

far more strong than any indications of peace. And under these impressions, it is not justifiable to look forward to the appreciation of the English funds, and hazard the whole of our stock for so uncertain an event.—And even the possible appreciation at the distant hour of peace does not, in our opinion, justify the continuance of the stock in the English funds, it can be laid out to more advantage in our own country—Besides, we can never subscribe to the opinion, that wealth creates national happiness; it is the proper application of money to great national objects of improvement, that constitutes its true value, and while our rivers, roads and public institutions, want the fostering hand of government, we consider the delay of obtaining what is practicable, under the pretext of being entitled to more, the most ruinous and destructive policy. If the British nation, as the senate allege, is so much interested in national faith or the preservation of peace, why is any part of the stock withheld? If they are observant of justice and sound policy, why have two years of fruitless negotiation passed away in the attempt to recover our stock?—That Mr. King's exertions have been steady and unremitting, is evidenced by the vote of thanks of this legislature, more than a year ago, for his zeal and attention to the subject; and yet what has been the result?

The senate say, they have reason to believe the chancellor had not dismissed the bill of the state's assignee in September last; but have we not equal, or stronger authority to believe, that he has decided that he has no jurisdiction of the case? And if no jurisdiction, will the senate point out how the stock is to be obtained other than by negotiation? And will they be pleased to say what prospect exists that the future will be more successful than the past? We are not to discover the pretext of the crown of Great Britain to this stock, nor did we intimate that he is successor to the people of Maryland. This may amuse, but can not convince. It is enough for us to be informed, that we have no redress in law or equity, and that being in the hands of the officers of the crown, we must obtain the stock only through his consent.—To this every day opposes new obstacles.

The late impressment of our seamen, and political differences likely to ensue, will create new impediments.

The senate are pleased to say, Mr. King thinks the detention of any part of the stock impolitic and unjust. Will giving him unlimited power to negotiate alter his sentiments? And will he, with such sentiments, accept less than the whole, if the whole can be obtained? Surely not.—But the senate say, if the resolution has passed, and known in England before the transfer, it will be construed as a surrender of the ten thousand six hundred and fifty pounds sterling. The difference in sentiment of the two houses is as likely to be known in England as the resolution, if passed, and hence the passage of it is not likely to be prejudicial. But the senate alleges, that the publicity of the proposed resolution will give a knowledge of our ultimatum, and look like an abandonment of part, in nature of a *douceur*. How this is to be reconciled to the senate's idea of the friendly disposition, the policy and justice of Great-Britain, we are at a loss to know, having always understood, that sound policy and national justice were superior to *douceur*. But this idea of a *douceur* holds out to us, that the British ministry are, like the French directory, to be bribed, and yet at the same time we are to believe that their high sense of justice will secure to us the stock. Arguments like these are confuted by being mentioned. We consider the resolution as a measure of sound policy, and as such it has our decided and hearty concurrence. We therefore trust the senate will yet reconsider and pass the resolution; at all events we are desirous, that if the loss of this stock results from not giving Mr. King authority to negotiate for it, either unlimited or in the terms of the resolution, that the people of Maryland should know that it did not flow from the conduct of the house of delegates, but that every exertion in their power to procure it has been made.

By order,

W. HARWOOD, clk.

Which was read, and, on motion, ORDERED, That Mr. Carroll, Mr. Campbell and Mr. Dorsey, be a committee to prepare an answer thereto.

The bill, entitled, An act to authorise an exchange of lands between John Eversfield and the other representatives of Matthew Eversfield, late of Prince-George's county, was read the second time, and the question put, That the said bill do pass with the proposed amendments.

**Amendments proposed.** After the word "that" in the 2d line of the 3d page insert "it shall and may be lawful for the chancellor, upon the petition of the said John Eversfield, Susanna Eversfield, Thomas Mundell and Verinda his wife, and Anne Eleanor Eversfield, to inquire into the circumstances above stated, and if he shall be of opinion that an exchange of the said lands between the said John Eversfield and the other representatives of the said Matthew Eversfield, will be for the advantage and benefit of the minors, he may decree the same to be done. And be it enacted, That if the chancellor shall decree an exchange of the said lands between the said John Eversfield and the other representatives of the said Matthew Eversfield, that." After the word "heirs" in the 14th line of the same page insert the words "as tenants in common, and not as joint tenants." After the word "heirs" in the first line of the fourth page insert the words "as tenants in common, and not as joint tenants."

The yeas and nays being required, appeared as follow:

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

Mr. Thomas, president, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Ridgely, Mr. McMechen and Mr. Milligan. 6.

N E G A T I V E.

Mr. Grahame, Mr. Dorsey and Mr. Chesley. 3.

So it was determined in the affirmative.