

The bill reported by Mr. Stewart of Anne-Arundel, entitled, An act to alter and amend the constitution and form of government, and to repeal the 60th article thereof; and the bill reported by Mr. Hughes of Montgomery, entitled, An act to correct an error in an act passed at December session eighteen hundred and twenty-six, for the benefit of Hester Whitaker and others, the heirs and representatives of Alexander Whitaker, deceased, were severally read the second time, considered, passed without amendment, and sent to the senate for concurrence.

The house then proceeded to consider the bill as amended by, and reported from, the committee on internal improvement, entitled, An act to authorise the building a bridge across the south branch of the Patapsco river, from a point on the land of Richard Cromwell to a point on the opposite shore, on the land of William Krebs; when, on motion by Mr. Steuart of Baltimore, the house was called, and the absent members sent for.

In the progress of the second reading of said bill,

On motion by Mr. M. Mahon, the question was propounded, Will the house agree to adopt the following as an amendment of the bill, to come in after the fifth section thereof, viz.

Add, as the sixth section of the bill

“And be it enacted, That if at any time hereafter any obstructions to the navigation of the river Patapsco should arise from the erection of the bridge authorised to be built by this act, so as to impede the free passage of such boats or vessels, as are or may be used on said river above said bridge, or the navigation into the middle branch of the Patapsco as it now is, the owner or owners of said bridge shall be liable to indictment in the county court of Anne-Arundel or Baltimore counties, for occasioning such obstructions; and upon conviction thereof shall be adjudged by the court in which such conviction takes place, to remove all such obstructions at his or their own expense; and if such obstructions shall not be removed agreeably to the judgment of said court, within thirty days thereafter, then it shall be the duty of said court, upon proof of neglect or refusal of the owner or owners of said bridge to obey the judgment of said court within said period, to impose upon said owner or owners such fine as they may deem adequate to the removal of such obstructions, to be collected with the costs of prosecution as other fines, and to be applied under the direction of said court for the removal of said obstructions.”

And it was resolved in the affirmative.

On motion by Mr. M. Mahon, the first section of said bill was then amended by adding at the end of that section, the following words:

Add at the end of the first section of the bill “the said bridge to be built on piles, to begin at high water mark, and with a draw sufficiently wide for all vessels or boats now or hereafter navigating said river.”

The bill having been read throughout, the question was then taken, Shall the bill pass as amended? And it was resolved in the affirmative.

The house then adjourned until to-morrow morning ten o'clock.