

Kent News. THE ELECTION.

SAURDAY MORNING, Nov. 6, 1886.

The Result in Kent.

WORLDLY FINLEY be a powerful "unknown quantity" in the close house? But, fortunately for the House, he was not there.

In Washington democratic losses in Tuesday's election are attributed to lack of organization, apathy and the use of protection money. Senator Gorman says the Maryland campaign was well managed.

On L. VICTOR BROWN, the gallant young Western Maryland leader, fails to secure the Congressional prize, but his brilliant campaign added fresh laurels and added his political faith with assurance of highest honor.

The Baltimore Sun on the morning after the election contained full returns from every county and election district in the State, and so correct were these returns that in rare instances did it figure vary a particle from the official vote! Such remarkable correctness and expedition is worthy of note.

The Democratic of Queen Anne's have adopted the "Old Primary" plan for nominating candidates. We believe the Kent plan decidedly the better of the two, but hope our neighbors may give satisfaction in returning to "first thoughts." No plan is perfect, but it is not an give perfect satisfaction. Defeated candidates will always be found with ample "cause" for grievance and motive for "kicking."

One of the best results of the congressional campaign in Maryland is the defeat of Finley in the Fourth (Baltimore) district. It should be a lesson to him and others like him. Political parties can respect their own adversaries, but for traitors within the camp there is no mercy.

A Little Rest, Please!

Local politicians are already beginning to agitate the question of candidates for next year. All such agitation is certainly premature. Do give us a rest, please. Talk about next year's politics, or this year's thirty-cent corn-pone, even the bog clodders would be more profitable theme for discussion for the next six months, after we have fully settled the "issues" of this little year of contest.

"OFF YEAR" REVERSES.

From time immemorial the "off year" has been fraught with reverses for the party in control of the National administration. Well do we remember in years ago when the "unfettered" in the off year would sweep the country, but here would bound and our visions enlarge. We imagined it the forecast of more profitable Presidential contest soon to follow. But how sadly fallacious it always proved! The administration party would only beat at the worst for their reverse.

So, today, Republicans are counting their gains and predicting great things for the year in '88. Such hopes are vain. With wisdom—a common-sense platform and good candidate, Democratic success in '88 will be overwhelming.

The Next Congress.

The latest returns show that the Republicans made considerable gains in Tuesday's congressional elections. In Kentucky Speaker Carlisle is reported to have been defeated, though his friends still claim a majority for him, and two other Kentucky districts are reported to have been carried by the republicans. In Illinois W. R. Morrison has been defeated, and the returns show a total republican gain of four Congressmen in that State. In Indiana the republicans have gained three Congressmen, in Ohio five, in New York ten, in New Jersey one, in North Carolina two, in Iowa one, and two in Michigan. In Virginia the republicans elect six Congressmen, the democrats three and the labor party one. This is a gain of four or five for the republicans and a loss of five for the democrats. In West Virginia one democrat and one republican are elected across two districts, in doubt, though Flick, republican, is reported elected in the second district. In Pennsylvania the democrats have gained one, in Connecticut one, in Massachusetts two, in Minnesota three, in Nebraska one, in Tennessee one, and in South Carolina one. This would indicate a net republican gain of 15 or 16. It would require a net gain of twenty-three to give the republicans a majority in the next House. Below will be found a summary of the results in the several States:

DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS.

Alabama	8	Alabama	8
Arkansas	5	Arkansas	5
California	1	California	1
Colorado	2	Colorado	2
Connecticut	1	Connecticut	1
Delaware	1	Delaware	1
Florida	2	Florida	2
Georgia	10	Georgia	10
Illinois	10	Illinois	10
Indiana	9	Indiana	9
Iowa	3	Iowa	3
Kansas	4	Kansas	4
Kentucky	10	Kentucky	10
Maine	1	Maine	1
Massachusetts	3	Massachusetts	3
Michigan	2	Michigan	2
Minnesota	3	Minnesota	3
Mississippi	7	Mississippi	7
Montana	1	Montana	1
Nebraska	3	Nebraska	3
Nevada	1	Nevada	1
New Hampshire	0	New Hampshire	0
New Jersey	3	New Jersey	3
New York	10	New York	10
North Carolina	4	North Carolina	4
Ohio	11	Ohio	11
Oregon	1	Oregon	1
Pennsylvania	9	Pennsylvania	9
Rhode Island	0	Rhode Island	0
South Carolina	1	South Carolina	1
Tennessee	1	Tennessee	1
Texas	10	Texas	10
Vermont	1	Vermont	1
Virginia	6	Virginia	6
West Virginia	3	West Virginia	3
Wisconsin	4	Wisconsin	4

REPUBLICAN CONGRESS.

Alabama	8	Alabama	8
Arkansas	5	Arkansas	5
California	1	California	1
Colorado	2	Colorado	2
Connecticut	1	Connecticut	1
Delaware	1	Delaware	1
Florida	2	Florida	2
Georgia	10	Georgia	10
Illinois	10	Illinois	10
Indiana	9	Indiana	9
Iowa	3	Iowa	3
Kansas	4	Kansas	4
Kentucky	10	Kentucky	10
Maine	1	Maine	1
Massachusetts	3	Massachusetts	3
Michigan	2	Michigan	2
Minnesota	3	Minnesota	3
Mississippi	7	Mississippi	7
Montana	1	Montana	1
Nebraska	3	Nebraska	3
Nevada	1	Nevada	1
New Hampshire	0	New Hampshire	0
New Jersey	3	New Jersey	3
New York	10	New York	10
North Carolina	4	North Carolina	4
Ohio	11	Ohio	11
Oregon	1	Oregon	1
Pennsylvania	9	Pennsylvania	9
Rhode Island	0	Rhode Island	0
South Carolina	1	South Carolina	1
Tennessee	1	Tennessee	1
Texas	10	Texas	10
Vermont	1	Vermont	1
Virginia	6	Virginia	6
West Virginia	3	West Virginia	3
Wisconsin	4	Wisconsin	4

First Congressional District.

The following is the vote by counties in this congressional district, which is 5,310 less than that cast two years ago, when Gilson's majority over Boston was 2,985. It will be seen that the vote in this district was not as close as it was in 1884, but that the margin of the House of Delegates, the third highest in the number of votes polled:

Second Congressional District.

The following is the vote by counties in this congressional district, which is 5,310 less than that cast two years ago, when Gilson's majority over Boston was 2,985. It will be seen that the vote in this district was not as close as it was in 1884, but that the margin of the House of Delegates, the third highest in the number of votes polled:

Third Congressional District.

The following is the vote by counties in this congressional district, which is 5,310 less than that cast two years ago, when Gilson's majority over Boston was 2,985. It will be seen that the vote in this district was not as close as it was in 1884, but that the margin of the House of Delegates, the third highest in the number of votes polled:

Fourth Congressional District.

The following is the vote by counties in this congressional district, which is 5,310 less than that cast two years ago, when Gilson's majority over Boston was 2,985. It will be seen that the vote in this district was not as close as it was in 1884, but that the margin of the House of Delegates, the third highest in the number of votes polled:

Fifth Congressional District.

The following is the vote by counties in this congressional district, which is 5,310 less than that cast two years ago, when Gilson's majority over Boston was 2,985. It will be seen that the vote in this district was not as close as it was in 1884, but that the margin of the House of Delegates, the third highest in the number of votes polled:

Sixth Congressional District.

The following is the vote by counties in this congressional district, which is 5,310 less than that cast two years ago, when Gilson's majority over Boston was 2,985. It will be seen that the vote in this district was not as close as it was in 1884, but that the margin of the House of Delegates, the third highest in the number of votes polled:

Seventh Congressional District.

The following is the vote by counties in this congressional district, which is 5,310 less than that cast two years ago, when Gilson's majority over Boston was 2,985. It will be seen that the vote in this district was not as close as it was in 1884, but that the margin of the House of Delegates, the third highest in the number of votes polled:

Eighth Congressional District.

The following is the vote by counties in this congressional district, which is 5,310 less than that cast two years ago, when Gilson's majority over Boston was 2,985. It will be seen that the vote in this district was not as close as it was in 1884, but that the margin of the House of Delegates, the third highest in the number of votes polled:

Ninth Congressional District.

The following is the vote by counties in this congressional district, which is 5,310 less than that cast two years ago, when Gilson's majority over Boston was 2,985. It will be seen that the vote in this district was not as close as it was in 1884, but that the margin of the House of Delegates, the third highest in the number of votes polled:

Tenth Congressional District.

The following is the vote by counties in this congressional district, which is 5,310 less than that cast two years ago, when Gilson's majority over Boston was 2,985. It will be seen that the vote in this district was not as close as it was in 1884, but that the margin of the House of Delegates, the third highest in the number of votes polled:

Eleventh Congressional District.

The following is the vote by counties in this congressional district, which is 5,310 less than that cast two years ago, when Gilson's majority over Boston was 2,985. It will be seen that the vote in this district was not as close as it was in 1884, but that the margin of the House of Delegates, the third highest in the number of votes polled:

Twelfth Congressional District.

The following is the vote by counties in this congressional district, which is 5,310 less than that cast two years ago, when Gilson's majority over Boston was 2,985. It will be seen that the vote in this district was not as close as it was in 1884, but that the margin of the House of Delegates, the third highest in the number of votes polled:

Thirteenth Congressional District.

The following is the vote by counties in this congressional district, which is 5,310 less than that cast two years ago, when Gilson's majority over Boston was 2,985. It will be seen that the vote in this district was not as close as it was in 1884, but that the margin of the House of Delegates, the third highest in the number of votes polled:

Fourteenth Congressional District.

The following is the vote by counties in this congressional district, which is 5,310 less than that cast two years ago, when Gilson's majority over Boston was 2,985. It will be seen that the vote in this district was not as close as it was in 1884, but that the margin of the House of Delegates, the third highest in the number of votes polled:

Fifteenth Congressional District.

The following is the vote by counties in this congressional district, which is 5,310 less than that cast two years ago, when Gilson's majority over Boston was 2,985. It will be seen that the vote in this district was not as close as it was in 1884, but that the margin of the House of Delegates, the third highest in the number of votes polled:

Sixteenth Congressional District.

The following is the vote by counties in this congressional district, which is 5,310 less than that cast two years ago, when Gilson's majority over Boston was 2,985. It will be seen that the vote in this district was not as close as it was in 1884, but that the margin of the House of Delegates, the third highest in the number of votes polled:

THE TOTAL VOTE in Baltimore city was 47,275, and the democratic majority over all opposition was 13,275. The total vote in 1884, the total vote of the city was 63,335, and the democratic majority of Cleveland over all was 2,312. The total vote of the city in 1884 was 62,418, and the democratic majority was 5,550. In Cecil county the liquor question created most interest, but the congressional contest. The amended prohibition law was adopted by 213 majority.

A SMALL DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY BUT A HEAVY RESERVE—SOME INTERESTING FIGURES.

The election in Kent last Tuesday was one of the quietest ever known. At all the voting places there was an entire absence of excitement and no disorder of any kind that we have heard of. In the morning the polls were opened at 10 o'clock, and the indication of the leaders to make estimates of results before the day of election proved to have been well founded. There is no good reason why voters should not come out and express their choice in an "off year" when candidates for Congress alone are in the field, but they will not do it nevertheless, and especially in this case when the result can be so certainly forecast as in this Congressional district.

The democrats anticipated a majority in the county against them because of the short vote, well knowing the fact that the opposition party is composed in very large degree of an element that is sure to be at the polls whether the contest be for officers many or few. These anticipations were realized in the presence as usual of the colored voter at every poll, but the county was won for all that, though it was by a very close margin.

The prohibition vote for St. Johns in 1884 was as follows: First district, G; second, 16; third, 5; fourth, 1st precinct 11; 2nd precinct 3; fifth, 7—total 48. This year there is an increase in the prohibition vote in each district, and judging from those cast in the fourth, they are drawn about equally from the two old parties.

The following figures will be found interesting:

Kent County Overall						
DISTRICTS	1st.	2d.	3d.	4th.	5th.	Total.
Census	270	320	240	310	340	1710
Gilson, D.	340	320	238	311	301	1710
Melson, P.	23	15	14	11	7	70
Gilson's majority over Hudson, S.	317	305	224	299	293	1544

For convenience in comparing the vote cast on Tuesday, with the vote cast last year, we give the vote of 1885 for the State ticket and county clerk:

DISTRICTS						
1st.	2d.	3d.	4th.	5th.	Total.	
Comptroller	416	397	330	376	410	2329
Turner	421	383	324	383	443	2354
Clerk	1037	778	613	760	297	2685
Check	587	385	384	619	521	2310
Sparks	447	393	280	378	193	1491
Total	1024	778	614	759	297	2685

The total registration in the county for 1886 is as follows:

DISTRICTS					
1st.	2d.	3d.	4th.	5th.	Total.
White	2802	2802	2802	2802	11208
Colored	180	180	180	180	720
Total	2982	2982	2982	2982	11928

The total registration in the county for 1885 was as follows:

DISTRICTS					
1st.	2d.	3d.	4th.	5th.	Total.
White	2802	2802	2802	2802	11208
Colored	180	180	180	180	720
Total	2982	2982	2982	2982	11928

The total registration in the county for 1884 was as follows:

DISTRICTS					
1st.	2d.	3d.	4th.	5th.	Total.
White	2802	2802	2802	2802	11208
Colored	180	180	180	180	720
Total	2982	2982	2982	2982	11928

The total registration in the county for 1883 was as follows:

DISTRICTS					
1st.	2d.	3d.	4th.	5th.	Total.
White	2802	2802	2802	2802	11208
Colored	180	180	180	180	720
Total	2982	2982	2982	2982	11928

The total registration in the county for 1882 was as follows:

DISTRICTS					
1st.	2d.	3d.	4th.	5th.	Total.
White	2802	2802	2802	2802	11208
Colored	180	180	180	180	720
Total	2982	2982	2982	2982	11928

The total registration in the county for 1881 was as follows:

DISTRICTS					
1st.	2d.	3d.	4th.	5th.	Total.
White	2802	2802	2802	2802	11208
Colored	180	180	180	180	720
Total	2982	2982	2982	2982	11928

The total registration in the county for 1880 was as follows:

DISTRICTS					
1st.	2d.	3d.	4th.	5th.	Total.
White	2802	2802	2802	2802	11208
Colored	180	180	180	180	720
Total	2982	2982	2982	2982	11928

The total registration in the county for 1879 was as follows:

DISTRICTS					
1st.	2d.	3d.	4th.	5th.	Total.
White	2802	2802	2802	2802	11208
Colored	180	180	180	180	720
Total	2982	2982	2982	2982	11928

The total registration in the county for 1878 was as follows:

DISTRICTS					
1st.	2d.	3d.	4th.	5th.	Total.
White	2802	2802	2802	2802	11208
Colored	180	180	180	180	720
Total	2982	2982	2982	2982	11928

The total registration in the county for 1877 was as follows:

DISTRICTS					
1st.	2d.	3d.	4th.	5th.	Total.
White	2802	2802	2802	2802	11208
Colored	180	180	180	180	720
Total	2982	2982	2982	2982	11928

The total registration in the county for 1876 was as follows:

DISTRICTS					
1st.	2d.	3d.	4th.	5th.	Total.
White	2802	2802	2802	2802	11208
Colored	180	180	180	180	720
Total	2982	2982	2982	2982	11928

The total registration in the county for 1875 was as follows:

DISTRICTS					
1st.	2d.	3d.	4th.	5th.	Total.
White	2802	2802	2802	2802	11208
Colored	180	180	180	180	720
Total	2982	2982	2982	2982	11928

The total registration in the county for 1874 was as follows:

DISTRICTS					
1st.	2d.	3d.	4th.	5th.	Total.
White	2802	2802	2802	2802	11208
Colored	180	180	180	180	720
Total	2982	2982	2982	2982	11928

MRS. WASHINGTON, National Organizer, will lecture at the M. E. Church, Chestertown, on THURSDAY EVENING, Nov. 11, at 7 o'clock. The public are invited to attend.

NOTICE—Members of the Kent County Agricultural Association are requested to meet at the Club Room, Weston Station, Monday, November 16th, at 2 o'clock, p. m. WM. P. NORRIS, Pres., HENRY T. MASSEY, Sec'y.

NOTICE—All persons are hereby warned against trespassing with dog, gun or otherwise on the farm of the undersigned in Still Pond, Kent county, Md. W. B. TURNER, Nov. 6, 1886—31.

NOTICE—All persons are hereby cautioned against trespassing with dog, gun or otherwise on the farm of the undersigned in Still Pond, Kent county, Md. W. B. TURNER, Nov. 6, 1886—31.

NOTICE—All persons are hereby cautioned against trespassing with dog, gun or otherwise on the farm of the undersigned in Still Pond, Kent county, Md. W. B. TURNER, Nov. 6, 1886—31.

NOTICE—All persons are hereby cautioned against trespassing with dog, gun or otherwise on the farm of the undersigned in Still Pond, Kent county, Md. W. B. TURNER, Nov. 6, 1886—31.

NOTICE—All persons are hereby cautioned against trespassing with dog, gun or otherwise on the farm of the undersigned in Still Pond, Kent county, Md. W. B. TURNER, Nov. 6, 1886—31.

NOTICE—All persons are hereby cautioned against trespassing with dog, gun or otherwise on the farm of the undersigned in Still Pond, Kent county, Md. W. B. TURNER, Nov. 6, 1886—31.

NOTICE—All persons are hereby cautioned against trespassing with dog, gun or otherwise on the farm of the undersigned in Still Pond, Kent county, Md. W. B. TURNER, Nov. 6, 1886—31.

NOTICE—All persons are hereby cautioned against trespassing with dog, gun or otherwise on the farm of the undersigned in Still Pond, Kent county, Md. W. B. TURNER, Nov. 6, 1886—31.

NOTICE—All persons are hereby cautioned against trespassing with dog, gun or otherwise on the farm of the undersigned in Still Pond, Kent county, Md. W. B. TURNER, Nov. 6, 1886—31.

NOTICE—All persons are hereby cautioned against trespassing with dog, gun or otherwise on the farm of the undersigned in Still Pond, Kent county, Md. W. B. TURNER, Nov. 6, 1886—31.

NOTICE—All persons are hereby cautioned against trespassing with dog, gun or otherwise on the farm of the undersigned in Still Pond, Kent county, Md. W. B. TURNER, Nov. 6, 1886—31.

NOTICE—All persons are hereby cautioned against trespassing with dog, gun or otherwise on the farm of the undersigned in Still Pond