that I did not commence to write the will until 4th April 1848. I don't think anytime elapsed from 1st March up to the period of 4th April, that I did not see her, some times twice a day. About 4th April I received a peremptory message borne by Coleman Warford from Miss Colvin. I said to Mr. Warford that his Aunt was not in a testamentary condition. He said her mind was clear. I told him that he must blind not to see it. I took her the Will on the 5th April, and told her not to execute it until she was better, and on no account to execute it without sending for me. Witness here read Memoranda made by himself at the time of the two occasions mentioned in the memoranda

On 6th April, Warford called upon me to say that his Aunt wanted me to be present, that she was going to execute the Will. I told him I would not sanction the Will by my presence. He begged me to go saying that my conduct would cast suspicion upon the Will. I told him I meant to cast suspicion upon the Will. I probably commenced to receive instructions for the Will of '48 as early as February, she continually changed her purposes. Sometimes during this period she was in a state of stupor. She could not remember the instructions she had given an hour after giving them. My brother was a Witness to the Will of 1848. He is now dead. Dr Johns was one and Dr. Andrews (I believe) the third. On 6th April 1848, my brother who resided in East Baltimore near Exeter street came to my office in the afternoon, and said to me George, do you know Miss Rachel has executed a Will to day, adding she is not fit, she is crazy, on some expression of this kind (to which he the witness said I hope you did not witness it. Dr. Seackle then said, Yes, he had, he was only attesting her signature.

That Dr. Seackle also stated that he had said the same to Dr. Johns, who said she was competent, although he, Dr Johns, had observed her incoherency. To which declarations of Dr. Seackle to the witness as evidence, the Defendant by his Counsel objected, but the Court overruled the objection and being of opinion that the same were admissable upon the case of Southsend vs Townsend 9 G. & J. R. 506, permitted said declarations to be given in evidence to the jury, to which opinion and permission, and to the overruling by the Court of the objection of the Defendant to said declaration of evidence, the Defendant excepted and asks the Court to sign and seal this his first bill of exceptions, which is accordingly done this twenty sixth (26th) day of January A. D. 1860

R. A. Martin {seale}

In addition to all the evidence in both sides contained in the first exception, which it is agreed to be considered as forming part of this exception, the Lessors of the plaintiff further proved by the witness Seackle that his brother knew Miss Rachel Colvin intimately, almost as well as witness did.

I saw Miss Rachel 7th April 1848, and often after that. In the spring, I think it was of 1849, she sent for me to come and see her. When I called upon her she told me she had fallen and ruptured some blood vessel and that her mind was as clear as it had ever been. She pulled the Will of 6th April 1848, from under her pillow and asked me how I ever came to let her execute it. I told her I had protested against it. She then said that little rascal shall never have a cent of my property. After this Miss Colvin sent for me again. On my way I met Coleman Warford. He told me Dr. Buckler would not let her see anyone. I went to see her a second time, and rang the front door bell. Isabell answered the ring, but I couldn't get in. I made still another effort to get in. I went around to the back door and was let in by Ann Hutchins. I went in and talked with Miss Rachel about various subjects. All of a sudden she said I am going to Washington. Don't you know I have been married to General Taylor? I have got a seven story house in Washington. The tenant won't pay rent, but Gen. Taylor says he'll turn him out. When I first commenced the conversation with her she talked rationally enough. In 1849 Warford had told me that his Aunt was deranged. This was on the first occasion when he told me I couldn't see her. I recollect that Haig came to me as counsel for Miss Colvin told me he was her agent (at which I was surprised) and asked my advice as to whether or not he should retain the agency. I advised him to give it up. Warford also came to me about the same time. He said that he was distressed at the manner in which his Aunt was forcing his sister upon Haig and that he was going to horsewhip him. I told him I would call upon his Aunt. When I saw her, before I could open my mouth, she introduced the subject of Haig. She said he was the first merchant in Baltimore. I asked her who he was? She said he rented her house and made some other remarks about him. I told her it was improper for her to act as she was doing. She said Rache was going to marry Haig. When she entrusted Haig with her business I thought she was incompetent from her appearance and from the fact itself that she had constituted him agent, which was so different from her usual mode of dealing when in a sound state of mind. This was about 1847. About this time she had determined to send Miss Rachel Jane away. I thought she would have done so. (She was not maniacal but she didn't know what she was doing.) Miss Rachel Jane's character was exceedingly gentle and lovely. In '49, after the rupture of the blood vessel, I don't recollect the instructions she gave me by which to prepare a Will. In the conclusion of the year 1849 she said, referring to my boy, I suppose you are going to make a lawyer of him? I told her I would leave him to choose his own profession. She said that was right, and then made the remark about General Taylor before mentioned. She would frequently talk rationally enough upon ordinary topics, but when you got her upon the subject of the