

Which was read the first and second time and the question put, that the house concur therewith? The yeas and nays being required appeared as follow :

**AFFIRMATIVE**—Messrs. Scott, Boyer, Brown, Reynolds, Ford, Bayly, Long, Dennis, Griffith, Lecompte, Beard, A. D. Mitchell, Davidson, Calvert, T. N. Williams, E. K. Wilson, Quinton, J. Mitchell, Taney, Thomas, Howard, Jones, M'Mahon, Tomlinson—24

**NEGATIVE**—Messrs. Speaker, Neale, Sellman, C. Steuart, Little, Stansbury, Dickinson, Kemp, Pitt, Beall, Van Horn, Meconniken, Harrison, Stevens, Sewell, Bradford, Forwood, Denny, Willis, Styll, W. Steuart, Kershner, Schnebly, Bowles, Hilleary, Prather—26

So it was determined in the negative.

On motion by Mr. Lecompt, the question was put, that the house discharge the committee from the further consideration of the said subject? Determined in the affirmative.

Mr. T. N. Williams delivers a bill entitled, an act for the benefit of Ebenezer Truitt of Worcester county. Which was read the first and second time by special order and passed.

Mr. Sellman delivers a petition from Richard Ridgely of Anne Arundel county, praying for permission to remove certain negro slaves into this state, which belonged to his son Richard Ridgely, now deceased. Ordered that Messrs. Sellman, C. Steuart and Dorsey, be a committee to prepare and bring in the same.

Mr. Little delivers a bill entitled, an act to make a public road in Baltimore county. Which was read.

The bill entitled, an act annulling the marriage of Thomas Drake, and Martha his wife of Kent county, was read the second time and the question put, shall the said bill pass? The yeas and nays being required appeared as follow :

**AFFIRMATIVE**—Messrs. Scott, Spencer, Boyer, Tilghman, Brown, Stansbury, Lloyd, Kemp, Bayly, Long, Hart, Pitt, Lecompt, Beard, Davidson, Van Horn, Meconniken, Harrison, T. N. Williams, J. Mitchell, Sewell, Bradford, W. Steuart, Hughes, Schnebly, E. G. Williams, Kilgour, Tomlinson—29

**NEGATIVE**—Messrs. Speaker, Neale, Causin, Sellman, C. Steuart, Ireland, Reynolds, Stonestreet, Little, Dennis, Griffith, A. D. Mitchell, Somerville, Beall, Calvert, Duvall, E. K. Wilson, Quinton, Taney, Thomas, Howard, Hall, Forwood, Willis, Kershner, Bowles, M'Mahon, Hilleary, Prather.—29

So it was determined in the negative.

On motion by Mr. Little the question was put, that the house re-consider the said bill? Determined in the affirmative, and the question put, shall the said bill pass? The yeas and nays being required appeared as follow :

**AFFIRMATIVE**—Messrs. Scott, Spencer, Boyer, Tilghman, Brown, Ford, Little, Stansbury, Dickinson, Lloyd, Kemp, Bayly, Long, Hart, Pitt, Lecompt, Beard, Davidson, Van Horn, Meconniken, Harrison, T. N. Williams, J. Mitchell, Sewell, Bradford, W. Steuart, Hughes, Kershner, Schnebly, E. G. Williams, Kilgour, Tomlinson.—32

**NEGATIVE**—Messrs. Speaker, Neale, Causin, Sellman, C. Steuart, Ireland, Reynolds, Stonestreet, Dennis, Griffith, A. D. Mitchell, Somerville, Beall, Calvert, Duvall, Stevens, E. K. Wilson, Quinton, Taney, Thomas, Howard, Hall, Forwood, Willis, Bowles, M'Mahon, Hilleary, Prather—28

So it was determined in the affirmative.

The house according to the order of the day proceeded to the further consideration of the bill entitled, a further supplement to the act entitled, an act respecting the equity jurisdiction of the county courts, and on motion by Mr. Little the question was put, that the 6th section of the said bill be stricken out. Determined in the affirmative.

Mr. Kilgour proposed the following amendments to the said bill :

And be it enacted, That any person, other than the plaintiffs may serve a subpoena issuing from any of the county courts as courts of Chancery, and upon proof made to the court by affidavit of the service of the said subpoena when the same has not been served by the sheriff, and upon the failure of the party to appear in obedience to such subpoena, or on his appearing and failing to obey any order or rule of the court, it shall and may be lawful for the court to issue an attachment against the party so failing, in the manner herein before directed, and to be served and returned by the sheriff, under the penalty herein before prescribed in cases of attachments.

And be it enacted, That when some of the defendants in any suit in equity, brought in any of the county courts of this state, reside out of the county in which such suit is brought, but within this state, that a subpoena or subpoenas may issue against such absent defendant directed to the sheriff of the county in which such defendant shall reside; & it shall be the duty of such sheriff to serve and return such process according to the command thereof, & if the party summoned shall not appear, or appearing shall fail to comply with the order or rule of the court, process of attachment may issue against such party, directed to the sheriff of the county in which the said party shall reside, & it shall be the duty of the sheriff to execute, & in all things obey the command contained in the said process, & upon the failure of the sheriff to return any such subpoena or attachment, or to produce the body of the party attached, or the return of the said attachment, the court from which such process issued may fine the said sheriff any sum not exceeding fifty dollars, and issue an execution therefor, together with the costs thereon, directed to the coroner of the county in which such sheriff resides, and returnable to the court of the last mentioned county, and a short copy of the order of the court imposing such fine, shall accompany the said execution, on which said order and execution, such further proceedings may be had as are now authorised, where a writ of *capias ad satisfaciendum* issues from one county to another.

And be it enacted, That the county courts in their discretion may appoint intermediate terms between the common law terms in the respective counties, for the transaction of business on the equity side of the court to which said process shall be returnable as well as to the stated terms of the court." Which were read the first time and on motion by Mr. Lloyd, the question was put, that the further consideration of the said bill be postponed, and that the said amendments be printed? Determined in the affirmative.