senate, December 31, 1803: Read the first time and ordered to lie on the table."

"By order, J. B. DUCKETT, clk.
 "By the senate, January 2, 1804: Read the second time and will not pass.
 "By order, J. B. DUCKETT, clk."
 The house adjourns till to-morrow morning 9 o'clock.

W E D N E S D A Y, January 4, 1804.

THE house met. Present the same members as on yesterday. The proceedings of yesterday were read. Mr. Clarke, from the committee, delivers to the speaker the following report:

THE committee to whom was referred the petition of Edward Owings, of Frederick county, stating, that a part of the road mentioned in the petition, which runs through the said petitioner's land, is inconvenient to the people generally who make use of the said road, and praying that so much of the said road as runs through the said petitioner's land may be shut up, and another road opened by said Edward Owings be declared a public highway, report, that they have taken the same under consideration, and by the counter petition of Henry Ramspark, of said county, it is represented, among other things, that the said road has been a public highway for upwards of fifty years, without inconvenience to the people, that no dissatisfaction has been manifested, except by Mr. Edward Owings, and that a number of the adjoining neighbours would be much injured by an alteration of the direction of the said road; the committee, therefore, under those circumstances, are of opinion that the legislature ought to decline granting the prayer of the petitioner.

By order, A. GOLDR, clk.

Which was read the first and second time and concurred with.

The bill to aid the defect of the deed therein mentioned, was read the second time and passed.

The bill respecting special courts of oyer and terminer and gaol delivery, was read the second time, and the question put, That the further consideration thereof be postponed till the next session of assembly? Resolved in the affirmative.

On motion, the question was put, That the further supplement to the act, entitled, An act to erect Baltimore-town, in Baltimore county, into a city, and to incorporate the inhabitants thereof, have a second reading on the first day of June next? Determined in the negative.

The question was then put, That the further consideration of the said bill be postponed till the next session of assembly? Determined in the negative.

On the second reading of the said bill, the question was put, That the word "four" be stricken out of the second enacting clause of the said bill? Resolved in the affirmative.

On progression in reading the said bill, the question was put, That the words "shall have the same qualifications in every respect as delegates to the general assembly," be stricken out of the fourth enacting clause of the said bill? Determined in the negative.

On motion, the question was put, That the following be received as an amendment to the said bill? "Provided always, and be it enacted, that nothing in this act contained shall have any effect or operation unless the same shall be assented to by a majority of all the members of the first branch of the city council, after a new election of members, in the first session after such new election." The yeas and nays being required, appeared as follow:

A F F I R M A T I V E.

Messrs	Angier, Thomas, Mercer, Hall,	Dorsey, Holland, Carcaud, Lemmon,	Brown, Meluy, Rose, Veazey,	Miller, Sheredine, Alexander, Van-Horn,	Roberts, Sudler, Hawkins, Shriver,	Clarke, Montgomery, Forwood, E. Davis,	Lytle, Dickson, Dugan,	Kershner, Smith, Yates.	36.
--------	--	--	--------------------------------------	--	---	---	------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----

N E G A T I V E.

Messrs	R. Neale, W. Neale, Hopewell, Harwood,	Grahame, Gantt, Jones, Chapman,	M'Pherson, Ridgely, Dashiell, Carroll,	Cottman, Hyland, Goldsborough, Bayly,	Shaaft, Muir, Thompson, Wilson,	Rich, Zeller, Swearingen,	T. Davis, Veatch, Linthicum,	Bayard, Tomlinson, Simkins.	29.
--------	---	--	---	--	--	---------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----

So it was resolved in the affirmative.

On motion, the question was put, That the following be received as an amendment to the said bill? "and provided also, that the same be assented to by a majority of the members of the second branch of the said city council." The yeas and nays being required, appeared as follow:

A F F I R M A T I V E.

Messrs	W. Neale, Hopewell, Thomas, Dorsey,	Grahame, Stuart, Jones, Chapman,	M'Pherson, Ridgely, Lloyd, Carroll,	Goldsborough, Bayly, Calvert, Muir,	Thompson, Sudler, Wilson,	Montgomery, E. Davis, Kershner,	Swearingen, T. Davis, Linthicum,	Bayard, Tomlinson, Cresap.	28.
--------	--	---	--	--	---------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------	-----

N E G A T I V E.

Messrs	R. Neale, Angier, Mercer, Harwood,	Hall, Gantt, Holland, Carcaud,	Lemmon, Brown, Meluy, Rose,	Cottman, Veazey, Miller, Sheredine,	Alexander, Van-Horn, Roberts, Lowrey,	Purnell, Hawkins, Shriver, Forwood,	Lytle, Rich, Dickson, Dugan,	Smith, Yates, Veatch, Simkins.	34.
--------	---	---	--------------------------------------	--	--	--	---------------------------------------	---	-----

So it was determined in the negative.