

Mr. BROWN submitted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the resolution regulating and limiting debate on the judiciary report, be applicable to all the business of the Convention until otherwise ordered."

Which was read.

On the question being put,

Will the Convention adopt said resolution?

Mr. BROWN moved the question be taken by yeas and nays,

Which being ordered,

Appeared as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Donaldson, Sellman, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Sherwood, of Talbot, Hodson, Phelps, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Tuck, Grason, Wright, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Stephenson, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Brent, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Ware, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Weber, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Ege, Shower, Cockey and Brown—41.

Negative—Messrs. Blakistone, Pres't, *pro. tem.*, Morgan, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Weems, Bond, Sollers, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Dasbiell, Williams, Bowie, McCubin, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Schley, Davis, Waters and Smith—28.

So the resolution was adopted.

Mr. SOLLERS gave notice that he should move to reconsider the vote of the Convention just taken on said resolution.

Mr. HARBINE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Washington county, against the formation of a new county, to be called "Lee county" out of parts of Washington and Frederick counties.

Which was read, and

Referred to the committee on New Counties.

Mr. HOWARD said:

That he had observed an article running the rounds of the newspapers, stating that the expenses of this Convention would amount to \$200,000. He was not willing that they should be responsible for imaginary sins; they had enough real ones, he thought, to answer for.

He would, therefore, (and he believed this was quite parliamentary,) ask the gentleman who was chairman of the committee on accounts, whom he presumed had an accurate knowledge of this subject, to state to the Convention, if he knew, what had been the expenses of the Convention up to this day.

Mr. WELLS made some remarks which will be published hereafter.

On motion of Mr. TUCK,

The Convention took up for consideration the report of the Committee on the legislative department.

The question pending to said report was on the amendment offered by Mr. LEE, as an additional section to said report, being as follows:

"Sec. 44. The General Assembly shall, at its second session after the adoption of this Constitu-

tion, 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, are sufficient within the space of seven years, to satisfy or pay such judgment or other liens."

Mr. DASHIELL said, that he could not consent to let a vote be taken upon a proposition so important as the one now under consideration, without making a few remarks in its behalf. He regretted very much indeed, that time was not allowed to elaborate fully its merits. It was a measure that tended to alleviate the condition of that class of persons in the community, who stood most in need of our favor and protection.—The unfortunate debtor, and his helpless family, were the objects of its solicitude.

This article directs the legislature to pass a law similar to a law which now exists in Delaware, and which has been working very beneficially in that State for a number of years. Similar laws also, he believed were now in force in Pennsylvania and Virginia. It partakes in its nature of the old *Ellegit* system, but somewhat modified to suit the genius of our government. It is a law which the humanity of the age would encourage; and which the cruelty and hardships of the present system of execution demand its protecting power. What is its nature? What is its object?

It is designed, sir, to protect the weak from the strong—the man of low estate, from the wealthy—the oppressed from the oppressor. It is designed to rescue the little homestead of the poor man from the grasping power of the rich and worldly. How often have I witnessed with an aching heart the little home of the poor man, sold under the hammer of the Sheriff for one-fourth of its value, and for an amount, which its rent would have extinguished in less than seven years.

How often have I witnessed the patrimony of the inconsiderate young man who had been ensnared by the wilds of the *shaver*, sold for a debt which with interest and costs, could have been liquidated by rent in much less than seven years. His birth place—the scenes of his youthful perambulations—the home of his childhood—the resting place of his deceased ancestors—all, all gone—and gone forever.

This provision, Mr. President, is designed to prevent the sale of real estate for a longer term than seven years where the debt and costs can be paid by the rent in that time. It is to prevent the sacrifice of that kind of property for a much less sum than its real value, which under the present system of execution often occur. It works no injury to the creditor, for he may receive his debt either in yearly instalments with interest, or he may receive the whole amount at once and forthwith by selling the estate for seven years.

Then, sir, at the expiration of said time, and after the creditor shall have received his debt, the land reverts back to its original owner. This, sir, is much more humane—much more just, and much more accords with the advancement of the age, than the present barbarous mode of dispos-