msa_sc2901_scm2351-0348 ©Maryland State Archives

rity. He could never have entertained an affection for her, if she had not been amiable and intelligent, nor, perhaps, even if her parents had been unworthy; but all things else he considered comparatively indifferent. Himself accustomed, from his earliest years, to fashionable society, he knew its exact value; and he was accustomed to say that "worth, not wealth was what he sought in a wife."

Mary, on her part, loved Frank for his frankness, intelligence and generous qualities, and not for his fortune. "I would rather remain single," she said, "than marry for wealth."

About three months after the day on which our story opens, Kate Villiers called on her old school-mate Emma.

"Who do you think is going to be married?" she said. "You give it up? Well Frank Hasting and Mary Murray."

"What!" exclaimed Emma, pale with mortification, for she had herself assidously sought Frank's notice, "not Frank Hastings and that "thread and needle women's" daughter?"

"Yes! and a happy couple they will make—Mary will now have the wealth she is so well fitted adorn."

"I shan't visit her," said Emma, pettishly. "She's a nobody. If Mr. Hastings choses to disgrace himself, let him; but he'll find out the "old families" wont recognize his acquaintance."

"Pshaw!" said Kate contemptuously.—"You know better. Mr. Hastings is, himself, a member of one of the few "old families" we have; and being such, is above all the ridiculous notions of the more "parvenue." It happens, too, that Mary was "good blood," as you would call it. She is the grand-daughter of a signer of the Declar tion, an American patent of nobility, I take it, if we have any at all."

"Then it is on that account he marries her," was the splenetic reply.

"No he never knew it till he asked her to have him. Her virtues and accomplishments won his heart, and they alone."

In due time Frank and Mary were married, Kate being led to the altar on the same day. Emma has learnt a lesson, and since then inquires less superciliously about a new acquaintance.

KENT NEWS.

CHESTER TOWN, MD.

Saturday, August 10, 1850.

DEMOCRATIC WHIG NOMINATION.

FOR GOVERNOR

WILLIAM B. CLARKE,

OF WASHINGTON COUNTY.

Election, Wednesday, the 2nd of October

Mr. Pearce and the Compromise Bill.

Various rumors and surmises have been thrown out against our Senator, in regard to an amendment of his to the Compromise Bill, and which amendment, it is alledged was the cause of the defeat of that bill.—The charge is an unjust one, and now that the matter is beginning to be fully understood, Mr. Pearce is relieved from all responsibility in causing the defeat of the bill, and the true cause of defeat is placed where it rightfully belongs—*to the very objectionable amendment of Mr. Dawson, of Georgia, and the course of the Texas Senators!!*

Mr. Pearce was a sincere friend of the Compromise bill, and was prepared to go as far in securing the passage of that bill as any member of the Senate, and had already yielded much to secure the success of the measure. But those who know our faithful and distinguished Senator, hardly expected him to surrender every honest and firm conviction of right and principle; and after he had gone as far as his conscience and his dictates of duty would permit in endeavoring to secure the passage of the bill, was to be restricted from offering amendments to rid the bill of such obnoxious features as the one offered by Mr. Dawson; an amendment known to be repugnant to many sincere friends of the Compromise, *and which was carried by the votes of twelve Senators who were the warmest opponents of the bill.* Mr. Pearce simply offered an amendment to do away with the objectionable features of the Dawson amendment, and to this extent only, did he interfere with the bill at all, which beyond the shadow of doubt, never could have passed with the amendment of the Georgia Senator engrafted on it.

Those who know Senator Pearce, as we do here, feel assured that he acted solely in accordance with the dictates of his judgment and his conscientious conviction of right and principle. He had just given his State the most ample evidence of his devotion to her interest, by refusing to accept one of the most desirable and honorable positions in the gift of the President—he had just rejected place and power, only because he would not vacate the trust reposed in him by the Whigs of Maryland, and it is folly to suppose that he would have, even remotely, defeated a measure in which the people of his State felt so deep an interest as in the bill alluded to. His political opponents have eagerly caught up this unjust charge against Mr. Pearce, in order to make political capital, but now that the facts are being fully developed, they are welcome to all they can gain on this point.

We are sorry we have not room for the full debate on this particular point, and must content ourselves with some extracts from Mr. Pearce's speech in relation to the matter. We have also, in another column given the remarks of the National Intelligencer, and a letter to the Patriot on the same subject.

We hope yet to see the main features of the Compromise bill passed by the present Congress. Mr. Pearce has already reported a bill upon the subject, and accounts from Washington indicate that it is likely to be received with favor.

The Loco Foco Convention.

Tuesday last was the regular day of meeting, called by the Loco Focos of this county, to nominate their candidates for the State Convention to form a new Constitution.

The meeting adjourned without making any nomination, but for what cause we do not know, unless they were disappointed in not being able to get a Whig to run on their ticket. This is, however, mere surmise, but we do know, that they intended placing Whigs on their ticket—*provided they could get them,* which we think they will fail in doing, as scarcely any intelligent Whig, but must know that, if the Loco Focos had the majority in Kent county, they would ridicule the idea of placing a Whig on their ticket!! In Baltimore city and county; Talbot, Cecil and other Loco Foco counties, the Whigs made propositions to run a Union ticket, which was peremptorily refused by the Loco Focos, and yet in Whig counties they have the modesty to try and get Whigs on their ticket!!!

The Whigs will nominate their ticket to day in the districts, and select the Sentorial delegate on Tuesday next, and will present faithful and capable men—gentlemen who, whilst they will favor wholesome and liberal reforms, will stand by the Eastern Shore and Eastern Shore interests, and will not yield representation according to population, in order to advance party interests.

☞The Fair which was to be held at St. Paul's Church, to day, has been postponed, till next Saturday, the 17th instant.

Senator Pearce.

We copy from that old and reliable Whig paper the National Intelligencer the following in regard to Mr. Pearce. The Intelligencer being the Whig organ at Washington, and familiar with all the proceeding of which it sparks, may be relied on.—We also give a letter from Washington, to that staunch and able Whig journal the Baltimore Patriot on the same subject:—

From the National Intelligencer.

Blame has been cast upon Mr. Senator Pearce—we think unkindly, and without due allowance—as having, by his vote on Wednesday last, been the cause of the failure of that measure. In the course of publication of the current debates in the Senate we have to-day reached those interesting proceedings on Wednesday a careful examination of which will show, not only upon what grounds Mr. Pearce finally voted against the bill, but that, after the amendments, which had essentially changed its character, he could not have well done otherwise. We say this in no spirit of derogation from the motives or merits of those who differed from him on this occasion, but in the spirit of justice to a Whig Senator, who has, we are confident—true and faithful Whig as he is—always faithfully and conscientiously discharged his duties in the Senate."

The following letter from a gentleman in Washington, who was present in the occasion of which he writes, and whose means of information authorizes him to speak decisively, will show how it really was that the Compromise bill came to be defeated. It also authorizes us to hope that its defeat will only serve to secure the ultimate passage of the measures included in it, in a shape acceptable to a large majority of Congress, and to the country at large. The movement of Mr. Pearce, of which he gave notice, can hardly fail to this result:

SENATOR PEARCE. AND THE INJUSTICE OF ATTACKS ON HIM—THE TRUE CAUSE OF THE DEFEAT OF THE COMPROMISE BILL.

Correspondence of the Baltimore Patriot.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 2, 1850

The correspondent of the Sun has done Senator Pearce great injustice, in attributing the defeat of the Compromise bill to his course. I will briefly show this by a simple statement of facts; which are familiar to all in this city who watched the course of proceedings on this bill.

When the amendment of Mr. Dawson was adopted, the fate of the bill was sealed. *That amendment, and the course pursued by the Texas Senators, was the true cause of the defeat of the Compromise bill!!* Indeed, so objectable was the amendment of Mr. Dawson, that Mr. Phelps and others, who were the avowed opponents of the bill, supported the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, with the express view of thereby ensuring its defeat. That amendment was known to be odious to some six or seven sincere friends of the Compromise and was only offered to conciliate the Texas Senators, and the only agency that Senator Pearce had in the matter, was in endeavoring to relieve the bill of a highly objectionable features, which if it remained, would inevitably have killed the whole measures, and when the full facts of the case are known, the true cause of the failure of this great plan will be fairly devoted.

Every man here in Washington, who knows Senator Pearce, knows his word and sincerity cannot be doubted, and it can hardly be supposed that he would have, even indirectly, struck at a measure that he felt the interest in which he did in the success of the Compromise bill, for it is generally credited here that, when first offered a place in the Cabinet, he unequivocally declared that, even if he concluded to accept office, he would not do so, until he had voted for the Compromise bill. It is hardly reasonable, and indeed unjust, to charge the defeat of this bill to the Maryland Senator! He is innocent of this charge to a certainty.

These are substantially the facts of the case, and I would suggest to the correspondent of the Sun to make proper enquiries of those who were actively engaged in this measure, and see if this statement is not borne out. I am willing to put the case before any member of the body who took a close and impartial view of the whole proceeding. Let him ask Senator Douglas, Foote, or any other among the friends of the measure.

The main features of the Compromise bill will be again revived, judging from the movements of senator Foote yesterday, as also a notice given by Mr. Pearce that he should introduce a bill relating to New Mexico, the boundaries of Texas, &c.—There is no cause to despair!!

JUSTICE.

WASHINGTON, August 5, 1850.

The Compromise is by no means dead yet, but still lives in the Senate Chamber, and in all its parts are as full of life and vitality, as before their dismemberment.—It now seems probable that all the leading provisions will speedily pass the Senate as distinct and separate measures.

Mr. Pearce, this morning, introduced his bill for the establishment of the Texas boundary line—and ably supported it, in speech which was well received, and which seems to created an impression throughout the Senate favorable to the bill, and there can be but little doubt of it passing by a strong vote, at an early day.

Mr. Pearce's Speech.

The following is extracted from the speech of Mr. Pearce in relation to the causes of the defeat of the compromise bill, and repelling the charge that his amendment was one of the immediate causes of the failure of that bill:—

"I am not willing that the responsibility of the defeat of the bill should be laid at my door, unless I am justly chargeable with it. From any just responsibility I will not shrink; and I will vindicate myself here and elsewhere, whoever may attack me. It will be recollected that to this bill as introduced by the committee, I had given a cordial assent, though, perhaps, a slow one; for I admit that there was a considerable process of meditation on my part before I brought myself to yield it the unqualified support which at last I was willing to give it. But it will be recollected that the bill defeated yesterday was not the bill which it was on Tuesday last; but it was of quite a different character to that presented by the committee, that the form the bill assumed after the amendment of the Senator from Georgia (Mr Dawson) was not what we had been discussing for months, and to which no similar amendment had, up to that time, been offered; that it was not the bill which had engaged the attention of the people, and commanded the assent and approbation, as I believe, of the people of the State which I represent; but that the the feature introduced into the bill by the Senator from Georgia was a new feature, which essentially altered the character of the bill. It was one which limited the application of the power of the territorial government proposed by the bill in the beginning and contended for thorugh the whole of the discussion; it limited it to a part of the territory of New Mexico, where there was no population requiring government, while it left to that portion where there is a population requirinf government no other government than the military government which the Senator from Kentucky denounced here, or the jurisdiction of Texas. Sir, that was a point upon which I was immovable. I told the senator from Georgia, when he presented the amendment, that it would defeat the bill. I told the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Foote) that if forced to vote I should vote against it. I was taken by surprise by the introduction of the amendment, but I did not take the friends of the bill by surprise, for I warned them of my opposition, right or wrong. I was opposed on principle——"

In allusion to the amendment offered by Mr. Pearce to get rid of Mr. Dawson's amendment, he says:—

I made the effort yesterday in the only parliamentary way known to me. I manifested every disposition to carry the bill—the bill as reported by the committee, with the amendments which had been attached to it, with the exception of the one which I have mentioned; and when the Senate had stricken out that portion of the bill which I moved to strike out, if they had not refused to reinsert what I proposed, with the amendment intended to be in the place of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia—if other gentlemen in this body had thought proper to sustain that, the bill would have been carried.

It will be recollected that, upon offering my amendment, I clearly stated my object, and pledged myself beforehand to accept any different amendment which would effect my purpose, regardless of a form—my sole object being to rid the bill of the obnoxious amendment of the Senator from Georgia, which varied its character and threatened its defeat." No gentleman rose in his place and suggested any such modification. Is the defeat of this bill, then, to be charged upon me more than upon the Senators from Texas? If they had given their assent to the proposition which I submitted to the Senate, the bill would have been passed. I charge that here, and it cannot be denied. I am willing to take my share of the responsibility, and, if it is justly due, I am willing to take it all; but I am persuaded that the Senators from Texas have a little too much candor and courage to wish to throw upon me the whole of the responsibility. I do not believe they do. They chose to insist upon a proposition to which the majority of the Senate did not choose to assent; and therefore the bill was defeated.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The President of the United States, on Tuesday last, sent a message to Congress, communicating a letter from Governor Bell, of Texas, in relation to the boundary of that State, (addressed to the late President,) together with the reply of Mr. Webster, thereto, as Secretary of State. The Baltimore Sun copies these documents with the following remarks:

These papers are of a character well adapted to commend that popular confidence in the prudence, judgment, and vigor of the new executive authorities is peculiarly desirable at such an epoch as the present in our country's history.—The occasion is one hardly to be regretted, which proves the men on whom the responsibilities of government have fallen to be prepared for the emergencies which present themselves.

The position assumed by President Fillmore, and the arguments presented by Mr. Webster for the consideration Governor Bell, are such as address themselves to the common sense of the people, while they are manifestly sustained by constitutional order. They indicate firmness and determination, without menace; and contain no allusion to the extremity of force, apart from the coercive obligations springing immediately from the requirements of the constitution. The language of the Executive is to the effect: "Texas threatens to do what the constitution forbids; Texas is a part of the constitution, and that demands certain unequivocal action at the hands of the government. Texas, therefore, by the constitution, requires the government of the United States to resist violence even at her hands." And this is, really, one of the most beautiful features of our federal relation. Each State holds the United States bound to resist and subdue the spirit of insubordination, even within its own borders, as well as in the territory of any other State.

But the extremity of force is deprecated in the most generous and conciliatory terms. The urgency of the case is sensibly felt; the perplexity and conflict of opinion is appreciated; the importance of harmonious adjustment is made the paramount theme of executive suggestion, and we earnestly hope that this disposition will be met in the same spirit by Congress. There are a number of facts to be considered in the matter of the Texan claim which should induce liberal action in treating with her. If she is chafed, though by her own indiscretion, the greater power can afford to be generous, so long as it does not cease to be just; and no pecuniary consideration, that does not involve injustice to the residue of the States, should be suffered to interfere with the arrangement of this boundary question.

It seems to be generally conceded that this matter must have priority, in the disposition of the general issues embraced in the compromise bill And it will occur, we suppose, to most men, that if the Texas difficulty is arranged with something like mutual satisfaction between the contestant parties, that the others will, in all probability, be greatly ameliorated, and taken up in the spirit of Compromise, may be disposed of without much difficulty.

There is really very little reasonable ground of opposition to be overcome, nor has there been at any time, with reference to the troublesome affairs of the session.—If the represenatives of the people only carried with them to their seats in the capitol a fair proportion of the patriotism that they might derive from free intercourse with the people, every one of the issues which have respectively excited the Senate and in some degree aroused the anxieties of the country at large, would have long since been amicably adjusted. The pride of opposition overrides the highest principle of honorable concession; the etiquette of legislation overshadows the suggestions of good sense; the specific takes precedence of the general; Buncombe rises majestically to put the country at defiance; the unthinking laugh, judicious grieve; and the upshot of the whole is that Congress finally arrives at some conclusion akin to that at which the people have been waiting for them long before.

Reform Convention Nomination.

WASHINGTON COUNTY.—The Whigs of Washington county have nominated the following ticket; Samuel Mumma, (since declined) Geo. Sehley, Alexander Neill, Jr.' John Miller, John D. Hart and John Newcomer.

The Democrats in this County called a Convention under the disguise of a no-party Convention, but nominated a ticket composed entirely of Democrats, as follows: Jervis Spencer, John T. Mason, Thomas Harbine, J. C. Heys, Eli Crampton and Michael Newcomer.

FREDERICK COUNTY.—In this County; the Whigs proposed to the Democrats, that a Union Ticket should be formed, each party selecting three. In consequence of the rejection of this proposition the Whig proceeded to the nomination of a full Whig ticket, composed of the following gentlemen, viz: David W. Naill, Wm. Lynch, Benjamin A. Cunningham, Peter Grabill, Lewis F. Coppersmith, and Jacob Root.

The Democrats under the name of Reformers have nominate a ticket composed of Francis Thomas, Daniel S. Biser and Edward Shriver, Democrats and Wm. Cost Johnson, Frederick A. Schley and James M. Coale, have declined. The Convention meets this day to fill the vacancies.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY.—The Whigs of this County have nominated Messrs Allen Bowie Davis, Dr. Washington Waters, Wm. B. Howard, J. M. Kilgour and Samuel D. Waters.

The Democrats have taken no action on the formation of a ticket.

ANNE ARUNDLE.—The Whig nomination in this County are Chief Justice Thomas B. Dorsey, John W. S. Causin, Dr. Wm W. Watkins, Thomas Donaldson, George Wills and James Kent.

The Democratic Convention to nominate their ticket, meets this day.

HARFORD COUNTY.—The Whig ticket in Harford is as follows: Ralph S. Lee, Dr. Thomas C. Hopkins, Oliver H. Thomas, Evans S. Rogers and Hugh C. Whiteford.

The Democratic nominations made under the assumed title no-party organization are, Col. Wm. B. Stephehson, Samuel M. Magraw, Dr. John Sappington, Ramsey McHenry and James Nelson—all Democrats.

BALTIMORE CITY.—Democratic ticket, Chas. J. M. M. Gwinn, Robert J. Brent, George W. Sherwood, David Stewart, Elias Ware, Jr., and Benjamin C. Prestman.

Arrangements are in progress for the nomination of a Whig ticket, the Democrats having refused the Whig offer of a union ticket.

BALTIMORE COUNTY.—The Democratic nomination will be made to-day. The Democracy here refused a union ticket.—Each party will nominate.

CHARLES COUNTY.—The Whigs of Charles have nominated Gen. John G. Chapman, Col. Wm. D Merrick, George Brent and James D. Carpinter, (has since declined.)

CALVERT.—The Whigs have nominated the following gentlemen: A. R. Sollers, J. J. Dalrymple, George W. Weems and John Bond.

The Democrats have nominated John Parran, J. C. Parker, R. Mackall and William H. Specknell.

DORCHESTER.—The whig ticket is composed as follows: Hon. John N. Steele, Hon. W. T. Goldsborough, Joseph E. Muse. Jr., Thos. H. Hicks and Francis P. Phelps.

CECIL.—The Democrats have nominated Hon. Louis McLean, Hon. Albert Constable, Wm. McCullough, John M. Miller, and B. B. Chambers.

ALLEGHANY.—In Alleghany, the Democrats having refused to join in a union ticket each party will make separate nominations.

The two parties are generally in all other Counties taking steps to bring out a ticket composed of their respective party friends. Frederick is the only County which so far has a mixed ticket of Whigs and Democrats.

Markets.

Baltimore August 9, 1850.

White Wheat—1 20 to 1 25
Red do —1 00 to 1 12.
Yellow Corn—66 68.
White do—64a66.
Rye—62.
Oats—25a30.

MARRIED.

August the 7th, by Rev. S. Townsend, Charles T. Wyatt, Esq., of Caroline county, to Sarah P. Lamb, of Kent.

[The Philadelphia and Baltimore papers will please copy.]

Religious Notice.

A Convocation will be held in St. Paul's Church, Lower District, on *Wednesday and Thursday*, 14th and 15th of August. Morning Service will begin at half-past ten o'clock; evening Service at three. The Holy Communion will be administered on *Wednesday.* ☞Churchmen and others are invited to attend.

Aug. 10, '50.—1t

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

The next session will begin on MONDAY, the 14th day of October; 1850, and close 1st March; 1851.

Nathan R. Smith, M. D. Surgery.

Wm. E. A. Aiken, M.D., Chemistry and Pharmacy.

Samuel Chew, M. D., Therapentics, Materia Medica and Hygiene.

Joseph Roby, M. D., Anatomy and Physiology.

Wm. Power, M. D., Theory and Practice of Medicine.

Richard H. Thomas, M. D. Midwifery Diseases of Woman and Children.

George W Miltenberger, M D, Pathological Anatomy.

The most ample opportunities for the prosecution of Practical Anatomy at a moderate expense.

Clinical Lectures four times a week, by Professors Smith and Power, in the Baltimore Infirmary; with the privilege of daily visits to its wards, without charge to the students for the ticket.

Fees for the Lectures $90 to $95; Practical Anatomy $10; Matriculation $5; Graduation $20.

WILLIAM E. A. AIKEN, Dean.

Baltimore, July 1st, 1850.

August 10, 1850.

WASHINGTON COLLEGE.

ORDER OF EXERCISES AT COMMENCEMENT.

August 10, 1850.

1. MUSIC.
2.—*Prayer*—by Rev. THEODORE D. VARIANT.

GRADUATING CLASS.

3—SAMUEL G. FISHER.—Salutatory Oration.
4—WM. H. LASSELL.—Ancient Rome.
5 MUSIC.
6—JOHN W. HOLLYDAY.—Ancient Greece.
7—WM. J. STONE—Valedictory Oration.
8 MUSIC.
9—CONCERT EXERCISE BY A CLASS OF 14 STUDENTS—Rolla's Address to the Peruvians.—*Sheridan.*
10 MUSIC.

Exercises in Declamation.

11—C. DORSEY WRIGHT.—Cicero against Catiline—*in Latin.*
12—PERE L. WICKES.—Importance of preserving the Union—*Webster.*
13—HOUSTON ECCLESTON.—Speech on the Compromise Bill—*Webster.*
14—JAMES T. LASSELL.—Anniversary of Bunker Hill, June 1850—*E. Everett.*
15 MUSIC.
16—JAMES A. RINGGOLD.—Speech of Catiline—*Croly.*
17—WM. T. WRIGHT—Extract from McDowell's Speech.
18—SAMUEL COMEGYS.—Marco Bozzaris—*Halleck.*
19 DIALOGUE.
Mordent—ROBERT H. MCCOY.
Lenox.—SAMUEL MERRITT.
20 MUSIC.
21—WM. A. VICKERS—Brutus' Address to Collatinus—*Alfieri.*
22—JOHN DAVIS.—Right of England to tax America—*Burke.*
23—ALBERT DEGORSE.—America and England—*Phillips.*
24—THOMAS S. DODD.—Obligations of America to La Fayette—*Hayne.*
25 MUSIC.
26 DIALOGUE—ANON.
Digit—A mathematician—PERE MILLER.
Sesquipedalia—A linguist and philosopher—FREDERIC DESHIELL.
Trill—A musician—GEORGE BOWEN.
Drone—A servant of Mr. Morrell—ALBERT DECORSE.
27—JOHN W. CARROLL—Military Insubordination.—*Clay.*
28—WM. E. MCQUAY—On laying the corner stone of Bunker Hill Monument—*Webster.*
29—JOHN H. REDUE—The missing Ship—*Epes Sargent.*
30 MUSIC.
31—WM. TREW.—On the Compromise Bill—*Clay.*
32—SAMUEL F. SMITH.—Song of Macmurtough—*Scott.*
33—DIALOGUE—Cato's Senate—*Addison:*
Sempronius—WM. BEATTY.
Lucius—WM H. HEIGHE.
Cato—WM. WALLACE.
Decius—WM. SLACUM.
34—CHARLES G. RICAUD—National character—*Maxy.*
35 MUSIC.
36—JAMES HOPKINS.—Tribute to Washington—*Phillips.*
37—AMBROSE P. CARROLL.—Henry V. encouraging his soldiers.—*Shakspeare.*
38—JOHN E. SUDLER.—Battle the only alternative.—*Patrick Henry.*
39—GEORGE A. TOWNSEND.—Hohenlinden—*Campbell.*
40 MUSIC.
41—DIALOGUE—Satire on dueling.—*Sheridan.*
Sir Lucius O'Trigger—BENJ. VICKERS.
Mr. Acres—EMORY TOWNSEND.
42 MUSIC.
43—CONCERT EXERCISE by a Class of 17 Students.—Power of Eloquence.—*Carey.*
44 MUSIC.
45 DEGREES CONFERRED.
46. BENEDICTION.

ESTATE OF SAM'L E. KENNARD.

Maryland, *Kent* county, Orphans Court, August 6, 1850.

On the application of Simon W. Boyer, and Richard H. Digges, Ex'trs of Sam'l E. Kennard, late of Kent county deceased.

Ordered. That they give the notice required by law for creditors to exhibit their claims against the said deceased's estate and that the same be published once in each week for the space of three successive weeks in the Kent News, printed in Chestertown.

In testimony that the foregoing is truly copied from the minutes of the proceedings of the Orphans' Court of the county aforesaid I have hereunto set my hand and [Seal] of my office, affixed this 6th day of August, 1850.

Test, EBEN. WELCH.
Register of Wills for Kent county.

In compliance with the above Order the is to give notice that the subscriber of Kent county, hath obtained from the Orphans' Court of Kent county Md., letters Testamentary the personal estate of Sam'l E. Kennard late of Kent county, deceased. All persons having claims against the said deceased's estate are hereby warned to exhibit the same with the vouchers thereof to the Orphans' Court, on or before the 29th of February, 1851, they may otherwise be excluded from the benefit of the said estate.

Given under our hands this 6th day of August, 1850.

SIMON W. BOYER, and
RICHARD H. DIGGS,
Executors of Samuel E. Kennard, dec'd.

August 10, 1850—3w