

of the city of Baltimore, endorsed "will pass with the proposed amendments;" which amendments were read, assented to, and the bill ordered to be engrossed.

Also the supplement to the act, entitled, An act to incorporate Emmitsburgh, in Frederick county, endorsed "will pass with the proposed amendment;" which amendment was read, assented to, and the bill ordered to be engrossed.

Also the supplement to the act to extend the jurisdiction of justices of the peace of this state; also the bill for the benefit of Lemuel Offutt, and others, severally endorsed "will not pass."

And the following message:

By the Senate, Jan. 27, 1826.

Gentlemen of the House of Delegates.

We have rejected the bill from your house, entitled, "An act for the benefit of Lemuel Offutt, and of Samuel Hardesty, and Johnson Hardesty, of Montgomery county," because we believe that full and ample relief in those cases is provided by the act of eighteen hundred and twenty-three, chapter 87, to which we beg leave to refer you.

By order.

Wm Kilty, Clk.

And the resolution in favour of the Union Academy, and others, endorsed "assented to."

Mr. Tyson, chairman of the committee of grievances and courts of justice, delivers the following report:

The committee of grievances and courts of justice, to whom was referred an order, "to inquire into the expediency of abolishing the high court of chancery, and of establishing district chancery courts in its stead," beg leave to submit the following report:

Although at first view, this order appeared to contain two distinct propositions, yet upon closer inspection it will be seen that it submits but *one* proposition, for the consideration of your committee. The proposition is this—is it expedient to abolish the present high court of chancery, for the purpose of establishing district chancery courts upon its ruins.

Your committee do not deem themselves authorised, to go into an examination of the abstract question, of the expediency of abolishing the high court of chancery, or of the expediency of abolishing it, for the purpose of establishing any system of their own, in its stead; their inquiry is narrowed down to the simple question, "would it be expedient to substitute district chancery courts in the room of the present high court of chancery." The character of these district chancery courts is not described in the order, nor is any reference had to the mode in which the state might be districted for the purposes of equity. Your committee are left to the necessity, first, of inventing a character for these courts, then of dividing into imaginary sections the territory of Maryland, as the bounds of their respective jurisdictions, and after they have done so, they are compelled to say, whether this creature of their imagination, should or should not be a creature *in* reality.

Your committee conceive, that the best ordered chancery courts