Kent News.

SATURDAY......................MAY 3, 1890.

CONVICTED OF MURDER !

Frank Harris, for Shooting Edwin Brown and Alfred Trusty, Convicted of Murder in the Second Degree.

A JURY RENDERS THIS VERDICT IN ONE CASE AND THE COURT IN THE OTHER CASE.

Great Interest by the Colored People and Public Sentiment Divided.

ABLE ARGUMENTS BY COUNSEL.

Judge Wickes Defines Murder.

The most exciting trial of the term lasted less than two days. His honor, Judge Wickes, who has presided alone until Wednesday has used every effort to expedite business. The Harris case was called Monday morning; an afternoon session was held that day and all the evidence was in before the adjournment at night. Next day was given to the argument of counsel and the jury retired at 1.30. This we venture to say was one of the quickest murder trials in the history of our court considering the number of witnesses examined and the determined contest of counsel on either side.

Frank Harris was charged with shooting Alfred Trusty and Edwin Brown on the night of November 7, 1889, in the street near Perkins' hall in Chestertown. All the parties are colored. Harris is about 35 years of age; heavy built, copper color, and is a son of the late Henry Harris, who kept an oyster house for many years on Cross street. Frank has been employed for five or six years on the steamers of the Chester river line and at the time of the tragedy held the position of hall and baggage man on the Emma A. Ford. The two men killed were near the same age and also lived in Chestertown. The tragedy occurred about 10 o'clock at night and startled our whole community on Friday morning when it became generally known. The colored people especially were greatly excited over it and for awhile sentiment ran strong against Harris. Probably nine-tenths of them would gladly have assisted in the job of hanging him at that time. But this class have been gradually changing front, and when the trial came on most of them were anxious for his acquittal. More than half of the court room was occupied by these people who watched with great interest every step in the proceedings.

Marion deK. Smith conducted the case for the State with consummate ability and the prisoner was faithfully defended by Messrs. Hope H. Barroll and Richard D. Hynson, two able members of the Kent bar.

At 9½ o'clock Sheriff Comegys and Deputy-sheriff Morgan brought the prisoner into court and placed him in the dock. The difficult task of securing a jury was then commenced. From the first twelve of the regular panel only three were obtained and from the next twelve three more. Talismen were then summoned and when the defense had reached within one of their limit in challenging the jury was full, as follows: Edwin S. Morris, Edward T. Comegys, James T. Dixon, Wm. D. Pennington, Bedford Roe, Samuel Todd, John Brice, Geo. S. Biddle, D. Arthur Bacchus, Jas. S. Bradley, E. J. Watson, R. F. Parks.

State's Attorney Smith, in his opening statement, recited the leading facts which were expected to be proven by the prosecution, and read the law covering and constituting the crime of murder. The defense reserved their opening.

The prisoner was tried first for the killing of Trusty.

Dr. W. Frank Hines was the first witness called: I heard the reports of a pistol on the night of the shooting about 10 o'clock, and in a few minutes I was sent for. When I arrived on the scene I found two men lying dead in the street near the hall. Trusty was shot in the left side evidently by a ball from a large pistol. I live about 175 yards from the hall; the sound of the first two shots were not so loud as the second shots. I examined the body at the inquest and could find no ball; it did not go through him; it entered between the 6th and 7th or 7th and 8th ribs; used an 8-in. probe; location of wound was in the region of the heart and caused his death.

Wm. E. Graves, colored—I did not go in the hall; was outside and saw Frank Harris come out; saw six or eight persons together laughing and talking; this crowd dispersed and Harris and Trusty were standing near the mouth of the alley near a brick building 20 yards from the hall. I was 25 ft. from them; it was moonlight and I could see plainly. I heard four shots; a boy came out of the hall and fired two light shots and immediately afterwards there were two heavy shots fired by Frank Harris. Trusty was with Frank, nearest me; my attention was first attracted by the report and flash of the pistol. After the first shot Trusty said 'Look out Frank you will shoot me!' Immediately the second shot was fired and Trusty backed towards me while I was looking at them; I saw Trusty reel and fall to the ground. I told him to get up, that he would get his clothes all dirty, and he replied 'Oh, Ned, Frank has shot me!' While I was standing there some one said that a man was lying behind the ice wagon; I went and saw a dead man then went back to Trusty not more than four feet away and as I came up Harris said that Chaney and "Moll" were playing monkey business. Some one said 'Frank, you shot those fellows,' but he made no reply. After unbuttoning the vest of Trusty I found blood on his left breast and Trusty again exclaimed that Frank shot him.

Upon cross-examination the witness said when Trusty backed back he was laughing and clapping his hands and told Harris to look out or you'll shoot me. I heard no conversation between Harris and Trusty nor heard of any difficulty.

Jim Blake—I saw Trusty and Harris outside the hall; I came out of the hall with Freeman, Chaney, Trusty and Harris and others and took a drink with them. I heard four shots fired, the first two were fired by a boy in front of the hall; two or three seconds after I heard two more shots and saw Trusty lying on the ground. I saw blood on his shirt. He did not get up.

Will Tilghman—I went to the hall and came out with Trusty, Harris and others. I heard no laughing; heard four shots, two behind me and two in front of me, two light and two heavy. Frank Harris fired the last two soon after the first two were fired. I saw the flash from the pistol and after the second shot saw Trusty lying on the ground. After going to Brown I came back to Trusty who was then moaning. I was 15 or 20 yards from Harris at the time of the shooting.

At this point a discussion arose between the counsel as to the admission of Trusty's dying exclamation as evidence. The judge decided that it could not, on the ground that the man was unconscious of his condition; for, said the judge, if he be conscious that he is on the brink of death he will be just as likely to tell the truth as though he were a sworn witness. There might be, continued the judge, fifty or more who could testify to the man's dying condition and yet the man himself be unconscious of the fact.

Tilghman further testified to having started for the boat and was overtaken by Harris. I asked him why he shot those men and he said he didn't do it. I asked him what he did with the pistol and he said he hadn't had any. We parted at the gang plank.

Joe Hall—I came out of the hall five minutes after the shooting; saw the men lying on the ground; overtook Harris on Water street and remarked that it was a serious affair about the shooting, to which Harris in reply said yes.

Louis Blake—I came out of the hall and saw two men lying on the ground; I recognized Trusty, lifted him up and he moaned; saw two men as I went home one of whom was Harris. He called me and asked me what was the matter up there. I told him that two men were shot and no one knew who did it.

Harrison Redding—I was home standing in my door, heard the shots and went to the hall. I passed three men who jumped over the fence from Perkins' lot and ran towards the bridge, but could not recognize any of them.

Anna Rebecca Hill—Alfred Trusty went in the hall behind me. I saw Harris and Tighman go out of the hall; saw Tilghman come to the door, beckon to Trusty and made a sign to him by putting his finger to his mouth and Trusty went out.

Becky Medford—I live on Maple avenue and went down to the hall following the music; I was in bed, when hearing pistol shots and much noise, I got up, went to the door and saw two men and two women get over Perkins' fence and go down towards the bridge; it was moonlight and I plainly saw Frank Harris, Sam'l Russell, Hester Graves and Mary Pratt.

Ex-Deputy Sheriff Edward Lambert—I found Harris on the boat and with Constable Henley arrested him about 11.30; he seemed to be asleep and when aroused said nothing, and walked to jail as straight as I could; next morning when the NEWS reporter came I asked the questions, and the prisoner, without any threat or reward, gave voluntarily to the NEWS these statements: Harris said he staid in the hall until the concert was nearly over; came out and was in the crowd when the shots were fired; Trusty was near me at the time; we were singing at the time; did not see Ned Brown last night; did not have a pistol last night; Tilghman was at the boat when I got there; he was standing on the platform; I had been drinking but was not drunk and knew well what was going on; heard four shots fired and it sounded like a small pistol; I never carry a weapon; Trusty and I came out of the hall together, with others, but I did not know them; we went into the road to a wagon and there talked together.

The following Sunday, or several weeks afterwards, Harris told Mr. Dugan and Constable Henley that the shooting of the men was an accident and that some one grabbed the pistol out of his hand.

This concluded the testimony for the State, at which time the court took a recess until 5 P. M. At 5 P. M. the court convened and the evidence for the defence was taken.

John H. Evans—I have heard Harris' character discussed, it was good on the boat.

Mr. Smith drew out the statement that the prisoner's character was only discussed relative to his duties on the boat. The State asked that the testimony be ruled out as it did not touch his peaceable disposition. The court decided the testimony irrelevant.

Edw. Graves—Heard Frank say "That is a d—— pop; why don't you pull out something that will make a noise," and he immediately fired; I saw Frank and Trusty playing before the shots; Trusty was drunk and Frank was drinking also; they were always the best friends; both good singers; would drink and sing together; saw him put the bottle to his mouth and drink twice.

Jim Blake—I have known him from childhood; have heard his character discussed and it is peaceable, quiet and without malace; Trusty and Harris were great friends; went around much; I drank with Frank and Frank was drunk; heard some one say that "Moi" was fooling; Harris and Trusty were laughing and talking before the shooting; saw him drink twice.

Henry Freeman—I saw a crowd playing with their overcoats, throwing them up and falling on them. I saw Frank and Trusty drink and I drank with them. I heard the shots but no cross words. His reputation is good. Frank was drunk.

John Chaney—I took a drink on the boat and one at the hall. Frank and Trusty seemed to be very friendly and Frank was pretty full up. All speak good of him.

Joe Hall—Frank was drunk, staggering. His reputation is good.

Justice T. S. Dodd—Frank was intoxicated. I met him coming out of the Crawford House. Becky Medford said before me at the inquest that when she heard the firing she went to the door and saw three men and two women running past her door. Frank ran into me and I thought it was deliberate. I saw him and three others standing near the old church and as I passed Frank pulled a flask out and broke it against the church.

Jim Thompson—I was drinking with Frank all the way from Baltimore; drank with Blake, Trusty, Harris and others at Burchinal's corner, in Mr. Tom Wickes' back yard and at the old church we threw away some because we couldn't drink it. I saw Frank hit Trusty with a stick telling him to get up and stop that monkey business. I have heard his character discussed as quiet and peaceable. One pint would not start what we drank.

On cross-examination he said that he was not drunk but was able to play in the band and walk straight.

Sam Russell—I was not in Perkins' lot nor with Mary Pratt. I would not believe Becky Medford on her oath. I overtook Harris at Perkins' saloon and left him at Voshell's corner. We did not run nor were there any women with us. Harris was pretty drunk.

Cross-examined—Ten minutes after the shooting I left Rasin's corner, passed the wounded men, saw nothing unusual, went to the hall and learned that two men had been shot: came out, looked at bodies and went home. I said to Frank that this is a d—— affair and he said pretty bad.

Mary Pratt and Hester Graves both denied being in Perkins' lot and of anything to do with the affair.

Wm. Perkins—I have known Becky Medford for some time and would not believe her on her oath. I have never known Frank of being in a fuss and has always bore a good character.

Mr. Allen Harris testified to the good reputation of the prisoner.

Frank Harris—I brought to town on Thursday ½ gallon of whiskey and was drinking all the way from Baltimore. I waited on the supper table; after supper I went to Burchinal's corner and there I met Thompson, Blake, Trusty and several others and we all drank together. I carried 1½ pints up town. I went in the hall with Trusty but don't know what time we came out. I remember firing, but did not see any one in front that would be harmed by shooting. I was pretty full, and would not have fired if I'd thought it would hurt any one, for I would rather have shot myself than any body else. No harsh words passed between us. Some one was firing and I wanted to make a noise too. The pistol belonged to Mr. Parvis, who gave it to me to sell for him. It had two balls in it. I expected to sell it to Garrison Thomas that night. I am not in the habit of carrying concealed weapons. I did not run across Perkins' lot nor go down town with any women.

Cross-examination—Mr. Lambert was not present when I was interviewed by the KENT NEWS reporter. I do not remember any of the statements made. I was sick and scared and did not know I had killed any one. Can't tell whether I said the things testified by Mr. Lambert or not. I had been drinking "stone fences" the night before. I called the entertainment a variety or monkey show. Went in and out of the hall taking a drink each time; held the pistol up and fired; heard some one say that Brown and Trusty were shot. I don't know what has become of the pistol. I remember telling Mr. Albert Dugan that if I shot any men it was an accident.

Argument of Counsel.

Mr. Smith opened for the State in a speech of forty-five minutes, claiming a verdict of murder in the first degree. His case looked very weak for any conviction of murder when he began his argument, but before he sat down he had so thoroughly linked the loosened clasps that the prisoner and his friends must have trembled with apprehension even lest a verdict calling for the death penalty should be rendered.

For the defence R. D. Hynson opened. This young attorney is fast acquiring the skill of his father in management and his effectiveness in pleading. His rapid strides in this direction were apparent in this case. His law was plentiful and pointed, and his manner calm, earnest and effective. He spoke forty-five minutes, making a marked impression on the jury and spectators.

Mr. Barroll spoke one hour and five minutes, and saved the prisoner's neck. Mr. B. is always earnest in manner and eloquent; he wastes no words, but goes direct at the mark and shoots quick and sharp. He was more than usually earnest and effective on this occasion. He cleverly healed the wounds made by the State's Attorney upon the defendant witnesses and in turn handled "Becky" without gloves, terming her "the odorous Becky Medford, who should be Becky Ringgold!"

The State had the closing and Mr. Smith made good use of it. He took a full hour in delivering one of the most skillful and masterly arguments in a capital crime we have ever heard in this court and sealed the charge of murder upon the prisoner.

The Verdict.

The jury retired at half-past one P. M., and remained out only forty minutes, when they returned a verdict of "murder in the second degree." The prisoner manifested no emotion whatever during any part of the trial; he was perfectly calm and unmoved at every stage, and when placed upon the witness stand he went through the ordeal of questioning and cross-questioning with the same calmness of manner and with perfect deliberation of speech. When the foreman of the jury uttered the verdict his only manifestation was a slight smile.

The second case—that of killing Brown—was called, and after consultation with the prisoner, the counsel for the defence agreed with the State's Attorney to submit the case to the court upon the testimony offered in the other case. His honor, Judge Wickes, promptly declared the prisoner guilty of murder in the second degree for killing Brown. He said: "To constitute murder in the first degree, there must be premeditation and deliberation. The testimony is not of such a character as to satisfy me beyond a reasonable doubt that such deliberation and premeditation existed, but there can be no doubt that the prisoner is guilty of murder in the second degree."

Other Court Proceedings.

The following is a continuation of the regular proceedings from where our report left off last week:

SATURDAY, April 26.—Judge Wickes on the bench. A jury was empaneled to determine the mental condition of Amanda Beverly, colored, and she was declared insane; she will be kept at the county almshouse.

Grand jury presented James Johnson, Joseph E. Gilpin and Chester Musical, Literary and Social Club for violating local option law.

Grand jury made following report and was discharged:

To the Honorable Circuit Court:—We most respectfully report that during six days we have diligently inquired into all matters that have come to our knowledge by examining 62 witnesses. We have made 32 indictments. Seven constables have as the law requires, appeared before us and made such reports as convince us of their faithful performance of duty. We have visited the jail and find it in a cleanly condition, and find the prisoners therein confined, who are all colored, appear to be well-cared for, and as comfortable as the circumstances of their confinement will permit. We also thank the court for the indulgence extended to us, and the officers of the court for their kindness, prompt attention and courtesy toward us. Respectfully submitted.

CORNELIUS J. SCOTT, foreman.

Lewin W. Wickes was examined and admitted to practice at the bar.

Court adjourned until Monday.

MONDAY, April 28.—Court met with Judge Wickes on the bench. [Monday and Tuesday were occupied with Harris trial as given elsewhere.]

TUESDAY AND WEDNESDAY. — Judge Wickes presiding. Judge Stump took his seat Wednesday.

State vs. Geo. Deems—for shooting with intent to kill Jack Russell at Quaker Neck wharf. The two men were engaged in a game called "crap" and a wrangle occurred over one cent; several stones were thrown by Russell and two pistol shots were fired by Deems—the balls from the latter whizzing past the head of a man oystering in the river. Deems said he "only fired to frighten Russell and keep him from knocking him in the head with a stone." Smith for State; Barroll and Lewin W. Wickes for defence. Tried before the court. Verdict, not guilty on first count, but guilty on second and sentenced to House Correction for six months.

State vs. The Chester Musical and Literary Club—charged with violating the local option law. Jury trial. Smith for State; Vickers and Hynson for defence. Jesse G. Duyer testified that he bought liquor from the club house on the 19th of April, and that he was not then a member; has since become a member by signing the roll book. J. E. Gilpin testified that he is the president and general manager of the club, with the following board of managers: C. H. Davis, J. Brice, G. E. Biddle, G. T. Perkins and J. E. Gilpin; that the property of the club consisted of furniture, liquors, &c.; the membership book was turned over to him when he took charge and Mr. Duyer's name was then on it; he therefore furnished him with liquor in good faith as he did any other member. The book was produced showing this signature and the names of S. H. Crawford and John Carr as witnesses, and this signature was claimed by the defense to correspond so nearly with Mr. D's acknowleged signature that Mr. Gilpin was fully justified in accepting it as such. In reply to questions by Judge Wickes, Mr. Gilpin said the club numbered over one thousand members; that no dividend had been made because the club was always behind; it was now $180 behind. The club was incorporated April 1, 1888, with S. H. Crawford president.

The case was argued by Mr. Smith for State and Mr. Vickers for defense. The jury retired and after an absence of about twenty minutes brought in a verdict of not guilty.

A second indictment against the club was for selling liquor to John Johnson. The facts were about the same and the jury returned a verdict of not guilty in this case also.

The case against J. E. Gilpin was for selling to J. G. Duyer, and it was submitted to the court upon the same testimony as that taken before the jury in the Club case. The court said not guilty.

State vs. Samuel Turner—indicted for maliciously cutting carriages in Quaker Neck. Tried before the court. Guilty. Sentenced to one week in jail, because, said Judge Wickes, the prisoner has already had two months imprisonment. Smith for State; Hynson for defence.

The case of State vs. Walter Cromwell was continued.

State vs. Geo. W. Walls, Galena—for selling intoxicating liquors. Tried before the court. Not guilty. Hynson for defence.

State vs. Edw. Eisenbrey and Louis Broll—charged with illegal dredging on Swan Point bar on the 9th of January last. Smith for State; Vickers for Eisenbrey; Pearce and Hynson for Broll. Capt. Turner and his mate, of the steamer McLane, and Capt. Horney, of the Helen Baughman, testified for the State, and Capt. Broll and the cook of the "Bulack" and others testified for the defence.

THURSDAY.—Judges Wickes and Stump on the bench.

State vs Eisenbrey and Broll concluded, before the court. The court decided Broll not guilty; Eisenbrey guilty and sentenced to the House of Correction for four months.

State vs. James Johnson, Millington—charged with selling whiskey to John Johnson. Jury trial. Smith for State; Hynson for defence. Verdict not guilty.

FRIDAY.—Hon. Judges Wickes and Stump on the bench.

State vs. George Taws and Jefferson Davis—indicted for illegal dredging. Jury trial. Smith for State; H. W. Vickers, Thos. C. Weeks and Peter J. Campbell for defence.

TAKE NOTICE

Tax-Payers of the Fifth District!

THE TAXES ARE NOW DUE; the tax-book for the Fifth District is in my hands and I am ready to receive the amounts due for 1889. All who have taxes to pay will find it very much to their interest to pay promptly. The law is so strict that I am not allowed to indulge even though I were so inclined. For the accommodation of tax-payers I will be in Chestertown on the first Tuesday in each month; at Fairlee on the first Monday in each month; at Rock Hall every Saturday afternoon, and at home at other times.

WM. H. COLEMAN.

Aug. 17, 1889—tf.

TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION.

A Full and Interesting Meeting.

The Teachers' Association for Kent county met at the school-room in Chestertown on Friday April 25th. Though it was rainy weather the attendence was very good, for of 61 teachers in the county 54 were present. At the opening of the meeting Mrs. Stevens entertained the teachers with some charming music rendered in her usual efficient style. The chairman of the literary committee, Mr. John F. Copper, reported questions for discussion at the next meeting and after some discussion they were adopted by the association.

1st. How may both teachers and pupils spend their vacation most profitably?

2d. What is the place of history in our school course?

The association began the discussion of the question brought over from the last meeting, What is Teaching? Mr. Topping opened the discussion by reading a paper followed by Messrs. Tonkin and Melvin who presented their views in the same manner. Some of the ladies, among them, Miss Gooding and Miss Lizzie Fowler, had prepared themselves, in writing, their opinions and views concerning the question. The question was discussed in many phases and because it was broad it was not completely covered in the discussion. Some of the points were that those who thought teaching was an occupation of much ease, simply sitting in the shade, were in error; that teaching was more than lesson-hearing, it was a development and training of the mental faculties; showing the pupil how to instruct himself that the teacher might become useless so far as the pupil's progress is concerned. Such eminent educators as Payne, Bain, Swett and Raub were frequently quoted in the course of the discussion. The Examiner closed the discussion and in his remarks gave some valuable and practical hints as to how the pupils of our schools should be taught. The next question discussed was "How may backward pupils be most successfully treated by the teacher?" As many stated backwardness was the result of timidity, dullness, or lack of ambition, and mentioned as a successful treatment, gentleness, kindness, patience, encouragement, extra time for the dull and timid ones, while those who had no pride or ambition would have to be compelled to perform their duty even if corporal punishment had to be one of the means to compel negligent or indifferent ones to keep pace with the industrious and diligent. To manage those who were backward because they were unable to start to school until winter and who perhaps would be unable to begin the work of the grade, it was suggested that some of their studies be dropped to have more time for teaching other studies that were not readily comprehended. One of the teachers thought it was an advantage to have backward pupils. To looked after them prevented the teacher from losing interest in his work. This question was thoroughly ventilated and from the number of methods stated it did not seem to be difficult to select some of them for the purpose of testing their practicableness.

Mr. T. B. Long offered resolutions deprecating the reported prospective removal of Prof. M. A. Newell from the principalship of the State Normal School, which were unanimously adopted.

Dr. Reid, of Washington College, addressed the association having for his subject "The Choice of Words." The address was interesting as well as elaborate, and the audience followed the elegant speaker with marked attention.

The association adjourned until 1½ P. M. at which hour the president called to order for the afternoon session. The Examiner inquired how many were able to accomplish the work in arithemetic assigned for the 4th grade. It was found that but one was able to accomplish the work with any satisfaction.

The association at this point was favored with an essay by Miss Helena Link, called "Love of Country." "The question "How can instruction be made most permanent?" was next discussed by several of the teachers who expressed their opinions that pupils should be trained to observe closely, and concentrate their minds on that which they study. Pupils recollect when the practical value is seen. Memory should be cultivated, what is done should be done thoroughly, and reviews should be frequently and on essentials. Dr. Reid participated in the discussion, and said that in repeating again and again was the way to fix anything permanently in the mind. He related some instances in his career as a school-boy in which the lesson had been so well fixed in his memory by drill and repetition that he has never forgotten it. The part in Swett's Methods of Teaching relating to general managements of schools and what should be done by the teacher, and what should be required of the pupils during a class recitation, was read and comments made, and some of the suggestions by the author caused a discussion in which both ladies and gentlemen participated. The Examiner called the teachers' attention to a by-law of the State Board of Education by which pupils are admitted to the first grade during the first ten school days during September and February of each year, provided each school has an average attendance of fifteen. He urged the teachers to comply with the by-law. There being no further business before the association, it adjourned.

PRESENT.

BALTIMORE MARKET. — The Baltimore papers of yesterday quote as follows:

WHEAT—Longberry, good to prime, 73@85.
CORN—white and yellow, 39@42.
OATS—29@31½.

DIED.

Near Chestertown, on the 26th inst., LAWRENCE BUCHANAN, in the 77th year of his age. Interment in Chester Cemetery on Sunday afternoon.

In Middletown, Del., on Tuesday, April 22, JAMES M. ERNEST, formerly of this county, in the 42d year of his age.

At Georgetown, Kent county, Md., April 22d, Mrs. MARIAN DILL, wife of A. G. Dill, in her 29th year.

Death of an Aged and Respected Citizen.

JOHN A. MILLER, who died near Worton Station, March 30, was one of Worton's most honored and respected citizens. He was 76 years of age and since the death of his wife, which occurred in June of last year, he has been in failing health and expressed a desire to depart this life and be with his companion in a brighter world.

In early life he was thrown upon his own resources by the death of his parents and became an apprentice in Baltimore, where he served three years at carpentering; afterwards following the trade on the Eastern Shore, and today many buildings in this and adjoining counties stand as monuments of his industry and skill.

He afterwards conducted the wheelwright and blacksmith shops at Hanesville, often working several young men and doing the largest business ever before or since done at that place. In 1863, desiring to follow some business in which his children might engage, he began farming, which business he continued to follow until failing health on the part of himself and wife rendered it necessary for them to retire from the active duties of life. He sold his real estate and invested in securities. In business he was scrupulously honest, positively refusing to lend money above the legal rate of interest.

He leaves an estate amounting to about $30,000 which he accumulated by industry and economy. In politics he was a staunch Democrat, until 1879 when he was induced to lend his name as candidate for the sheriff's office on the reform democrat ticket with the understanding that his eldest son was to act as sheriff. Notwithstanding this fact his was one of the leading names on the ticket and in the third district, where he lived most of his life, he carried it by 120 majority, being the highest majority for a number of years. If he had entered politics in the party to which he had always been loyal with the vim and gush which was characteristic of him, undoubtedly he would have come to the front, but he never craved political honors but sought honor in the quiet life of an honest citizen.

In religion he was a Methodist. Though never connected with the church, yet he was a strict attendant upon its services and liberally contributed to its support. Such was his integrity and fidelity that he was often urged by the pastors to partake of the Lord's Supper, his life being such as to justify him in the act.

In his death the county sustains the loss of a good citizen, his acquaintance a warm friend and his children a lamented father. In laying him to rest one can find comfort only as did David of old in the knowledge that though he cannot return to us we can go to him. May we all so live that we may have that privilege is the desire of one who knew him as he was.

Monuments!

TOMBS, MARBLE POSTS, IRON RAILING, MARBLE CURBING,

—MANUFACTURED AT—

Chestertown Marble Works

A large finished stock of tombs to select from. Satisfaction guaranteed in every particular. All work set up and warranted.

a10-6t.* A. J. HYNSON.

TAX NOTICE.

All tax-payers of the FOURTH DISTRICT are notified that the taxes for 1889 are now over due and for 1888 are long in arrears. Settlements must be prompt. I will be at the Court House EVERY TUESDAY, and at home on SATURDAY.

d7-tf. H. M. STUART, Coll.

ADVERTISEMENT.

"LET US REASON TOGETHER."

The responsibility of saying whether our county shall have legalized taverns and saloons, or whether our present Local Option Law shall be retained, is laid upon the voters of the county by enactment of the late General Assembly of the State. The law is before the people, and the election therein ordered will be held on Saturday, May 10th, one week from today, between the hours of eight A. M. and six P. M. Have the citizens of the county considered the vast interests that are to be settled on that day? Have we permitted *ourselves to be deceived* by the idea that the license proposed is RESTRICTION? Can there be anything commendable in a law that defends that which is hurtful to the individual, to the family and to society? "IT CANNOT BE LEGALIZED WITHOUT SIN."

But "to the law and to the testimony." Let us take the law to pieces and look at its true inwardness. It means that in any cross-road village in this county there can be a place to sell intoxicating liquors, if any *man or woman, white or colored*, can gather up a few groceries, sufficient to constitute him or her a *store-keeper*, and will pay to the county the sum of two hundred and fifty dollars, in addition to the amount exacted for a regular trader's license, he or she can inflict upon that community the scourge of a groggery. The provision in the proposed law, that liquors in such places shall not be sold in less quantities than one pint, and that they shall not be drunk on the premises where purchased, is in no sense a guarantee against the broils and disturbances that accompany the saloon. The purchaser can drink it in the street or road, and outrage society with his drunkenness and brutishness, just as thoroughly as if he had drank it at the bar of the saloon. It is not "the baseless fabric of a dream" to assume that the fair domain of our county would soon be made ugly with such eruptions, the general peace of the community disturbed, pitfalls laid at the feet of the young, fathers now under restraint coaxed *from the vows they are trying to keep*, and innocent wives and children wrung with anguish.

Another feature of this saloon license is that it is transferable, just as a trader's license is transferable. With this feature of the law before us, what warrant have we that the transfer would not import vagabonds from communities where they could not get license in their own name, to outrage society *with revelry and bawdiness*? The law leaves an open door to such possibilities; and we ought to see that the door is shut with the slam of such majority as will keep it shut, by keeping the business under the ban of the law. As the EYES OF FACT see this matter, to vote for license is to wink at the nameless and *countless evils that always result from the* traffic. The business ALWAYS MEANS BLIGHT—BLIGHTED LIVES AND BLIGHTED HOMES. He that votes for license arrays himself with the man who petitions for the privilege of selling, and lends his influence (perhaps not always consciously) to the overthrow of the youth and manhood of our county; to break the peace of a neighbor's home, and break the heart of a neighbor's wife. It is giving your influence toward an evil, at the thought of which thousands of wives and mothers are sick with "hope deferred," when they look upon husbands trying to break the chains of habit, and upon sons in whom they had fixed fond hopes of integrity, honor and manliness.

But, you say "THE LAW IS VERY RESTRICTIVE." Yes, it has some restrictive features. But we must bear in mind the fact that the *restrictions of the law are the conception of the rum-power*; and that it is their policy to put on the garb of decency, in order to win the sympathy and patronage of the decent people. Satan knows his work can be best *done when he comes* as an angel of light. The cloven hoof is secluded by the shoe of decency, and the steel claw is covered with a velvet mitten. THE RESTRICTIONS IN THE LAW ARE NOT PUT THERE TO PROTECT THE PEOPLE, BUT TO WIN VOTES. THESE RESTRICTIONS HAVE THE ENDORSEMENT OF DISTILLERS, BREWERS, LIQUOR MEN AND SALOONIST EVERYWHERE, because they know it is necessary for them to flaunt their so-called restrictions, in order to obtain the smiles of the respectable. Do the restrictions against selling to minors protect your boy from the influence of the saloon that may be set up under *the very shadow of his home*? Suppose there is a restriction against selling to an intoxicated person? A man may not be noticeably drunk when asking for another drink; and yet THAT DRINK may be the one that crazes his brain, that flings him into the gutter, or sends him home, a curse and a shame to the innocent and helpless.

But again—a tavern or saloon, established under the license law now submitted to *the voters of the county, finds* entrenchment from which there is no deliverance through protest or remonstrance from the people, no matter how many people may make it. It may be to the disgust of an entire community to have a saloon in their midst, but the saloon once licensed and established, is not to be shaken off by protests or remonstrances by the people. No matter how great a pest-house the place may be; no matter how his plots may ensnare *the incautious*; *no matter what doors* are open to infamy and degradation; no matter whose children are ruined, nor whose hearts are broken, the community will have to endure the scourge.

Again: The provision by which the license-granting officer becomes a direct beneficiary from fees and commissions may prove a strong temptation for that official *to promote the securement of license upon* the part of any whom he may have power *to assist*. There ought not to be any possibility of profit to him, through temptation to collusion with seekers of license.

A word as to penalties for violation of the law.—First there must be indictment, then conviction, before punishment can be inflicted. With so much of our legal machinery run in the interests of the traffic, are indictments and convictions often possible? There are so many technical doors for violators to escape, that it is a rare thing to see the jail door open to the reception of a convicted rum-seller. Let him deny it who can.

Further—Will the tax-payer consent to foist upon his peace-loving neighbor this most hurtful and degrading law, upon the plea that it will reduce his taxes by a trifling amount? Will thinking, well-disposed men be bought to invade the rights of their fellows at such a low figure? Can we afford to build roads, bridges and school houses with tribute that bears the image and superscription of this king of terrors?

And yet again: And let it be well considered as a feature of the proposed law that will, if passed, afford squatters and peripatetic liquor venders a good opportunity to ply their trade. It is this: "*Licenses may be issued for a shorter period than one year upon the payment of a proportionate part of the license.*" This means that at every fishing shore during the fishing season; at every oystering rendezvous between September and April; at every agricultural fair; near every Methodist revival meeting; in any neighborhood during fruit shipping, or anywhere else where there is possible show for patronage, even for a few weeks, there may be a dram-shop, under the seal of the county; and who will say to the contrary?

Again. The wail of whiskey men that rent the air twelve years ago concerning the violent hands that Local option placed upon their property, cannot be raised in this campaign. There is no stock in trade now(?) upon which a vote for "no license" can lay violent hands. Nobody's property will be disturbed by defeating this proposed law.

O, men of Kent County, take no backward step in the matter of dram-selling. It is the evening of the 19th century. "Quit you like men." Go to your place of voting with a sense of right and justice; and let the hour of six o'clock P. M. that day record a majority "against license" that will confuse whiskey-dom, and gladden the homes that are now darkened, because of the peril in which they are placed.

By order of the Executive Committee against License. JAMES S. HARRIS,
1t.* Chairman Com. 3d Dist.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Appeal to Voters of Kent Irrespective of Party, to Consider the High License Law Dispassionately.

On Saturday, May 10th, the legally qualified voters of Kent county will decide by ballot whether the proposed high license law shall become operative or whether the present prohibitory law shall continue in force. There probably never was offered *to any people a more stringent license law* than the one proposed for this county. If this law should become operative liquor selling would be placed in the hands of *responsible and respectable people* as there is no probability that eight *freeholders in any* district would recommend any other than a proper person. Any man who pays three hundred dollars for the privilege of selling liquor in a community will not be likely to permit its being sold by other than licensed dealers.

The law, if it should become operative, would place in the county treasury probably three thousand dollars and leave in the county not over ten places, while at the present time *it is thought there is not far* short of a HUNDRED.

The grand jury that last sat in this county was as honest and conscientious as any heretofore known; four-fifths of them were strict temperance men. They found a number of bills against individuals and corporations. What was the result? Not *a single conviction; the only person* found guilty at all was a party who was indicted last October.

The grand jury sat six days costing Kent county about $400, while if it had not been for the violations of the local option law they could probably have gotten thro' in less than half the time.

The fact that there is less *open* drinking in the county than there was when liquor was sold under license is one of the standard *arguments of the prohibitionists.* If they would take the trouble to go to counties and cities where liquor is sold *openly, they would find that men don't get drunk* like they used to. Public opinion has forced the drunkard to the rear; his services are not needed in any business, and consequently he has ceased in a great degree to exist. Many temperance people say that wishing to protect their boys from temptation is the reason they will vote *against high license.* What temptation is it to a boy when he is not permitted to go where it is sold except with parent or guardian? *On the other hand what safeguard* has the boy when liquor is sold in secluded places by unscrupulous men who do not care how many of the youth of the country they destroy so long as they get their money. But, says the prohibitionist, we will enforce the law now on the books. What evidence have the citizens of this *county that they either will or can enforce* it? A tree is to be judged by its fruits. This law has been operative in Kent county over ten years and has not been enforced. Every session of the court shows more conclusively the impossibility of getting witnesses to convict men of illicit liquor selling. Many places are kept by non-residents who reap a rich harvest and at the first appearance of danger are among the missing.

This contest shows the curious sight of the temperance people and the illicit liquor sellers working hand in hand to defeat the nearest thing to a prohibitory law ever offered to the people of this county. Every vote cast by the violators of the local option law, and every vote they can influence, will on May 10th be cast against high license. Why should this not be the case? There is nothing unreasonable in the proposition, for as one dealer in that harmless *compound called pear cider remarked, he* would have to shut up shop if the bill was carried, and so would all the rest of them.

The idea is being industriously circulated among the colored people (we would be sorry to think by prohibition advocates) that they will not be able to get any liquor if high license passed, and consequently they are opposed to high license. If any of the opponents of high license will take the trouble to ask a few of their colored friends they will find this statement substantiated. It is hoped that every citizen of Kent county will carefully and dispassionately consider the matter, and that there will be enough votes for high license to give us an opportunity of testing a law that certainly will *control* the liquor traffic in a more satisfactory manner than a prohibitory law that does not prohibit. X.

A Large Invoice of

CYPRESS FENCING!

Cypress Fence Railing, 2x3 and 2x4

—SAWED—

CYPRESS SHINGLES

RIVED CYPRESS SHINGLES.

Just received direct from Roanoke River

FOR SALE at LOWEST MARKET RATES.

T. W. ELIASON, Jr.

Feb. 22, 1890.

—COUNTY COMMISSIONERS'—

Annual Notice

THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS of Kent County will meet at their office in Chestertown,

On TUESDAY, 4th day of March, 1890,

at 10½ o'clock A. M., and will continue to meet at the same place and hour

EVERY TUESDAY

Until the SIXTH day of MAY, next,

for the purpose of noting transfers and correcting assessments.

All persons who have sold or transferred any assessible property since their last sitting for said purpose, are particularly requested to attend at an early day to have their assessment corrected and adjusted.

After TUESDAY, 6th of May, next,

no ALTERATIONS or CORRECTIONS in the assessments will be made for the present year

All persons having ACCOUNTS against the county are requested to present the same on or before

TUESDAY, the 3d day of June, next,

otherwise they may be excluded from the levy this year. All accounts properly chargeable to the county are required to be made out in a clear manner and itemized and rendered under oath.

All applications for pensions must be made in writing, stating the condition and circumstances of the applicant, and vouched for by three or more freeholders having a knowledge of the facts therein set forth.

N. B.—All persons neglecting to have their assessments corrected are hereby notified that no allowance for taxes paid in error in consequence of such neglect will be made.

T. J. SHALLCROSS, PRES'T,
R. C. MORGAN,
GEO. W. RODENHISER,
JOHN A. GROVES,
JOHN DICKINSON,
COMMISSIONERS.

Attest:—T. W. RUSSELL, CLERK. fe22.

MEN'S RED and WHITE UNDERSHIRTS, Ladies' and Children's Merino Vests, all grades at lowest price. J. H. SIMPERS.

SHERIFF'S NOTICE

—OF—

ELECTION!

TO THE JUDGES OF ELECTION AND VOTERS OF KENT COUNTY:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN to the Judges of Election and Qualified Voters of Kent County, that in accordance withe the provisions of chapter 517 of the Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland, passed at its January Session, 1890, a copy of which Act, as required thereby, is appended to this notice, an election will be held on

SATURDAY, the 10th day of May, 1890

at the usual places of voting in the several election districts and precincts of said county, namely:

For District No. 1..............................at MASSEYS
For District No. 2.....................at KENNEDYVILLE
For District No. 3..........................at SMITHVILLE
For District No. 4, 1st precinct, at CHESTERTOWN
For District No. 4, 2d precinct..............at POMONA
For District No. 5...........................at EDESVILLE

and which said election is for the purpose of submitting to the qualified voters of Kent county whether or not any person or persons, house, company, association or body corporate, as in said act described, may be licensed in Kent county, of this State, by whom, or in which spirituous or fermented liquors or intoxicating drinks may be sold, or whether or not no license to sell the same in said county shall be issued as provided in the act above mentioned.

The polls will be opened at 8 o'clock A. M., and closed at 6 o'clock P. M.

The Returning Judges are required and directed to meet at the Court House in Chestertown, on Tuesday next after the election (May 13) to make thier return thereof to the Clerk of the Circuit Court for Kent county.

The following is the full text of the High License law, which the Sheriff is required to publish in connection with the notice of election.

THE HIGH LICENSE LAW.

CHAPTER 517.

AN ACT to enable the qualified voters of Kent county to determine by ballot, whether spirituous or fermented liquors shall not be sold in said county, or shall be sold only as hereinafter provided, and to repeal all acts inconsistent herewith.

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Maryland, That Article Fifteen of the Code of the Public Local Laws, title "Kent County," subtitle "Liquors and Intoxicating Drinks," shall not remain in force on and after the first day of June, Eighteen Hundred and Ninety, and that all acts, or part of acts, inconsistent with the provisions of this act, shall be repealed, after said last mentioned date, provided however that this act shall not be construed to repeal said Article Fifteen of the Code of Public Local Laws, title "Kent County," subtitle "Liquors and Intoxicating Drinks," prior to the First day of June, Eighteen Hundred and Ninety, or to effect any offence already committed, or which may be committed before this act shall take effect, but all such offences may be prosecuted and punished under the law existing at the time of the commission of said respective offences, and provided further, that if for any reason this act shall not take effect on the First day of June, Eighteen Hundred and Ninety, the said article fifteen of the Code of Public Local Laws, title "Kent County," subtitle "Liquors and Intoxicating Drinks," shall continue to remain in force until other laws shall be enacted in lieu thereof.

SEC. 2. And be it enacted, That the question whether or not any person, or persons, house, company, association of body corporate, as hereinafter described, may be licensed in Kent county, of this State, by whom, or in which spirituous or fermented liquor or intoxicating drinks may be sold, or whether or not no license to sell the same in the said county shall be issued, shall be submitted to the qualified voters of said county on Saturday, the Tenth day of May, eighteen hundred and ninety, and the sheriff of said county, shall, at least three weeks previous to said election, cause public notice to be given of the submission of said question by advertisement, set up at the most public places within each election district of said county, and also by advertisement in two newspapers of greatest circulation therein, which said advertisement shall contain a copy of this act, and of the time and place of holding the said election, and the cost of such advertisement and handbills shall be paid by the county commissioners of said conuty, but if for any cause said notice shall not be given, said failure shall not effect the validity of this act, or operate to prevent its taking effect.

SEC. 3. And be it enacted, That ballots cast at said election on the question of license or no license to be counted as deciding for or against the sale of spirituous or fermented liquors or intoxicating drinks in said county, shall have printed or written on them the words, For License, or Against License, and the votes cast for license and the votes cast against license shall be carefully counted by the judges of said election in the respective election districts of said county and the number of votes for license and the number of votes against license shall be certified by them, and the return judges of said election shall meet at the court-house on the Tuesday next after said election and cast up the whole vote for license and against license in said district, and shall make a separate written return of said whole vote to the clerk of the circuit court for Kent county, and said clerk shall record among the records of his office, and shall prepare a certificate proclaiming the result of such election in said county, and cause said certificate to be published within ten days after said returns have been received by him once in all the newspapers published in said county.

SEC. 4. And be it enacted, That if it shall appear by the returns of said judges and certificate of said clerk that a majority of said votes have been cast against license for the sale of spirituous or fermented liquors in Kent county, then, and in that event article fifteen of the Code of Public Local Laws, title "Kent county," subtitle "Liquors and Intoxicating Drinks," and all amendments or supplementary act thereto shall remain in full force and effect in said county.

SEC. 5. And be it enacted, That if it shall appear by the return of said judges and the certificate of said clerk that a majority of such votes have been cast for license for the sale of spirituous or fermented liquors in Kent county, then and in that event section one hundred and forty-eight, one hundred and forty-nine, one hundred and fifty and one hundred and fifty-one of article fifteen of the Code of Public Local Laws, title "Kent County," subtitle "Liquors and Intoxicating Drinks," be and the same is hereby repealed and the following sections enacted in lieu thereof, to be called one hundred and forty-eight, one hundred and forty nine, one hundred and fifty, one hundred and fifty-one, one hundred and fifty-one A, one hundred and fifty-one B, one hundred and fifty-one C, one hundred and fifty-one D, one hundred and fifty-one E one hundred and fifty-one F, one hundred and fifty-one G, one hundred and fifty-one H, one hundred and fifty-one I, one hundred and fifty-one K, one hundred and fifty-one L, one hundred and fifty-one M, one hundred and fifty-one N, one hundred and fifty-one O.

SEC. 148. No person in Kent county shall obtain a license for the sale or barter of spirituous or fermented liquors or intoxicating drinks of any kind, or in any quantity whatever, except such as shall be qualified as hereinafter provided.

149. Any person in Kent county who will keep a house for the reception of guests, or of permanent or transient boarders, containing at least five chambers more than are needed for his family purposes, and which said five or more chambers are used for the reception of guests or permanent or transient boarders, containing therein for use at all times at least six good beds with sufficient covering therefor, and having upon his premises a stable or stabling sufficient for the accommodation of six or more horses shall be deemed and considered to be a hotel keeper within the meaning of this act.

150. Any person in Kent county, whether a hotel keeper or not, desiring to take out a license under this act, may file a petition with the Clerk of the Circuit Court for Kent county setting forth that the applicant wishes to sell spirituous or fermented liquors, and shall describe therein the premises to be occupied by said applicant; and provided the said applicant shall file with petition a written certificate signed by eight freeholders, resident citizens within the limits of the town or of the election district wherein the said applicant desires to sell, setting forth their belief that the applicant for such license will keep an orderly house and duly observe all the provisions of this act; and each person signing said certificate shall make affidavit before said Clerk, or before a Justice of the Peace of said county, that he is the owner of real estate in the election district wherein he resides of the assessed value of at least five hundred dollars, and that he has not during the current year signed a certificate for any other person applying for license to sell spirituous or fermented liquors within said district; and said applicant, if for a hotel license, shall satisfy the said Clerk, by his own oath, and by the oath of two respectable and disinterested witnesses, of their belief therein, that he has bona fide and without intending to evade the spirit and meaning of this act, duly provided, and will maintain and keep for use at least five chambers more than are needed for private or family purposes of said hotel keeper, to be used for the reception of guests or permanent or transient boarders, and at least six beds with sufficient covering therefor, with stabling for at least six horses, all of said chambers and beds to be and remain on the said premises on which spirituous or fermented liquors is by this act licensed to be sold, and each and every applicant, whether a hotel keeper or not, shall file in the office of said Clerk a bond, duly executed to the State of Maryland, with at least two sureties to be approved by said Clerk, in the penal sum of one thousand dollars, conditioned for the faithful observance of the provisions of this act; and the payment of any and all fines, penalties and damages which may be imposed or recovered under this act, provided that each surety on said bond shall make affidavit before said Clerk, or before a Justice of the Peace of said county, that said surety is the owner in fee simple of unencumbered real estate in Kent county of the assessed value of at least one thousand dollars, and that said surety has not within the current year executed a bond for any other applicant to sell spirituous or fermented liquors in Kent county. The Clerk of the Circuit Court may, in his discretion, require such further and other proof by the written affidavit of other parties as to the sufficiency of said bond, as he may deem proper; and if said Clerk shall wilfully or negligently grant a license to any person who shall not have complied with the provisions of this act, said Clerk shall, upon indictment and conviction therefor, be fined not less than fifty nor more than three hundred dollars for each offense.

151. No license to sell spirituous or fermented liquors in Kent county shall be granted to any hotel keeper who shall have complied with the provisions of this act until such applicant, in addition to the sum or sums now required, or which hereafter may be required to be paid by the general license law of the State, shall also pay to said clerk the sum of three hundred dollars, to be paid to the county commissioners of Kent county by said clerk for the use of said county.

151 A. No license to sell spirituous or fermented liquors in Kent county shall be granted to any applicant other than a hotel keeper within the meaning of this act, who shall have complied with the provisions of this act, unless said applicant in addition to the sum or sums of money now required or that may hereafter be required to paid by the general license law of the State, shall also pay for a keeper of a resturant the sum of two hundred and fifty dollars, and for the keeper of a grocery to sell in unbroken packages or in quantities not less than one pint, and not to be drunk on the premises, the sum of two hundred and fifty dollars to be paid to said clerk, and by him paid to the county commissioners of Kent county for the use of said county.

151 B. All sums received by said clerk for license issued under this act shall be accounted for and paid over by said clerk to the County Commissioners of Kent county on the first day of March, June, September and December of each year, and the official bond of said Clerk shall be liable for all of said sums received for licenses issued under this Act; and said Clerk shall, in additionto fees now allowed by law, be entitled to receive the sum of one dollars for approving and filing the bond and other paper of applicants, and five per cent. commission on all sums paid by him to said County Commissioners under this Act, said fees and commissions to be paid by applicant for license without deduction from the sum to be paid to the county.

151 C. All licenses issued under this Act shall expire on the 1st day of May next thereafter, but licenses may be issued for a shorter period than one year upon the payment of a proportionate part of the license fee hereinbefore provided for; licenses issued under this Act shall be transferable as Traders' License now are under the general law of this State; provided that when any license under this act shall be granted or assigned to any minor or female, and provided that when any license granted under this act is assigned, the bonds of the assignor shall be liable for the act of the assignee as fully and to the same extent as said bond is liable for the acts of said assignor.

151 D. Any person who shall sell, directly or indirectly, at any place in Kent county any spirituous or fermented liquor or intoxicating drinks of any kind without first having obtained a license as required by this act, shall, upon indictment and conviction thereof, be fined not less than two hundred dollars nor more than five hundred dollars, and failing to pay such fine and cost of prosecution forthwith shall be sentenced to be confined in the Maryland House of Correction for a term of not less than six months nor more than one year.

151 E. No person obtaining a license under this act shall permit minors to enter the bar room or other place where liquor is sold, unless said minor is accompanied by the parent or guardian of such minor, nor shall any person obtaining a license under this act, his agents, servants or employees, sell, directly or indirectly, or give away at his, their or its place of business any spirituous or fermented liquors, alcoholic bitters, or intoxicating drinks of any kind whatsoever, to any minor, or to any person known to such vendor to be purchasing or receiving such liquors or intoxicating drinks as the agent of or on behalf of, or at the request of, any minor.

151 F. Any person who shall violate the provisions of the preceding section shall, upon indictment and conviction thereof, be fined not less than fifty dollars, nor more than five hundred dollars, or be imprisoned in the county jail for not less than thirty days nor more than six months, and the license of such person may be suppressed, in the discretion of the court.

151 G. No vendor of spirituous or fermented liquors licensed under this act shall sell, directly or indirectly, any spirituous or fermented liquor to any person who is intoxicated at the time, nor shall it be lawful for any such licensed vendor to keep open the room where spirituous or fermented liquors are sold between the hours of twelve o'clock at night and six o'clock in the morning, nor to sell, directly or indirectly, or give away in such room, or on or about the premises of such vendor, any spirituous or fermented liquor whatsoever between the hours aforesaid.

151 H. Any person violating the provisions of the preceding section shall, upon indictment and conviction thereof, be fined not less than twenty-five nor more than three hundred dollars, or be imprisoned in the county jail not less than thirty nor more than ninety days, at the discretion of the court.

151 I. Whenever any license shall be suppressed for any violation of this act it shall not be lawful for the Clerk of the Circuit Court for Kent county at any time to grant another license under this act to the person whose license has been suppressed, nor to grant a license to any other person to sell spirituous or fermented liquors upon the premises covered by the license suppressed, for the term of twelve months from the date of such suppression.

151 K. Any person who shall fraudulently procure a license as a hotel keeper without having complied in good faith with the provisions of this act defining hotel keepers, shall, upon indictment and conviction thereof, be fined not less than two hundred nor more than five hundred dollars; the license granted shall be suppressed by the court, and it shall be unlawful for the Clerk to issue any other license for the sale of spirituous or fermented liquors to such person.

151 L. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize any sale or barter or giving away of any spirituous or fermented liquor on the Sabbath day, commonly called Sunday, or on the day of election held in said county, under the constitution and laws of this State or of the United States.

151 M. On any prosecution under this act it shall only be necessary to state that the traverser did sell or give away spirituous or fermented liquors, without specifying the particular kind or quantity of liquor sold or given away.

151 N. All fines imposed and collected under this act shall be paid to the County Commissioners of Kent county for the use of said county.

151 O. All prosecutions for violations of any of the provisions of this act shall be upon presentment and indictment, and it shall be the duty of any Justice of the Peace for Kent county, upon information received and confirmed by the oath of a credible witness, to have any person arrested and committed to the county jail for a violation of the provisions of this act, unless such person shall give sufficient bail or recognizance with sureties to appear before the Circuit Court for Kent county at the next succeeding term thereof, to answer the charge.

SEC. 6. And be it enacted, That this act shall take effect from the date of its passage.

Approved April 8th, 1890.

ELIHU E. JACKSON, Governor.
JOHN HUBNER, Speaker House Delegates.
R. F. BRATTAN, President of the Senate.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a correct copy of an act of the General Assembly of Maryland passed at the January session, 1890.

apr12-5t. CARLTON SHAFER, Chief Clerk House of Delegates

SAMUEL COMEGYS,
April 19, 1890—te. Sheriff of Kent county

SPRING ARRANGEMENT.

TOLCHESTER LINE

On and after WEDNESDAY, March 5, 1890,

Steamer EMMA GILES!

will leave Tolchester Beach

EVERY WEDNESDAY at - 9 A. M. and 4.30 P. M.
Will leave Baltimore at - 7 A. M. and 2.30 P. M.

Freight received in Baltimore daily. For further particulars apply to

W. C. ELIASON, PRES'T,
Feb. 22, 1890. Pier 16, Light Street.

Chester River Steamboat Company.

CHANGE OF SCHEDULE.

MONDAY, MAR. 17, 1890.

Steamer EMMA A. FORD

Will leave Chestertown every Monday, Wednesday and Friday, at 8 A. M., stopping at Rolph's, Booker's, Quaker Neck, Eastern Neck, Queenstown, Kent Island and intermediate landings on Chester river.

RETURNING will leave Pier 7 Light Street Wharf at 11 A. M., alternate days.

Steamer GRATITUDE

of the Centreville and Corsica River Company will leave Centreville daily (except Sundays) at 7 A. M. on Corsica River, at Jackson's Creek and Rock Hall, M., and Baltimore at 2.30 P. M., stopping at landings going and returning. Leave Rock Hall at 9.30.

Fare $1 Round Trip.

The United States Express Company service on board both steamers, affording patrons an opportunity of making through shipments to all points in the United States without delay.

For the convenience of our patrons we have at Rock Hall landing ample accommodations for the care of teams.

March 15, 1890. GEORGE WARFIELD, PRESIDENT.

SASSAFRAS RIVER LINE!

On and after MONDAY, April 7th, 1890, the

"Steamer TOCKWOGH,"

Will leave Georgetown on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays at 7.30 and Buck Neck at 10.15 A. M.

Leave Pier 6, Light street, Baltimore, on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays at 10.30 A. M., stopping at all the landings on the route each way.

WILLIAM CUNDIFF,
April 5, 1890. Pier 6, Light Street Wharf.

Insurance!

FIRE, LIGHTNING AND LIFE!!

WM. H. McFEELY'S

AGENCY.

INSURE YOUR BUILDINGS

Against Fire and Lightning. Fires occur at unexpected moments, and a few dollars expended in Insurance furnishes very substantial assistance in event of loss.

INSURE YOUR LIVESTOCK

Against Lightning and Fire. Payment for same is promptly made, if killed on premises or anywhere else.

INSURE YOUR GRAIN

In the barn. The value of two bushels of wheat will protect $1,000 worth of grain for a month. Policies issued for from Two Weeks to Three Years at low rates.

INSURE YOUR LIFE

In the "New York Life," where you have the privilege of settling up your policy at the end of every five years, just as one's circumstances may demand.

WM. H. McFEELY,
Gen'l Ins. Agent, Chestertown, Md.
Office on Court street. jy9-tf.