

C H A P. XXXV.

An ACT to empower Mary Louttit, executrix of James Louttit, deceased, to convey one undivided third part of the mill and land therein mentioned. *PR.*

C H A P. XXXVI.

An ACT relating to the levy and poor of Anne-Arundel county.

The tobacco directed by the act of 1769, ch. 14, to be levied for the purpose of fitting up the old council chamber, and the conference chamber, for a court-house, and clerk's office, not being yet wanted, and no land having been yet purchased for a poor-house; and the tobacco to be levied this year, under the act of 1768, ch. 29, being likewise not yet wanted, the assessment of the first named tobacco is postponed until 1775, and the assessment of the second is postponed until 1774.

The trustees not having been able to procure land in the vicinity of Annapolis, are empowered to purchase any quantity, not exceeding 100 acres, lying within the county, and within ten miles of Annapolis. This act contains likewise the following general clause.

Trustees empowered to sue.

V. And be it further enacted, That the trustees for the poor in the several counties wherein work-houses are to be erected under the said act, shall be, and are hereby enabled and empowered, to demand, sue for, recover and receive, of and from the present or late sheriffs, any sum or sums of money or tobacco remaining in their hands respectively, for or on account of the assessments made in virtue of the said act.

C H A P. XXXVII.

An ACT empowering the county courts to settle with persons who were formerly inspectors of tobacco.

The county courts, at their next sitting, are required to call before them the inspectors of 1770, and adjust their accounts. And the inspectors are to sell publicly, during that sitting, any tobacco inspected in that year, which they might have sold under the inspection law. The courts are to receive what may appear due from the inspectors, and to pay what may appear due to them; and for that purpose the courts may, in November next, levy as much as may be necessary.

At a SESSION of ASSEMBLY, begun and held at the city of ANNAPOLIS, on Tuesday the fifteenth day of June, in the 2d year of the dominion of the Right Honourable HENRY HARFORD, Esq; absolute lord and proprietary of the province of Maryland, and ended the 3d day of July, *anno domini* 1773: The following laws were enacted.

ROBERT EDEN, Esq; Governor.

C H A P. I.

An ACT concerning estates-tail and the jurisdiction of the county courts.

The whole act was continued for one year, &c. by the act of October, 1780, ch. 12, and for another year, &c. by the act of November, 1781, ch. 7. All the parts relating to the jurisdiction of the county courts were again continued until the end of the next session by the act of November, 1782, ch. 32. They had a similar continuance by the act of April, 1783, ch. 36. They were again continued for one year, &c. by the act of November, 1783, ch. 30; and by the act of 1784, ch. 83, they were continued until the end of the next session, when they expired. But at that session an act passed concerning the jurisdiction of the county courts, very different from the provisions contained in this act.

The clauses respecting estates-tail expired with November session, 1782; but a perpetual law passed at that session, under the title of an act concerning estates-tail, which contains the precise words of the two first clauses of this act, except the enacting style, and the words "province" and "provincial," for which are substituted "state" and "general."

The provisions respecting county courts were as follow.

1. That if in any case where the county courts before this act had jurisdiction, an action should be brought in the provincial court, the plaintiff should suffer a nonsuit, and pay the defendant his costs.

2. That any action might be brought in the county courts, which, before this act, might have been brought in the provincial court. That if any plaintiff should, before judgment, remove his cause from the county court, he should suffer a nonsuit, and pay costs as aforesaid; and that writs of replevin might issue from the county courts returnable to the same.

3. That the defendant might, nevertheless, remove his cause, in the same manner as he might before this act, and in all cases too wherein jurisdiction was hereby given; and that appeals might be prosecuted in the same manner as before.

Lastly,