

N E G A T I V E.

Mr. Harwood, president, Mr. Christie, Mr. Johnson, Mr. M'Culloch, Mr. Partridge, Mr. Ringgold. 6.

So it was determined in the negative.

The question was then put, That the following be received as an amendment to the said bill? At the end of the 12th line of the 16th page add, "and provided also, that it shall not be lawful for the aforesaid company to set up any turnpike gate between the aforesaid mills and the intersection of the road leading from the mouth of Monocacy to Baltimore by said mills." The yeas and nays being required, appeared as follow:

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

Mr. Harwood, president, Mr. Houston, Mr. Mackall, Mr. Nelson. 4.

N E G A T I V E.

Mr. Brown, Mr. Christie, Mr. Johnson, Mr. M'Culloch, Mr. Partridge, Mr. Ringgold. 6.

So it was determined in the negative.

On further progression in reading, the question was put, That the following be received as an amendment to the said bill? At the end of the 2d line of the 19th page add, "provided that no toll or compensation shall be demanded by the said president and company, or their servants, for weighing any cart or waggon as aforesaid." The yeas and nays being required, appeared as follow:

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

Mr. Harwood, president, Mr. Brown, Mr. Christie, Mr. Duckett, Mr. Houston, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Mackall, Mr. Nelson. 8.

N E G A T I V E.

Mr. M'Culloch, Mr. Partridge, Mr. Ringgold. 3.

So it was resolved in the affirmative.

On further progression in reading, the question was put, That the following be received as an amendment thereto? Strike out the words "ten per centum" in the last line of the 25th page. Resolved in the affirmative. The question was then put, That the words "eight per centum" be inserted in lieu thereof? The yeas and nays being required, appeared as follow:

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

Mr. Harwood, president, Mr. Brown, Mr. Johnson, Mr. M'Culloch, Mr. Partridge, Mr. Ringgold. 6.

N E G A T I V E.

Mr. Christie, Mr. Duckett, Mr. Houston, Mr. Mackall, Mr. Nelson. 5.

So it was resolved in the affirmative.

On motion, ORDERED, That the further consideration of the said bill be postponed until to-morrow.

The clerk of the house of delivers a bill, entitled, An act for the relief of sundry insolvent debtors, passed by that house January 2, 1804; a bill, entitled, An act to enable Margaret and Harriet Hammond, of Baltimore county, to erect a bridge across Patapsco river at a place called Hammond's Ferry, a bill, entitled, An act to increase the tolls on the Susquehanna canal, and to repeal the third section of an act, entitled, A further supplement to the act, entitled, An act for making the river Susquehanna navigable from the line of this state to tide water, a bill, entitled, A supplement to an act, entitled, An act to repeal the second and third sections of an act, entitled, An act to extend the powers of the levy court of Allegany county relative to roads in said county, a bill, entitled, An act to confirm the partition made by certain commissioners therein mentioned, and for other purposes, a bill, entitled, An act to authorise the opening of a road in Anne-Arundel and Prince-George's county, severally passed by that house January 3, 1804; which were severally read the first time and ordered to lie on the table.

Also the bill, entitled, An act for erecting buildings for the use of the poor of Queen-Anne's county, and for other purposes, passed by that house January 2, 1804. Ordered to be engrossed. The bill, entitled, An act empowering the chancellor to direct a sale of the real estate of Richard Jacob Duckett, late of Prince-George's county, deceased, for the purposes therein mentioned, with the following message:

BY THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES, JANUARY 3, 1804.

GENTLEMEN OF THE SENATE,

WE have received, with your dissent, the bill, entitled, An act empowering the chancellor to direct a sale of the real estate of Richard Jacob Duckett, late of Prince-George's county, deceased, for the purposes therein mentioned, which bill we hope, upon further reflection, will meet with your approbation. The ancestor of those who are immediately interested in the object of the present bill, died possessed of a certain property, which at present is valuable, but which, before those entitled to it arrive to age, may be of little value.

If, under the existing laws, any relief could be afforded to such cases as the one contemplated by the bill before us, a particular interposition might be considered improper, but we submit whether there is any remedy. We are induced to believe there is none. Under the laws now in force, the property of an infant, held in conjunction with a person of full age, may, under certain circumstances, be sold by the authority of the court of chancery. But no general power is given to dispose of infants property, when they are solely interested. In the present case, infants are alone concerned, and the legislature may properly have reserved to themselves the right of deciding in each individual case, without making any general provision affecting the estates of infants. The general assembly have, in a variety of instances, legislated on those principles, and have passed special