

ch. 190; and the act of 1827, ch. 198, is but an arrangement of commutation of those lottery privileges. On all drawings the State was duly paid a tax, and so far she profited by them.— But the decision referred to, does in no sense regard these lottery grants as endowments from the State; they in fact costing the State nothing, and being really only *dispensations from penalties*, under the prohibitory lottery law. If even, however, they were endowments, the decision tells us, as reason would suggest, that they would not render this corporation a State property.*

In 1822 (by act of 1821, chap. 88,) the State was induced to lend the University \$30,000, in stocks created for the purpose; the premium of which, it was provided, should be received by the State instead of by the University, and be set apart for a sinking fund ultimately to pay the principal of the loan; the Professors of the Faculty of Physic being, however, required to enter into bond for the yearly payment of 5 per cent interest on the \$30,000. This interest until a year before the recent rupture in the University, which led to the litigation adverted to, was duly paid, as we understand. In the year 1828, a legacy of \$5000, was bequeathed by Mr. George Gray to “the University of Maryland for the use of the Infirmary,” and that sum was paid accordingly by Mr. Gray’s Executors. Donations in books and specimens of various kinds, and articles to enrich the cabinets of the University, it is understood, were likewise made at different times to the University. The personal means and responsibility of the Professors of medicine and of law, and these interests now detailed, have constituted the sources of all the supplies for enabling the University to furnish itself with its buildings, including an Infirmary, and all appropriate apparatus.† In 1826, its property then amassed was estimated at nearly \$100,000. It may be mentioned that several of the acts specified by us, recognize the expenditures of the Professors; and we have therefore almost a Legislative history of their individual merits in founding and erecting this Institution, and a Legislative testimonial to the private character of the Institution, as illustrated by its origin, and the individual energies and hazards by which it was matured. The Report of the Committee, already mentioned, at the session of 1825, also recognizes these private efforts. The acts in connexion with this point are 1825, ch. 188—1827, ch. 198—1831, ch. 270. In 1831 the Le-

* See Decision, page 17.

† See Report of Committee, 1825