

existed at the time of the first emigration of the people of Maryland, and which, before the fourth day of July 1776, by experience, had been found applicable to their local and other circumstances, and of such others as had since such emigration been made in England or Great Britain, and had been introduced, used or practised by the courts of law or equity in this State, that order may be taken therein." This Resolution does not appear to have been acted on; but, fifteen years later, the matter was again taken up in the Legislature, under the auspices of the late Chancellor Bland, to whom the Law in Maryland is otherwise so much indebted. He probably thought it better to follow the course that had been marked out before; and, accordingly, by Resolution No. 12 of Nov. Sess. 1809 (printed in the book before referred to as No. 22), moved by him, the subject was referred to the Chancellor and the Judges of the Court of Appeals, in nearly the terms of the Resolution of 1794, the principal difference being, that the commission was directed to report all such parts of the English Statutes as were proper to be introduced and incorporated into the body of the Statute law of the State. The fruit of this Resolution was the elaborate Report of Kilty—the then Chancellor—to which I have referred, and in which he classified the greater part of the British Statutes down to the Revolution into three grand divisions; the first, containing the titles of such Statutes as had not extended to the Province—the second, of those which had extended, but were not proper to be incorporated—and the third, of those which had extended and were proper to be incorporated. It is a little curious that, when, at Nov. Sess. 1810, it was proposed, on the motion of the same Mr. Bland, to print one thousand copies of the Report for the use of the State, the spirit of 1794 had so exhaled, that the House of Delegates was evenly divided on the adoption of the Resolution (No. 12 of that year in the before mentioned book), and it was finally passed on a *tie* by the vote of the Speaker—whose name it gives me pleasure to set down here—Gen. Tobias E. Stansbury, of Baltimore County. The economical scruples, which had then so much influence in the Legislature, probably prevented the publication, at that time, of the Statutes themselves according to the Report—a publication, which there is reason to believe that Chancellor Bland designed to take under his special superintendence. They still continued