

fied, but the proceeds existing in money or stock, yet still such is the desire of the law that the blood of him who acquired the property, or from whom it descended upon the infant, should have the enjoyment of it, that the fruits of the property, though its nature is entirely changed, is under the circumstances stated, given to those to whom it would have descended if its original character of real estate had been preserved.

There could not be a stronger illustration of the policy of the law than this, and though the land in the present case was not sold under the provisions of the Act of 1816, it cannot be improper to refer to it as indicating the general policy of the legislature upon the subject.

I should, therefore, proceed at once to ratify the report of the Auditor, giving the residue to the heirs-at-law, but for a difficulty suggested in the report itself, and that is that it does not clearly appear whether the land was or was not sold subject to the dower right of the defendant, Margaret S. Wirt. When that difficulty is removed, an order will be passed.

HENRY C. MACKALL and LEVIN GALE, for Exceptants.

JOHN C. GROOME, for the Heirs-at-law.

An appeal was taken from the order of the Chancellor passed in conformity with the above opinion, which is still pending.