

rent to the payment of creditors till the debts of the owners were entirely extinguished. But if the profits of a farm were applied to that purpose, what would become of the family who owned it, while it was passing through this course of redemption? They would be under the necessity of contracting debts, on the credit of their rever- sionary interest; and by the time a farm was re- leased from old liabilities, it would be necessary to place it under the management of new trust- ees for the payment of another set of creditors. In the mean time, it would be going out of repair and becoming of less value; and, if sold at last, would bring considerably less than if sold in the first instance. He hoped the Convention would dismiss this subject, as well as all others that ought to be left to the Legislature, and proceed in the consideration of such articles as ought to find a place in the Constitution.

Mr. MICHAEL NEWCOMER moved the previous question, which was seconded :

The question was then put on the amendment offered by Mr. TUCK; and was agreed to

The question then recurred upon the adoption of the section as amended;

Mr. PHELPS moved that the question be taken by yeas and nays, which being ordered appeared as follows:

*Affirmative.*—Messrs. Blakistone, Pres't *pro tem*. Hopewell, Lee, Sellman, Weems, Bond, Sollers, Sherwood, of Talbot, Dashiell, Hodson, Phelps, Bowie, McCubbin, George, Dirickson, McMas- ter, Fooks, Jacobs, Carter, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Harcastle, Brewer, Weber, Fitzpat- rick, Smith and Egge—27.

*Negative.*—Messrs. Ricaud, Chambers of Kent, Donaldson, Dorsey, Randall, Howard, Buch- anan, Bell, Welch, John Dennis, James U. Den- nis, Williams, Constable, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Tuck, Spencer, Grason, Wright, Shri- ver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Stephenson, Magraw, Nelson, Gwinn, Brent of Baltimore city, Sher- wood of Baltimore city, Ware, Schley, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Anderson, Parke, Cockey and Brown—41. So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SOLLERS moved to amend the report of the committee on the legislative department, by adding at the end thereof, as an additional sec- tion, the following:

“The Legislature shall grant no charter for banking purposes, or renew any banking cor- poration now in existence, except upon condi- tion that the stockholders and directors shall be liable in their individual capacity for all of said res- ponsibilities of said corporations, whether upon note, bill or otherwise, and upon the further con- dition that no director or other officer of said cor- poration shall borrow any money from, or have any accommodation at, or otherwise deal with said corporation, except as to salaries, and if any of said directors or other officers shall upon convic- tion in any court of law in this State, be found guilty of having borrowed or dealt with said cor- porations, except as to salaries as aforesaid, the person so offending shall be punished by confine- ment in the penitentiary for such time as the

Legislature may hereafter prescribe, and the charter of said banking corporation shall be for- feited forever.”

Mr. SOLLERS said:

That he offered this proposition in sincerity, and with a deep sense of the responsibility which he owed to a portion of the people of the State. He called for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the proposition.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, referred to the constitution of the State of Louisiana, to show that that State had gone much further in this matter than was proposed by the amendment of the gentleman from Calvert. He was in favor of creating a competition in this business as well as in others, and believed that the community would be just as well taken care of by the intro- duction of a well regulated system of free bank- ing.

Mr. BUCHANAN considered this as one of the very best propositions that had been offered to the Convention from the day of its commence- ment to the present hour, and of course he should vote for it with cheerfulness. But he rose to make a suggestion, which he hoped would be adopted. This amendment proposed, among other things, that the stockholders should be held responsible in their individual capacity, for all losses sustained by the corporation. Very often widows and minors were stockholders, and he thought that such stockholders and others of a like character, should not be made responsi- ble. He would offer an amendment to meet this state of the case. If the gentleman would accept it—well. If not, he would offer it as an independ- ent proposition.

Mr. SOLLERS could not accept the suggestions and desired to know if any objection could be made to his proposition? He stood here pre- pared to repudiate any objection that might be offered to it. Why was it that stockholders and corporations should not be responsible as well as individuals. He would give his reasons why they should be. He knew that these gentlemen—officers of the banks—(he did not say of all the banks.) made panics and speculated upon them. He knew that when the cashier presen- ted an account before the directors, and told them that a certain amount had been discounted that day, that the directors shared it among themselves, and shaved the honest people. He appealed to the democracy of this house, (they were all democrats in one sense,) to vote for his proposition. It was his desire to make these bank officers honest, and keep them from speculating on the miseries, necessities and pov- erties of other people.

Mr. WEEMS was exceedingly sorry to differ with his colleague on this subject.

Mr. SOLLERS. Is not the gentleman a direc- tor of the Farmers' Bank of Maryland?

Mr. WEEMS. I am, and will further answer the gentleman, that although I am a director in that bank, I am not actuated by any sinister mo- tives.

Mr. SOLLERS. Not at all, sir.