but, that his personal estate, with the annual value of his real estate, were insufficient to enable him to prosecute his studies with advantage; it was enacted, that his interest in the house and lot should be sold, and the proceeds applied towards his education and use. 1791, ch. 48. At the next session of the General Assembly, by the petition of Judith Wallace, on behalf of herself and her children, it was represented, that her husband John Wallace died intestate in the year 1789, leaving the said widow and five children, and seised of a tract of land containing eighty or ninety acres which was rich, but entirely destitute of timber and firewood; the expense of procuring which exhausted the annual profits of the land. Whereupon it was enacted, that the land so descended should be sold; and, with the proceeds, other land should be purchased in which the widow should have her right of dower, and which should be held, and pass as the land which had been sold. 1792, ch. 28. In addition to these many other similar estate Acts have been passed, in almost every one of which it appears, that the General Assembly were, in some way, satisfied of the truth of the facts as stated; and that it would be exceedingly difficult, if not altogether impracticable, to provide for the maintenance and education of the infants in any other manner than by the proposed sale of their real estate. 1805, ch. 28 and 33; 1809, ch. 21 and 72; 1810, ch. 57, 74 and 158; 1811, ch. 95, 149 and 209; 1812, ch. 83, 91, 175 and 186; 1813, ch. 19, 29, 54, 80, 93, 151 and 152; 1814, ch. 31, 44, 74 and 90; 1815, ch. 31, 117, 124, 130, 134 and 136; 1825, ch. 88; *Campbell's Case*, 2 *Bland*, 209.

In all, or almost all of these cases, it is evident, that the Legislature interposed merely for the purpose of removing a temporary * disability in order to give relief under a then pressing necessity; and to confer a capacity on infants to do acts **203** necessary to enable them to obtain maintenance and education, or to discharge a duty to creditors who had claims upon their property. No material injustice could arise from any legislative interposition to such an extent; because the infant's property was not to be applied to any purpose for which it was not generally or specially bound. To authorize a sale of an infant's imperishable estate for any other purpose, would be not merely to endow him with a capacity to act for his own support, or in discharge of an obvious duty; but, in effect, to divest him of his property, or to force him to make an alienation of it, according to the fanciful opinions and notions of others; in all cases with much risk to the whole, and the certain loss of a part in commissions to the agents employed to make the sale; and in many cases without the least just occasion for such alienation. *Seys* v. *Price*, 9 *Mod.* 220; *Hearle* v. *Greenbank*, 3 *Atk.* 695; *Ware* v. *Polhill*, 11 *Ves.* 278; *Ex parte Philips*, 19 *Ves.* 122.