

seventy-six; and which, by experience, have been found applicable to their local and other circumstances, and have been introduced, used and practiced by the Courts of Law or Equity." The distinction, therefore, made in former draughts of the Bill of Rights, between those Statutes which existed at the time of the first emigration of the people of Maryland, and were found applicable to their local circumstances, and those which had been subsequently made, and had been introduced, used and practised in the Courts, and which is alluded to in *Dashiell v. the Attorney General*, now no longer exists.

The present volume contains those English Statutes and parts of Statutes, which were reported by Chancellor Kilty to have been found applicable and proper to be incorporated in our laws; and, in addition, several others, which have since been declared by the Court of Appeals to be in force. Thus, in *Sibley v. Williams*, 3 G. & J. 52, it was determined that the Statutes 30 Car. 2, c. 7, and 4 & 5 W. & M. c. 24, s. 12, and, in *Shriver v. the State*, 9 G. & J. 1, that the Statute 9 & 10 W. 3, c. 15, were in force in the State; and these Statutes are accordingly included. So in *Matthews v. Ward*, 10 G. & J. 443, the Court of Appeals said that it was questionable whether the Statute 1 R. 3, c. 1, was in force here; I have not considered this expression of the Court as excluding all doubt, and have therefore inserted that Act by its title. I have added notes; in which I have endeavoured to collect the Acts of Assembly and those parts of the Code, which have changed, added to, or otherwise varied the provision of the several Statutes; and in which, also, I have endeavoured to collect the principal decisions of the English and our own Courts, construing the Statutes, or our Acts of Assembly, or the Code, respectively. I have confined myself to the English and Maryland cases, because my book would have grown enormously, had I cited the decisions of other States. But, with regard to the English cases, a noteworthy distinction is made, *viz.*: that the received construction of the English Statutes, at the time of the Revolution, may very properly be considered as accompanying the Statutes themselves, and forming an integral part of them; but subsequent decisions, although entitled to great respect, are not to be received as absolute authority; and, as an example of the application of the distinction, I may refer to *Mayor, &c. v. Banks*, 6 Md. 235.