

Edmonds, Mr. Lee has little or no interest in the prosecution of the matter, and its final decision is now certainly of less consequence to the State than it was before the passage by Congress of the several Acts generally termed "The Compromise Acts." Yet as it is scarcely consistent with the dignity of the State to abandon a prosecution which she originally undertook upon principle, and to settle a principle in which her citizens were deeply interested, because subsequent legislation has provided for their future protection, I presume you will feel yourself called upon to authorize such further proceedings as are necessary to bring the matter to a close. In the result and final decision there can be little doubt, and if authorized by you to proceed I shall endeavor to have the question properly argued in October.

I am Sir, with great regard  
Your Excellency's Obedt Servt  
J. S. Carpenter

I find on examination of the record, to which I had not access at the time of writing the above, that the apprehension of Bell and his discharge by Judge Edmonds occurred in Dec. 1851. The resolution to which I refer was adopted in the House of Delegates Feb. 7th 1850 and in the Senate on the 19th of that month.  
J. S. C.

Balt. Oct 8, 1852

Mr. Brent  
concerning  
forgoing  
communi-  
cation.

Dear Sir  
I distinctly informed Mr. Lee last winter that in my view further legislation was necessary in the matter of his fugitive slave, as there is no longer an Attorney General.  
I can only say that Mr. Graham was paid \$250 to argue the case and it seems to me that the obligation would rest on his surviving partners. I certainly could not further advise expenses to be incurred, as the State has already paid upwards of \$700 -  
Yours Truly  
Robt. B. Brent

His Excellency  
E. Louis Howe  
Annapolis