enacted nearly two hundred years ago, not, indeed, to outrage maternal affection-but, in favor of liberty and parental feeling; not to prevent mothers from having the care of their children, for under the tenures by Socage, or by Chivalry, they could not be their guardians by the Common law-but on the contrary, its design in part, was to make it lawful for mothers to have the care of their children-thus favoring the law of nature, and obeying the dictates of humanity.

As an excuse for being employed to perform their ignoble parts, they strive to show that the mother of the child also had persons employed. And how do they show it? Why verily, they get one man to say that I told him my niece was going for her child, and I would give him \$100 if he would go to Dr. Williams' (about 13 miles.) but did not say what I wanted him to do. A very likely story truly! and he fixes it on the very morning when Dr. Williams and the child were expected to be eight miles from home. And again: another man says, that another man told him, that he was going to Rehoboth after the daughter of Isaac Williams, and that if he could get her in a carriage, he would drive as fast as he could. Now what does all this amount to, and what has it to do with the controversy between the trio and me? If, however, it will be any gratification to them, I will tell them, that Mrs. Polk authorized me to say, that she would give Martin, or any other person, \$100, to assist her in recovering her child, should legal means fail. And further, for their comfort, I am authorized to say, she will not only give one hundred, but FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS to any one that will deliver her to her safe and sound, and sooner than she should be brought up in her present state of alienation of affection and ignorance, if she did not believe she would succeed in the High Court of Chancery, she would cheerfully give a thousand dollars to get possession of her.

To shew more clearly that the mother's anxiety to obtain the child, is not altogether selfish, I will state here, that a proposition was made to Mr. Williams through Governor Carroll, to this effect, viz: that if he would send the little girl four years to some school of good reputation, in some healthy part of the country, (not on the Eastern Shore) - make no objection to her being visited by her mother and her relations-let her summer or fall vacations (the sickly season on the Eastern Shore) be spent with her mother's relations, on the Western Shore, and her spring vacations with her father's relations on the Eastern Shore, the mother of the child would take no farther steps to obtain possession of her. But this

proposition was rejected.

They have seen fit to lug the divorce into their pamphlet. If they have any respect for the memory of the child's father, the less they say on that subject the better. I will only say now, in respect of that matter—the mother of the child asked the Legislature for it, for sufficient cause, and it was granted; -and the trio are welcome to make the most they can of it. The real cause has once been made public-and should it be necessaay to extend this controversy, it shall appear again with all the particulars.

A word respecting the certificates. That of Governor Carroll amounts to nothing. Jones and Martin's, have been alluded to above. Henry I. Carroll and S. H. Henry, are boys; the latter, is a son of one of the trio, and the former, is a nephew of another; and so far as my recollection serves me, neither of the boys was in the room at the beginning of the transaction.

Mr. E. L. Handy's certificate deserves more particular notice-especially as I referred to him. I knew very well he was not in the room when the "disgraceful scene" began. We had left him standing in the passage, I hoped he had seen the beginning from the door. From his own showing, he did not see all. I know that he did witness the latter part. It was, therefore, the first and most material part he did not see. Had he witnessed the beginning, his certificate would have been of quite a different complexion, though in that case, it would not have been asked for. Witnessing the latter part, he and the two boys must have seen Mr. C. C. Carroll tear the little girl away from her mother, in a manner well suiting a furious savage. This, I repeat, they must have noticed. It is very probable, the first thing Mr, Handy saw, was all five of us striving together; -and seeing me holding two of the trio, and endeavoring to loose their hands from the child-his suspicions having already been awakened by previous conversation doubtless in his presence and hearing, (as he had been for some days, perhaps weeks, on a visit at Mr. Henry's and Mr. Williams's) it was natural enough that he should think my object was to take the child away by force.

I will briefly notice, in conclusion, a few passages in the Trio's pamphlet.

They ask, why should I be at the church after Mrs. Polk had refused to prosecute the habeas corpus? I answer, as I did one of them at the church. I was not at all certain that my letter to Judge Spence had reached him, in which case he would be at the church, and our absence would be disrespectful. I therefore determined to go. But for this consideration, I should not have gone to Rehoboth, and the unpleasant result would have been obviated.

They deny that they were hired to do Mr. Williams's dirty business, and say they cannot be hired to do a mean action. As then they did it for the love of meanness itself, and of meanness personified, and not for pay, there is no excuse for them.

weers gen 1862