

Tolchester Company.

FALL SCHEDULE (Weather Permitting).

SASSAFRAS RIVER LINE.

In effect October 5, 1908. Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays steamer will leave Fredericktown at 7 a. m.

PORT DEPOSIT LINE.

In effect October 5, 1908. Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays steamer will leave Baltimore at 2.45 p. m.

Maryland, Delaware & Virginia R. R. Co.

CHESTER RIVER LINE.

SCHEDULE.

In Effect August 31, 1908.

Steamer will leave Pier 7 Light St. Wharf, Baltimore, Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday, 11 a. m.

Returning steamer will leave Chestertown, Maryland, Monday, Wednesday and Friday at 8 o'clock a. m.

WILLARD THOMPSON, General Manager.

T. MURDOCH, General Passenger Agent.

Professional Cards.

S. SCOTT BECK, ATTORNEY-AT-LAW.

V. M. PEPPER CONSTABLE.

HARRISON W. VICKERS, JR., ATTORNEY-AT-LAW.

H. HERBERT E. PERKINS, ATTORNEY-AT-LAW.

DR. FRANK B. HINES, CHESTERTOWN, MD.

DR. R. J. E. GRAHAM, CHESTERTOWN, MD.

DR. CHAS. RICHARD TWILLEY, GRADUATE OF THE BALTIMORE COLLEGE OF DENTAL SURGERY.

DR. C. P. GILPIN, DENTIST.

DR. H. C. HUGHES, DENTIST.

W. T. HICKS, FUNERAL DIRECTOR AND EMBALMER.

W. T. HICKS, CHESTERTOWN, - MARYLAND.

Political Speaker Interrupted.

WINDSOR HOTEL.

PHILADELPHIA.

A Card.

DR. BULL'S COUGH SYRUP IS RELIABLE.

COMMISSION CARDS.

CONROY BROWN, E. S. STEUBS.

J. HARRY VICKERS WITH BROWN & STUBBS.

COMMISSION MERCHANTS.

R. GROVES WITH CLIFTON & WOODLAND CO.

COMMISSION MERCHANTS.

JAMES W. JEROME.

COMMISSION MERCHANTS.

STEVENS BROTHERS.

COMMISSION MERCHANTS.

R. A. BRICE & SON.

COMMISSION MERCHANT.

W. M. P. IRELAND.

COMMISSION MERCHANT.

J. E. HENDRICKSON & CO.

COMMISSION MERCHANTS.

HARRIS KAPLAN.

NEW HEADQUARTERS.

PAINT AND PAPER HOUSES.

WM. L. FOWLER.

CURES BLOOD, SKIN DISEASES.

ORDER NISI.

Auditor's Notice.

WILLIAM C. SUTTON.

SANITARY PLUMBING.

SHAKING DOWN THE TRUSTS.

Chas. G. Dawes Visits Wall Street and Promises Republican Party Will Be Good.

Under New York date line of Sept. 10 the daily papers from the country publish a dispatch from which the following is taken:

"The visit of Charles G. Dawes, of Chicago (formerly Controller of the Currency) had more influence than anything else in arousing Wall Street uneasiness.

Mr. Dawes came to New York primarily to raise money for the Republican congressional campaign committee, and he gave the people he called upon very clearly to understand that the Republican majority in the house is in danger.

"Wall street has steered itself against the importunities of political canvassers for funds, but Mr. Dawes' visit was unquestionably impressive.

The people who saw and heard him what he said when he announced that unless means were taken to arrest the current and change the situation the Democrats would swing into control of the popular branch of congress and probably elect a president.

Mr. Dawes did not confine his visit alone to bankers and financiers. He devoted a good share of his attention to leading representatives of the manufacturing interests. He carried away some money, but not nearly as much as he had hoped for."

Proof is inexhaustible that Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound carries women safely through the Change of Life.

Read the letter Mrs. E. Hanson, 304 E. Long St., Columbus, Ohio, writes to Mrs. Pinkham:

"I was passing through the Change of Life, and suffered from nervousness, headaches, and other annoying symptoms. My doctor told me that Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound was good for me, and since taking it I feel so much better, and I can again do my own work. I never forget to tell my friends what Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound did for me during this trying period."

FACTS FOR SICK WOMEN.

For thirty years Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound, made from roots and herbs, has been the standard remedy for female ills.

It has positively cured thousands of women who have been troubled with displacements, inflammation, ulceration, fibroid tumors, irregularities, periodic pains, backache, that bearing-down feeling, flatulency, indigestion, dizziness or nervous prostration.

Mrs. Pinkham invites all sick women to write her for advice. She has guided thousands to health. Address, Lynn, Mass.

Do You Want Tender Beef?

You can't expect to get it unless you deal with a butcher who handles nice cattle.

THE UP-TOWN BUTCHER, CHARLES W. COPPER.

Choice Steak, Roast.

Etc. Just give us a trial, or ask some of our customers. We will try to treat you so you will wait to deal with us always.

We also handle SALT MEATS.

CHARLES W. COPPER, The Up-Town Butcher.

Opposit: N. C. Crow.

Ratification Nisi.

John Clark, versus Nicolas Gann, et al.

In the Circuit Court for Kent County in Equity. No. 1631.

ORDERED, this 22nd day of September, 1908, by the Circuit Court for Kent County in Equity, that the Auditor's Account and Report, stated and reported by Lewis W. Wickes, Auditor, in the above entitled cause, be ratified and confirmed, unless cause to the contrary thereof be shown on or before the 10th day of October next.

True Copy—Test: JAMES T. DIXON, Clerk.

Ratification Nisi.

John Clark, versus Nicolas Gann, et al.

In the Circuit Court for Kent County in Equity. No. 1631.

ORDERED, this 22nd day of September, 1908, by the Circuit Court for Kent County in Equity, that the Auditor's Account and Report, stated and reported by Lewis W. Wickes, Auditor, in the above entitled cause, be ratified and confirmed, unless cause to the contrary thereof be shown on or before the 10th day of October next.

True Copy—Test: JAMES T. DIXON, Clerk.

Ratification Nisi.

William W. Beck, assignee, versus Herbert B. Simpson.

In the Circuit Court for Kent County in Equity. No. 1614.

ORDERED, this 28th day of October, 1908, by the Circuit Court for Kent County in Equity, that the Auditor's Account and Report, stated and reported by Lewis W. Wickes, Auditor, in the above entitled cause, be ratified and confirmed, unless cause to the contrary thereof be shown on or before the 2nd day of November next.

True Copy—Test: JAMES T. DIXON, Clerk.

Auditor's Notice.

Thomas B. Wilson versus Ezekiel Hagen and others.

In the Circuit Court for Kent County, Md., in equity. No. 1484.

THE creditors of Thomas B. Wilson, late of Kent county, deceased, and all other persons interested in the fund derived from the sale of the property sold in the above cause are hereby notified to file their claims with the Auditor of the Circuit Court for Kent county, Md., on or before the 30th day of December, 1908, otherwise they will be excluded from participating in the fund to be added in this cause.

By order of Court: WILLIAM W. BECK, Special Auditor.

Dr. Bull's Cough Syrup is reliable.

Why try a new medicine when this old reliable remedy can be had for 25 cents, all druggists.

EXTRAVAGANCE GALORE.

A Change Needed in Order to Get Down to an Economical Administration.

The federal administration last year spent \$54,000,000 more than it spent in the 1898 war.

"As in our private life so in our national finances, the year 1907 seems to have been one of exorbitant cost and expenditure.

The government statement at the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1908, shows a deficit of \$59,656,361 and the increased deficit in July and August amounting to \$28,728,000 brings the total deficit for the preceding four months up to \$88,384,361, with reduced revenues of \$85,000,000.

The government disbursement was \$29,552,124, being in excess of the revenues in any year except 1906 and 1907 and \$54,000,000 more than was spent in the year when we conducted the war against Spain and paid the expense of landing armies in Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands."

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

Having said who is NOT putting up the money, now let them tell us who IS putting it up, under oath. Will they do it?

The Republican national committee denies it has received this year a dollar from the Standard Oil company or any subsidiary corporation.

PROTECT DEPOSITS.

GUARANTEE PLANK ONE OF MR. BRYAN'S WINNING CARDS.

The Object Lesson in Oklahoma and Convincing Men that their Savings in Banks Should be Protected as Well as Government Deposits.

The Democratic National Platform favors guaranteed bank deposits; the Republican platform is silent on that subject.

Mr. Bryan heartily champions the plan; Mr. Taft is strongly opposed to it.

Mr. Taft and Guaranteed Deposits.

In his speech of acceptance Mr. Taft puts himself squarely on record as being opposed to guaranteed deposits.

He says: "The Democratic platform recommends a tax upon national banks and upon such state banks as may come in, in the nature of enforced insurance to be secured so that the Federal Government should be able to pay the depositors of any bank which fails. The proposal is wholly impracticable unless it is to be accompanied by a complete reorganization of our banking system, with a supervision as close as practically possible a government bank. If the proposal were adopted exactly as the Democratic platform suggests, it would bring the whole banking system of the country down in ruins."

Why seek to confuse the people on a simple proposition? We are supposed to have Government supervision of national banks now.

Supervision does not mean a government bank; it simply means that the national bank inspectors will do just as we are expected to do under existing law—make their examination of banks thorough and make prompt and effective correction of any irregularities discovered.

So it will be difficult to frighten the people by the claim that guaranteed deposits means thorough supervision of banks. That's just exactly what the people want.

It is absurd to say that guaranteed deposits would "bring the whole banking system of the country down to ruin."

What does "guaranteed deposits" mean? It means that the savings of the masses shall be secured so that when men and women deposit their hard-earned money in banking institutions, they need not worry for fear it will be lost through the recklessness and dishonesty of bank officials.

The Federal Government demands of these banks security for the money it deposits. As a rule state governments and county governments and municipal governments make similar requirements. But now that it is proposed that depositors generally shall have some such assurance for the safe keeping of their wealth, we are told by the Republican candidate for the Presidency that the adoption of such a plan "would bring the whole banking system of the country down to ruin."

Oklahoma's Object Lesson.

Oklahoma has the guaranteed deposit plan and the following Associated Press dispatch tells of its operation in the first bank failure since the law went into effect:

"Guthrie, Okla., May 21, 1908.—Within one hour from the time H. H. Smock, Oklahoma banking commissioner, had taken charge of the International Bank of Colgate he had authority to pay the depositors in full, though the bank's cash and available funds in other banks fell \$22,000 short of the total amount of deposits. The commissioner was enabled to do this under the operation of the new banking law, and this is the first time it has been called into use. Under the operation of the guaranty banking law of Oklahoma a tariff of 1 cent is levied upon the average annual deposits of the banks, and this money is used in payment in full of all depositors of an insolvent state bank, after the funds have been exhausted."

Will the Banks Answer This?

In addition to the arguments already presented in favor of the guaranty bank, the following is submitted:

The United States Government requires a deposit of specific security from its depositors in a national bank; the state also requires security for its deposits, why should not security be given to the depositor who cannot examine for himself and does not know anything about the bank's solvency or methods? And loss to the national government, to the state, to the county or to the city would be borne by all the people and thus be small upon each one, while the loss to the individual has to be borne entirely by himself and may wipe out his entire savings. Is not the argument stronger in favor of the protection of depositors than it is in favor of the protection of the nation, the state, the county or the city?

But the case is even stronger when the bank is required to put up specific security for the protection of national, state, county, or city deposits. Its pledged securities are thus hypothecated and the inferior securities are left for the security of the depositors.

CASTORIA For Infants and Children.

The Kind You Have Always Bought

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Beardsley & Co., Baltimore, Md.