city, Presstman, Ware, John Newcomer, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Weber and Slicer—32.

So the vote was reconsidered.

The question then recurred on the amendment of Mr. BLAKISTONE.

Mr. JENIFER said:

The amendment had better lie over, that it might be printed, and that the members might have an opportunity to examine it. He had voted for it, but he had strong doubts about it. He moved it lie over until to-morrow.

If the question was taken now, he must vote against it.

Mr. WEEMS moved to postpone its consideration until Wednesday next.

Some conversation followed, and several suggestions were made, that the matter should again come up to-morrow.

Some conversation followed, and several suggestions were made that the matter should again come up to-morrow.

Mr WEEMS said, he must necessarily be absent to-morrow, and he hoped, therefore, that the Convention would either act on the question to-day, or postpone it until next Wednesday, by which time, he would be here. He desired to record his vote upon it.

Mr. WEEMS said:

That he had the honor of a seat in the legislature when the tax law was passed. He claimed to be the author of the sixty-fourth section of the law as it now stood. He offered this section as an amendment to the original bill and it was accepted by Mr. BOWIE, chairman of the committee of ways and means, by whom the bill was reported. It was his, [Mr. W's.,] deliberate opinion that the bill would not have become a law at that session, had not this section been adopted. The people expected that the faith of the State, as pledged by that law, would be redeemed. He was in favor of carrying out the provisions of the law.

Here Mr. W. read the sixty-fourth section, and stated, in conclusion, that he agreed in all which had fallen from the gentleman from St. Mary's, (Mr. Blakistone,) as to the propriety of carrying out the provisions of the law faithfully.

Mr. CHAMBERS said, the practice which had, of late become prevalent, was likely to lead to difficulties. A gentleman rose, presented a proposition, assigned all the reasons he could find to sustain it, and before he quit the floor, moved the previous question. No room for explanation or correction was allowed.

Now he supposed many gentlemen had voted entirely on the faith of what had fallen from his friend from St. Mary's, [Mr Blakistone.]' He had, with his usual animation and earnestness, urged the absolute and binding force of the law of 184–, in regard to the mode of distribution. His remarks would lead us to believe, what the gentleman seems to suppose is the fact, that the law of 1841, is the only, or at all events, the earliest one on this subject.

No mistake could be greater. There were other and earlier laws, pledging portions of these funds, with equal solemnity. He did not mean to go into the subject a large. A gentleman from Charles, [Mr. Merrick,] not now present, had examined this subject, and had given us, on a former occasion, the evidence of his investigations. We ought to wait and receive more full information, and he therefore urged a postponement of the subject.

Mr. THOMAS said he hoped the question would be postponed. There are other pledges of this internal improvement fund, than that which had been referred to by the gentleman from St. Mary's. He adverted to the joint resolution concerning the two million of loan to the Chesapeake and Ohio canal company, in which he said there was a rule laid down for the distribution of the revenue from that source, different from the rule now proposed. He referred also to the important question which had arose between Washington county and the Baltimore and Ohio railroad company. It had been agreed that a large sum was to be given to Washington county, in case the railroad did not pass through it. The case instituted to recover that sum, went to the court of appeals. The court decided that the Legislature had not the power to make a contract of this kind with the counties.

Mr CHAMBERS explained that the court had decided that that was not a contract of binding force; not that the parties had not power to make a contract.

Mr. THOMAS said he was not now going to argue the question. He thought the effect of making this transfer, ought to be well considered before going into it. There was an antagonism of interests growing up out of our system of internal improvements, which ought to be weighed before a provision was inserted in the organic law on the subject. A constitutional provision cannot be changed, and the parties, even if disposed, might thus be debarred from making a compromise, which the law and the joint resolution he had referred to would not forbid.

Mr. THOMAS then moved to postpone the consideration of the motion to Wednesday week.

Mr. WEEMS assented.

Mr. BLAKISTONE designated Monday week.

Mr. THOMAS said that day would be acceptable to him.

Mr. MCHENRY suggested that the bill and amendments should, in the interval, be printed.

Mr. WEEMS accepted the suggestion as a part of his motion.

Some conversation followed.

Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER called for a division of the question—first on postponement.

The consideration of the amendment was postponed to Monday week.

The question recurring on the motion to print, It was taken and agreed to.

Mr. LEE gave notice that, at the proper time, he should offer the following as an additional section to the report:

"*Sec.* 42. The General Assembly shall, at its second session after the adoption of this constitution, provide by law against the sale of any real estate to satisfy any judgment or other lien in cases where the yearly rents and profits, beyond the payment of taxes, and the necessary repairs,