msa_sc2901_scm2353-0241 ©Maryland State Archives

KENT NEWS.

CHESTER TOWN, Md.

Saturday Morning, January 28, 1854.

Notice.

ALL PERSONS INDEBTED to the Office "KENT NEWS," are politely requested to call and settle.

Dec. 3, 1853.

☞Advertisements has crowded out the most of our reading matter to day.

U. S. SENATOR.—Mr. Pearce was unanimously nominated, for re-election, in the caucus at Annapolis, on Wednesday last, Col. Hambleton having previously withdrawn. The election of Mr. P., is therefore looked upon as certain.

FROZEN TO DEATH.—Mr. Joseph Porter was found on Sunday morning last, near the Trappe, frozen to death. The deceased was intemperate, and no doubt liquor caused his death.

For the Kent News.

Public Balls—Public Records—Land Titles and Temples of Justice.

MR. EDITOR,

I have observed with some surprise, an article in your last edition over the signature of "Taxpayers & Landholders," the tenor of which is an attack upon those gentlemen of the County who recently obtained the use of the Court House for the purpose of having an assembly or "Public Ball."

I have been especially surprised, because the author disclaims any appeal to the moral or religious sentiment entertained by a portion of the community, and bases his objections solely upon the selection of the *place;* while, notwithstanding this disavowal, his evident purpose is to excite a prejudice against the use of the *place*, by an appeal to that very sentiment, which he professes to have left out of the question. This is entirely apparent to every reader of the communication; and we are therefore constrained to regard this appeal as the first proposition of his series.

We admit, that many individuals of undoubted respectability, intelligence and piety, are sincerely opposed to Dancing as "inconsistent with the spirit of the Bible, as calculated to dissipate solemn thought of Eternity," and as productive of all the evils ascribed to them by your correspondent.

We respect the honesty of these opinions, and most cordially acknowledge the right of private judgment, by virtue of which they are entertained.

But there is another large, intelligent and equally moral class of the community who sanction dancing and ascribe to it, no such evil tendencies as those recited by your correspondent. We only demand that in this age of freedom of speech and conduct, and in this land of equal laws and equal rights, the opinions of the latter class shall be respected however much others may dissent from these opinions.

We admit the proposition, that Taxpayers and citizens of the County have a right to express their sentiments as to the use of the public buildings. We claim that right for ourselves, and are content to submit the matter in controversy to the tribunal of the public judgment.

Your correspondent urges the proximity of the Church Yard as a paramount objection "to the use of the Court House for such a purpose as a Ball.—We cherish a profound sentiment of reverence for the sanctity of that spot devoted to the ashes of the departed—We would that this sentiment were universal, and in the case of our own community, more productive of *substantial results*. We would rejoice to see every individual deposit, marked by some touching and tasteful memento of friendship or affection. We would delight to constitute this place a beautiful retreat from the strife and care of the busy world—a place where the living, in mental communion with the disembodied spirits of the departed, might realize the evanescence of all things human, and learn to cultivate those virtues which, (though the *possessor* be dead) yet speak with eloquent and impressive voice.

But in all candor and kindness we ask your correspondent, whether this objection is heartfelt, or only devised for the purpose of accumulating his arguments or increasing their force? Does he, whenever entering that sacred "Temple of Justice," (of which he so pathetically speaks) cherish an increased sentiment of awe and reverence because of its proximity to the grave-yard? Is he, while crossing its portal, whether under pressure of business, or for purposes of a lighter sort, always conscious of that chastened and solemn feeling suggested by a reflection upon Death and Eternity? Is he aware that such sentiments are at such times elicited in the minds of his friends or neighbors. We anticipate a response in the negative. If so, with what grace can he condemn others for the lack of those reflections which he cannot claim for himself. "Cast out the *beam* out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast the mote that is in thy brother's eye!"

Has he upon former occasions had his sentiment of reverence for this sacred place, shocked and outraged by the appropriation of the Court House to Negro Serenades, Ethiopian dances, Exhibitions of Mesmerism, Phrenologic investigations, or any of the numerous performances of such a nature, to which this place has been appropriated? Has his indignation been aroused by the fact, that upon public occasions, ween the most respectable of our community have assembled, this sacred Temple has been defiled by the shouts and hooting of disorderly boys and men, its windows stormed and penetrated by deadly missiles, and the foulest insults offered to ladies and others who were present; that upon other occasions lights have been dispersed about the house and precincts, in imminent danger to the building, and within the reach and control of designing and mischievous persons? Has your correspondent even blown his trumpet upon these occasions, or did he give any public indication of his unwillingness that this consecrated Sanctuary of Justice should be thus perverted from its original purposes, or the venerable Church Yard be thus desecrated, and such foul insult be offered to the ashes of the dead? No. He has seem fit to reserve his invective for an occasion when ladies and gentlemen assemble in a spirit of order and propriety, to pass the evening in in a way which *they at least* regarded proper, and which a large and influential portion of the community sanction. Has he any rebuke for those who upon the evening of this very ball, created riot and disorder at its threshold? We think that your correspondent's objections come at this time with an exceedingly bad grace, and we much fear that your readers will not accord to them even the simple merit of sincerity.

Again, your correspondent says:—"The object of creating a Court House was for the purpose of Justice. It was never contemplated that it should be used for such a purpose as a Ball." We must here take issue with your correspondent. We are not aware as to the precise reflections which occupied the minds of those who caused the erection of this building. Its *primary* purpose was doubtless for the administration of Justice. They *may not have beyond this contemplated* any appropriation, but if they did at all contemplate, then we infer from experience and analogy, that they anticipated its occasional occupation for general purposes. In our small county villages, which frequently have no public Hall; the use of the Court House is often absolutely required for public uses, and althongh constructed as a "consecrated Temple of Justice," it is constantly diverted from that its original purpose.

Your correspondent here indulges in that species of arguments sometimes too common, but not the less unfair, viz—The argument from the use to the abuse. He says—"If used for a Ball to-night it may be claimed for another to-morrow night, and that thus it may be appropriated to Balls and dances of all kinds, even the lowest sort, as those conducted with a banjo." *True*, if used for a Ball to-night, its use *may* be sought for the same purpose to-morrow night, and so if used to-day or to-night for a College Exhibition, or a political meeting, or a Temperance assembly, it may be used for the same purpose to-morrow, and two or more of these assemblies may claim its use at the same time, thus producing conflict and discord, even to the obstruction of justice. But has this ever occurred? Have *political parties* ever wrangled for the use of this Temple of Justice? Have rival exhibitions of learning ever come in conflict? Have opposing Temperance assemblies ever contended for its occupation at one and the same moment? And does your correspondent really dread, or do the community really fear, that because a cotillion party was held in the Court House on a recent occasion, it is to be used in the same way, so often, or at such times as to interfere with the original design of the building, or to obstruct the public convenience. Does your correspondent really propose to class the recent party (planned as it was by gentlemen of the highest respectability, and attended by ladies of the most unimpeachable position and character,) with negro dances, enlivened by the banjo, or with other loose and disorderly festive gatherings? This language would import as much; and yet it is difficult to believe that he has thus meditated a foul and wanton insult to a section of the community, than whom none can claim a higher title to respect and regard.

We think that your readers must regard this class of objections as frivolous, if not insincere, and as employed only for the sake of the argument.

Your correspondent says, "Dancing is opposed to the moral sense of many tax-payers in our community, and the building should therefore not be used for any such purpose."

We have already admitted the first proposition, (the only valid one yet advanced) but we totally deny the conclusion deduced therefrom. The fact that it is a public building and constructed by the public at large, gives to each and every respectable section of that community, the equal right to use it for any purpose which they may deem proper.

There are those who consider certain *Temperance* organizations unwise, and as not calculated to promote that great moral reform. There are many who regard certain religious tenets as heretical, and in the highest degree shocking to the moral sense. There are othere who esteem particular political opinions as subversive of good government and even of good morals. But should this "Temple of Justice" be therefore denied to those who see fit to attend assemblies devoted to these several purposes? If so, the the example of the past is far remote from the theory, for we have yet to learn the instance in which the occupation of the place has been refused for any religious, political, moral, scientific, or patriotic purpose whatsoever,

Then is not this argument like its predecessors, employed only for a purpose?

Again objections are used upon the ground, "that the paint may be injured or wood-work defaced." We waive all reference to the fact that the paint has long since faded almost beyond the possibility of being *farther* defaced, and if your correspondent will aver, that this objection does not apply equally to many other occasions, upon which the furniture of the House was removed and platforms erected, we will admit that there is some validity in this objection.

But if he must acknowledge, that precisely the same risk of injury, the building has frequently incurred, upon occasions which he doubtless sanctioned, and upon which he was in all probability present, then the objection reduces itself to the simple proposition, with which he stated, viz: that Balls are intrinsically improper, and has nothing else in it. "So with the objection as to danger from fire."

The House has upon numerous occasions as we have before remarked well known to the community been lighted up for public use after night, some of which upon occasions, your correspondent has doubtless been present, and involving precisely the same hazard (if there be any) as upon the recent occasion. How liberal and how logical then to cite the negligence of a single individual by which the building was placed in jeopardy as an argument against its use for a public purpose?

We have thus endeavored to review your correspondent's propositions as they occur in the series.

We have yet one or two interrogatories to propound and in all kindness and sincerity. By what authority does he assume that so large and influential a body of Land-holders and Tax-payers were opposed to the use of the Court House for a Ball? Has he confered with them and learned their opinion in this behalf? If so, then he is illuminated, while the great bulk of the community remain in darkness.

The purpose to which this House was appropriated had for weeks before been well known to the County Commissioners who are the peculiar custodiers of the Public buildings to the Clerk, sheriff and public officers of the county, to the members of the Bar, the citizens of the Town of all classes and persuits and to many of the Land-holders and Tax-payers of the county; if then its use was such a desecration of the venerable church Yard, such a violation of the moral sense, such a perversion of the Temple of Justice, such an outrage upon the feelings of a large portion of the community, such an impending hazard to the Records of the county, why did not those interested speak out and fordid its use? What voice was heard in opposition, until your correspondent seized and discharged his javelin? Had the public sentiment been fully expressed, as assumed by your correspondent emphatically, the county might have been spared the foul disgrace of having its Temple of Justice thus desecrated had his objections been given to the community even one week earlier the stain might have been averted. "But he literly adopted the sage precaution of locking the door after the horse was stolen."

No voice then save that of your correspondent was publicly heard in opposition, but on the other hand, actively engaged in this foul desecration, members of the club by which it was planned and accomplished were gentlemen of the highest respectability and intelligence, Land-holders and Tax-payers, themselves owning the soil and tilling it; as zealous for the public good and as much interested in the public property, as your correspondent. These gentlemen came from all sections of the county, and extensively connected, and associated with its best and wealthiest citizens. Strange that the idea never crossed their minds. We are perverting the Temple of Justice, hazarding the county property, putting in jeopardy the Records? Unfortunately, that some thoughtful friend, at the elbow, did not whisper the impropriety of such a proceeding.

One more query, and I have done.—How long Mr Editor has your correspondent been a resident of this commuuity? I imagine for come considerable period. Does he not—as I have already inquired—remember occasions when this Temple of Justice was occupied by itinerant Millerite divines for days together. Has he no recollection of its having been repeatedly used by Ethiopian Ministrels, Mountebanks, harlequins and merry andres? Is he not aware that it has long ago resounded to the echo of the violin—that well known symbol of the dance. Were not many of these performances offensive to the moral sense, degrading to the taste, pernacious to the habits and equally hazarding the Public Records!

Why then has not your correspondent's indignant censure been expended before. Why did he not invoke the proper sentiment of the community to avert these things for the future? Why did he not make his solemn appeal to the County Commissioners to take this Temple of Justice under their protection and rescue the county from these crying evils. Why, I again ask, has he reserved the bitterness of his virtuous indignation and the fullness of his censure, for an occasion when ladies and gentlemen of unimpeachable character assembled without ill will or offence to any individual, to engage in an amusement which they regarded as social innocent and graceful.

We will not make the charge of incincerity, but in view of the transparent fallacy of your correspondent's arguments and his palpable inconsistency displayed in his philiphic, against the use of the Court House in a way approved by a large body of the most respectable and influential citizens of the county, while he has calmly and silently observed its use in times past for purposes which no intelligeut or respectable citizen can defend, we fear that the community will not regard his strictures as dictated by a lively interest for the public good, but, as flowing either from that general sentiment against dancing, which he so carefully disclaimed in the onset, or from some motive not acknowledged and which he would not willingly avow.

Your correspondent concludes that the Court House was thus used without due reflection, and consideration. He is mistaken in this regard. It was used after mature consideration, by those who know their responsibilities of their acts, probably, and who will not shrink from the consequences.

We would rather, in the spirit of charity, suppose that the author of the article which we have reviewed, omitted due reflection in submiting it to the public.

We are loth to believe that any citizen of our community could cherish a spirit so illiberal censorious, and unmanly, as to seek from motives of mere prejudice or bigotry to debar a large and respectable class of the community from those privileges which they hold in common, and which they cheerfully accord to their fellow citizens.

We presume that until the County Commissioners shall confine the use of this Temple of Justice to its original and primary purpose, the holding of the courts; they will not be likely to discriminate between its occupation for purposes approved by one class of the community and those which are sanctioned by other classes equally respectable, and equally entitled to consideration.

We have occupied more of your space Mr. Editor than we designed. But inasmuch as we regard the use of this building as common to all *respectable* citizens of the county, (they being judges of the use to which it shall be appropriated) So we regard all as interested in the explosion of a theory so narrow, illiberal and exclusive, as that advanced by your corrrespondent. We have therefore endeavored to exhibit the utter fallacy and absurdity of his propositions, and trust that, even he, may yet acknowledge, that they were conceived hastily and expressed without due reflection.

For the News.

MR. EDITOR:—In our communication of last week, upon the subject of the use of the Court House for Balls, we discover a slight inaccuracy in the words "the building is of wood." It should be the interior of the building. The interior structure, with its large amount of wood, was in our mind's eye at the time of writing—the floors, stairs, jury-boxes, gallery, wainscotting, &c. We presume no one misunderstood the remark, as the fires and lighis were within, and the danger could consequently have been only to the combustible portions, and not to the exterior walls.

LANDHOLDERS & TAXPAYERS,

Baltimore Grain Market.

Baltimore, January 26, 1854.

Wheat, white	2 02 to 2 05	bsh.
" red	1 95 " 2 02	"
Corn white	87 " 89	"
" yellow	88 " 90	"
Oats	44	"
Rye	$105 " 110	"

Chester Town Price Current.

Chester Town, Jan. 28, '54.

Turkeys—10 cts. per lb.
Geese—7 do
Ducks—25 to 31 per pair.
Wild do. —25 to 75 do
Butter—25 cts. lb.
Eggs—15 doz.
Potatoes—$1 bush.
Dried Peaches—$1 25 bush.
Corn Meal—87½ do
Buckwheat—3½ cts. lb.
Beef—5 a 6 cts. by qr.
Hides—4½ cts. lb.

MARRIED.

On the 25th inst., by Rev. James A. Massey, Mr. WILLIAM H. COPPER to Miss ELIZABETH WILLIAMS; both of this county.

DIED.

In Broad Neck, on Saturday last, ROSAMAN MASLIN, relict of the late Jacob Maslin.

In Worton on the 20th inst., Mrs. WATTS, consort of Mr. George Watts.

Posts for Sale.

THE undersigned has for sale a large quantity of Chesnut POSTS, which he will deliver at low rates.

WM. H. GODWIN.

Jan. 28. 1854.

LECTURE.

ALBERT E. BASSFORD, Esq. will deliver a Lecture, at Washington College: on Friday evening, February 10th.

Subject—*Character of the Puritans.*

Jan. 28, 1854.

Postponed.

THE Farm of R. W. Ringgold which was advertised to be sold to-day (Saturday Jan. 28, 1854) is postponad until furher notice.

jan. 28, 1854.

The Champion,

HAS discontinued her trips to Chester River until further notice. She is undergoing repairs and will resume her trips as early as possible.

H. J. STRANBERG.

Jan. 28, 1854.

Blacksmithing &c.

I WILL still have horse shoeing done in the best manner, and at the shortest notice. Those that have shoeing to be done will do well to give me a call CASH will be required in all cases.

JAMES MERCHANT.

Harris's cor. near Chestertown.

Jan 28, 1854.

For Sale.

A FINE yoke of STEERS well broken to the Cart, plow and harrow. goes well to the timberwheels they can be seen at my farm.

JOHN E GALE,
near Rees's Corner.

Jan. 28, 1854.

I HAVE ON HAND AND FOR sale—Coats, Pants, Vests, Draws, Shirts, Hats, Caps, family, extra and superfine Flour, Meal, Brandies, Gin, old Rye &c., with a general assortment of Groceries.

Corn, Wheat, Oats, Rye, Butter, Eggs, Rags &c., taken in exchange for goods at market prices.

WM. BACCHUS.

Jan. 28, 1854.

Notice.

THE subscriber respectully informs his friends and the public that he is carrying on his GRIST & SAW MILLS. He thinks it unnecessary to say anything about qualification, having followed the business for 30 years, he asks a trial and leaves the public to determine the quality and quantity. The prices for sawing will be 75 cts. per hundred for all Boards and square Lumber Pailings $1,00 per hundred. Lathing 25 cts. per hundred, runing measure.

WM. BACCHUS.

Jan. 28, 1854.

VENDUE.

BY virtue of an order of the Orpeans' Court of Kent county, the undersigned will expose to public sale on

Monday

the 6th day of February next, at the late residence of Moses Kennard, dec'd, all the personal property of said deceased, (negroes excepted) consisting of

3 head of Horses,
4 head of Milch Cows,
2 Yearlings two year old next spring,
2 brood Sows, 13 head of Shoats, a lot Corn and Corn Blades, 1 Carriage, one horse cart, 1 Wheat fan, Ploughs and Harrows, a lot of Bacon, and many other articles not necessary to name. Also all the

HOUSEHOLD AND KITCHEN FURNITURE,

including Beds, Bedding, Bureau, Tables, Chairs, &c.

☞Sale to commence at 10 o'clock.

TERMS.—All sums below $10 cash; all above that amount a credit of six months will be given, and note with approved security required.

MOSES KENNARD,
Adm'r. Moses Kennard, dec'd.

Jan. 28, 1854.

TRUSTEE'S Sale.

BY virtue of a Decree of the Circuit Court of Kent county, sitting as a Court of Equity, the undersigned, trustee, will expose to public sale, to the highest bidder, on

TUESDAY,

the 21st day of February, at eleven o'clock; A. M. at the tavern porch of Jno McDaniel, Esq. in Chester Town, a

House and Lot of Land

in Kent county, near Fairlee Mill, and adjoining the lands of Richard Smyth, Esq., containing from

1 to 2 Acres,

and late the property of Joseph H. Middleton deceased.

The House has two rooms below and two above stairs.

The Terms of Sale,

As prescribed by the Decree, are, that the purchase money shall be paid on a credit of six, twelve and eighteen months from the day of sale, payable in three equal instalments, with interest from the day of sale, and secured by a Bond of the purchaser with security to be approved by the trustee.

The creditors of the late Joseph H. Middleton are notified to file their claims duly proved, with the Clerk of the Circuit Court for Kent county within four months from the day of sale.

GEORGE VICKERS,
Trustee.

C. Town, Jan. 28, 1854—tds

Trustee's SALE.

BY virtue of a Decree of the Circuit Court Kent county, sitting as a Court of Equity, the undersigned, trustee, will expose to public sale, to the highest bidder, on

TUESDAY

the 21st day of February next, at 12 o'clock. Merdin, at the tavern Porch of John McDaniel, Esq. in Chester Town, a part of a



Tract of Land,

lying adjoining Chester Ville, in Kent county, and on the public road to Millington, late the property of John Woodall, deceased, containing

28 Acres, 3 Roods and 11 Perches,

more or less.

There is no dwelling on the premises, but an out house, which answers for the purpose of Corn House, Stable and Carriage House.

THE TERMS OF SALE. as prescribed by the Decree, are that the purchaser shall give bond to the Trustee with approved security for the purchase money, in three equal inttalments, payable in six, twelve and eighteen months from the day of sale, with interest from the day of sale.

GEORGE VICKERS,
Trustee.

Chester Town, Jan'y 28, '54—tds

TRUSTEE'S SALE.

BY virtue of a Decree of the Circuit Court of Kent county, in Equity, the subscriber, as trustee, will offer at public sale, on

TUESDAY,

the 21st day of February next, at 12 o'clock, M., at the door of the hotel of John McDaniel, in Chester Town, all that

FARM or tract of Land

situate in the vicinity of Swan Creek, of which the late Robert A. Gamble died seized. The farm contains about

100 Acres,

part in WOOD.



There is a new two story Frame DWELLING and Kitchen, on the Land with necessary out buildings,

The Farm is convenient to water and in a good neighborhood.

TERMS OF SALE:

A credit of six and twelve months with interest from the day of sale, to be secured by bond with surety.

J. B. RICAUD,
Trustee.

Jan. 28, 1854—tds

The creditors of the late Robert A. Gamble, are notified to file their claims with the vouchers thereof, with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Kent county, within six months from the day of sale.

Or parcel of Ground

situate near Chester Town, and adjoining the lands of James F. Gordon, of which the late Joseph Redue died seized. The land is highly improved and will be sold to suit purchasers.

THE TERMS OF SALE:

A credit of six and twelve months, to be secured by bond of purchaser with surety, with interest from the date of decree.

J. B. RICAUD,
Trustee.

Jan. 28, 1854—tds

The creditors of Joseph Redue are notified to file their claims with the vouchers thereof, with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Kent county, within four months from the day of sale.