respectively, being entirely compatible, and the powers and authority of one not inconsistent with or opposed to the powers and authority of the other." It will be seen therefore, from the opinion of the court, which the memorialists rely upon as the basis of their claim, that the old corporation of 1807 is still in existence, and entitled to its property. It is true it is now in a state of inactivity, but it may possibly rouse up and assert its rights hereafter, as the memorialists have now done; for if the court be right in their opinion relative to the tenacity of life in corporations, it is difficult to conceive how one is to be extinguished. Ten years of perfect torpidity in the case of the Regents, formed no impediments to resuscitation: but whether the old corporation be dissolved or not, cannot effect the right of the Regents of the University to its property. The memorialists cannot, since the court has determined that their charters are entirely independent, claim such kindred with the first, as would authorise them in the event of dissolution, to claim as heirs at law. Now, if the act of 1812 is not incompatible with the act of 1807, by what process do the Regents of the University make themselves entitled to the property acquired by the Regents of the Medical College? The property, as before shown, was acquired before the memorialists had any corporate existence: no ingenuity therefore, if the court is right in regarding the Regents as an independent corporation, can date their being before the act of 1812, and before then the Medical College was built by another corporation "distinct and independent."—Have the memorialists any plausible pretext even, for asking the State to surrender up to them this part of the property?

We do not however concur with the court in their opinion, that the act of 1812, and the act of 1807 are consistent with each other; but it is fair to apply the principles of the court to the claim of Regents, for two reasons, first, because they rely on that opinion as the foundation of their right; and secondly, because the opposite of that opinion, would leave the Regents not only without property, but also without a corporate existence, as their charter would be unconstitutional as well as the act of 1825. With due deference to the Court of Appeals, we think the conflict between the act of 1812 and 1807 is so apparent on their face, that we cannot conceive how any one could read them without perceiving it. That the Legislature intended to merge one in the other, and that they have effectually carried out that intention, none who read can well doubt or deny. The act of 1807, established a Medical College, and the act of 1812 certainly took that College to make part of a University.—When it became a Faculty of the University, and under the control of the Regents of 1812, there was nothing left for the corporation of 1807, to exercise any corporate power or franchise upon. What was the office of the Regent under the act of 1807? was it not to govern "the College of Medicine of *Maryland*," and was it not their duty and privilege to have medical lectures delivered every winter in that College? Then