

FOUR o'CLOCK, P. M.

The house met.

Mr. Brown, from the minority of the committee, to whom was referred the petition of James Clark and others, of Anne Arundel county, praying redress for certain grievances therein mentioned, delivered the following report:

The undersigned members of the committee to whom were referred the memorial of James Clark, and sundry citizens of Anne Arundel county, have had the same under consideration and respectfully

REPORT,

That in their opinion the facts mentioned in the said memorials, that neither the chief judge of the third judicial district of this State, nor the orphans' court of Anne Arundel county deemed the securities on the bond which the said Clark wished them respectively to approve and accept from him as the sheriff elect of said county, did not give him, or form any just cause of complaint against the action of the said judge or of the said court, because the law having wisely required that the said authorities should be satisfied of the sufficiency of the securities offered on such bond before it could be approved and accepted by either of them, it was obviously the duty of the said Clark, upon his finding that they were not deemed sufficient by the said judge, to have promptly obtained and offered additional or other securities until the said judge should consider them sufficient.

To have immediately pursued this course was so obviously the duty of the said Clark when he found, by the mere fact of the non-approval of his bond by the said judge, that the securities whom he had offered were not deemed sufficient, that the undersigned would feel surprised at his having avoided that direct and proper path if they did not perceive in his subsequent steps ample evidence of a settled purpose to determine not only for the said judge, or the orphans court of said county, but also for the people of Maryland, the sufficiency of the securities whom he had thought fit alone to obtain and offer on his bond: the arrogance of such a claim or purpose requires, in the opinion of the undersigned, no comment at their hands, to them it appears to be alone necessary that it be clearly stated or understood to be generally reprobated.

We do not regard the right of the said Clark to offer his bond to the orphans court for their approbation, as in the nature of a right to appeal from the decision of the chief judge of the third judicial district, and by the fact that the said court did not know the securities whom he offered on his bond to be sufficient, which is proved by their not having accepted said bond; and by the circumstances of his offering for their approbation the identical bond which the said judge had not seen fit to accept, we think the said court acted correctly when they declined to accept the said bond