

144, entitled an Act to incorporate the Board of Beneficence of St. John's Independent Methodist Protestant Church in the City of Baltimore,

And the report was adopted.

Mr. Spates, from the same Committee, submitted the following

REPORT.

The Committee on Corporations to whom were referred the bill to amend the Act of 1864, chapter 144, and to authorize the Board of Beneficence of St. John's Independent Methodist Protestant Church to hold property amounting to the clear yearly value of fifty thousand dollars, and the memorial of Henry Kellogg and Martha Kellogg, praying for a repeal of the said Act of incorporation, respectfully report that they have given both subjects their careful consideration after hearing the full and elaborate arguments of counsel representing the different parties interested.

Your Committee consider the objects for which the said corporation are authorized to hold property, to be vague, indefinite and uncertain, and under the discretion which they have to apply the funds, their powers to appropriate the property to various objects may be said to be almost unlimited.

Such powers conferred on corporations under the name of charity, should not, as a general rule, be granted, and are in opposition to our views of public policy; while we entertain these views of the powers conferred by the original Act, we are unable to favor an extension of the right of this corporation to take and hold any larger amount of property. Indeed, it seems to have been contrary to the intentions of Mr. John Clarke, who procured the passage of the law, and who is the only individual who has bestowed his bounty upon it, that it should hold more than this limited amount of property. Your Committee therefore report unfavorably upon the bill proposing to extend the powers of the said corporation to hold property to an amount yielding a clear yearly value of fifty thousand dollars.

In reference to the memorial praying for the repeal of the charter of the said corporation: Your Committee are of the opinion that while as an original question, they would not favor such an Act of incorporation, yet a prior Legislature having granted the charter, the repeal of the charter is a more delicate matter, and involves questions of property and rights which appertain to the Judicial rather than the Legislative department; for these reasons, your Committee re-