

the members of this monthly meeting becoming numerous, those residing in the west part of the town formed themselves into and were in 1807 established a separate meeting, and called the Monthly Meeting of Baltimore for the Western District, to which meeting were added other members called the Elkridge preparative meeting, not before belonging to either meeting, and the old Baltimore Monthly Meeting was then for the purpose of distinction, called the Monthly Meeting of Baltimore for the Eastern District.

That in 1812, a. 158, a law was passed providing for the perpetuating the trust and uses for which the said property was by the act of 1793 authorized to be held, by the conveyance of the same for the like purposes to the trustees therein named, and to such others as the said Monthly Meeting should from time to time appoint. This law is asked to be so altered so as to give the Monthly Meeting for the Western District an equal interest in the said property, which it is suggested would be according to the original title papers—no other intimation of the reason or propriety of such an alteration of the act of 1812 is given—The memorialists have forbore to express any opinion whether such change be right or wrong, they appear to ask for it, because they are directed to do so by their superior meeting. The legislature is left to look to the original deeds, the act of 1793, and the times of the establishment of these monthly meetings to ascertain whether such alteration of the law ought to be made. These deeds and the acts referred to, are of the extent, and the meetings of the date herein stated; upon an attentive consideration of which it appears to your committee that this property could only be held for the use of the monthly meeting existing at the time of the purchases as the religious society capable of controlling and directing the use of it. No individual interest was or could be the object of the purchases, or of the law of 1793. And since the adoption of the present government without the aid of the act of 1793, that meeting or any other could not have rightfully exercised controul over, or directed the use of the property. The disability found in the bill of rights, renders that act necessary, by which all benefit of the property was vested in the Monthly Meeting then existing as a religious society. The act of 1812 creates no new rights: it provides merely for the continuance and exercise of those which existed before, and all such are preserved by its letter and terms. To assign to the memorialists any specific object, it must be that the Western District Meeting should be admitted to "an equal interest in the property," with the original Eastern District Meeting. This it is suggested would be according to the original title papers—your committee think otherwise, and view it as repugnant to them; for, by these, and the Act of 1793, which directs their effect, the property is clearly appropriated to the controul and use of the monthly meeting then existing, as the religious society authorized to hold, and enjoy the benefits thereof. The Western District not being established until long after in 1807, no semblance of right is perceived by your committee for that meeting, as such to claim an equal interest with the other in the property—the forming of that meeting or society of individuals who had previously belonged to the other, could not transfer such a right, nor indeed any right—the rights and privileges of individuals in the original meeting or society to participate in the use of the property could only be personal to them as members. When they had left the one and formed themselves into another new meeting or society, it must be holden that they had relinquished and left behind them the rights and privileges of the first! Otherwise incalculable mischief and confusion in such religious institutions would be the result; and the parent society by every younger one emanating from it would be deprived of its property or funds until there might be little or nothing left:—Such a condition should not be imposed upon any society without the clearest manifestations of the assent of its members. The vesting in the Western District Meeting by an Act of Assembly an equal interest with the other meeting in the property in question, appears to your committee to be greatly interfering with the rights of property, and unauthorized in the case before them. They therefore submit the conclusion that the object of the memorial appears to them improper, and ought not to be granted.

By order, JNO. CLOUD, Clk.

February 15th, 1819—Read the first and second time by special order, and concurred with.

By order, JOHN BREWER, Clk.

True copy from the original,

Test, JOHN BREWER, Clk.

GPTC