

for the benefit of his creditors and next of kin. *Hensloe's Case*, 9 Co. 37; *Carter v. Crawley*, T. Raym. 496; *Marriott v. Marriott*, Gilb. Eq. Rep. 203; *Manning v. Napp*, 1 Salk. 37; 2 Inst. 397; 2 Blac. Com. 494; 13 Ed. 1 c. 19; *Kilty Rep.* 144. But the bishops who had been so long in the habit of appropriating all the goods of intestates, found within their respective districts, to their own uses, were permitted to retain the right of granting administration of all such effects; and, therefore, to secure to themselves their fees and perquisites for so doing, they refused to admit the validity of an administration granted any where beyond their own peculiar jurisdiction. *Middleton v. Crofts*, 2 Atk. 659; *Roberson Succession*, 250, 251. And following out the same rule, the Courts of law and equity of England, held that they could not take notice of any letters of administration granted in a foreign country, without intimating, that they refused \*to do so, in order to

**498** hold the property of the intestate within reach, as a means of satisfying his English creditors and next of kin; or if there were no creditors, or next of kin, as a means of securing it for the benefit of the State to whom, in such case, it properly belonged. *Daniel v. Luker*, *Dyer*, 305; *Jauncey v. Sealey*, 1 Vern. 397; *Tourton v. Flower*, 3 P. Will. 370; *Atkins v. Smith*, 2 Atk. 63; *Thorne v. Watkins*, 2 Ves. 36.

But latterly, in England as well as in this country, a more enlarged and just view has been taken of this matter; and it has been held, that as the State must have a right to regulate that which it protects, and is bound in duty to see its own citizens satisfied before it suffers the property of their debtor to be withdrawn from its jurisdiction, no foreign administration shall be recognized here. And that the administration of all deceased persons' estates must be taken out here by a citizen of the United States, 1798, ch. 101, sub-ch. 4 and 5, in order that there may be some person here responsible to our own citizen creditors, legatees, and distributees of the deceased, to the full value of his effects found here; and also, that after the debts have been paid, if there be no next of kin, that the surplus be paid to the State, or to the public schools here, to whom, in such cases, it properly belongs; or according to the law of the deceased's last domicile. *Bempde v. Johnstone*, 3 Ves. 198; *Somerville v. Lord Somerville*, 5 Ves. 750; *In the Goods of Beggia*, 2 Eccle. Rep. 126; *Holmes v. Remsen*, 20 John. Rep. 265; *Græme v. Harris*, 1 Dall. 456; *McCullough v. Young*, 1 Bin. 63; *Desesbats v. Berquier*, 1 Bin. 336, 349, note; *Anonymous*, 1 Hayw. 355; *Admr. of Butts v. Price*, 1 Cam. & Norw. 68; *Harrison v. Sterry*, 5 Cran. 289; *Smith v. The Union Bank of Georgetown*, 5 Peters, 518; *Glenn v. Smith*, 2 G. & J. 493; *Charlotte Hall School v. Greenwell*, 4 G. & J. 408; *Thomas v. Visitors of Frederick County School*, 7 G. & J. 370.