

Art. 4. That the people of this State have the sole and exclusive right of regulating the internal government and police thereof, as a free, sovereign and independent State.

The act of 1812, chapter 194, was continued in force by this article—see notes to article 8. *Baltimore v. Board of Police*, 15 Md. 483.

This article referred to in construing article 1, sections 1 to 5, of the Md. constitution—see notes thereto. *Anderson v. Baker*, 23 Md. 619.

Art. 5. That the inhabitants of Maryland are entitled to the Common Law of England, and the trial by Jury, according to the course of that law, and to the benefit of such of the English statutes as existed on the Fourth day of July, seventeen hundred and 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; and also of all Acts of Assembly in force on the first day of June, eighteen hundred and sixty-seven; except such as may have since expired, or may be inconsistent with the provisions of this Constitution; subject, nevertheless, to the revision of, and amendment or repeal by, the Legislature of this State. And the Inhabitants of Maryland are also entitled to all property derived to them from or under the Charter granted by His Majesty, Charles the First, to Cæcilius Calvert, Baron of Baltimore.

Law of England.

This article has no reference to adjudications in England anterior to the colonization or to the judicial adoptions here of any part of the common law during the continuance of the colonial government, but to the common law in mass as it existed here either potentially or practically and as it prevailed in England at the time, except such portions of it as are inconsistent with the spirit of the constitution and the nature of our political institutions. Whether particular parts of the common law are applicable to our local circumstances, etc., is a question for the courts to decide; how what the common law of England was at the time of the adoption of the declaration of rights is to be determined. *State v. Buchannon*, 5 H. & J. 358.

The pre-eminence of the state over the citizen is a necessary incident to sovereignty; it constitutes a branch of the common law adopted by this article (as it stood in the constitution of 1776). *State v. Milburn*, 9 G. 111.

By the common law, to which under this article the inhabitants of Maryland are entitled, no woman could in person take an official part in the state government except as overseer of the poor, without express statutory authority. This article referred to in deciding that a woman (independent of statute) is not entitled to practice law in Maryland. *In re Maddox*, 93 Md. 731.

This article does not support the contention that the whole common law, as it existed in Maryland at the time this article was adopted, became a part of the constitution, and hence was beyond legislative change. *Day v. State*, 7 Gill, 325.

This article is not to be expounded according to the rule of construction applicable to declaratory laws, but as adopting the different classes of the statutes to which it relates *sub modo* only and rejecting all others; and as laying down rules by which to ascertain what statutes were so adopted—a different rule applying to each class. What statutes "by experience have been found applicable." *Dashlell v. Attorney-General*, 5 H. & J. 401.

The marriage acts were not among the "English statutes which existed on July 4th, 1776, and which by experience have been found applicable," etc.—see article 63, section 1, *et seq.* *Harrison v. State*, 22 Md. 487.