msa_sc2901_scm2351-0351 ©Maryland State Archives

THE KENT NEWS,
A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER,
DEVOTED TO
AGRICULTURE, POLITICS AND GENERAL NEWS
Is Published every Saturday.
EDWARD MANSFIELD,
PROPRIETOR.

Terms:

$2 00 payable in advance or $2 50 at the expiration of the first six months. No subscription received for a shorter period than six months, and no aper will be discontinued until all arrears are paid. Single copies 6 1-4 cents.

Advertisements, not exceeding 12 lines will be inserted three times for $1, and 25 cents for each insertion thereafter. Larger one in proportion.—A liberal deduction will be made to yearly advetisers. Advertisement must have the number o times marked, or they will published till forbid and charged accordingly.

All communications must be postpaid.

AUCTION SALES.

LAND
FOR
Sale.

THE undersigned will offer at public sale on

SATURDAY,

the 17th of August, 1850, at the tavern of Mr. John McDaniel, in Chester Town, at 11 o'clock, A. M all that

FARM

situate in Kent county, and about four miles from Chester Town, which belonged to Mrs. Mary S. Th mas, dec'd.

The Farm contains about

590

ACRES OF LAND

Lying on the main road leading from said town to Worton.

For the convenience of persons disposed to purchase, the land has been surveyed and, and laid off in

TWO FARMS

one containing about **330 Acres** and the other about **260 Acres.**



Upon the larger division there is a comfortable frame *DWELLING HOUSE.* and the usual OUT BUILDINGS with an ample supply of



WOOD
and
TIMBER.



Upon the other division there are no buildings but it abounds in

WOOD
& TIMBER,

distant about two miles from navigable water, and is therefore worthy the attention of persons disposed to engage in the Wood business.

There is a plentiful supply of CHESNUT, upon both divisions.

Mr. Parsons, the tenant, will show the property.

THE TERMS OF SALE,

will be that the purchaser or purchasers shall give bond with security to be approved by the undersigned, for the payment of the purchase money in three equal annual instalments—the bond to bear interest from the day of sale.

JOS WICKES.

Chester Town, }
July 27, 1850. } tds

FARM
FOR SALE.

THE FARM lying within three miles of Chester Town, occupied by Mr. B. B Wroth, and adjoining the lands of Mr. W. H. P. Worrell—containing

160 *Acres,*

INCLUDING 30 ACRES IN



WOOD
AND
TIM-
BER,



detached from the Farm, but lying within one mile of the Farm

The Farm is divided into FOUR FIELDS, each well watered. A fine meadow may be made.



The DWELLING is a large *TWO STORY BRICK,* with a good KITCHEN, new MEAT and POULTRY HOUSES; *CORN-HOUSE and STABLING.* Possession can be given at the end of the year.

FOR TERMS apply to the subscriber near Church Hill, Queen Ann's county, or to his Agent George Vickers, Esq., Chester Town.

FRANCIS A. RUTH.

July 20, 1850.—3w

THE KENT NEWS.

Frustra laboat, quiomnibus, placere studet: —"He labors vainly, who endeavors to please every one."

VOL. 11. CHESTER TOWN, MD., AUGUST 17, 1850. NO. 16.



POETRY.

[From the Harford Gazette.]

OH! POOR LOUIS LOWE!

TUNE—*Lucy Neal.*

BY BLUE BIRD.

As Loco songs are all the rage,
And singing all the go;
I'll grind you out a few short lines
About poor Louis Lowe.
Oh! poor Louis Lowe,
Poor Enoch Louis Lowe,
You're full of gas, but cannot pass
To where you'd like to go.

The "White house by the old Bay-shore"
Is a tempting place you know,
But never can its walls contain
Poor Enoch Louis Lowe.
Oh! poor Louis Lowe, &c.

The *gassers* all may gas their best,
And *blowers* all may blow,
But give us *High*, and we're content
That they may make their *Lowe.*
Oh! poor Louis Lowe, &c.

Poor Louis is a democrat,
A modern Loco chip,
Although he did in '40 times
Hurrah and shout for "Tip"
Oh! poor Louis Lowe, &c.

He is a man of talents rare,
Can sing, and shout, and dance,
Besides he got the "polish" on,
In Republicana France.
Oh! poor Louis Lowe, &c.

The Lowe-co pack may chase us up,
May yelp, and snap and bark,
And while they sing in praise of Lowe,
Why: we'll elect our Clarke.
Oh! poor Louis Lowe, &c.

Tho' slanderous tongues may lie and snarl,
And strive to make a show.
The Organ-man must tune his pipes
To the death of Louis Lowe.
Oh! poor Louis Low ,
My Enoch Louis Lowe,
Upon your tomb may weeds of gloom
In mournful silence grow.

POPULAR TALES

TWO GOOD ANECDOTES.

Holden's Magazine for August, contains the following. Our first extract is from a sketch of Rev. T. P. Hunt, famous south and west as a temperance lecturer.

A small temperance society had been startled in a c mmunity very much under the control of a rich distiller commonly called "Bill Myers." This man had several sons who had become drunkards on the facilities offered by their education at home. The whole family was arrayed against the movement, and threatened to break up any meeting called to promote the object. Learning this, Mr *Hunt* went to a neighboring district for temperance volunteers for that particular occasion. He then gave out word for a meeting, and at the time found his friends and enemies about equal in numbers This fact prevented any outbreak, but could not prevent noise.

Mr Hunt mounted his platform, and by a few sharp anecdotes and witty sayings soon silenced all noise except the sturdy "Bill Myers." The old Dutchman crying out, "Mishter Hunt, money makes the mare go." To every shot which seemed ready to demolish him, the old fellow presented the one shield, "Mishter Hunt; money makes the mare go."

At last Mr. Hunt stopped and addressed the impurturable German. "Look here Bill Myers, you say money makes the mare go, do you?"

"Yes, dat ish just what I say, Mishter Hunt."

"Well, Bill Myers, you own and work a distilery, don't you?" inquired Mr *Hunt.*

"Dat ish none of your business, Mishter Hunt. But den, I ish not ashamed of it. I has got a still, and work it too."

"And you say, "money makes the mare go," do you mean by that, that I have come here to get the money of these people."

"Yes, Mishter Hunt, dat is just what I mean."

"Very well; you work a distilery to make money, and I lecture on temperance to make money, and as you say, "money makes the mare go," Bill Myers bring out your *mare* and I'll bring out mine and we'll show them togather."

By this time the whole assembly was in a tittet of delight, and even Myer's followers could not repass their merriment at the evident embarrasment of their oracle. In the meantime, we must premise that Mr. Hunt knew a large number of the drunkards present, and among them the sons of Myers himself

"Bill Myres, who is that holding himself up by that tree?" inquired Mr. Hunt, pointing to a young man so drunk that he could not stand alone.

The old man started, as if stung by an adder, but was obliged to reply: "Dat ish my son, but what of dat, Mishter Hunt?"

"Good deal of that, Bill Myres, for I guess that *son has been riding your mare, and thrown, too!*

Here there was a perfect uproar from all parts of the assembly, and, as soon as order was restored, Mr. Hunt proceeded, as he pointed to another son:

"Bill Myers, who is that staggering about as if his legs were as weak as potatoe vines after a frost?"

"Well I suppose dat ish my son, too," replied the old man, with a crest fallen look.

"He has been riding your mare, too, and got a tumble!

At this point the old man put up both hands in a most imploring manner, and exclaimed: "Now, Mishter Hunt, you won't say any more, I will be still."

This announcement was received with a roar of applause and laughter, and from that moment Mr. Hunt had all the ground to himself.

The next is from "The country in Chunks."

Paddy attending a "Broad brim" convention for the first time, was much astonished and puzzled withal at the manner of worship. Having been told that the better "breathern spake even as they were moved by the Spirit," he watched the proceedings with increasing disgust from their "shayth ed way of worship," till one young Quaker rose and commenced solemnly;—

"Breathern I have married"—

"The devil ye hev!" interrupted Pat—Quaker sat down in confusion, but the spirit moving Pat no further the young man mustered courage and broke ground again.—

"Breathren I have married a daughter of the Lord."—

"The devil ye hev that!" said Pat, "but it'll be a long, long while before ye'll *see your father in law.*

THE TEXAS BOUNDARY.

SPEECH OF THE HON. J. A. PEARCE.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the special order of the day, being the bill "proposing to the State of Texas the establishment of her northern and western boundaries, the relinquishment by the said State of all territory claimed by her exterior to said boundaries, and of all her claim upon the United States.

After having introduced this bill on Monday last, Mr. Pearce addressed the Senate as follows:

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. President, I think it must be admitted that the great obstacle in the pathway of our legislation during the present session has been this disputed boundary of Texas. That was the final difficulty of the compromise bill, and may be considered as a principal cause of its defeat. I am very well aware of the motives which induced the combination of several measures in one. I know it is supposed that sometimes such a union produces a combination of interests favorable to the passage of the united bill, but I think it just as often happens that this union produces a concentration of the elements of opposition, insufficient each one of itself to defeat the measure to which, when combined, have sufficient force to overthrow the whole. Besides, sir, I confess that it seems to me to be right that each measure should be determined by the considerations which are properly applicable to itself alone, being neither helped nor prejudiced by what relates to another subject. I have, therefore, determined to present to the Senate a bill for the establishment of the boundary of Texas, unconnected with any other subject. It is a subject of great importance, because it involves not only the rights and claims of the United States, but, what is of far more importance, it involves the peace and harmony of the Union, so vital to the welfare and prosperity of all of the States, and so dear, I am sure I may say, to every patriotic heart.

The bill I present, sir, is not the result of a calculating bargain, in which the rights of each party have been estimated with exact precision, and their money-value counted at the market rate; neither does it disregard the rights and obligations of the respective parties and surrender up everything to the demands of one. I have endeavored to frame it with a view to allow Texas liberally for whatever territory she may cede to the United States, as well as for whatever claims she may relinquish to the United States, to relieve her from the burden of obligations which have been supposed by many to be equitably binding on the Union; and with a view also to preserve to the Government of the United States, an entire Territory, and to secure to the people of that Territory such protection as was guarantied to them by the late treaty with Mexico. The bill proposes a boundary which I cannot suppose will be agreeable to every one. I think, however, that it is more free from objection than any other boundary which has yet been proposed, and it allows Texas compensation, large and liberal I admit, but which I yet think I can defend upon principles of justice, equity, and of patriotism. I was very desirous to form a boundary, in one respect, somewhat differently from the shape which I was finally compelled to give it. I may remark before I proceed that three provisions of the bill are taken, with some amendment and the addition of the last proviso, from the bill which was introduced into the Senate in the early part of the session by the Senator from Missouri, [Mr. Benton.] It struck as a very desirable thing to avoid two difficulties. First, to give such a boundary as will avoid objection which has so often been urged by Southern gentlemen to other proposed boundaries, that they were proposals to surrender to the North territory which, by the joint resolutions, of annexation, and in the spirit of the Missouri compromise, was guarantied to the South or to southern institutions. Secondly, it was very desirable to avoid the dismemberment of New Mexico; to preserve it intact, if not in the whole of its original extent, as contended for by some, at least so far as the territorial authority has practically been exercised. I have endeavored to keep both those objects in view, and I think I have approximated to it, though I may not perfectly have accomplished both. In order to avoid the southern objections, I have begun the northern boundary at the intersection of the 100th meridian west of Greenwich by the parallel of 26° 30′ north latitude. That cuts off a portion of the undoubted territory of Texas. The Senate are well aware that by the treaty with Spain of 1819, our boundary ran up the Sabine river to the 33d parallel of north latitude; thence north to the Red river with the Red river to the 100th degree of west longitude; and thence north to the Arkansas, and so on. The parallel of 100°, then, was the boundary between Spain and the United States at the time of that treaty of 1828 with Mexico we recognize that boundary as applied to Mexico, and the territory west of it as belonging to Mexico. By the convention of 1838 with Texas, proposing to appoint commissioners to run and mark a part of this boundary, we recognize her as the owner of the soil west of the 100th degree of west longitude. There is no disputing, therefore—and if there were, abundant facts could be shown for my purpose—that a large area of territory, whose extent westward is indeed indefinite, did belong and does now belong to Texas. A portion of that territory I propose to cut off and cede to the United States, but I do not propose to cut off any of the territory south of 46° 30′. My proposal is to run the northern boundary line three degrees west of the parallel of 36° 30′, until it shall reach the 103d degree of longitude west from Greenwich. The bill introduced by the Senator from Missouri early in the session, contemplated 102° west from Greenwich as the boundary of Texas on the west, and that boundary was perfectly satisfactory to me; but as it was not so to the gentlemen from Texas, whom it was desirable to conciliate, I yielded it, partly on that account, and partly because I did not think it absolutely necessary to adhere to it.

Running my eye over the latest map of this country which I have seen, the map of Dr. Wislzenus, to which my attention was kindly called by the Senator from Missouri, I find that between the meridians of 102 and 103, and extending more than two and a half degrees of latitude, lies the *Elano Estacado*, or the staked plain, of which we have heard before—high, arid table land, in fact a desert, as waste and as barren of vegetation as the waves of the Dead Sea. If I had fixed the boundary on the 102d degree of longitude this arid desert, a worthless tract of country, would have been thrown outside of Texas and into New Mexico, except a small part of it on the east, which, if it had belonged to New Mexico, as would have been the case by such an argument, would have been cut off by the desert from all communication with the settled parts of the country of which it was a portion. North of this waste the land is better, though I cannot say what proportion of it is valuable. It lies, however, on the upper waters of the Red river and the Canadian fork of Arkansas, which here are rivers of Texas. The object of the Senator from Missouri was to provide such a western boundary for Texas as would give her the command of the heads of all the Texan rivers. This object is fully accomplished by the meridian of 103, which I have taken. By this arrangement also a liberal margin is left to New Mexico, not only to protect the present settlements, but to allow room for her expansion—enough to make her; in time, as population fills up a respectable and tolerably strong State.—The line to the Rio Grande is objectionable, I know, to some members of the Senate, and I should have been glad to consult their wishes by running it a little further south, but I find that that would meet with as much or more opposition. The Senate, however, can change it if they please. This line does, to be sure, cut off New Mexico, according to the estimate of the Senator from Missouri, [Mr. Brown,] to whose superior geographical knowledge I cheerfully defer. He proposed to carry New Mexico down to the mouth of the Puerco river, and said of the line in the compromise bill that it cut off the legs of New Mexico, amputated her at the hips. But there is very little objection now to this, because the Senate is aware that the recent Convention of New Mexico, which met to form State institutions, performed that process of amputation for themselves, not precisely at the exact line which I propose, but so nearly so as to make it not worthy the attention of the Senate. I suppose that, inasmuch as they have amputated these members theselves, it is not of very material consequence for us to take the trouble to splice them together again. Now, this line strikes the Rio Bravo del Norte near El Paso; according to several maps, a little south El Paso. But I am bound to say in candor to the Senate, that more recent maps, and the one I have mentioned, made from actual observations, give the latitude of El Paso as 31° 45′ 50″, which is about fourteen miles south of the line which I propose. I should be very glad if I thought I could obtain the consent of the Senate to run this line down to El Paso, so as to correspond precisely with the line adopted by the Convention of New Mexico. The difference, however, is a small one. The town of El Paso itself, as the Senate knows, is not on the east side of the river, but belongs to the State of Chihuahua, in Mexico, and the settlements upon the American side up to the 32d degree, do not, I take it, contain much population.—There is a small settlement at Eleazario, some fifteen miles further south, formerly in Chihuahua, but which by a freak of the river, changing its channel, is now on the east side and in the United States. This proposed line will give about half of the whole course of the Puerco to New Mexico, along which are valleys nearly parallel to those of those of the Bravo del Norte, which are suitable for settlement and the abodes of civilization: and I think that with this territory on the east side of the river, and that which is not in dispute on the west of the river, we shall be able to form a State quite respectable enough.

Well, now, sir, it becomes me to say to the Senate what there is that Texas surrenders to the United States, and what other considerations there are which have induced me to offer the large amount of compensation proposed in the bill. In the first place, Texas surrenders all the territory north of the boundary line I have described, and between it and the Arkansas river, which is undoubtedly hers. It is, to be sure, a wild territory without settlements, and almost unknown to civilization, but traversed occasionally by her rangers and some trapers and hunters; indeed, I believe her rangers once had a conflict there with the troops of United States, by whom they were disarmed—an affair which made quite a disturbance between the Governments of Texas and the United States for a time. Humboldt, I think, states the northern boundary of New Mexico to be 38°—at least he says that it reaches from the 31st to the 38th degree of north latitude. North of this projects the long, narrow neck of land which reaches to the 42d parallel, our old boundary, and of which it may be difficult to say to whom it did belong—to m Mexico or Texas. The latter claimed it. It contained some seventeen or eighteen thousand square miles of territory, important for other purposes than tillage or settlement. All this is, I know, not worth the ten millions which I propose to give Texas; but then we must recollect that Texas has claims to other territory, which she surrenders by the bill, I do not say "rights;" I carefully make the discrimination)—to the whole of the country east of the Rio Grande. The Senate very well know that I am one of those who never believed in the validity of those claims, but I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that there are others who think that these claims are perfectly valid. While I must maintain the convictions of my own reason, I must be deferential and respectful to gentlemen who entertain a different opinion. I know that there are many gentlemen on this floor who believe that Texas has always, from the time of the battle of San Jacinto, or rather the arrangement with Santa Anna, had a valid and just claim to the whole of the territory east of the Rio Grande.—I also know that there are other gentlemen who do not entertain that opinion, and who, prior to the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, thought that Texas had no manner of claim to this country, but that since that treaty she has acquired a good right to it—that which was only a claim having ripened into a tule. Such is the opinion of the Senator from Georgia, [Mr. Berrien,] whose integrity and whose parliamentary and judicial ability command my most profound respect. That Senator made an able and ingenious argument upon this floor to prove that to be the effect of the treaty—that the limits of Texas not having been fixed by treaty between the United States and Mexico, we are estopped from denying her claim to the Rio Grande. It is not necessary for me to go into this argument. I only desire to say that all this, though it may not decide the claim of Texas, gives some color to it, at all events. Then, sir, the Government of the United States have recognized her title to the Rio Grande country, and though the acts of a former Executive seem to contradict it, yet it must be admitted that Mr. Polk and his Administration did in 1847 express an opinion in favor of this claim. I never subscribed to the sufficiency of the reasons for this opinion, and indeed held them to be wholly unsatisfactory; yet, when an eminent functionary of the Government, bound by a high duty in this respect, gives an opinion directly contrary to my own, I do not feel, in a case like this, that I ought to question his sincerity, or deny all consideration to it. On the contrary, it is of the very nature of compromise to allow weight to the opinions of others which are adverse to our own. I think, therefore, that part of the proposed ten millions may fairly be set down to the account of the claims thus supported, even if we be not satisfied of their validity.

But, sir, there is another consideration, and it is one to which I have been exceedingly unwilling to give my assent, but to which, nevertheless, I have been unable to refuse it. The Senate are aware that the State of Texas has incurred, since her independence, a considerable debt. They know also that she has issued bonds to her creditors, in some of which the revenues from her customs are specially pledged for the payment of principal and interest. Upon the annexation of Texas to the United States, her right to levy duties upon imports was surrendered to the Government of the United States; so that source of revenue became extinct, or fell into the possession of the United States. The revenue derivable from this source is not at present large, but it is likely to become very large and valuable in future. I understand, from authorities on which I can rely, that the trade of Texas at this time amounts to five millions of dollars a year, and that in the city of Houston alone seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars' worth of dutiable goods are consumed annually. We know that the population is increasing with considerable rapidity, and in the course of a few years will swell up to such an amount as would enable the State, if still in possession of the revenue derived from the duty on imports, to defray the interest on the bonds, and finally to extinguish them by a full payment. True, Texas reserved to herself her public lands, but it is also true there they are at present a very inadequate source of revenue, and likely to continue so for some time. When a state pledges her revenue, it is with an understanding that the current expenses of the government shall be deducted, because, if not the the government, unsupported by fiscal means, could not exist; anarchy would ensue, and the responsibility and obligations to the creditors would become absolutely valueless. But, sir, these creditors, to whom the revenues of Texas were pledged for the payment of their bonds, must undoubtedly have relied upon that source of revenue; they must have looked not to the present productiveness of these Texan sources of income, but to their future productiveness; and although they had no legal right to compel Texas to appropriate the revenue derived from that source to the payment of the bonds, and are utterly powerless to compel the United States, yet the very fact that they rest entirely upon moral force for the performance of those obligations to them, gives them a higher claim to the equity and consideration of the Congress of the United States. I will not liken it to the case of a mortgage, because I do not suppose the operations of the Government can be likened to a mortgage, being things different in their natures, but, so far as there is any analogy at all, it is undoubtedly in favor of the case which I now present. The creditors of Texas had a moral claim, at all events, upon the duties on imports into Texas. Those duties have been taken by the United States, under the terms of annexation; and, although there was a special stipulation in the joint resolutions of annexation; that these creditors of Texas should not claim of the United States Government the payment of these duties, yet it may well be doubted whether that agreement between the United States and Texas can release the United States from its moral obligations to the creditors, or whether, these duties having been specifically pledged by Texas for the payment of these bonds, it is not the duty of the United States, at all events, to make some compensation to these creditors. Well sir this being the case, I think I am perfectly safe in saying that the Congress of the United States need never expect to get rid of the claims of these creditors of Texas until they are paid. Considering the vast extent of Texas, the large population which must soon fill her settlements, that her productive capacity will soon be quadrupled, and that her ability to consume will keep pace with increasing production, we must see that no inconsiderable tribute to our Treasury will flow from the customs duties on Texan commerce. It is not a sufficient answer to say that without annexation Texas would have had no security, and therefore no increase of commerce for we know that her independence would been acknowledged by Mexico on the condition of eternal separation from the United States: and that if this scheme, guarantied by England and France, had gone into operation, she would soon have gathered strength and grown in prosperity. Besides, sir, I remember that when we were opposing annexation, one prominent objection was that we should come under obligations to pay a part of her debt. One of her bonds was exhibited in the Senate, and we were told to mark the pledge and heed the liability which would devolve on us. All these are considerations which have weighed with me in determining the amount of ten millions allowed in the bill.

I have been furnished with a statement from the office of the Auditor and Competroller of Texas, which gives the names of the holders of all Texan bonds for which the revenue for imports duties was specially pledged, and the amounts of principal and interests respectively due to each, calculated up to some time in 1848. The aggregate amount is $4,045,027 14; which by this time, as the intest is at the rate of ten per cent, per annum, must be about four millions and a half. If to this sum, which equity strongly calls on us to allow we add a liberal amount for the territory which Texas undoubtedly cedes, and allow liberally also for the territory which she claims, and which some think she is justly entitled to, although I with others differ as to that, you will have reached the aggregate amount of the $10,000,000 which is proposed to be paid in the bill.