

[Correspondence of the Baltimore Sun]

ELLICOTT'S MILLS, Feb 11

Contested Election in Howard County.

At the election last fall, in Howard county, the returns for register of wills, brought up by the return judges, gave Thomas Bruce Hobbs one majority over Thomas Jenkins, the former register. Upon counting the votes of some of the districts it was believed that errors had been made in the returns, which made the election a tie; but the return judges, not deeming themselves competent to correct errors, the returns were forwarded to the Governor. Mr Jenkins sent to the Governor, soon after, a notice of his intention to contest the election. The Governor having no care but the returns, which gave Hobbs one majority, deemed it his duty to commission Mr Hobbs, and he has been acting as register for some time.

Mr Jenkins soon after the meeting of the Legislature sent in a petition to the House of Delegates for an examination of the case, and a committee was appointed to examine it and report. Subsequently, in order to save expense and trouble, a commission was issued by the Speaker of the House empowering McLane Brown, Esq, of this place, to take testimony in the case. Some 21 or 25 witnesses have been summoned, which has given additional interest to the case, and to-day the commission sat to commence it. Dr W. H. Worthington was appointed clerk to record the testimony, and Mr. Hammond appeared for Mr Jenkins and Mr. Alex. H. Hobbs for Mr T. B. Hobbs. Several witnesses have been examined, and from present appearances it will occupy two or three days. The commission adjourned to meet at 9 o'clock tomorrow.

[Correspondence of the Baltimore Sun.]

ANNAPOLIS, Feb. 11.

Homestead Exemption.

The committee of one (in the Legislature) from each county and three from Baltimore city, on this subject, have had two meetings, in which was exhibited a great diversity of sentiment—from the highest constitutional limit down to a mere nominal exemption. Two thirds of the committee would no doubt agree to recommend the sum of \$100. An important question in connection with the subject, is the propriety of making the exemption law applicable to debts already contracted, and also to the law of distress for rent. A majority of the committee is no doubt opposed to the incorporation of these provisions. The legal members entertain no doubt, however, of the constitutional power of the Legislature to enact these provisions.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES —
Tuesday, Feb 10 — Nos 99 and 100 Aaron B. Cooley, plaintiff in error, v. the Board of Wardens of Philadelphia, &c. The argument of these cases was continued by Messrs. St. G. T. Campbell and Dallas for the defendants in error.