construction referred to, has been put upon those acts by the Court of Appeals, as appears by the case of *Hickley* vs. *Farmers and Merchants Bank*, 5 *G. & J.*, 377, and other cases.

It has been decided, that the distinctions, which have been recognised in England, between voluntary and involuntary transfers, are applicable to our insolvent system, and that, consequently, when a transfer by a debtor to his creditor is sought to be avoided as a fraud upon the system, it must be shown, not only that the transfer was made with a view, and under an expectation of taking the benefit of the insolvent law, but that it was likewise voluntary. And that a transfer could not be considered voluntary, which was made to a man demanding payment. *Crawfords and Sellman* vs. *Taylor*, 6 *G. & J.*, 323.

Such was the state of the law in Maryland, when the act of 1834, chap. 293, was passed, being a supplement to the insolvent laws, relating to the city and county of Baltimore, the first section of which provides, "that all conveyances, assignments, sales, deliveries, payments, conversions, or dispositions of property or estate, real, personal or mixed, debts, rights, or claims, or confessions of judgment, that shall be made, or caused, or allowed to be made, whether upon request or otherwise, by any applicant, to or in favor, or with a view to the advantage or security of, *and with intent to prefer any creditor or creditors*, security or securities of such applicant, when such applicant shall have had no reasonable expectation of being exempted from liability, or execution for, or on account of his debts, without applying for the benefit of the insolvent laws as aforesaid, shall be deemed within the meaning and effect of the sixth section of the act to which this is a supplement, to have been made with a view or under an expectation on the part of the applicant, of being or becoming an insolvent debtor, and with intent thereby to give an undue and improper preference.

This act of the legislature was passed shortly after the decision of the Court of Appeals, in the case of Crawfords and Sellman vs. Taylor, and it is by no means a violent supposition,